GExperts Learning Academy

Executive Programmes

Executive-programme study and facilitator manual

32 courses | 10 modules per course | 10 practice questions per module

Study resource and facilitator reference

Draft content for learning and review. Course pages on the Academy website contain interactive module navigation and answer reveals. This resource does not confer an accredited qualification or external certification. Verify laws, standards, site procedures and awarding-body requirements before delivery.

Contents and use

Use the module objectives, lessons, teaching notes and activities to guide facilitated study. Learners should attempt the practice questions before checking the answer key at the end of each module.

EX-064 | Orange Basin Executive Masterclass

Level: EX | Duration: 2 days | Audience: Learners appropriate to the stated programme level

2 days EX programme focused on Orange Basin Executive Masterclass, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Orange Basin Executive Masterclass.
- 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.

Module 1: Appraisal to production decision gates

Learning objectives

- Explain appraisal to production decision gates, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Appraisal to production decision gates
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Teach five instructional gates: opportunity screening, concept selection, definition, execution and operations readiness. Gate names vary by company. Each gate needs a decision owner, minimum evidence, uncertainty range and documented conditions. Distinguish a gate decision from routine progress reporting.

Decision logic. Appraisal can change the resource range or reveal poor productivity. Sanction requires technical maturity and commercial confidence; execution still faces schedule and integration risk. Put unknowns in an evidence register with owner and due date, rather than quietly turning assumptions into facts.

Worked example. A concept looks profitable but lacks a credible export route. The review can defer sanction while route studies proceed.

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 gate checklist for a fictional Namibian deepwater development.

Model answer guide. Include reservoir, cost, export, HSE, permits and financing evidence, with conditional decisions where evidence is insufficient.

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

Activity

Build a gate checklist for a fictional Namibian deepwater development.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of appraisal to production decision gates?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about appraisal to production decision gates?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about appraisal to production decision gates be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating appraisal to production decision gates?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in appraisal to production decision gates?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning appraisal to production decision gates?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for appraisal to production decision gates. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on appraisal to production decision gates contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about appraisal to production decision gates?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in appraisal to production decision gates?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Deepwater development concept selection

Learning objectives

- Explain deepwater development concept selection, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Deepwater development concept selection
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Compare subsea tieback, standalone floating production and shore-linked concepts against reservoir, metocean, water depth, distance and product requirements. A concept is an integrated system of wells, facilities, export and support infrastructure. Show the interfaces before scoring alternatives.

Decision logic. Apply mandatory constraints before weighted scoring. Document weighting, uncertainty and options that fail a hard requirement. Lowest capital cost may increase operating risk or reduce recovery. Revisit selection when appraisal or market evidence changes.

Worked example. Concept A costs less initially but cannot accommodate the high gas case; Concept B has expansion capacity.

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 concept matrix with technical, commercial, environmental and local-capability criteria.

Model answer guide. Reject infeasible options before ranking and include lifecycle cost, flexibility and uncertainty.

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

Activity

Prepare a concept matrix with technical, commercial, environmental and local-capability criteria.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of deepwater development concept selection?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about deepwater development concept selection?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about deepwater development concept selection be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating deepwater development concept selection?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in deepwater development concept selection?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning deepwater development concept selection?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for deepwater development concept selection. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on deepwater development concept selection contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about deepwater development concept selection?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in deepwater development concept selection?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Petroleum economics overview

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum economics overview, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum economics overview
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Economics translates technical scenarios into cash-flow consequences. Define decision alternatives and the perspective first, then estimate volume, timing, realised prices, costs, fiscal payments and closure. Compare value, affordability and exposure together.

Decision logic. Use transparent assumptions with units and source dates. A model's arithmetic can be correct while its development assumptions are implausible. Separate geological uncertainty, engineering uncertainty and market risk, and show which could reverse the decision.

Worked example. Two fictional projects have equal undiscounted cash surplus but one receives cash five years later.

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. Explain which may have greater present value and what additional information is required.

Model answer guide. Earlier comparable cash usually has greater present value at positive discount rates; require timing and risk details.

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

Activity

Explain which may have greater present value and what additional information is required.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum economics overview?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum economics overview?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum economics overview be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum economics overview?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum economics overview?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum economics overview?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum economics overview. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum economics overview contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum economics overview?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum economics overview?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Royalties taxes and government take

Learning objectives

- Explain royalties taxes and government take, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Royalties taxes and government take
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Fiscal systems allocate project value between investors and the state through mechanisms such as royalties, taxes, bonuses or contractual sharing. Compare mechanisms conceptually. Do not assume a production-sharing system applies to Namibia or import tax rates from another jurisdiction.

Decision logic. Model the actual legal and contractual hierarchy only after specialist verification. Government take depends on timing, cost recovery, deductions and price as well as headline rates. Keep illustrative fiscal cases visibly separate from current law.

Worked example. In a fictional classroom system, 5% royalty on USD 100 revenue is USD 5. This assumption is not a statement of Namibian law.

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 a gross-revenue royalty with a profit-based levy using two cost scenarios.

Model answer guide. Royalty remains linked to gross revenue while profit-based payments change with allowed costs; note legal definitions matter.

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

Activity

Compare a gross-revenue royalty with a profit-based levy using two cost scenarios.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of royalties taxes and government take?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about royalties taxes and government take?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about royalties taxes and government take be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating royalties taxes and government take?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in royalties taxes and government take?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning royalties taxes and government take?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for royalties taxes and government take. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on royalties taxes and government take contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about royalties taxes and government take?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in royalties taxes and government take?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Local content and national value

Learning objectives

- Explain local content and national value, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local content and national value
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local content can include employment, skills, supplier participation and durable industrial capability. Distinguish domestic ownership, local expenditure and actual value retained locally. A purchase from a locally registered importer may contain little domestic production.

Decision logic. Measure outcomes with a defined boundary, baseline and evidence. Avoid assuming a proposed policy target is current law. Supplier development must protect quality and safety while building realistic capacity and fair access.

Worked example. A fictional USD 1 million local invoice contains USD 850,000 imported equipment and USD 150,000 local services.

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 the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

Model answer guide. Fifteen percent in this simplified boundary; employment, skills and retained value need separate evidence.

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

Activity

Calculate the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content and national value?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content and national value?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content and national value be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content and national value?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content and national value?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content and national value?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content and national value. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content and national value contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content and national value?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content and national value?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain orange basin executive masterclass: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Orange Basin Executive Masterclass. 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for orange basin executive masterclass: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of orange basin executive masterclass: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about orange basin executive masterclass: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about orange basin executive masterclass: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating orange basin executive masterclass: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in orange basin executive masterclass: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning orange basin executive masterclass: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for orange basin executive masterclass: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on orange basin executive masterclass: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about orange basin executive masterclass: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in orange basin executive masterclass: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain orange basin executive masterclass: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Applied Case describes a practical part of Orange Basin Executive Masterclass. 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for orange basin executive masterclass: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of orange basin executive masterclass: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about orange basin executive masterclass: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about orange basin executive masterclass: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating orange basin executive masterclass: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in orange basin executive masterclass: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning orange basin executive masterclass: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for orange basin executive masterclass: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on orange basin executive masterclass: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about orange basin executive masterclass: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in orange basin executive masterclass: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain orange basin executive masterclass: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Orange Basin Executive Masterclass. 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for orange basin executive masterclass: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of orange basin executive masterclass: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about orange basin executive masterclass: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about orange basin executive masterclass: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating orange basin executive masterclass: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in orange basin executive masterclass: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning orange basin executive masterclass: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for orange basin executive masterclass: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on orange basin executive masterclass: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about orange basin executive masterclass: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in orange basin executive masterclass: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain orange basin executive masterclass: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Orange Basin Executive Masterclass. 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for orange basin executive masterclass: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of orange basin executive masterclass: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about orange basin executive masterclass: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about orange basin executive masterclass: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating orange basin executive masterclass: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in orange basin executive masterclass: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning orange basin executive masterclass: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for orange basin executive masterclass: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on orange basin executive masterclass: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about orange basin executive masterclass: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in orange basin executive masterclass: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain orange basin executive masterclass: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Orange Basin Executive Masterclass

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Orange Basin Executive Masterclass: Competence Review describes a practical part of Orange Basin Executive Masterclass. 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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 orange basin executive masterclass: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for orange basin executive masterclass: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of orange basin executive masterclass: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about orange basin executive masterclass: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about orange basin executive masterclass: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating orange basin executive masterclass: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in orange basin executive masterclass: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning orange basin executive masterclass: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for orange basin executive masterclass: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on orange basin executive masterclass: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about orange basin executive masterclass: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in orange basin executive masterclass: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-065 | Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy

Level: EX | Duration: 3 days | Audience: Learners appropriate to the stated programme level

3 days EX programme focused on Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy.
- 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.

Module 1: Petroleum policy and institutional governance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy and institutional governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum policy and institutional governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Policy sets objectives, institutions assign authority, and governance creates accountability for decisions and resources. Explain government, regulator and state enterprise roles conceptually without asserting an unverified current Namibian structure.

Decision logic. Separate commercial participation from regulatory judgement and manage conflicts transparently. Define decision rights, disclosure, assurance and challenge. A strong governance design includes implementation capacity and an audit trail, not just an organisation chart.

Worked example. A fictional institution both promotes investment and evaluates its own project compliance, creating a conflict to manage.

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. Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

Model answer guide. Identify segregated decisions, independent review, declarations and public accountability where applicable.

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

Activity

Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy and institutional governance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy and institutional governance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy and institutional governance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Licensing and acreage management

Learning objectives

- Explain licensing and acreage management, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Licensing and acreage management
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Licences define rights and obligations within specified areas and periods. Work commitments, reporting, transfers and relinquishment may be governed by the applicable framework. Explain the difference between holding acreage and receiving all approvals to develop or operate.

Decision logic. Assess technical capability, beneficial ownership, financial capacity and compliance evidence within lawful processes. Keep commercial attractiveness separate from eligibility. Do not invent bid-round dates, licence terms or regulator powers for Namibia.

Worked example. A fictional explorer holds an exploration right but has not secured approval for a later development activity.

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 an approval dependency map and identify verification questions.

Model answer guide. Separate rights, environmental approvals, development decisions and operational consents; verify each duty.

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

Activity

Build an approval dependency map and identify verification questions.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of licensing and acreage management?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about licensing and acreage management?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about licensing and acreage management be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating licensing and acreage management?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in licensing and acreage management?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning licensing and acreage management?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for licensing and acreage management. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on licensing and acreage management contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about licensing and acreage management?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in licensing and acreage management?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Revenue stewardship and intergenerational value

Learning objectives

- Explain revenue stewardship and intergenerational value, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Revenue stewardship and intergenerational value
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum revenue can be volatile, delayed and uncertain. Budget planning should distinguish gross project sales from actual public receipts. Discuss stabilisation, saving, expenditure quality and transparency as policy design choices rather than prescribed legal arrangements.

Decision logic. Stress test revenue forecasts against price, timing, cost and production changes. Evaluate who bears downside risk and how public commitments are funded before revenues arrive. Governance and oversight are as important as the name of a fund.

Worked example. A fictional budget assumes 100 revenue units, but delayed startup reduces receipts to 20 in the planned year.

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 a downside budget scenario and two safeguards against premature commitments.

Model answer guide. Include conservative planning, contingent commitments, transparent reporting and defined oversight.

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

Activity

Develop a downside budget scenario and two safeguards against premature commitments.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about revenue stewardship and intergenerational value be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for revenue stewardship and intergenerational value. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on revenue stewardship and intergenerational value contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Environmental legal register and compliance

Learning objectives

- Explain environmental legal register and compliance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Environmental legal register and compliance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Environmental duties can arise across assessment, permits, operating conditions, waste, monitoring and closure. Identify the activity, receptor and obligation before choosing evidence. A permit application is different from an issued approval.

Decision logic. Build a current obligations register verified against official instruments and site-specific conditions. Do not import foreign discharge limits as local law. Compliance monitoring should record accountable owners, exceedances, corrective action and reporting requirements.

Worked example. A project has an assessment report but no verified record of the required approval decision.

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 a fictional compliance register and classify missing evidence.

Model answer guide. Flag unverified approvals and conditions; do not mark compliant merely because a study exists.

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

Activity

Review a fictional compliance register and classify missing evidence.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of environmental legal register and compliance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about environmental legal register and compliance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about environmental legal register and compliance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating environmental legal register and compliance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in environmental legal register and compliance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning environmental legal register and compliance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for environmental legal register and compliance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on environmental legal register and compliance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about environmental legal register and compliance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in environmental legal register and compliance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Local content and national value

Learning objectives

- Explain local content and national value, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local content and national value
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local content can include employment, skills, supplier participation and durable industrial capability. Distinguish domestic ownership, local expenditure and actual value retained locally. A purchase from a locally registered importer may contain little domestic production.

Decision logic. Measure outcomes with a defined boundary, baseline and evidence. Avoid assuming a proposed policy target is current law. Supplier development must protect quality and safety while building realistic capacity and fair access.

Worked example. A fictional USD 1 million local invoice contains USD 850,000 imported equipment and USD 150,000 local services.

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 the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

Model answer guide. Fifteen percent in this simplified boundary; employment, skills and retained value need separate evidence.

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

Activity

Calculate the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content and national value?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content and national value?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content and national value be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content and national value?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content and national value?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content and national value?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content and national value. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content and national value contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content and national value?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content and national value?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy. 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Applied Case describes a practical part of Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy. 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy. 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy. 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy: Competence Review describes a practical part of Petroleum Policy, Governance and National Strategy. 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy, governance and national strategy: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-066 | Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation

Level: EX | Duration: 3 days | Audience: Learners appropriate to the stated programme level

3 days EX programme focused on Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation.
- 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.

Module 1: Production sharing and service contracts

Learning objectives

- Explain production sharing and service contracts, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Production sharing and service contracts
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. A production-sharing arrangement typically allocates production through contract mechanisms, while service contracts compensate specified services. Concessions use a different rights and fiscal structure. These are comparative models, not interchangeable labels or claims about Namibia.

Decision logic. Explain cost eligibility, recovery limits, sharing and audit conceptually. Contract economics depends on detailed definitions, valuation and timing. Have learners compare two explicitly fictional structures without implying their terms apply to an actual licence.

Worked example. In a fictional PSA, 100 units remain after royalty; eligible recovery of 40 leaves 60 for contractual sharing.

