Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance

GExperts Learning Academy | PC-X25 | PC | 12-18 weeks

Course overview

12-18 weeks PC programme focused on Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Designed for: Experienced professionals

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance.
- Interpret an applied case using evidence and stated assumptions.
- Identify risks, safeguards, role boundaries and escalation points.
- Prepare a clear recommendation for a multidisciplinary audience.

Course guide

Work through each module objective, lesson and teaching note, complete the applied activity and assessment, then use the separate Academy practice page for practice questions and answer feedback.

Separate practice questions:
https://www.globalexpertsconsultoria.com/training/academy/courses/questions/?course=PC-X25

Academic and certification status

Draft learning resource for study and review. It does not confer accreditation, external certification, a regulated qualification, professional licence, safety-critical competence or site authorisation. Confirm approvals, current laws, standards, approved procedures and awarding-body requirements before delivery.

Module 1: Project initiation and governance

Learning objectives

- Explain project initiation and governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Project initiation and governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. A project charter defines purpose, intended benefits, scope boundary, sponsor, authority and success criteria. Distinguish a project output from the benefit it enables. Governance establishes who approves funding, change and acceptance at each stage.

Decision logic. Test alignment with business need and implementation capacity before detailed planning. Record assumptions and dependencies. A charter should identify exclusions and decision rights rather than promising guaranteed results. Benefits need an owner beyond project handover.

Worked example. A fictional project delivers a warehouse system; the intended benefit is reduced picking errors, which must be measured separately.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Write a one-page charter with benefits, authority and evidence of success.

Model answer guide. Include sponsor, measurable outcomes, scope, constraints, assumptions and acceptance owner.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Write a one-page charter with benefits, authority and evidence of success.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 2: Scope and work breakdown structures

Learning objectives

- Explain scope and work breakdown structures, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Scope and work breakdown structures
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Scope defines required outputs and boundaries. A WBS decomposes deliverables into manageable work packages; a dictionary clarifies content, exclusions and acceptance. Activities are derived from scope rather than substituted for it.

Decision logic. Trace requirements to deliverables and verification. Check for omissions, overlap and owner interfaces. Scope changes should assess cost, schedule, risk and benefits before approval. A detailed WBS is useful only when it supports responsibility and control.

Worked example. Two teams both assume the other supplies offshore installation support.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Build a WBS and dictionary entry resolving the missing interface.

Model answer guide. Assign the deliverable, acceptance evidence, owner and boundary explicitly.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Build a WBS and dictionary entry resolving the missing interface.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 3: Risk assessment and uncertainty management

Learning objectives

- Explain risk assessment and uncertainty management, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Risk assessment and uncertainty management
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Define the activity and potential harm, identify hazards, evaluate existing controls, then decide further controls and ownership. A risk matrix supports prioritisation but does not prove a risk is tolerable. Include affected people and changing conditions.

Decision logic. Test whether controls are present and effective. Residual risk should be reassessed after control implementation, not merely after a promise. Escalate high-consequence uncertainty for competent review. Project risk also includes schedule, cost and opportunity effects.

Worked example. A permit lists a barrier that has not yet been installed. The claimed residual risk is premature.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Complete a risk register with cause, event, consequence, control, owner and verification.

Model answer guide. Keep hazard and consequence distinct and require evidence before taking control credit.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Complete a risk register with cause, event, consequence, control, owner and verification.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 4: Project quality and acceptance

Learning objectives

- Explain project quality and acceptance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Project quality and acceptance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Quality planning defines requirements, methods and evidence for conformance. Assurance evaluates the system; control checks outputs. Inspection and test plans use hold and witness points appropriate to consequence and scope.

Decision logic. Trace requirements through supplier records, fabrication, testing and handover. A test result must identify what was tested and against which criterion. Do not invent acceptance limits from generic training notes. Nonconformities require controlled disposition.

Worked example. A certificate reports a successful test but omits item identification and the acceptance basis.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Review the fictional dossier and write a nonconformity and closure requirement.

Model answer guide. Require traceable identity, approved criteria, valid method and authorised disposition.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Review the fictional dossier and write a nonconformity and closure requirement.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 5: Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance: Work Planning

Learning objectives

- Explain project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: work planning, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance: Work Planning
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance: Work Planning describes a practical part of Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance. Learners connect the principles to asset performance, people, operational risk, project value and local context.

Decision logic. Review the objective, evidence, limits, interfaces and applicable controls for project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: work planning. Decisions require current information, role-appropriate authority, competent review and documented assumptions.

Worked example. Use an applied Namibia-relevant case in which a team plans project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: work planning while balancing safety, integrity, schedule, cost, environmental protection and local capability.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Prepare a decision brief for project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: work planning: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Model answer guide. A sound response defines scope; uses current, traceable evidence; applies approved requirements and controls; records assumptions; assigns competent owners; checks interfaces; and communicates a measurable decision with an escalation path.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Prepare a decision brief for project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: work planning: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 6: CAPEX OPEX and estimating

Learning objectives

- Explain capex opex and estimating, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of CAPEX OPEX and estimating
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Capital estimates cover assets and development; operating estimates cover recurring delivery and support activities. Define scope, price basis, location, currency, schedule and exclusions before estimating. A number without its basis is difficult to review.

