# Oil-Spill Response Technician

**GExperts Learning Academy | TV-051 | TV | 3 months**

## Course overview

3 months TV programme focused on Oil-Spill Response Technician, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Designed for: Learners appropriate to the stated programme level

## Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Oil-Spill Response Technician.
- 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=TV-051

## 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: Oil spill prevention and response awareness

## Learning objectives

- Explain oil spill prevention and response awareness, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

## Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil spill prevention and response awareness
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil-Spill Response Technician

## Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Spill prevention addresses containment, transfer interfaces, equipment integrity and human actions. Response aims to protect people, prioritise receptors and use suitable tactics under authorised command. Response options depend on oil, weather and access.

Decision logic. Teach notification and planning through tabletop cases. Equipment presence alone does not establish readiness. Actual deployment, dispersant use and marine operations require competent teams and applicable approvals. This course does not confer an external response qualification.

Worked example. A hose leak occurs during a fictional transfer; wind and current threaten a sensitive receptor.

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 first-response decision log without activating real equipment.

Model answer guide. Prioritise safety, source control within authority, notification, verified information and coordinated response.

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

## Applied activity

Prepare a first-response decision log without activating real equipment.

## 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: Shoreline protection and recovery

## Learning objectives

- Explain shoreline protection and recovery, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

## Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Shoreline protection and recovery
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil-Spill Response Technician

## Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Shoreline response depends on substrate, access, ecological sensitivity, oil condition and public safety. Intervention can itself cause damage. Explain survey, prioritisation, waste handling and recovery endpoints conceptually.

Decision logic. Choose tactics through authorised environmental and operational review. Avoid assuming the most aggressive cleanup is best. Define evidence for completion and monitoring rather than promising restoration by a fixed date. No unsupervised shoreline deployment is included.

Worked example. A fragile fictional wetland may be harmed by heavy vehicles even when access would speed cleanup.

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. Compare protection and cleanup options and list tradeoffs.

Model answer guide. Include secondary damage, access, responder safety, waste and agreed endpoints.

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

## Applied activity

Compare protection and cleanup options and list tradeoffs.

## 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: Oil-Spill Response Technician: Systems and Interfaces

## Learning objectives

- Explain oil-spill response technician: systems and interfaces, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

## Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil-Spill Response Technician: Systems and Interfaces
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil-Spill Response Technician

## Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil-Spill Response Technician: Systems and Interfaces describes a practical part of Oil-Spill Response Technician. 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 oil-spill response technician: systems and interfaces. 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 oil-spill response technician: systems and interfaces 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 oil-spill response technician: systems and interfaces: 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 oil-spill response technician: systems and interfaces: 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 4: Oil-Spill Response Technician: Evidence and Decision Gates

## Learning objectives

- Explain oil-spill response technician: evidence and decision gates, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

## Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil-Spill Response Technician: Evidence and Decision Gates
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil-Spill Response Technician

## Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil-Spill Response Technician: Evidence and Decision Gates describes a practical part of Oil-Spill Response Technician. 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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: Oil-Spill Response Technician: Work Planning

## Learning objectives

- Explain oil-spill response technician: work planning, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

## Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil-Spill Response Technician: Work Planning
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil-Spill Response Technician

## Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil-Spill Response Technician: Work Planning describes a practical part of Oil-Spill Response Technician. 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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: Oil-Spill Response Technician: Data and Performance

## Learning objectives

- Explain oil-spill response technician: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

## Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil-Spill Response Technician: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil-Spill Response Technician

## Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil-Spill Response Technician: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Oil-Spill Response Technician. 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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: Oil-Spill Response Technician: Applied Case

## Learning objectives

- Explain oil-spill response technician: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

## Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil-Spill Response Technician: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil-Spill Response Technician

## Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil-Spill Response Technician: Applied Case describes a practical part of Oil-Spill Response Technician. 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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: Oil-Spill Response Technician: Communication and Escalation

## Learning objectives

- Explain oil-spill response technician: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

## Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil-Spill Response Technician: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil-Spill Response Technician

## Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil-Spill Response Technician: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Oil-Spill Response Technician. 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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: Oil-Spill Response Technician: Knowledge Check

## Learning objectives

- Explain oil-spill response technician: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

## Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil-Spill Response Technician: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil-Spill Response Technician

## Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil-Spill Response Technician: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Oil-Spill Response Technician. 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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: Oil-Spill Response Technician: Competence Review

## Learning objectives

- Explain oil-spill response technician: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

## Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil-Spill Response Technician: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil-Spill Response Technician

## Detailed teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil-Spill Response Technician: Competence Review describes a practical part of Oil-Spill Response Technician. 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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 oil-spill response technician: 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.