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 the split at a stated fictional 50:50 profit share.

Model answer guide. Each party receives 30 profit units; cost recovery and royalty are separate flows under this simplified example.

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

Activity

Calculate the split at a stated fictional 50:50 profit share.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of production sharing and service contracts?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about production sharing and service contracts?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about production sharing and service contracts be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating production sharing and service contracts?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in production sharing and service contracts?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning production sharing and service contracts?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for production sharing and service contracts. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on production sharing and service contracts contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about production sharing and service contracts?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in production sharing and service contracts?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Royalties taxes and government take

Learning objectives

- Explain royalties taxes and government take, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Royalties taxes and government take
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Fiscal systems allocate project value between investors and the state through mechanisms such as royalties, taxes, bonuses or contractual sharing. Compare mechanisms conceptually. Do not assume a production-sharing system applies to Namibia or import tax rates from another jurisdiction.

Decision logic. Model the actual legal and contractual hierarchy only after specialist verification. Government take depends on timing, cost recovery, deductions and price as well as headline rates. Keep illustrative fiscal cases visibly separate from current law.

Worked example. In a fictional classroom system, 5% royalty on USD 100 revenue is USD 5. This assumption is not a statement of Namibian law.

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 a gross-revenue royalty with a profit-based levy using two cost scenarios.

Model answer guide. Royalty remains linked to gross revenue while profit-based payments change with allowed costs; note legal definitions matter.

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

Activity

Compare a gross-revenue royalty with a profit-based levy using two cost scenarios.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of royalties taxes and government take?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about royalties taxes and government take?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about royalties taxes and government take be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating royalties taxes and government take?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in royalties taxes and government take?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning royalties taxes and government take?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for royalties taxes and government take. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on royalties taxes and government take contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about royalties taxes and government take?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in royalties taxes and government take?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: NPV IRR and payback

Learning objectives

- Explain npv irr and payback, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of NPV IRR and payback
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Net present value discounts dated cash flows at a stated rate. Internal rate of return is a rate making NPV zero and may be ambiguous for unusual cash-flow patterns. Payback measures recovery timing and ignores some value effects.

Decision logic. Compare projects using consistent perspective, currency and risk assumptions. NPV scale and capital constraints matter; ranking by IRR alone can mislead. Real cash flows require a compatible real discount rate and nominal flows a compatible nominal rate.

Worked example. Minus 100 now and plus 121 after two years has zero NPV at 10% because 121 divided by 1.1 squared equals 100.

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 NPV at 5% and explain why the result changes.

Model answer guide. NPV is about 9.75; a lower discount rate increases the present value of the future receipt.

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

Activity

Calculate NPV at 5% and explain why the result changes.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of npv irr and payback?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about npv irr and payback?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about npv irr and payback be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating npv irr and payback?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in npv irr and payback?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning npv irr and payback?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for npv irr and payback. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on npv irr and payback contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about npv irr and payback?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in npv irr and payback?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Sensitivity and scenario analysis

Learning objectives

- Explain sensitivity and scenario analysis, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Sensitivity and scenario analysis
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Sensitivity changes one input to understand model response; scenarios change coherent sets of assumptions. A tornado chart ranks tested effects, not the probability of events. Distinguish uncertainty ranges from forecasts and assigned probabilities.

Decision logic. Check dependencies: schedule delay may increase cost and defer revenue together. A correlated downside should not be represented as independent optimistic inputs. Identify decision-changing variables and the evidence that could narrow them.

Worked example. Price down 20% and CAPEX up 20% are separate sensitivities; combined delay, inflation and low price is a downside scenario.

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 sensitivity table and one coherent downside scenario.

Model answer guide. Preserve the base case, document changed inputs, and explain causal links in the combined case.

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

Activity

Prepare a sensitivity table and one coherent downside scenario.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about sensitivity and scenario analysis be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for sensitivity and scenario analysis. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on sensitivity and scenario analysis contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Dispute prevention and resolution

Learning objectives

- Explain dispute prevention and resolution, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Dispute prevention and resolution
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Disputes often begin with ambiguity, undocumented change or inconsistent expectations. Teach contemporaneous records, issue escalation and contractual notice awareness. Separate technical disagreement from entitlement and relationship management.

Decision logic. Map negotiation, mediation, expert determination, arbitration or litigation only as options governed by actual agreements and law. Protect privileged or sensitive information and obtain legal advice where needed. Never invent notice periods or enforceability claims.

Worked example. A contractor requests extra payment for changed access conditions but the instructions and impact records are incomplete.

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. Assemble an issue chronology and identify evidence gaps.

Model answer guide. Separate established facts, disputed facts, contract questions and commercial options.

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

Activity

Assemble an issue chronology and identify evidence gaps.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of dispute prevention and resolution?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about dispute prevention and resolution?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about dispute prevention and resolution be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating dispute prevention and resolution?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in dispute prevention and resolution?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning dispute prevention and resolution?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for dispute prevention and resolution. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on dispute prevention and resolution contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about dispute prevention and resolution?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in dispute prevention and resolution?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Contract negotiation simulation

Learning objectives

- Explain contract negotiation simulation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contract negotiation simulation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Negotiation preparation identifies objectives, alternatives, authority and acceptable tradeoffs. Separate positions from underlying interests. Technical and fiscal terms interact with schedule, investment and risk; avoid negotiating a headline number in isolation.

Decision logic. Use a mandate sheet and issue log. Teams cannot commit outside delegated authority. Explore package trades, test downside consequences and record unresolved points before drafting. This role-play creates no actual offer, agreement or legal advice.

Worked example. The fictional state team values training commitments while an investor values schedule certainty; both need measurable and feasible terms.

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. Run a three-round negotiation and submit an unsigned term sheet plus risk commentary.

Model answer guide. Credit quantified commitments, authority checks, alternatives, clear conditions and documented unresolved issues.

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

Activity

Run a three-round negotiation and submit an unsigned term sheet plus risk commentary.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of contract negotiation simulation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about contract negotiation simulation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about contract negotiation simulation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating contract negotiation simulation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in contract negotiation simulation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning contract negotiation simulation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for contract negotiation simulation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on contract negotiation simulation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about contract negotiation simulation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in contract negotiation simulation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation: Applied Case describes a practical part of Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation. 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 petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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 petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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 petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation. 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 petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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 petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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 petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation. 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 petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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 petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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 petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation: Competence Review describes a practical part of Petroleum Fiscal Systems and Contract Negotiation. 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 petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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 petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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 petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum fiscal systems and contract negotiation: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-067 | Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers

Level: EX | Duration: 3 days | Audience: Learners appropriate to the stated programme level

3 days EX programme focused on Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers.
- 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.

Module 1: 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: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of capex opex and estimating?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about capex opex and estimating?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about capex opex and estimating be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating capex opex and estimating?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in capex opex and estimating?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning capex opex and estimating?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for capex opex and estimating. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on capex opex and estimating contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about capex opex and estimating?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in capex opex and estimating?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Production profiles and sales revenue

Learning objectives

- Explain production profiles and sales revenue, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Production profiles and sales revenue
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Revenue depends on saleable volume, realised price, quality adjustments and contractual timing. Production at the reservoir is not identical to metered sales. Separate losses, own use, inventories and transfer points.

Decision logic. Keep price and production scenarios consistent with capacity and availability. Define whether prices are real or nominal and how exchange rates apply. Do not insert present market prices without a dated source; use synthetic classroom values.

Worked example. Fictional annual sales of 1 million barrels at USD 70/barrel produce USD 70 million gross revenue before adjustments.

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. Recalculate with 10% lower sales volume and a USD 3 quality discount.

Model answer guide. 0.9 million times 67 equals USD 60.3 million; explain both volume and price effects.

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

Activity

Recalculate with 10% lower sales volume and a USD 3 quality discount.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of production profiles and sales revenue?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about production profiles and sales revenue?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about production profiles and sales revenue be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating production profiles and sales revenue?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in production profiles and sales revenue?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning production profiles and sales revenue?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for production profiles and sales revenue. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on production profiles and sales revenue contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about production profiles and sales revenue?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in production profiles and sales revenue?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: NPV IRR and payback

Learning objectives

- Explain npv irr and payback, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of NPV IRR and payback
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Net present value discounts dated cash flows at a stated rate. Internal rate of return is a rate making NPV zero and may be ambiguous for unusual cash-flow patterns. Payback measures recovery timing and ignores some value effects.

Decision logic. Compare projects using consistent perspective, currency and risk assumptions. NPV scale and capital constraints matter; ranking by IRR alone can mislead. Real cash flows require a compatible real discount rate and nominal flows a compatible nominal rate.

Worked example. Minus 100 now and plus 121 after two years has zero NPV at 10% because 121 divided by 1.1 squared equals 100.

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 NPV at 5% and explain why the result changes.

Model answer guide. NPV is about 9.75; a lower discount rate increases the present value of the future receipt.

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

Activity

Calculate NPV at 5% and explain why the result changes.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of npv irr and payback?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about npv irr and payback?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about npv irr and payback be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating npv irr and payback?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in npv irr and payback?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning npv irr and payback?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for npv irr and payback. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on npv irr and payback contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about npv irr and payback?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in npv irr and payback?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Breakeven price analysis

Learning objectives

- Explain breakeven price analysis, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Breakeven price analysis
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Breakeven price is the price satisfying a defined value condition, such as NPV zero at a chosen discount rate. It depends on production, cost, timing and fiscal assumptions. State whether the measure is project, operating or equity breakeven.

Decision logic. Use a controlled price iteration with a checked model. Include closure and relevant fiscal effects. A single breakeven number hides uncertainty and cannot substitute for a full investment assessment. Compare delay and cost escalation cases.

Worked example. With no discounting or fiscal effects, total cost 60 million divided by sales 1 million barrels gives USD 60/barrel breakeven.

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. Repeat for 0.8 million barrels and explain the sensitivity.

Model answer guide. USD 75/barrel under the simplified assumptions; lower volume spreads cost across fewer barrels.

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

Activity

Repeat for 0.8 million barrels and explain the sensitivity.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of breakeven price analysis?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about breakeven price analysis?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about breakeven price analysis be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating breakeven price analysis?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in breakeven price analysis?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning breakeven price analysis?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for breakeven price analysis. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on breakeven price analysis contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about breakeven price analysis?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in breakeven price analysis?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Risked value and decision trees

Learning objectives

- Explain risked value and decision trees, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Risked value and decision trees
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Expected monetary value weights defined outcomes by probabilities that sum to one. It supports comparisons but does not capture every strategic, distributional or catastrophic consequence. Teach chance nodes separately from decision nodes.

Decision logic. Value of information depends on whether new evidence can improve a decision. An expensive study has little decision value if the same choice follows every possible result. Explain probability calibration and dependencies before presenting a precise number.

Worked example. Success gives plus 200 with probability 0.3 and failure minus 50 with probability 0.7; EMV is 25 in the same money units.

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. Draw the tree and compare with a certain value of 20, noting risk preferences.

Model answer guide. EMV favours 25 versus 20, but downside exposure and constraints may change the choice.

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

Activity

Draw the tree and compare with a certain value of 20, noting risk preferences.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of risked value and decision trees?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about risked value and decision trees?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about risked value and decision trees be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating risked value and decision trees?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in risked value and decision trees?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning risked value and decision trees?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for risked value and decision trees. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on risked value and decision trees contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about risked value and decision trees?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in risked value and decision trees?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers. 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Applied Case describes a practical part of Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers. 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers. 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers. 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers: Competence Review describes a practical part of Oil and Gas Project Economics for Decision-Makers. 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in oil and gas project economics for decision-makers: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-068 | Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation

Level: EX | Duration: 2 days | Audience: Learners appropriate to the stated programme level

2 days EX programme focused on Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation.
- 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.

Module 1: Local content and national value

Learning objectives

- Explain local content and national value, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local content and national value
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local content can include employment, skills, supplier participation and durable industrial capability. Distinguish domestic ownership, local expenditure and actual value retained locally. A purchase from a locally registered importer may contain little domestic production.

Decision logic. Measure outcomes with a defined boundary, baseline and evidence. Avoid assuming a proposed policy target is current law. Supplier development must protect quality and safety while building realistic capacity and fair access.

Worked example. A fictional USD 1 million local invoice contains USD 850,000 imported equipment and USD 150,000 local services.

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 the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

Model answer guide. Fifteen percent in this simplified boundary; employment, skills and retained value need separate evidence.

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

Activity

Calculate the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content and national value?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content and national value?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content and national value be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content and national value?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content and national value?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content and national value?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content and national value. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content and national value contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content and national value?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content and national value?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Skills gaps and workforce development

Learning objectives

- Explain skills gaps and workforce development, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Skills gaps and workforce development
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. A skills plan compares future tasks with existing competence, training capacity and realistic deployment timing. Occupation counts differ from competence requirements. Separate short awareness training, trade qualification, supervised experience and authorisation for a role.

Decision logic. Use employer-validated task profiles and assess prior learning fairly. Include instructor capacity, workshops, placements and inclusion barriers. Forecast jobs as scenarios rather than guarantees. Measure deployment and demonstrated capability, not enrolment alone.

Worked example. A project needs ten technicians but only six candidates meet the required prior trade foundation.

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. Create a staged development plan with bridging, assessment and supervised placement.

Model answer guide. Identify prerequisites, capacity, funding, evidence and contingency rather than promising rapid certification for all.

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

Activity

Create a staged development plan with bridging, assessment and supervised placement.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of skills gaps and workforce development?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about skills gaps and workforce development?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about skills gaps and workforce development be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating skills gaps and workforce development?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in skills gaps and workforce development?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning skills gaps and workforce development?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for skills gaps and workforce development. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on skills gaps and workforce development contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about skills gaps and workforce development?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in skills gaps and workforce development?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Supplier qualification and development

Learning objectives

- Explain supplier qualification and development, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Supplier qualification and development
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Supplier readiness combines legal identity, technical capability, HSE, quality, finance and delivery capacity. Prequalification is a screening stage, not an award guarantee. SMEs need clear evidence requirements and realistic package sizes.

Decision logic. Diagnose gaps and agree measurable development actions. Keep conflict-of-interest controls and transparent evaluation. A supplier can be ready for one package but not another; capability is scope-specific. Avoid treating registration on a portal as proof of competence.

Worked example. A small firm has strong fabrication skill but no traceable material-control process for the proposed package.