Decision logic. Use analogous, parametric and bottom-up methods according to data maturity. Separate base estimate, identified risk contingency and other reserves under the adopted governance. Avoid implying that contingency is spare money for scope additions.

Worked example. A fictional equipment package is 10 million and installation is estimated at 40% of equipment cost; subtotal is 14 million before other scope.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Write an estimate basis and identify five excluded cost items.

Model answer guide. Include logistics, commissioning, taxes, spares and owner costs where appropriate; state assumptions rather than silently adding them.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Write an estimate basis and identify five excluded cost items.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 7: Planning scheduling and critical path

Learning objectives

- Explain planning scheduling and critical path, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Planning scheduling and critical path
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. A schedule links activities through dependencies, durations, calendars and resources. Critical path identifies the longest duration path under the model's assumptions. Float is a calculated property, not spare time owned automatically by one team.

Decision logic. Validate logic before trusting dates. Resource constraints and uncertain weather windows can change the critical path. Compression may add cost or risk. State assumptions and update from actual progress rather than forcing the plan to match a desired date.

Worked example. Path A takes 3 plus 4 days; parallel path B takes 5 days. The simplified project duration is 7 days.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Calculate duration after A's first task increases to 5 days.

Model answer guide. The A path becomes 9 days; assess downstream effects and valid recovery choices.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Calculate duration after A's first task increases to 5 days.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 8: Stakeholder engagement and communication

Learning objectives

- Explain stakeholder engagement and communication, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Stakeholder engagement and communication
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Stakeholders can affect or be affected by a project. Analyse interests, influence, exposure and communication needs. Consultation is a continuing process, not simply sending information. Include groups with high impact exposure but limited formal power.

Decision logic. Choose accessible channels and record concerns, responses and decisions. Avoid assuming silence equals consent. Communication plans should define purpose, owner, timing, feedback and confidentiality. Actual commitments need delegated authority.

Worked example. A fictional port project consults officials but overlooks fishers whose access may change.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Develop an engagement plan and grievance-response route.

Model answer guide. Include affected groups, accessible formats, response tracking and boundaries on commitments.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Develop an engagement plan and grievance-response route.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 9: Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance: Knowledge Ch

Learning objectives

- Explain project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance. Learners connect the principles to asset performance, people, operational risk, project value and local context.

Decision logic. Review the objective, evidence, limits, interfaces and applicable controls for project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: knowledge check. Decisions require current information, role-appropriate authority, competent review and documented assumptions.

Worked example. Use an applied Namibia-relevant case in which a team plans project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: knowledge check while balancing safety, integrity, schedule, cost, environmental protection and local capability.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Prepare a decision brief for project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: knowledge check: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Model answer guide. A sound response defines scope; uses current, traceable evidence; applies approved requirements and controls; records assumptions; assigns competent owners; checks interfaces; and communicates a measurable decision with an escalation path.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Prepare a decision brief for project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: knowledge check: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Module 10: Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance: Competence R

Learning objectives

- Explain project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance: Competence Review describes a practical part of Project Risk, Assurance and Portfolio Governance. Learners connect the principles to asset performance, people, operational risk, project value and local context.

Decision logic. Review the objective, evidence, limits, interfaces and applicable controls for project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: competence review. Decisions require current information, role-appropriate authority, competent review and documented assumptions.

Worked example. Use an applied Namibia-relevant case in which a team plans project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: competence review while balancing safety, integrity, schedule, cost, environmental protection and local capability.

Facilitator prompts. Ask learners to distinguish verified facts from assumptions, identify who has decision authority, name stop-work triggers and state what evidence could change their recommendation. Compare technical, HSE, commercial and community perspectives.

Activity. Prepare a decision brief for project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: competence review: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Model answer guide. A sound response defines scope; uses current, traceable evidence; applies approved requirements and controls; records assumptions; assigns competent owners; checks interfaces; and communicates a measurable decision with an escalation path.

Assessment evidence. Score accuracy (30%), use of evidence (20%), safeguards (20%), analysis (20%) and communication (10%).

Applied activity

Prepare a decision brief for project risk, assurance and portfolio governance: competence review: scope, evidence, assumptions, hazards, safeguards, owner, decision gate and escalation trigger.

Assessment

Formative: 10-question practice quiz with answer feedback

Summative: Applied decision brief or practical case assessed against the rubric; proposed pass mark 70%, subject to academic approval.

Practice

Use the separate Academy practice questions and answer key page for this module.

Facilitator close-out and resources

Facilitator close-out

Record attendance, assessment evidence, learner support needs, incidents and improvement actions according to approved provider processes. Do not sign learners off for regulated or safety-critical work without the authorised assessment and certification route.

Resources and references

- Supplied GExperts/IUM reference materials; verify reuse rights and currentness.
- Current applicable Namibian legislation, standards and approved site procedures supplied by the provider.
- Case worksheet and instructor slides must be produced and reviewed before course release.