Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination

GExperts Learning Academy | SC-X10 | SC | 1-3 days

Course overview

1-3 days SC programme focused on Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Designed for: New entrants and cross-sector professionals

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination.
- 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=SC-X10

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: Offshore hazards and safe working

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore hazards and safe working, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore hazards and safe working
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Hazards include moving machinery, hydrocarbons, pressure, electricity, weather, dropped objects and human exposure. Risk depends on likelihood and consequence in a defined task. Hazard recognition is the beginning of control, not permission to work.

Decision logic. Use elimination, substitution and engineered controls before relying only on procedures or PPE. Include manual handling and hazardous substances from the IMIST source themes. Train learners to stop and escalate unsafe conditions and remain within their authority.

Worked example. A walkway crosses a lifting zone. A helmet alone does not remove dropped-load exposure.

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. Identify five hazards in a fictional deck layout and propose controls in hierarchy order.

Model answer guide. Prefer segregation or changed routing over PPE alone; identify responsible verification.

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

Applied activity

Identify five hazards in a fictional deck layout and propose controls in hierarchy order.

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: Permit to work isolation and SIMOPS

Learning objectives

- Explain permit to work isolation and simops, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Permit to work isolation and SIMOPS
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. A permit coordinates specified work within defined conditions and time. It complements risk assessment, isolation, competence and supervision. SIMOPS review considers interactions between tasks that may be safe individually but unsafe together.

Decision logic. Walk through planning, authorisation, briefing, verification, suspension and handback conceptually. A signature does not establish a safe condition. Changes in scope, personnel or environment require review under the site system. Never reuse a classroom permit as operational authorisation.

Worked example. Hot work and a nearby hydrocarbon transfer are proposed concurrently. Their interaction needs coordinated review.

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 two fictional permits and identify interface conflicts and suspension triggers.

Model answer guide. Include shared hazards, isolation boundaries, authority, communication and revalidation after change.

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

Applied activity

Review two fictional permits and identify interface conflicts and suspension triggers.

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: Process safety fundamentals

Learning objectives

- Explain process safety fundamentals, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Process safety fundamentals
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Process safety prevents major loss-of-containment and energy-release events. Personal injury rates do not measure every major-accident risk. Explain hazard, initiating event, preventive barriers, mitigative barriers and consequences using a bowtie.

Decision logic. Assess barrier performance standards, degradation and independent assurance. HAZID, HAZOP and other reviews have different purposes and need competent facilitation. Do not call a classroom checklist a certified safety study. Track temporary changes and overdue critical actions.

Worked example. An asset reports no slips but has several overdue safety-critical tests; major-accident assurance remains weak.

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 bowtie for a fictional separator loss of containment.

Model answer guide. Separate prevention and mitigation and assign barrier evidence, owner and degradation response.

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

Applied activity

Build a bowtie for a fictional separator loss of containment.

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: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Evidence and Decision

Learning objectives

- Explain contractor hse and simops coordination: evidence and decision gates, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Evidence and Decision Gates
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Evidence and Decision Gates describes a practical part of Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination. 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: evidence and decision gates. 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: evidence and decision gates 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: evidence and decision gates: 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: evidence and decision gates: 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 5: Human factors and safe teamwork

Learning objectives

- Explain human factors and safe teamwork, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Human factors and safe teamwork
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Human performance is influenced by fatigue, workload, design, communication and organisational pressure. Errors are not explained adequately by blaming an individual. Teach clear handover, challenge, confirmation and usable procedures.

Decision logic. Identify conditions that make error likely and improve the system. A worker should be able to raise concerns without retaliation. Discuss language and comprehension checks, especially where teams have different experience levels. Avoid presenting awareness as immunity from error.

Worked example. A night-shift handover omits an isolation limitation because both workers assume the other knows.

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. Redesign the handover and role-play a closed-loop confirmation.

Model answer guide. Include critical status, restrictions, pending actions and acknowledgement, supported by a usable record.

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

Applied activity

Redesign the handover and role-play a closed-loop confirmation.

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: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain contractor hse and simops coordination: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination. 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: data and performance. 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: data and performance 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: data and performance: 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: data and performance: 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 7: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain contractor hse and simops coordination: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Applied Case describes a practical part of Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination. 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: applied case. 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: applied case 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: applied case: 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: applied case: 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 8: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Communication and Es

Learning objectives

- Explain contractor hse and simops coordination: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination. 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: communication and escalation. 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: communication and escalation 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: communication and escalation: 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: communication and escalation: 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 9: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain contractor hse and simops coordination: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination. 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: 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: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain contractor hse and simops coordination: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination

Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination: Competence Review describes a practical part of Contractor HSE and SIMOPS Coordination. 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: 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 contractor hse and simops coordination: 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.