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. Create a supplier improvement plan with evidence and milestones.

Model answer guide. Include material traceability, qualified personnel, quality records and capacity checks matched to scope.

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

Activity

Create a supplier improvement plan with evidence and milestones.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of supplier qualification and development?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about supplier qualification and development?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about supplier qualification and development be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating supplier qualification and development?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in supplier qualification and development?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning supplier qualification and development?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for supplier qualification and development. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on supplier qualification and development contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about supplier qualification and development?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in supplier qualification and development?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Procurement and supplier qualification

Learning objectives

- Explain procurement and supplier qualification, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Procurement and supplier qualification
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Procurement translates a defined need into sourcing, evaluation, award and contract management. Separate mandatory eligibility, technical acceptance and commercial comparison. Clear specifications and evaluation criteria should exist before bids are opened.

Decision logic. Manage conflicts, confidentiality and fair treatment. Lowest price may not be lowest evaluated cost if quality, delivery and lifecycle support differ. Document decisions and follow delegated authority; this classroom exercise awards no real contracts.

Worked example. A low bid excludes offshore mobilisation while another includes it.

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. Normalise three fictional bids and prepare an evaluation recommendation.

Model answer guide. Compare like-for-like scope, clarify exclusions and include risk with an auditable decision basis.

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

Activity

Normalise three fictional bids and prepare an evaluation recommendation.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of procurement and supplier qualification?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about procurement and supplier qualification?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about procurement and supplier qualification be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating procurement and supplier qualification?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in procurement and supplier qualification?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning procurement and supplier qualification?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for procurement and supplier qualification. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on procurement and supplier qualification contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about procurement and supplier qualification?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in procurement and supplier qualification?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Petroleum policy and institutional governance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy and institutional governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum policy and institutional governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Policy sets objectives, institutions assign authority, and governance creates accountability for decisions and resources. Explain government, regulator and state enterprise roles conceptually without asserting an unverified current Namibian structure.

Decision logic. Separate commercial participation from regulatory judgement and manage conflicts transparently. Define decision rights, disclosure, assurance and challenge. A strong governance design includes implementation capacity and an audit trail, not just an organisation chart.

Worked example. A fictional institution both promotes investment and evaluates its own project compliance, creating a conflict to manage.

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. Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

Model answer guide. Identify segregated decisions, independent review, declarations and public accountability where applicable.

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

Activity

Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy and institutional governance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy and institutional governance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy and institutional governance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain local content, supplier development and industrialisation: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation. 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content, supplier development and industrialisation: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content, supplier development and industrialisation: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content, supplier development and industrialisation: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content, supplier development and industrialisation: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content, supplier development and industrialisation: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content, supplier development and industrialisation: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content, supplier development and industrialisation: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain local content, supplier development and industrialisation: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Applied Case describes a practical part of Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation. 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content, supplier development and industrialisation: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content, supplier development and industrialisation: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content, supplier development and industrialisation: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content, supplier development and industrialisation: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content, supplier development and industrialisation: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content, supplier development and industrialisation: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content, supplier development and industrialisation: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain local content, supplier development and industrialisation: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation. 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content, supplier development and industrialisation: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content, supplier development and industrialisation: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content, supplier development and industrialisation: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content, supplier development and industrialisation: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content, supplier development and industrialisation: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content, supplier development and industrialisation: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content, supplier development and industrialisation: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain local content, supplier development and industrialisation: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation. 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content, supplier development and industrialisation: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content, supplier development and industrialisation: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content, supplier development and industrialisation: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content, supplier development and industrialisation: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content, supplier development and industrialisation: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content, supplier development and industrialisation: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content, supplier development and industrialisation: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain local content, supplier development and industrialisation: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation: Competence Review describes a practical part of Local Content, Supplier Development and Industrialisation. 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for local content, supplier development and industrialisation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content, supplier development and industrialisation: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content, supplier development and industrialisation: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content, supplier development and industrialisation: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content, supplier development and industrialisation: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content, supplier development and industrialisation: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content, supplier development and industrialisation: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content, supplier development and industrialisation: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content, supplier development and industrialisation: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-069 | Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment

Level: EX | Duration: 3 days | Audience: Learners appropriate to the stated programme level

3 days EX programme focused on Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment.
- 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.

Module 1: Deepwater development concept selection

Learning objectives

- Explain deepwater development concept selection, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Deepwater development concept selection
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Compare subsea tieback, standalone floating production and shore-linked concepts against reservoir, metocean, water depth, distance and product requirements. A concept is an integrated system of wells, facilities, export and support infrastructure. Show the interfaces before scoring alternatives.

Decision logic. Apply mandatory constraints before weighted scoring. Document weighting, uncertainty and options that fail a hard requirement. Lowest capital cost may increase operating risk or reduce recovery. Revisit selection when appraisal or market evidence changes.

Worked example. Concept A costs less initially but cannot accommodate the high gas case; Concept B has expansion capacity.

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 concept matrix with technical, commercial, environmental and local-capability criteria.

Model answer guide. Reject infeasible options before ranking and include lifecycle cost, flexibility and uncertainty.

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

Activity

Prepare a concept matrix with technical, commercial, environmental and local-capability criteria.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of deepwater development concept selection?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about deepwater development concept selection?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about deepwater development concept selection be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating deepwater development concept selection?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in deepwater development concept selection?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning deepwater development concept selection?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for deepwater development concept selection. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on deepwater development concept selection contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about deepwater development concept selection?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in deepwater development concept selection?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Flow assurance

Learning objectives

- Explain flow assurance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Flow assurance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Flow assurance manages the ability to transport fluids through operating and transient conditions. Hydrates, wax, scale, corrosion and slugging can threaten performance. Explain the pressure-temperature-composition relationship qualitatively with a cooling pipeline sketch.

Decision logic. Assess startup, shutdown and restart as well as steady operation. Chemical treatment, insulation and operating strategies interact with facilities and environmental constraints. Classroom discussion does not prescribe inhibitor doses or live restart sequences.

Worked example. A pipeline flows normally when warm but cools during a long shutdown, changing restart risk.

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 flow-assurance risk register for normal operation and shutdown.

Model answer guide. Include fluid data, thermal history, safeguards, monitoring and an authorised specialist review before restart.

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

Activity

Build a flow-assurance risk register for normal operation and shutdown.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of flow assurance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about flow assurance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about flow assurance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating flow assurance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in flow assurance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning flow assurance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for flow assurance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on flow assurance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about flow assurance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in flow assurance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Routes to shore and infrastructure choices

Learning objectives

- Explain routes to shore and infrastructure choices, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Routes to shore and infrastructure choices
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Compare direct offshore export, pipeline landfall, shuttle-to-terminal and domestic processing as distinct options. Oil reaching national waters does not imply physical landing or domestic refining. Geography, throughput, markets and permitting shape the choice.

Decision logic. Evaluate utilisation, distance, terrain, marine exposure, storage, product demand and lifecycle cost. Infrastructure can be shared only when commercial and technical interfaces align. Do not assert that any Namibian shore-landing route or commissioning date is confirmed.

Worked example. A low-volume early development may favour offshore export while a larger future cluster could change infrastructure economics.

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 conditional shore-routing recommendation with trigger conditions.

Model answer guide. Separate current evidence from future options; include demand, volume, cost, environment and commercial access.

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

Activity

Write a conditional shore-routing recommendation with trigger conditions.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about routes to shore and infrastructure choices be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for routes to shore and infrastructure choices. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on routes to shore and infrastructure choices contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Project finance and funding structure

Learning objectives

- Explain project finance and funding structure, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Project finance and funding structure
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Financing links investors, lenders, project cash flows and contractual risk allocation. Explain equity, debt, debt service, covenants and security conceptually. Financing availability depends on credible technical, commercial and environmental evidence.

Decision logic. Distinguish project economics from shareholder returns and loan serviceability. Debt can amplify returns and risk. Check downside cash available for debt service rather than assuming forecast revenue is free cash. No financing commitment is implied.

Worked example. Cash available for debt service of 120 and scheduled debt service of 100 gives a coverage ratio of 1.2.

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. Stress the ratio when available cash falls by 25% and discuss consequences.

Model answer guide. Coverage falls to 0.9; the project may not meet scheduled service without remedies under its actual agreements.

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

Activity

Stress the ratio when available cash falls by 25% and discuss consequences.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of project finance and funding structure?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about project finance and funding structure?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about project finance and funding structure be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating project finance and funding structure?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in project finance and funding structure?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning project finance and funding structure?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for project finance and funding structure. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on project finance and funding structure contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about project finance and funding structure?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in project finance and funding structure?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Production readiness and marine assurance

Learning objectives

- Explain production readiness and marine assurance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Production readiness and marine assurance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Operational readiness brings people, procedures, equipment, spares, assurance and emergency arrangements together before service. Marine assurance addresses vessel capability, condition and interfaces for the intended task. Treat readiness as evidence-based acceptance.

Decision logic. Use independent challenge and clear ownership of exceptions. Operational teams must accept the asset with known limitations and an approved response. A dashboard with all green cells is unreliable if supporting records are missing or outdated.

Worked example. A readiness review shows trained staff but no tested spare-parts supply route for a critical pump.

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. Create a readiness dossier and a conditions-to-close register.

Model answer guide. Include maintenance, spares, competence, emergency drills and marine interfaces with accountable owners.

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

Activity

Create a readiness dossier and a conditions-to-close register.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of production readiness and marine assurance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about production readiness and marine assurance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about production readiness and marine assurance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating production readiness and marine assurance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in production readiness and marine assurance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning production readiness and marine assurance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for production readiness and marine assurance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on production readiness and marine assurance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about production readiness and marine assurance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in production readiness and marine assurance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain deepwater development and infrastructure investment: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment. 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of deepwater development and infrastructure investment: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating deepwater development and infrastructure investment: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in deepwater development and infrastructure investment: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning deepwater development and infrastructure investment: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for deepwater development and infrastructure investment: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on deepwater development and infrastructure investment: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in deepwater development and infrastructure investment: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain deepwater development and infrastructure investment: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Applied Case describes a practical part of Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment. 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of deepwater development and infrastructure investment: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating deepwater development and infrastructure investment: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in deepwater development and infrastructure investment: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning deepwater development and infrastructure investment: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for deepwater development and infrastructure investment: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on deepwater development and infrastructure investment: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in deepwater development and infrastructure investment: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain deepwater development and infrastructure investment: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment. 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of deepwater development and infrastructure investment: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating deepwater development and infrastructure investment: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in deepwater development and infrastructure investment: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning deepwater development and infrastructure investment: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for deepwater development and infrastructure investment: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on deepwater development and infrastructure investment: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in deepwater development and infrastructure investment: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain deepwater development and infrastructure investment: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment. 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of deepwater development and infrastructure investment: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating deepwater development and infrastructure investment: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in deepwater development and infrastructure investment: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning deepwater development and infrastructure investment: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for deepwater development and infrastructure investment: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on deepwater development and infrastructure investment: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in deepwater development and infrastructure investment: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain deepwater development and infrastructure investment: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment: Competence Review describes a practical part of Deepwater Development and Infrastructure Investment. 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for deepwater development and infrastructure investment: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of deepwater development and infrastructure investment: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating deepwater development and infrastructure investment: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in deepwater development and infrastructure investment: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning deepwater development and infrastructure investment: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for deepwater development and infrastructure investment: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on deepwater development and infrastructure investment: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about deepwater development and infrastructure investment: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in deepwater development and infrastructure investment: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-070 | Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk

Level: EX | Duration: 2 days | Audience: Learners appropriate to the stated programme level

2 days EX programme focused on Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk.
- 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.

Module 1: 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: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of process safety fundamentals?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about process safety fundamentals?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about process safety fundamentals be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating process safety fundamentals?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in process safety fundamentals?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning process safety fundamentals?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for process safety fundamentals. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on process safety fundamentals contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about process safety fundamentals?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in process safety fundamentals?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Risk Controls

Learning objectives

- Explain board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Risk Controls
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Risk Controls describes a practical part of Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk. 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls. 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: risk controls?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Environmental and social impact assessment

Learning objectives

- Explain environmental and social impact assessment, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Environmental and social impact assessment
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. An ESIA identifies project alternatives, baseline conditions, potential impacts, mitigation and monitoring. Social assessment includes affected livelihoods, access, distribution of benefits and grievance processes. Assessment should inform choices before they are fixed.

Decision logic. Apply avoidance before mitigation and consider cumulative impacts. Consultation needs accessible information and documented responses. A study's completion does not guarantee regulatory approval or community agreement. Actual scope follows applicable requirements and specialist review.

Worked example. Two fictional supply-base sites differ in transport distance and fishing-community access impacts.

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 alternatives and prepare a consultation and mitigation plan.

Model answer guide. Show impact pathways, alternatives, affected groups, residual impacts and monitoring commitments.

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

Activity

Compare alternatives and prepare a consultation and mitigation plan.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of environmental and social impact assessment?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about environmental and social impact assessment?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about environmental and social impact assessment be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating environmental and social impact assessment?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in environmental and social impact assessment?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning environmental and social impact assessment?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for environmental and social impact assessment. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on environmental and social impact assessment contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about environmental and social impact assessment?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in environmental and social impact assessment?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Emergency preparedness and command

Learning objectives

- Explain emergency preparedness and command, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Emergency preparedness and command
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Emergency planning identifies credible scenarios, warning, command, communications, muster, evacuation, medical support and external interfaces. Responsibilities and fallback communications should be understood before an event. Awareness differs from emergency-team qualification.

Decision logic. Use tabletop exercises with timed injects, observer records and debrief actions. Test loss of communications or unavailable resources. Never simulate an actual distress call or activate real emergency equipment without authorised arrangements.

Worked example. A fictional offshore incident interrupts the primary communication link during a weather restriction.

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. Run a tabletop with incident controller, operations, logistics and communications roles.

Model answer guide. Prioritise people, establish command, verify information, use planned backup channels and document decisions.

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

Activity

Run a tabletop with incident controller, operations, logistics and communications roles.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of emergency preparedness and command?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about emergency preparedness and command?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about emergency preparedness and command be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating emergency preparedness and command?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in emergency preparedness and command?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning emergency preparedness and command?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for emergency preparedness and command. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on emergency preparedness and command contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about emergency preparedness and command?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in emergency preparedness and command?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Safety and project leadership

Learning objectives

- Explain safety and project leadership, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Safety and project leadership
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Leadership sets priorities through decisions, resources and response to bad news. Explain the difference between stated values and incentives that reward unsafe shortcuts. Leaders need clear delegation, listening and evidence-based challenge.

Decision logic. Use leading indicators tied to important barriers and delivery outcomes. Review overdue actions and organisational capacity, not just aggregate counts. Encourage escalation and resolve conflicting objectives openly. Authority remains accountable even when tasks are delegated.

Worked example. A manager requests schedule recovery while critical tests are incomplete. The team must resolve priorities explicitly.

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 leadership response and a 30-day improvement plan.

Model answer guide. Require safe sequencing, resources, action owners and follow-up; do not reward concealment of incomplete work.

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

Activity

Write a leadership response and a 30-day improvement plan.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of safety and project leadership?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about safety and project leadership?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about safety and project leadership be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating safety and project leadership?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in safety and project leadership?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning safety and project leadership?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for safety and project leadership. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on safety and project leadership contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about safety and project leadership?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in safety and project leadership?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk. 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Applied Case describes a practical part of Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk. 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk. 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk. 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk: Competence Review describes a practical part of Board Oversight of Offshore Safety and Environmental Risk. 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in board oversight of offshore safety and environmental risk: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-071 | Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security

Level: EX | Duration: 2 days | Audience: Learners appropriate to the stated programme level

2 days EX programme focused on Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security.
- 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.

Module 1: Crude oil quality and assay interpretation

Learning objectives

- Explain crude oil quality and assay interpretation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Crude oil quality and assay interpretation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Crude properties include density, sulfur, acidity, metals, salt, water and distillation behaviour. API gravity is a density scale, not a complete quality grade. Explain how crude assay and sampling representativeness affect refinery fit and valuation.

Decision logic. A light crude can still present processing or materials challenges. Compare whole-crude properties with fraction yields and contaminants. Distinguish a laboratory result, a contractual specification and a refinery's acceptable feed envelope.

Worked example. Two hypothetical crudes have similar API gravity but very different sulfur and metals contents.

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 the two fictional assays and list additional data needed for refinery selection.

Model answer guide. Include contaminant management, fraction yields, blending and sampling quality; avoid ranking by API gravity alone.

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

Activity

Compare the two fictional assays and list additional data needed for refinery selection.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about crude oil quality and assay interpretation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for crude oil quality and assay interpretation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on crude oil quality and assay interpretation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Refining gas processing and product markets

Learning objectives

- Explain refining gas processing and product markets, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Refining gas processing and product markets
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Refining separates crude into fractions and upgrades them to meet product needs. Distillation, conversion and treating perform different functions. Explain simple versus more complex configurations and the role of hydrogen, utilities and environmental controls.

Decision logic. A refinery investment requires feedstock security, product demand, scale, logistics, finance and regulatory feasibility. Local crude production does not by itself justify a refinery. Compare netbacks from export and processing under explicit assumptions.

Worked example. A fictional simple refinery produces fractions that do not match the domestic demand mix, requiring imports or exports anyway.

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 a refinery-versus-export decision matrix.

Model answer guide. Include product specifications, market size, capital, utilities, emissions, feed assurance and logistics.

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

Activity

Develop a refinery-versus-export decision matrix.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of refining gas processing and product markets?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about refining gas processing and product markets?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about refining gas processing and product markets be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating refining gas processing and product markets?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in refining gas processing and product markets?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning refining gas processing and product markets?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for refining gas processing and product markets. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on refining gas processing and product markets contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about refining gas processing and product markets?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in refining gas processing and product markets?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Offtaker qualification and crude sales

Learning objectives

- Explain offtaker qualification and crude sales, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offtaker qualification and crude sales
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offtake evaluation combines buyer identity, ownership, trading capacity, credit, compliance, logistics and contract performance. Explain nomination, measurement, quality adjustment, payment security and delivery terms. Evidence should be verified through authorised sources.

Decision logic. Score technical and commercial capability separately from mandatory compliance requirements. Consider payment timing, security enforceability and concentration risk. A letter of interest is not a binding purchase obligation. Legal and credit specialists approve actual counterparties and terms.

Worked example. An unknown buyer offers the highest price but cannot substantiate credit support or receiving capacity.

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 due-diligence checklist and conditional recommendation for three fictional buyers.

Model answer guide. Reject price-only ranking and document unresolved credit and delivery risks.

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

Activity

Prepare a due-diligence checklist and conditional recommendation for three fictional buyers.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offtaker qualification and crude sales be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offtaker qualification and crude sales. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offtaker qualification and crude sales contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Price risk and hedging concepts

Learning objectives

- Explain price risk and hedging concepts, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Price risk and hedging concepts
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Physical sales create price exposure across production, inventory and pricing periods. Forwards, futures and options can alter that exposure but introduce basis, liquidity, counterparty and operational risk. Use paper examples only; no trading recommendation is made.

Decision logic. A hedge should match an approved objective and exposure. Overhedging can create new speculative positions. Show how volume uncertainty and benchmark mismatch leave residual risk. Explain governance, limits and independent valuation before discussing instruments.

Worked example. A fictional producer expects 100 units but produces 60 after hedging 100; 40 units of the hedge are no longer matched to output.

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. Map production, benchmark and timing exposures and propose governance questions.

Model answer guide. Identify volume and basis mismatch plus approval, monitoring and collateral needs.

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

Activity

Map production, benchmark and timing exposures and propose governance questions.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of price risk and hedging concepts?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about price risk and hedging concepts?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about price risk and hedging concepts be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating price risk and hedging concepts?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in price risk and hedging concepts?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning price risk and hedging concepts?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for price risk and hedging concepts. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on price risk and hedging concepts contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about price risk and hedging concepts?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in price risk and hedging concepts?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Routes to shore and infrastructure choices

Learning objectives

- Explain routes to shore and infrastructure choices, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Routes to shore and infrastructure choices
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Compare direct offshore export, pipeline landfall, shuttle-to-terminal and domestic processing as distinct options. Oil reaching national waters does not imply physical landing or domestic refining. Geography, throughput, markets and permitting shape the choice.

Decision logic. Evaluate utilisation, distance, terrain, marine exposure, storage, product demand and lifecycle cost. Infrastructure can be shared only when commercial and technical interfaces align. Do not assert that any Namibian shore-landing route or commissioning date is confirmed.

Worked example. A low-volume early development may favour offshore export while a larger future cluster could change infrastructure economics.

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 conditional shore-routing recommendation with trigger conditions.

Model answer guide. Separate current evidence from future options; include demand, volume, cost, environment and commercial access.

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

Activity

Write a conditional shore-routing recommendation with trigger conditions.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about routes to shore and infrastructure choices be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for routes to shore and infrastructure choices. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on routes to shore and infrastructure choices contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in routes to shore and infrastructure choices?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain crude marketing, refining and energy security: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security. 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of crude marketing, refining and energy security: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about crude marketing, refining and energy security: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about crude marketing, refining and energy security: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating crude marketing, refining and energy security: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in crude marketing, refining and energy security: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning crude marketing, refining and energy security: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for crude marketing, refining and energy security: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on crude marketing, refining and energy security: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about crude marketing, refining and energy security: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in crude marketing, refining and energy security: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain crude marketing, refining and energy security: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Applied Case describes a practical part of Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security. 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of crude marketing, refining and energy security: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about crude marketing, refining and energy security: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about crude marketing, refining and energy security: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating crude marketing, refining and energy security: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in crude marketing, refining and energy security: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning crude marketing, refining and energy security: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for crude marketing, refining and energy security: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on crude marketing, refining and energy security: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about crude marketing, refining and energy security: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in crude marketing, refining and energy security: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain crude marketing, refining and energy security: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security. 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of crude marketing, refining and energy security: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about crude marketing, refining and energy security: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about crude marketing, refining and energy security: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating crude marketing, refining and energy security: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in crude marketing, refining and energy security: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning crude marketing, refining and energy security: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for crude marketing, refining and energy security: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on crude marketing, refining and energy security: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about crude marketing, refining and energy security: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in crude marketing, refining and energy security: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain crude marketing, refining and energy security: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security. 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of crude marketing, refining and energy security: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about crude marketing, refining and energy security: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about crude marketing, refining and energy security: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating crude marketing, refining and energy security: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in crude marketing, refining and energy security: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning crude marketing, refining and energy security: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for crude marketing, refining and energy security: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on crude marketing, refining and energy security: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about crude marketing, refining and energy security: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in crude marketing, refining and energy security: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain crude marketing, refining and energy security: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security: Competence Review describes a practical part of Crude Marketing, Refining and Energy Security. 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for crude marketing, refining and energy security: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of crude marketing, refining and energy security: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about crude marketing, refining and energy security: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about crude marketing, refining and energy security: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating crude marketing, refining and energy security: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in crude marketing, refining and energy security: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning crude marketing, refining and energy security: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for crude marketing, refining and energy security: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on crude marketing, refining and energy security: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about crude marketing, refining and energy security: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in crude marketing, refining and energy security: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-072 | Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders

Level: EX | Duration: 2 days | Audience: Learners appropriate to the stated programme level

2 days EX programme focused on Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders.
- 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.

Module 1: Digital twins and model purpose

Learning objectives

- Explain digital twins and model purpose, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Digital twins and model purpose
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. A digital twin is a purpose-driven digital representation connected to an asset or process through defined data and update arrangements. Distinguish a static drawing, an analytical model and a maintained operational representation.

Decision logic. Specify the decision, fidelity, data, validation and ownership before investing. A visually convincing twin can be wrong. Evaluate model drift and consequences of incorrect recommendations. Integration with control or maintenance requires governed change and human accountability.

Worked example. A fictional pump twin predicts wear but has not been updated after a major overhaul.

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. Define a twin use case and a validation and update plan.

Model answer guide. Include decision value, measurements, acceptance evidence, versioning and human review.

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

Activity

Define a twin use case and a validation and update plan.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of digital twins and model purpose?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about digital twins and model purpose?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about digital twins and model purpose be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating digital twins and model purpose?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in digital twins and model purpose?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning digital twins and model purpose?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for digital twins and model purpose. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on digital twins and model purpose contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about digital twins and model purpose?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in digital twins and model purpose?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Artificial intelligence in operations

Learning objectives

- Explain artificial intelligence in operations, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Artificial intelligence in operations
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. AI can support classification, anomaly detection and forecasting when data and evaluation match the intended task. Explain training data, validation, error and drift. A confident output is not evidence of correctness.

Decision logic. Use a decision-impact assessment and compare against a simpler baseline. Keep humans accountable for consequential choices. Avoid sensitive data in prompts and do not connect models to live controls through this course. Define fallback when data shift.

Worked example. A model trained on one pump type gives frequent false alarms on a different design.

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. Create an evaluation plan with error costs and a human review route.

Model answer guide. Include representative test data, false positives and negatives, drift monitoring and clear limits.

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

Activity

Create an evaluation plan with error costs and a human review 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of artificial intelligence in operations?

- A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.
- B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.
- C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.
- D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about artificial intelligence in operations?

- A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.
- B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.
- C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.
- D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about artificial intelligence in operations be handled?

- A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.
- B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.
- C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.
- D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating artificial intelligence in operations?

- A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.
- B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.
- C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in artificial intelligence in operations?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning artificial intelligence in operations?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for artificial intelligence in operations. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on artificial intelligence in operations contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about artificial intelligence in operations?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in artificial intelligence in operations?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: OT and ICS cybersecurity awareness

Learning objectives

- Explain ot and ics cybersecurity awareness, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of OT and ICS cybersecurity awareness
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Operational technology controls physical processes, so availability, safety and predictable operation are central. Explain assets, zones, connections, remote access and dependencies conceptually. Security controls must be coordinated with operational and safety requirements.

Decision logic. Use a tabletop risk assessment on fictional architecture. Inventory, controlled access, segmentation, backup and recovery are discussion topics, not permission for live changes or scanning. Approved change and incident procedures govern actual systems.

Worked example. An unrecorded remote-support connection bypasses the fictional architecture's reviewed access path.

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 risk and propose review questions without touching any real network.

Model answer guide. Request asset ownership, approved access route, monitoring, recovery and safety coordination.

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

Activity

Identify risk and propose review questions without touching any real network.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about ot and ics cybersecurity awareness be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for ot and ics cybersecurity awareness. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on ot and ics cybersecurity awareness contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Information security management systems

Learning objectives

- Explain information security management systems, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Information security management systems
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. An ISMS establishes governance for protecting information through risk management, responsibilities, controls and continual improvement. Define scope, interested parties and information assets before selecting controls. This is original awareness content informed by the supplied implementation proposal.

Decision logic. Connect risk treatment, documented decisions, monitoring, audit and corrective action. Obtain licensed standards for formal implementation and verify external certification requirements with the relevant body. This course does not award PECB or ISO certification and reproduces no official examination.

Worked example. A fictional academy protects student records through defined access, retention and incident responsibilities.

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. Draft an ISMS scope, three risks and a treatment review plan.

Model answer guide. Require risk owners, justified treatments, evidence, review and escalation; distinguish organisational certification from personal credentials.

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

Activity

Draft an ISMS scope, three risks and a treatment review plan.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of information security management systems?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about information security management systems?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about information security management systems be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating information security management systems?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in information security management systems?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning information security management systems?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for information security management systems. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on information security management systems contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about information security management systems?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in information security management systems?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Petroleum policy and institutional governance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy and institutional governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum policy and institutional governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Policy sets objectives, institutions assign authority, and governance creates accountability for decisions and resources. Explain government, regulator and state enterprise roles conceptually without asserting an unverified current Namibian structure.

Decision logic. Separate commercial participation from regulatory judgement and manage conflicts transparently. Define decision rights, disclosure, assurance and challenge. A strong governance design includes implementation capacity and an audit trail, not just an organisation chart.

Worked example. A fictional institution both promotes investment and evaluates its own project compliance, creating a conflict to manage.

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. Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

Model answer guide. Identify segregated decisions, independent review, declarations and public accountability where applicable.

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

Activity

Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy and institutional governance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy and institutional governance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy and institutional governance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders. 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Applied Case describes a practical part of Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders. 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders. 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders. 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders: Competence Review describes a practical part of Digital Transformation and Cyber Risk for Energy Leaders. 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in digital transformation and cyber risk for energy leaders: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-073 | Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation

Level: EX | Duration: 3 days | Audience: Learners appropriate to the stated programme level

3 days EX programme focused on Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation.
- 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.

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: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of project initiation and governance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about project initiation and governance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about project initiation and governance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating project initiation and governance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in project initiation and governance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning project initiation and governance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for project initiation and governance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on project initiation and governance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about project initiation and governance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in project initiation and governance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: 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: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about stakeholder engagement and communication be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for stakeholder engagement and communication. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on stakeholder engagement and communication contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Contract strategy and risk allocation

Learning objectives

- Explain contract strategy and risk allocation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contract strategy and risk allocation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Contracts define scope, deliverables, payment, acceptance, change and remedies. Lump sum, reimbursable and target-cost arrangements allocate uncertainty differently. Begin with scope maturity and market capability rather than choosing a familiar contract label.

Decision logic. Risk should be allocated to parties able to manage it, with realistic pricing and assurance. Unclear interfaces create disputes despite detailed clauses. Actual indemnity, liability, insurance and governing-law terms require qualified legal and commercial review.

Worked example. A supplier prices an undefined offshore interface as an exclusion; the owner's total risk remains unresolved.

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. Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

Model answer guide. Include deliverables, acceptance evidence, owner interfaces, change control and exclusions.

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

Activity

Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about contract strategy and risk allocation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for contract strategy and risk allocation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on contract strategy and risk allocation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Earned value and project control

Learning objectives

- Explain earned value and project control, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Earned value and project control
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Planned value represents scheduled budgeted work; earned value represents budgeted value of completed work; actual cost represents expenditure. CPI equals EV divided by AC and SPI equals EV divided by PV under the chosen measurement method.

Decision logic. Earned value needs a reliable baseline and objective progress rules. Spending less may reflect delayed work, not efficiency. Forecasts require remaining-work judgement and known changes. Explain that aggregate indices can hide critical delays or poor quality.

Worked example. With EV 80, AC 100 and PV 90, CPI is 0.8 and SPI about 0.89.

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 the indices and write a management interpretation.

Model answer guide. Cost efficiency and progress are adverse under the baseline; investigate causes and forecast remaining work.

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

Activity

Calculate the indices and write a management interpretation.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of earned value and project control?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about earned value and project control?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about earned value and project control be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating earned value and project control?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in earned value and project control?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning earned value and project control?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for earned value and project control. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on earned value and project control contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about earned value and project control?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in earned value and project control?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Safety and project leadership

Learning objectives

- Explain safety and project leadership, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Safety and project leadership
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Leadership sets priorities through decisions, resources and response to bad news. Explain the difference between stated values and incentives that reward unsafe shortcuts. Leaders need clear delegation, listening and evidence-based challenge.

Decision logic. Use leading indicators tied to important barriers and delivery outcomes. Review overdue actions and organisational capacity, not just aggregate counts. Encourage escalation and resolve conflicting objectives openly. Authority remains accountable even when tasks are delegated.

Worked example. A manager requests schedule recovery while critical tests are incomplete. The team must resolve priorities explicitly.

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 leadership response and a 30-day improvement plan.

Model answer guide. Require safe sequencing, resources, action owners and follow-up; do not reward concealment of incomplete work.

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

Activity

Write a leadership response and a 30-day improvement plan.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of safety and project leadership?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about safety and project leadership?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about safety and project leadership be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating safety and project leadership?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in safety and project leadership?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning safety and project leadership?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for safety and project leadership. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on safety and project leadership contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about safety and project leadership?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in safety and project leadership?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation. 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Applied Case describes a practical part of Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation. 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation. 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation. 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation: Competence Review describes a practical part of Energy Project Leadership and Stakeholder Negotiation. 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy project leadership and stakeholder negotiation: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X01 | National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities.
- 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.

Module 1: Petroleum policy and institutional governance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy and institutional governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum policy and institutional governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Policy sets objectives, institutions assign authority, and governance creates accountability for decisions and resources. Explain government, regulator and state enterprise roles conceptually without asserting an unverified current Namibian structure.

Decision logic. Separate commercial participation from regulatory judgement and manage conflicts transparently. Define decision rights, disclosure, assurance and challenge. A strong governance design includes implementation capacity and an audit trail, not just an organisation chart.

Worked example. A fictional institution both promotes investment and evaluates its own project compliance, creating a conflict to manage.

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. Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

Model answer guide. Identify segregated decisions, independent review, declarations and public accountability where applicable.

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

Activity

Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy and institutional governance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy and institutional governance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy and institutional governance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Risk Controls

Learning objectives

- Explain national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Risk Controls
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Risk Controls describes a practical part of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities. 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls. 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national energy strategy and investment priorities: risk controls?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Systems and Interfaces

Learning objectives

- Explain national energy strategy and investment priorities: systems and interfaces, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Systems and Interfaces
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Systems and Interfaces describes a practical part of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities. 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national energy strategy and investment priorities: systems and interfaces?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: systems and interfaces?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national energy strategy and investment priorities: systems and interfaces be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national energy strategy and investment priorities: systems and interfaces?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national energy strategy and investment priorities: systems and interfaces?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national energy strategy and investment priorities: systems and interfaces?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national energy strategy and investment priorities: systems and interfaces. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national energy strategy and investment priorities: systems and interfaces contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: systems and interfaces?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national energy strategy and investment priorities: systems and interfaces?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Local content and national value

Learning objectives

- Explain local content and national value, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local content and national value
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local content can include employment, skills, supplier participation and durable industrial capability. Distinguish domestic ownership, local expenditure and actual value retained locally. A purchase from a locally registered importer may contain little domestic production.

Decision logic. Measure outcomes with a defined boundary, baseline and evidence. Avoid assuming a proposed policy target is current law. Supplier development must protect quality and safety while building realistic capacity and fair access.

Worked example. A fictional USD 1 million local invoice contains USD 850,000 imported equipment and USD 150,000 local services.

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 the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

Model answer guide. Fifteen percent in this simplified boundary; employment, skills and retained value need separate evidence.

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

Activity

Calculate the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content and national value?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content and national value?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content and national value be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content and national value?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content and national value?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content and national value?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content and national value. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content and national value contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content and national value?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content and national value?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Royalties taxes and government take

Learning objectives

- Explain royalties taxes and government take, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Royalties taxes and government take
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Fiscal systems allocate project value between investors and the state through mechanisms such as royalties, taxes, bonuses or contractual sharing. Compare mechanisms conceptually. Do not assume a production-sharing system applies to Namibia or import tax rates from another jurisdiction.

Decision logic. Model the actual legal and contractual hierarchy only after specialist verification. Government take depends on timing, cost recovery, deductions and price as well as headline rates. Keep illustrative fiscal cases visibly separate from current law.

Worked example. In a fictional classroom system, 5% royalty on USD 100 revenue is USD 5. This assumption is not a statement of Namibian law.

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 a gross-revenue royalty with a profit-based levy using two cost scenarios.

Model answer guide. Royalty remains linked to gross revenue while profit-based payments change with allowed costs; note legal definitions matter.

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

Activity

Compare a gross-revenue royalty with a profit-based levy using two cost scenarios.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of royalties taxes and government take?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about royalties taxes and government take?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about royalties taxes and government take be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating royalties taxes and government take?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in royalties taxes and government take?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning royalties taxes and government take?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for royalties taxes and government take. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on royalties taxes and government take contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about royalties taxes and government take?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in royalties taxes and government take?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain national energy strategy and investment priorities: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Data and Performance describes a practical part of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities. 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national energy strategy and investment priorities: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national energy strategy and investment priorities: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national energy strategy and investment priorities: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national energy strategy and investment priorities: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national energy strategy and investment priorities: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national energy strategy and investment priorities: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national energy strategy and investment priorities: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national energy strategy and investment priorities: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain national energy strategy and investment priorities: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Applied Case describes a practical part of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities. 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national energy strategy and investment priorities: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national energy strategy and investment priorities: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national energy strategy and investment priorities: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national energy strategy and investment priorities: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national energy strategy and investment priorities: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national energy strategy and investment priorities: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national energy strategy and investment priorities: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national energy strategy and investment priorities: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain national energy strategy and investment priorities: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities. 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national energy strategy and investment priorities: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national energy strategy and investment priorities: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national energy strategy and investment priorities: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national energy strategy and investment priorities: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national energy strategy and investment priorities: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national energy strategy and investment priorities: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national energy strategy and investment priorities: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national energy strategy and investment priorities: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain national energy strategy and investment priorities: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities. 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national energy strategy and investment priorities: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national energy strategy and investment priorities: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national energy strategy and investment priorities: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national energy strategy and investment priorities: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national energy strategy and investment priorities: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national energy strategy and investment priorities: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national energy strategy and investment priorities: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national energy strategy and investment priorities: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain national energy strategy and investment priorities: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities: Competence Review describes a practical part of National Energy Strategy and Investment Priorities. 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national energy strategy and investment priorities: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national energy strategy and investment priorities: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national energy strategy and investment priorities: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national energy strategy and investment priorities: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national energy strategy and investment priorities: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national energy strategy and investment priorities: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national energy strategy and investment priorities: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national energy strategy and investment priorities: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national energy strategy and investment priorities: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national energy strategy and investment priorities: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X02 | Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety.
- 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.

Module 1: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Core Concepts

Learning objectives

- Explain executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Core Concepts
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Core Concepts describes a practical part of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety. 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts. 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: core concepts?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: 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: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of process safety fundamentals?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about process safety fundamentals?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about process safety fundamentals be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating process safety fundamentals?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in process safety fundamentals?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning process safety fundamentals?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for process safety fundamentals. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on process safety fundamentals contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about process safety fundamentals?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in process safety fundamentals?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Systems and Interfaces

Learning objectives

- Explain executive oversight of offshore production and safety: systems and interfaces, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Systems and Interfaces
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Systems and Interfaces describes a practical part of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety. 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive oversight of offshore production and safety: systems and interfaces?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: systems and interfaces?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: systems and interfaces be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive oversight of offshore production and safety: systems and interfaces?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: systems and interfaces?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive oversight of offshore production and safety: systems and interfaces?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: systems and interfaces. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive oversight of offshore production and safety: systems and interfaces contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: systems and interfaces?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: systems and interfaces?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Incident investigation and learning

Learning objectives

- Explain incident investigation and learning, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Incident investigation and learning
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. An investigation establishes what happened, why controls failed and how recurrence can be prevented. Preserve evidence, protect people and separate verified facts from assumptions. Near misses can reveal major weaknesses without actual harm.

Decision logic. Use a timeline and causal analysis to explore technical, human and organisational contributors. Avoid premature blame and unsupported conclusions. Actions should address causes, have accountable owners and be checked for effectiveness. Reporting follows applicable site and legal requirements.

Worked example. A dropped tool caused no injury, but exclusion-zone and securing controls were ineffective.

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. Analyse a fictional near miss and propose three causal actions.

Model answer guide. Include physical prevention, work-system improvements and verification, rather than retraining alone.

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

Activity

Analyse a fictional near miss and propose three causal actions.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of incident investigation and learning?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about incident investigation and learning?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about incident investigation and learning be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating incident investigation and learning?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in incident investigation and learning?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning incident investigation and learning?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for incident investigation and learning. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on incident investigation and learning contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about incident investigation and learning?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in incident investigation and learning?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Safety and project leadership

Learning objectives

- Explain safety and project leadership, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Safety and project leadership
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Leadership sets priorities through decisions, resources and response to bad news. Explain the difference between stated values and incentives that reward unsafe shortcuts. Leaders need clear delegation, listening and evidence-based challenge.

Decision logic. Use leading indicators tied to important barriers and delivery outcomes. Review overdue actions and organisational capacity, not just aggregate counts. Encourage escalation and resolve conflicting objectives openly. Authority remains accountable even when tasks are delegated.

Worked example. A manager requests schedule recovery while critical tests are incomplete. The team must resolve priorities explicitly.

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 leadership response and a 30-day improvement plan.

Model answer guide. Require safe sequencing, resources, action owners and follow-up; do not reward concealment of incomplete work.

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

Activity

Write a leadership response and a 30-day improvement plan.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of safety and project leadership?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about safety and project leadership?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about safety and project leadership be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating safety and project leadership?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in safety and project leadership?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning safety and project leadership?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for safety and project leadership. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on safety and project leadership contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about safety and project leadership?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in safety and project leadership?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain executive oversight of offshore production and safety: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety. 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive oversight of offshore production and safety: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive oversight of offshore production and safety: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive oversight of offshore production and safety: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive oversight of offshore production and safety: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain executive oversight of offshore production and safety: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Applied Case describes a practical part of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety. 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive oversight of offshore production and safety: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive oversight of offshore production and safety: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive oversight of offshore production and safety: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive oversight of offshore production and safety: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain executive oversight of offshore production and safety: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety. 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive oversight of offshore production and safety: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive oversight of offshore production and safety: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive oversight of offshore production and safety: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive oversight of offshore production and safety: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain executive oversight of offshore production and safety: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety. 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive oversight of offshore production and safety: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive oversight of offshore production and safety: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive oversight of offshore production and safety: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive oversight of offshore production and safety: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain executive oversight of offshore production and safety: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety: Competence Review describes a practical part of Executive Oversight of Offshore Production and Safety. 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive oversight of offshore production and safety: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive oversight of offshore production and safety: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive oversight of offshore production and safety: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive oversight of offshore production and safety: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive oversight of offshore production and safety: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive oversight of offshore production and safety: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive oversight of offshore production and safety: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X03 | Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience.
- 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.

Module 1: Revenue stewardship and intergenerational value

Learning objectives

- Explain revenue stewardship and intergenerational value, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Revenue stewardship and intergenerational value
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum revenue can be volatile, delayed and uncertain. Budget planning should distinguish gross project sales from actual public receipts. Discuss stabilisation, saving, expenditure quality and transparency as policy design choices rather than prescribed legal arrangements.

Decision logic. Stress test revenue forecasts against price, timing, cost and production changes. Evaluate who bears downside risk and how public commitments are funded before revenues arrive. Governance and oversight are as important as the name of a fund.

Worked example. A fictional budget assumes 100 revenue units, but delayed startup reduces receipts to 20 in the planned year.

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 a downside budget scenario and two safeguards against premature commitments.

Model answer guide. Include conservative planning, contingent commitments, transparent reporting and defined oversight.

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

Activity

Develop a downside budget scenario and two safeguards against premature commitments.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about revenue stewardship and intergenerational value be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for revenue stewardship and intergenerational value. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on revenue stewardship and intergenerational value contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in revenue stewardship and intergenerational value?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Risk Controls

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Risk Controls
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Risk Controls describes a practical part of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience. 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls. 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: risk controls?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Systems and Interfaces

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: systems and interfaces, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Systems and Interfaces
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Systems and Interfaces describes a practical part of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience. 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: systems and interfaces be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: systems and interfaces. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: systems and interfaces contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Evidence and Decision Gates

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: evidence and decision gates, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Evidence and Decision Gates
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Evidence and Decision Gates describes a practical part of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience. 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: evidence and decision gates be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: evidence and decision gates. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: evidence and decision gates contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: 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: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about risk assessment and uncertainty management be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for risk assessment and uncertainty management. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on risk assessment and uncertainty management contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience. 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Applied Case describes a practical part of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience. 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience. 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience. 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience: Competence Review describes a practical part of Petroleum Revenue Transparency and Budget Resilience. 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum revenue transparency and budget resilience: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X04 | Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy.
- 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.

Module 1: Atmospheric testing principles

Learning objectives

- Explain atmospheric testing principles, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Atmospheric testing principles
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Atmospheric testing considers oxygen, flammable and toxic hazards with instruments suitable for the task. Calibration, functional checks, sampling location, response time and sensor limitations affect validity. A reading is evidence at a place and time, not a permanent guarantee.

Decision logic. Use manufacturer-approved training and site procedures for actual instrument operation and acceptance limits. Teach why an unsuitable or failed sensor makes a reading unreliable. Do not prescribe entry thresholds or authorise testing competence through online questions alone.

Worked example. A detector displays zero but its required functional check failed. Zero cannot be trusted as proof of safe atmosphere.

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. Evaluate fictional detector records and decide whether evidence is fit for use.

Model answer guide. Reject unreliable evidence, withdraw the instrument according to procedure and escalate for approved replacement or review.

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

Activity

Evaluate fictional detector records and decide whether evidence is fit for use.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of atmospheric testing principles?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about atmospheric testing principles?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about atmospheric testing principles be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating atmospheric testing principles?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in atmospheric testing principles?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning atmospheric testing principles?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for atmospheric testing principles. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on atmospheric testing principles contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about atmospheric testing principles?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in atmospheric testing principles?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Risk Controls

Learning objectives

- Explain gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Risk Controls
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Risk Controls describes a practical part of Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy. 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls. 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in gas development, lng and regional market strategy: risk controls?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Global petroleum markets and price formation

Learning objectives

- Explain global petroleum markets and price formation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Global petroleum markets and price formation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Crude markets connect producers, traders, refiners and transport providers. Prices often reference benchmarks adjusted for quality, location and contract terms. OPEC is a producers' organisation, not a buyer qualification or an assurance of payment.

Decision logic. Separate physical delivery, price exposure and credit exposure. A high headline price can be offset by freight, quality discounts, finance or default risk. No company is labelled reliable without current due diligence and an approved transaction basis.

Worked example. Offer A is USD 75/barrel with USD 5 freight; offer B is USD 73 with USD 1 freight, before other terms.

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 simplified netbacks and identify non-price checks.

Model answer guide. A gives 70 and B gives 72 USD/barrel; check credit, delivery, sanctions and quality terms before selection.

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

Activity

Compare simplified netbacks and identify non-price checks.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about global petroleum markets and price formation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for global petroleum markets and price formation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on global petroleum markets and price formation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Offtaker qualification and crude sales

Learning objectives

- Explain offtaker qualification and crude sales, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offtaker qualification and crude sales
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offtake evaluation combines buyer identity, ownership, trading capacity, credit, compliance, logistics and contract performance. Explain nomination, measurement, quality adjustment, payment security and delivery terms. Evidence should be verified through authorised sources.

Decision logic. Score technical and commercial capability separately from mandatory compliance requirements. Consider payment timing, security enforceability and concentration risk. A letter of interest is not a binding purchase obligation. Legal and credit specialists approve actual counterparties and terms.

Worked example. An unknown buyer offers the highest price but cannot substantiate credit support or receiving capacity.

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 due-diligence checklist and conditional recommendation for three fictional buyers.

Model answer guide. Reject price-only ranking and document unresolved credit and delivery risks.

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

Activity

Prepare a due-diligence checklist and conditional recommendation for three fictional buyers.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offtaker qualification and crude sales be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offtaker qualification and crude sales. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offtaker qualification and crude sales contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offtaker qualification and crude sales?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Contract strategy and risk allocation

Learning objectives

- Explain contract strategy and risk allocation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contract strategy and risk allocation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Contracts define scope, deliverables, payment, acceptance, change and remedies. Lump sum, reimbursable and target-cost arrangements allocate uncertainty differently. Begin with scope maturity and market capability rather than choosing a familiar contract label.

Decision logic. Risk should be allocated to parties able to manage it, with realistic pricing and assurance. Unclear interfaces create disputes despite detailed clauses. Actual indemnity, liability, insurance and governing-law terms require qualified legal and commercial review.

Worked example. A supplier prices an undefined offshore interface as an exclusion; the owner's total risk remains unresolved.

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. Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

Model answer guide. Include deliverables, acceptance evidence, owner interfaces, change control and exclusions.

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

Activity

Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about contract strategy and risk allocation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for contract strategy and risk allocation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on contract strategy and risk allocation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain gas development, lng and regional market strategy: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy. 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of gas development, lng and regional market strategy: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating gas development, lng and regional market strategy: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in gas development, lng and regional market strategy: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning gas development, lng and regional market strategy: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for gas development, lng and regional market strategy: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on gas development, lng and regional market strategy: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in gas development, lng and regional market strategy: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain gas development, lng and regional market strategy: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Applied Case describes a practical part of Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy. 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of gas development, lng and regional market strategy: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating gas development, lng and regional market strategy: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in gas development, lng and regional market strategy: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning gas development, lng and regional market strategy: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for gas development, lng and regional market strategy: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on gas development, lng and regional market strategy: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in gas development, lng and regional market strategy: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain gas development, lng and regional market strategy: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy. 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of gas development, lng and regional market strategy: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating gas development, lng and regional market strategy: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in gas development, lng and regional market strategy: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning gas development, lng and regional market strategy: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for gas development, lng and regional market strategy: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on gas development, lng and regional market strategy: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in gas development, lng and regional market strategy: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain gas development, lng and regional market strategy: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy. 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of gas development, lng and regional market strategy: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating gas development, lng and regional market strategy: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in gas development, lng and regional market strategy: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning gas development, lng and regional market strategy: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for gas development, lng and regional market strategy: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on gas development, lng and regional market strategy: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in gas development, lng and regional market strategy: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain gas development, lng and regional market strategy: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy: Competence Review describes a practical part of Gas Development, LNG and Regional Market Strategy. 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for gas development, lng and regional market strategy: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of gas development, lng and regional market strategy: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating gas development, lng and regional market strategy: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in gas development, lng and regional market strategy: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning gas development, lng and regional market strategy: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for gas development, lng and regional market strategy: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on gas development, lng and regional market strategy: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about gas development, lng and regional market strategy: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in gas development, lng and regional market strategy: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X05 | Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability.
- 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.

Module 1: Project finance and funding structure

Learning objectives

- Explain project finance and funding structure, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Project finance and funding structure
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Financing links investors, lenders, project cash flows and contractual risk allocation. Explain equity, debt, debt service, covenants and security conceptually. Financing availability depends on credible technical, commercial and environmental evidence.

Decision logic. Distinguish project economics from shareholder returns and loan serviceability. Debt can amplify returns and risk. Check downside cash available for debt service rather than assuming forecast revenue is free cash. No financing commitment is implied.

Worked example. Cash available for debt service of 120 and scheduled debt service of 100 gives a coverage ratio of 1.2.

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. Stress the ratio when available cash falls by 25% and discuss consequences.

Model answer guide. Coverage falls to 0.9; the project may not meet scheduled service without remedies under its actual agreements.

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

Activity

Stress the ratio when available cash falls by 25% and discuss consequences.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of project finance and funding structure?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about project finance and funding structure?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about project finance and funding structure be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating project finance and funding structure?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in project finance and funding structure?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning project finance and funding structure?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for project finance and funding structure. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on project finance and funding structure contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about project finance and funding structure?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in project finance and funding structure?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Risk Controls

Learning objectives

- Explain energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Risk Controls
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Risk Controls describes a practical part of Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability. 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls. 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: risk controls?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: 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: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of capex opex and estimating?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about capex opex and estimating?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about capex opex and estimating be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating capex opex and estimating?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in capex opex and estimating?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning capex opex and estimating?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for capex opex and estimating. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on capex opex and estimating contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about capex opex and estimating?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in capex opex and estimating?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: 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: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about risk assessment and uncertainty management be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for risk assessment and uncertainty management. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on risk assessment and uncertainty management contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Contract strategy and risk allocation

Learning objectives

- Explain contract strategy and risk allocation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contract strategy and risk allocation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Contracts define scope, deliverables, payment, acceptance, change and remedies. Lump sum, reimbursable and target-cost arrangements allocate uncertainty differently. Begin with scope maturity and market capability rather than choosing a familiar contract label.

Decision logic. Risk should be allocated to parties able to manage it, with realistic pricing and assurance. Unclear interfaces create disputes despite detailed clauses. Actual indemnity, liability, insurance and governing-law terms require qualified legal and commercial review.

Worked example. A supplier prices an undefined offshore interface as an exclusion; the owner's total risk remains unresolved.

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. Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

Model answer guide. Include deliverables, acceptance evidence, owner interfaces, change control and exclusions.

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

Activity

Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about contract strategy and risk allocation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for contract strategy and risk allocation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on contract strategy and risk allocation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability. 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Applied Case describes a practical part of Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability. 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability. 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability. 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability: Competence Review describes a practical part of Energy Infrastructure Finance and Project Bankability. 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy infrastructure finance and project bankability: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X06 | Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience.
- 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.

Module 1: OT and ICS cybersecurity awareness

Learning objectives

- Explain ot and ics cybersecurity awareness, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of OT and ICS cybersecurity awareness
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Operational technology controls physical processes, so availability, safety and predictable operation are central. Explain assets, zones, connections, remote access and dependencies conceptually. Security controls must be coordinated with operational and safety requirements.

Decision logic. Use a tabletop risk assessment on fictional architecture. Inventory, controlled access, segmentation, backup and recovery are discussion topics, not permission for live changes or scanning. Approved change and incident procedures govern actual systems.

Worked example. An unrecorded remote-support connection bypasses the fictional architecture's reviewed access path.

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 risk and propose review questions without touching any real network.

Model answer guide. Request asset ownership, approved access route, monitoring, recovery and safety coordination.

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

Activity

Identify risk and propose review questions without touching any real network.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about ot and ics cybersecurity awareness be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for ot and ics cybersecurity awareness. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on ot and ics cybersecurity awareness contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in ot and ics cybersecurity awareness?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Information security management systems

Learning objectives

- Explain information security management systems, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Information security management systems
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. An ISMS establishes governance for protecting information through risk management, responsibilities, controls and continual improvement. Define scope, interested parties and information assets before selecting controls. This is original awareness content informed by the supplied implementation proposal.

Decision logic. Connect risk treatment, documented decisions, monitoring, audit and corrective action. Obtain licensed standards for formal implementation and verify external certification requirements with the relevant body. This course does not award PECB or ISO certification and reproduces no official examination.

Worked example. A fictional academy protects student records through defined access, retention and incident responsibilities.

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. Draft an ISMS scope, three risks and a treatment review plan.

Model answer guide. Require risk owners, justified treatments, evidence, review and escalation; distinguish organisational certification from personal credentials.

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

Activity

Draft an ISMS scope, three risks and a treatment review plan.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of information security management systems?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about information security management systems?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about information security management systems be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating information security management systems?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in information security management systems?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning information security management systems?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for information security management systems. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on information security management systems contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about information security management systems?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in information security management systems?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Systems and Interfaces

Learning objectives

- Explain board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: systems and interfaces, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Systems and Interfaces
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Systems and Interfaces describes a practical part of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience. 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: systems and interfaces be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: systems and interfaces. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: systems and interfaces contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: systems and interfaces?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Evidence and Decision Gates

Learning objectives

- Explain board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: evidence and decision gates, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Evidence and Decision Gates
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Evidence and Decision Gates describes a practical part of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience. 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: evidence and decision gates be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: evidence and decision gates. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: evidence and decision gates contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: evidence and decision gates?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Petroleum policy and institutional governance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy and institutional governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum policy and institutional governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Policy sets objectives, institutions assign authority, and governance creates accountability for decisions and resources. Explain government, regulator and state enterprise roles conceptually without asserting an unverified current Namibian structure.

Decision logic. Separate commercial participation from regulatory judgement and manage conflicts transparently. Define decision rights, disclosure, assurance and challenge. A strong governance design includes implementation capacity and an audit trail, not just an organisation chart.

Worked example. A fictional institution both promotes investment and evaluates its own project compliance, creating a conflict to manage.

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. Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

Model answer guide. Identify segregated decisions, independent review, declarations and public accountability where applicable.

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

Activity

Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy and institutional governance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy and institutional governance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy and institutional governance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience. 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Applied Case describes a practical part of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience. 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience. 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience. 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience: Competence Review describes a practical part of Board-Level Cybersecurity and Digital Resilience. 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in board-level cybersecurity and digital resilience: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X07 | Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders.
- 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.

Module 1: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Core Concepts

Learning objectives

- Explain methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Core Concepts
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Core Concepts describes a practical part of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders. 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts. 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: core concepts?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Risk Controls

Learning objectives

- Explain methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Risk Controls
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Risk Controls describes a practical part of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders. 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls. 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: risk controls?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Systems and Interfaces

Learning objectives

- Explain methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: systems and interfaces, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Systems and Interfaces
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Systems and Interfaces describes a practical part of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders. 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: systems and interfaces?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: systems and interfaces?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: systems and interfaces be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: systems and interfaces?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: systems and interfaces?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: systems and interfaces?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: systems and interfaces. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: systems and interfaces contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: systems and interfaces?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: systems and interfaces?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Evidence and Decision Gates

Learning objectives

- Explain methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: evidence and decision gates, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Evidence and Decision Gates
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Evidence and Decision Gates describes a practical part of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders. 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: evidence and decision gates?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: evidence and decision gates?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: evidence and decision gates be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: evidence and decision gates?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: evidence and decision gates?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: evidence and decision gates?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: evidence and decision gates. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: evidence and decision gates contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: evidence and decision gates?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: evidence and decision gates?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Work Planning

Learning objectives

- Explain methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: work planning, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Work Planning
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Work Planning describes a practical part of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders. 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: work planning?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: work planning?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: work planning be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: work planning?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: work planning?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: work planning?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: work planning. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: work planning contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: work planning?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: work planning?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders. 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Applied Case describes a practical part of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders. 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders. 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders. 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders: Competence Review describes a practical part of Methane, Flaring and Carbon Accountability for Leaders. 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in methane, flaring and carbon accountability for leaders: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X08 | Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk 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.

Module 1: Marine operations and station keeping

Learning objectives

- Explain marine operations and station keeping, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Marine operations and station keeping
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Floating facilities and vessels maintain position through mooring, dynamic positioning or combinations appropriate to their design. Marine operations depend on weather, equipment condition and personnel competence. Explain station-keeping failure consequences for risers, lines and transfer operations.

Decision logic. Operating windows are vessel- and task-specific. Review weather forecasts, redundancy, assurance and abort criteria before work. Do not use classroom numbers as vessel limits. Interface plans should define who can pause the operation and how changes are communicated.

Worked example. An operation remains within yesterday's forecast but the latest forecast deteriorates during the planned work window.

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 go-or-defer briefing identifying information needed, authority and contingency.

Model answer guide. Use current metocean data, approved limits, equipment status and safe disengagement planning.

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

Activity

Prepare a go-or-defer briefing identifying information needed, authority and contingency.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of marine operations and station keeping?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about marine operations and station keeping?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about marine operations and station keeping be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating marine operations and station keeping?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in marine operations and station keeping?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning marine operations and station keeping?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for marine operations and station keeping. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on marine operations and station keeping contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about marine operations and station keeping?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in marine operations and station keeping?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Environmental and social impact assessment

Learning objectives

- Explain environmental and social impact assessment, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Environmental and social impact assessment
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. An ESIA identifies project alternatives, baseline conditions, potential impacts, mitigation and monitoring. Social assessment includes affected livelihoods, access, distribution of benefits and grievance processes. Assessment should inform choices before they are fixed.

Decision logic. Apply avoidance before mitigation and consider cumulative impacts. Consultation needs accessible information and documented responses. A study's completion does not guarantee regulatory approval or community agreement. Actual scope follows applicable requirements and specialist review.

Worked example. Two fictional supply-base sites differ in transport distance and fishing-community access impacts.

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 alternatives and prepare a consultation and mitigation plan.

Model answer guide. Show impact pathways, alternatives, affected groups, residual impacts and monitoring commitments.

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

Activity

Compare alternatives and prepare a consultation and mitigation plan.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of environmental and social impact assessment?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about environmental and social impact assessment?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about environmental and social impact assessment be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating environmental and social impact assessment?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in environmental and social impact assessment?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning environmental and social impact assessment?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for environmental and social impact assessment. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on environmental and social impact assessment contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about environmental and social impact assessment?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in environmental and social impact assessment?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Spill modelling and response planning

Learning objectives

- Explain spill modelling and response planning, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Spill modelling and response planning
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Spill models estimate transport and fate under specified release, oil and environmental assumptions. They produce scenarios, not exact predictions. Explain trajectory uncertainty, weathering and the importance of current metocean data.

Decision logic. Compare multiple release and weather cases. Connect outputs to response priorities and resource needs without treating a single line as a guaranteed path. Validate model limitations and update information during actual response through competent specialists.

Worked example. Two current scenarios carry a fictional release toward different receptors; one deterministic trajectory hides that range.

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 scenario maps described in the exercise and propose robust priorities.

Model answer guide. Identify common priorities, scenario-dependent actions, monitoring needs and uncertainty.

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

Activity

Compare scenario maps described in the exercise and propose robust priorities.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of spill modelling and response planning?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about spill modelling and response planning?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about spill modelling and response planning be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating spill modelling and response planning?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in spill modelling and response planning?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning spill modelling and response planning?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for spill modelling and response planning. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on spill modelling and response planning contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about spill modelling and response planning?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in spill modelling and response planning?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Biodiversity management

Learning objectives

- Explain biodiversity management, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Biodiversity management
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Biodiversity management identifies important habitats and species, evaluates exposure and applies avoidance, minimisation and restoration where appropriate. Conservation objectives and legal requirements need site-specific verification. Distinguish operational mitigation from a claim of net benefit.

Decision logic. Create measurable commitments with baseline and monitoring evidence. Offsets, if considered, need rigorous specialist and regulatory evaluation; they do not automatically erase impacts. Include cumulative pressures and stakeholder knowledge.

Worked example. A fictional development can reroute a support activity away from a sensitive seasonal habitat.

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. Draft a hierarchy-based biodiversity action plan.

Model answer guide. Prioritise avoidance, define indicators and ownership, and identify evidence needed for residual-impact review.

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

Activity

Draft a hierarchy-based biodiversity action plan.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of biodiversity management?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about biodiversity management?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about biodiversity management be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating biodiversity management?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in biodiversity management?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning biodiversity management?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for biodiversity management. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on biodiversity management contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about biodiversity management?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in biodiversity management?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Work Planning

Learning objectives

- Explain marine and offshore environmental risk governance: work planning, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

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

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Work Planning describes a practical part of Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk 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 marine and offshore environmental risk 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 marine and offshore environmental risk 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 marine and offshore environmental risk 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for marine and offshore environmental risk 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of marine and offshore environmental risk governance: work planning?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: work planning?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: work planning be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating marine and offshore environmental risk governance: work planning?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in marine and offshore environmental risk governance: work planning?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning marine and offshore environmental risk governance: work planning?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for marine and offshore environmental risk governance: work planning. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on marine and offshore environmental risk governance: work planning contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: work planning?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in marine and offshore environmental risk governance: work planning?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain marine and offshore environmental risk governance: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk 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 marine and offshore environmental risk governance: 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 marine and offshore environmental risk governance: 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 marine and offshore environmental risk governance: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for marine and offshore environmental risk governance: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of marine and offshore environmental risk governance: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating marine and offshore environmental risk governance: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in marine and offshore environmental risk governance: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning marine and offshore environmental risk governance: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for marine and offshore environmental risk governance: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on marine and offshore environmental risk governance: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in marine and offshore environmental risk governance: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain marine and offshore environmental risk governance: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Applied Case describes a practical part of Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk 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 marine and offshore environmental risk governance: 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 marine and offshore environmental risk governance: 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 marine and offshore environmental risk governance: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for marine and offshore environmental risk governance: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of marine and offshore environmental risk governance: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating marine and offshore environmental risk governance: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in marine and offshore environmental risk governance: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning marine and offshore environmental risk governance: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for marine and offshore environmental risk governance: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on marine and offshore environmental risk governance: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in marine and offshore environmental risk governance: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain marine and offshore environmental risk governance: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk 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 marine and offshore environmental risk governance: 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 marine and offshore environmental risk governance: 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 marine and offshore environmental risk governance: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for marine and offshore environmental risk governance: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of marine and offshore environmental risk governance: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating marine and offshore environmental risk governance: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in marine and offshore environmental risk governance: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning marine and offshore environmental risk governance: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for marine and offshore environmental risk governance: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on marine and offshore environmental risk governance: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in marine and offshore environmental risk governance: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain marine and offshore environmental risk governance: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

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

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk 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 marine and offshore environmental risk 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 marine and offshore environmental risk 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 marine and offshore environmental risk 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for marine and offshore environmental risk 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of marine and offshore environmental risk governance: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating marine and offshore environmental risk governance: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in marine and offshore environmental risk governance: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning marine and offshore environmental risk governance: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for marine and offshore environmental risk governance: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on marine and offshore environmental risk governance: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in marine and offshore environmental risk governance: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain marine and offshore environmental risk governance: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

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

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk Governance: Competence Review describes a practical part of Marine and Offshore Environmental Risk 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 marine and offshore environmental risk 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 marine and offshore environmental risk 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 marine and offshore environmental risk 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for marine and offshore environmental risk 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of marine and offshore environmental risk governance: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating marine and offshore environmental risk governance: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in marine and offshore environmental risk governance: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning marine and offshore environmental risk governance: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for marine and offshore environmental risk governance: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on marine and offshore environmental risk governance: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about marine and offshore environmental risk governance: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in marine and offshore environmental risk governance: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X09 | Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems.
- 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.

Module 1: Local content and national value

Learning objectives

- Explain local content and national value, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local content and national value
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local content can include employment, skills, supplier participation and durable industrial capability. Distinguish domestic ownership, local expenditure and actual value retained locally. A purchase from a locally registered importer may contain little domestic production.

Decision logic. Measure outcomes with a defined boundary, baseline and evidence. Avoid assuming a proposed policy target is current law. Supplier development must protect quality and safety while building realistic capacity and fair access.

Worked example. A fictional USD 1 million local invoice contains USD 850,000 imported equipment and USD 150,000 local services.

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 the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

Model answer guide. Fifteen percent in this simplified boundary; employment, skills and retained value need separate evidence.

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

Activity

Calculate the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content and national value?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content and national value?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content and national value be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content and national value?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content and national value?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content and national value?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content and national value. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content and national value contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content and national value?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content and national value?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Supplier qualification and development

Learning objectives

- Explain supplier qualification and development, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Supplier qualification and development
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Supplier readiness combines legal identity, technical capability, HSE, quality, finance and delivery capacity. Prequalification is a screening stage, not an award guarantee. SMEs need clear evidence requirements and realistic package sizes.

Decision logic. Diagnose gaps and agree measurable development actions. Keep conflict-of-interest controls and transparent evaluation. A supplier can be ready for one package but not another; capability is scope-specific. Avoid treating registration on a portal as proof of competence.

Worked example. A small firm has strong fabrication skill but no traceable material-control process for the proposed package.

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. Create a supplier improvement plan with evidence and milestones.

Model answer guide. Include material traceability, qualified personnel, quality records and capacity checks matched to scope.

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

Activity

Create a supplier improvement plan with evidence and milestones.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of supplier qualification and development?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about supplier qualification and development?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about supplier qualification and development be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating supplier qualification and development?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in supplier qualification and development?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning supplier qualification and development?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for supplier qualification and development. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on supplier qualification and development contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about supplier qualification and development?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in supplier qualification and development?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Skills gaps and workforce development

Learning objectives

- Explain skills gaps and workforce development, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Skills gaps and workforce development
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. A skills plan compares future tasks with existing competence, training capacity and realistic deployment timing. Occupation counts differ from competence requirements. Separate short awareness training, trade qualification, supervised experience and authorisation for a role.

Decision logic. Use employer-validated task profiles and assess prior learning fairly. Include instructor capacity, workshops, placements and inclusion barriers. Forecast jobs as scenarios rather than guarantees. Measure deployment and demonstrated capability, not enrolment alone.

Worked example. A project needs ten technicians but only six candidates meet the required prior trade foundation.

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. Create a staged development plan with bridging, assessment and supervised placement.

Model answer guide. Identify prerequisites, capacity, funding, evidence and contingency rather than promising rapid certification for all.

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

Activity

Create a staged development plan with bridging, assessment and supervised placement.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of skills gaps and workforce development?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about skills gaps and workforce development?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about skills gaps and workforce development be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating skills gaps and workforce development?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in skills gaps and workforce development?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning skills gaps and workforce development?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for skills gaps and workforce development. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on skills gaps and workforce development contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about skills gaps and workforce development?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in skills gaps and workforce development?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Procurement and supplier qualification

Learning objectives

- Explain procurement and supplier qualification, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Procurement and supplier qualification
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Procurement translates a defined need into sourcing, evaluation, award and contract management. Separate mandatory eligibility, technical acceptance and commercial comparison. Clear specifications and evaluation criteria should exist before bids are opened.

Decision logic. Manage conflicts, confidentiality and fair treatment. Lowest price may not be lowest evaluated cost if quality, delivery and lifecycle support differ. Document decisions and follow delegated authority; this classroom exercise awards no real contracts.

Worked example. A low bid excludes offshore mobilisation while another includes it.

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. Normalise three fictional bids and prepare an evaluation recommendation.

Model answer guide. Compare like-for-like scope, clarify exclusions and include risk with an auditable decision basis.

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

Activity

Normalise three fictional bids and prepare an evaluation recommendation.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of procurement and supplier qualification?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about procurement and supplier qualification?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about procurement and supplier qualification be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating procurement and supplier qualification?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in procurement and supplier qualification?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning procurement and supplier qualification?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for procurement and supplier qualification. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on procurement and supplier qualification contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about procurement and supplier qualification?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in procurement and supplier qualification?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Petroleum policy and institutional governance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy and institutional governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum policy and institutional governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Policy sets objectives, institutions assign authority, and governance creates accountability for decisions and resources. Explain government, regulator and state enterprise roles conceptually without asserting an unverified current Namibian structure.

Decision logic. Separate commercial participation from regulatory judgement and manage conflicts transparently. Define decision rights, disclosure, assurance and challenge. A strong governance design includes implementation capacity and an audit trail, not just an organisation chart.

Worked example. A fictional institution both promotes investment and evaluates its own project compliance, creating a conflict to manage.

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. Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

Model answer guide. Identify segregated decisions, independent review, declarations and public accountability where applicable.

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

Activity

Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy and institutional governance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy and institutional governance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy and institutional governance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems. 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Applied Case describes a practical part of Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems. 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems. 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems. 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems: Competence Review describes a practical part of Local Content Delivery and Supplier Ecosystems. 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content delivery and supplier ecosystems: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X10 | Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships.
- 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.

Module 1: Skills gaps and workforce development

Learning objectives

- Explain skills gaps and workforce development, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Skills gaps and workforce development
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. A skills plan compares future tasks with existing competence, training capacity and realistic deployment timing. Occupation counts differ from competence requirements. Separate short awareness training, trade qualification, supervised experience and authorisation for a role.

Decision logic. Use employer-validated task profiles and assess prior learning fairly. Include instructor capacity, workshops, placements and inclusion barriers. Forecast jobs as scenarios rather than guarantees. Measure deployment and demonstrated capability, not enrolment alone.

Worked example. A project needs ten technicians but only six candidates meet the required prior trade foundation.

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. Create a staged development plan with bridging, assessment and supervised placement.

Model answer guide. Identify prerequisites, capacity, funding, evidence and contingency rather than promising rapid certification for all.

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

Activity

Create a staged development plan with bridging, assessment and supervised placement.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of skills gaps and workforce development?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about skills gaps and workforce development?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about skills gaps and workforce development be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating skills gaps and workforce development?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in skills gaps and workforce development?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning skills gaps and workforce development?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for skills gaps and workforce development. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on skills gaps and workforce development contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about skills gaps and workforce development?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in skills gaps and workforce development?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Workplace competence and assessment evidence

Learning objectives

- Explain workplace competence and assessment evidence, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Workplace competence and assessment evidence
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Competence requires consistent performance against defined criteria in relevant conditions. Attendance and quiz scores are limited evidence. Use observation, work products, questioning and authenticated logbooks, with reasonable adjustments that preserve the required standard.

Decision logic. Assessors must be competent and authorised under the adopted scheme. Safety-critical steps are mandatory, not averaged away by other marks. Record not-yet-competent outcomes, feedback, remediation and reassessment. No national unit-standard equivalence is claimed without formal mapping and approval.

Worked example. A learner answers every question correctly but cannot identify an unsafe equipment condition during observation.

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. Plan two supervised observations and a logbook authentication method.

Model answer guide. Require task conditions, critical criteria, assessor signature, evidence and reassessment route.

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

Activity

Plan two supervised observations and a logbook authentication method.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of workplace competence and assessment evidence?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about workplace competence and assessment evidence?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about workplace competence and assessment evidence be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating workplace competence and assessment evidence?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in workplace competence and assessment evidence?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning workplace competence and assessment evidence?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for workplace competence and assessment evidence. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on workplace competence and assessment evidence contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about workplace competence and assessment evidence?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in workplace competence and assessment evidence?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Systems and Interfaces

Learning objectives

- Explain energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: systems and interfaces, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Systems and Interfaces
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Systems and Interfaces describes a practical part of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships. 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: systems and interfaces be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: systems and interfaces. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: systems and interfaces contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Evidence and Decision Gates

Learning objectives

- Explain energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: evidence and decision gates, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Evidence and Decision Gates
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Evidence and Decision Gates describes a practical part of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships. 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: evidence and decision gates?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: evidence and decision gates?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: evidence and decision gates be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: evidence and decision gates?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: evidence and decision gates?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: evidence and decision gates?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: evidence and decision gates. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: evidence and decision gates contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: evidence and decision gates?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: evidence and decision gates?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Local content and national value

Learning objectives

- Explain local content and national value, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local content and national value
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local content can include employment, skills, supplier participation and durable industrial capability. Distinguish domestic ownership, local expenditure and actual value retained locally. A purchase from a locally registered importer may contain little domestic production.

Decision logic. Measure outcomes with a defined boundary, baseline and evidence. Avoid assuming a proposed policy target is current law. Supplier development must protect quality and safety while building realistic capacity and fair access.

Worked example. A fictional USD 1 million local invoice contains USD 850,000 imported equipment and USD 150,000 local services.

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 the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

Model answer guide. Fifteen percent in this simplified boundary; employment, skills and retained value need separate evidence.

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

Activity

Calculate the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content and national value?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content and national value?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content and national value be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content and national value?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content and national value?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content and national value?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content and national value. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content and national value contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content and national value?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content and national value?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships. 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Applied Case describes a practical part of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships. 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships. 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships. 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships: Competence Review describes a practical part of Energy Workforce Planning and Skills Partnerships. 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy workforce planning and skills partnerships: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X11 | Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure.
- 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.

Module 1: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Core Concepts

Learning objectives

- Explain public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Core Concepts
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Core Concepts describes a practical part of Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure. 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts. 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: core concepts?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Contract strategy and risk allocation

Learning objectives

- Explain contract strategy and risk allocation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contract strategy and risk allocation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Contracts define scope, deliverables, payment, acceptance, change and remedies. Lump sum, reimbursable and target-cost arrangements allocate uncertainty differently. Begin with scope maturity and market capability rather than choosing a familiar contract label.

Decision logic. Risk should be allocated to parties able to manage it, with realistic pricing and assurance. Unclear interfaces create disputes despite detailed clauses. Actual indemnity, liability, insurance and governing-law terms require qualified legal and commercial review.

Worked example. A supplier prices an undefined offshore interface as an exclusion; the owner's total risk remains unresolved.

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. Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

Model answer guide. Include deliverables, acceptance evidence, owner interfaces, change control and exclusions.

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

Activity

Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about contract strategy and risk allocation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for contract strategy and risk allocation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on contract strategy and risk allocation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Project finance and funding structure

Learning objectives

- Explain project finance and funding structure, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Project finance and funding structure
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Financing links investors, lenders, project cash flows and contractual risk allocation. Explain equity, debt, debt service, covenants and security conceptually. Financing availability depends on credible technical, commercial and environmental evidence.

Decision logic. Distinguish project economics from shareholder returns and loan serviceability. Debt can amplify returns and risk. Check downside cash available for debt service rather than assuming forecast revenue is free cash. No financing commitment is implied.

Worked example. Cash available for debt service of 120 and scheduled debt service of 100 gives a coverage ratio of 1.2.

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. Stress the ratio when available cash falls by 25% and discuss consequences.

Model answer guide. Coverage falls to 0.9; the project may not meet scheduled service without remedies under its actual agreements.

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

Activity

Stress the ratio when available cash falls by 25% and discuss consequences.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of project finance and funding structure?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about project finance and funding structure?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about project finance and funding structure be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating project finance and funding structure?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in project finance and funding structure?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning project finance and funding structure?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for project finance and funding structure. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on project finance and funding structure contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about project finance and funding structure?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in project finance and funding structure?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Petroleum policy and institutional governance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy and institutional governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum policy and institutional governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Policy sets objectives, institutions assign authority, and governance creates accountability for decisions and resources. Explain government, regulator and state enterprise roles conceptually without asserting an unverified current Namibian structure.

Decision logic. Separate commercial participation from regulatory judgement and manage conflicts transparently. Define decision rights, disclosure, assurance and challenge. A strong governance design includes implementation capacity and an audit trail, not just an organisation chart.

Worked example. A fictional institution both promotes investment and evaluates its own project compliance, creating a conflict to manage.

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. Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

Model answer guide. Identify segregated decisions, independent review, declarations and public accountability where applicable.

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

Activity

Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy and institutional governance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy and institutional governance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy and institutional governance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: 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: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about risk assessment and uncertainty management be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for risk assessment and uncertainty management. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on risk assessment and uncertainty management contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure. 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Applied Case describes a practical part of Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure. 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure. 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure. 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure: Competence Review describes a practical part of Public-Private Partnerships in Energy Infrastructure. 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in public-private partnerships in energy infrastructure: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X12 | Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication.
- 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.

Module 1: Emergency preparedness and command

Learning objectives

- Explain emergency preparedness and command, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Emergency preparedness and command
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Emergency planning identifies credible scenarios, warning, command, communications, muster, evacuation, medical support and external interfaces. Responsibilities and fallback communications should be understood before an event. Awareness differs from emergency-team qualification.

Decision logic. Use tabletop exercises with timed injects, observer records and debrief actions. Test loss of communications or unavailable resources. Never simulate an actual distress call or activate real emergency equipment without authorised arrangements.

Worked example. A fictional offshore incident interrupts the primary communication link during a weather restriction.

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. Run a tabletop with incident controller, operations, logistics and communications roles.

Model answer guide. Prioritise people, establish command, verify information, use planned backup channels and document decisions.

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

Activity

Run a tabletop with incident controller, operations, logistics and communications roles.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of emergency preparedness and command?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about emergency preparedness and command?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about emergency preparedness and command be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating emergency preparedness and command?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in emergency preparedness and command?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning emergency preparedness and command?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for emergency preparedness and command. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on emergency preparedness and command contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about emergency preparedness and command?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in emergency preparedness and command?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Risk Controls

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Risk Controls
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Risk Controls describes a practical part of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication. 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls. 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: risk controls?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Systems and Interfaces

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore crisis leadership and public communication: systems and interfaces, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Systems and Interfaces
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Systems and Interfaces describes a practical part of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication. 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore crisis leadership and public communication: systems and interfaces?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: systems and interfaces?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: systems and interfaces be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore crisis leadership and public communication: systems and interfaces?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: systems and interfaces?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore crisis leadership and public communication: systems and interfaces?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: systems and interfaces. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore crisis leadership and public communication: systems and interfaces contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: systems and interfaces?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: systems and interfaces?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: 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: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about stakeholder engagement and communication be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for stakeholder engagement and communication. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on stakeholder engagement and communication contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Safety and project leadership

Learning objectives

- Explain safety and project leadership, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Safety and project leadership
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Leadership sets priorities through decisions, resources and response to bad news. Explain the difference between stated values and incentives that reward unsafe shortcuts. Leaders need clear delegation, listening and evidence-based challenge.

Decision logic. Use leading indicators tied to important barriers and delivery outcomes. Review overdue actions and organisational capacity, not just aggregate counts. Encourage escalation and resolve conflicting objectives openly. Authority remains accountable even when tasks are delegated.

Worked example. A manager requests schedule recovery while critical tests are incomplete. The team must resolve priorities explicitly.

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 leadership response and a 30-day improvement plan.

Model answer guide. Require safe sequencing, resources, action owners and follow-up; do not reward concealment of incomplete work.

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

Activity

Write a leadership response and a 30-day improvement plan.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of safety and project leadership?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about safety and project leadership?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about safety and project leadership be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating safety and project leadership?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in safety and project leadership?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning safety and project leadership?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for safety and project leadership. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on safety and project leadership contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about safety and project leadership?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in safety and project leadership?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore crisis leadership and public communication: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication. 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore crisis leadership and public communication: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore crisis leadership and public communication: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore crisis leadership and public communication: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore crisis leadership and public communication: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore crisis leadership and public communication: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Applied Case describes a practical part of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication. 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore crisis leadership and public communication: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore crisis leadership and public communication: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore crisis leadership and public communication: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore crisis leadership and public communication: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore crisis leadership and public communication: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication. 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore crisis leadership and public communication: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore crisis leadership and public communication: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore crisis leadership and public communication: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore crisis leadership and public communication: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore crisis leadership and public communication: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication. 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore crisis leadership and public communication: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore crisis leadership and public communication: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore crisis leadership and public communication: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore crisis leadership and public communication: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore crisis leadership and public communication: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication: Competence Review describes a practical part of Offshore Crisis Leadership and Public Communication. 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore crisis leadership and public communication: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore crisis leadership and public communication: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore crisis leadership and public communication: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore crisis leadership and public communication: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore crisis leadership and public communication: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore crisis leadership and public communication: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore crisis leadership and public communication: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X13 | Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design.
- 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.

Module 1: Licensing and acreage management

Learning objectives

- Explain licensing and acreage management, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Licensing and acreage management
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Licences define rights and obligations within specified areas and periods. Work commitments, reporting, transfers and relinquishment may be governed by the applicable framework. Explain the difference between holding acreage and receiving all approvals to develop or operate.

Decision logic. Assess technical capability, beneficial ownership, financial capacity and compliance evidence within lawful processes. Keep commercial attractiveness separate from eligibility. Do not invent bid-round dates, licence terms or regulator powers for Namibia.

Worked example. A fictional explorer holds an exploration right but has not secured approval for a later development activity.

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 an approval dependency map and identify verification questions.

Model answer guide. Separate rights, environmental approvals, development decisions and operational consents; verify each duty.

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

Activity

Build an approval dependency map and identify verification questions.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of licensing and acreage management?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about licensing and acreage management?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about licensing and acreage management be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating licensing and acreage management?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in licensing and acreage management?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning licensing and acreage management?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for licensing and acreage management. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on licensing and acreage management contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about licensing and acreage management?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in licensing and acreage management?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Royalties taxes and government take

Learning objectives

- Explain royalties taxes and government take, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Royalties taxes and government take
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Fiscal systems allocate project value between investors and the state through mechanisms such as royalties, taxes, bonuses or contractual sharing. Compare mechanisms conceptually. Do not assume a production-sharing system applies to Namibia or import tax rates from another jurisdiction.

Decision logic. Model the actual legal and contractual hierarchy only after specialist verification. Government take depends on timing, cost recovery, deductions and price as well as headline rates. Keep illustrative fiscal cases visibly separate from current law.

Worked example. In a fictional classroom system, 5% royalty on USD 100 revenue is USD 5. This assumption is not a statement of Namibian law.

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 a gross-revenue royalty with a profit-based levy using two cost scenarios.

Model answer guide. Royalty remains linked to gross revenue while profit-based payments change with allowed costs; note legal definitions matter.

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

Activity

Compare a gross-revenue royalty with a profit-based levy using two cost scenarios.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of royalties taxes and government take?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about royalties taxes and government take?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about royalties taxes and government take be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating royalties taxes and government take?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in royalties taxes and government take?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning royalties taxes and government take?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for royalties taxes and government take. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on royalties taxes and government take contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about royalties taxes and government take?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in royalties taxes and government take?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Petroleum legislative architecture

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum legislative architecture, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum legislative architecture
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Distinguish legislation, regulations, licence conditions, contracts and internal procedures. Public-law obligations and private agreements serve different functions. A commercial agreement cannot be assumed to waive a statutory requirement. Identify which authority and jurisdiction govern each issue.

Decision logic. Teach a verification method rather than unverified current legal rules: locate the official instrument, record amendment and commencement status, confirm applicability, and obtain qualified review. Classroom comparisons of concessions and PSAs are not statements of Namibia's adopted system.

Worked example. A contract refers to an old environmental instrument; the legal register must check current requirements before relying on it.

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. Create a legal-register template for exploration, development and operations.

Model answer guide. Include instrument, version, duty, applicability, owner, evidence and next review date.

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

Activity

Create a legal-register template for exploration, development and operations.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum legislative architecture?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum legislative architecture?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum legislative architecture be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum legislative architecture?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum legislative architecture?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum legislative architecture?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum legislative architecture. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum legislative architecture contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum legislative architecture?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum legislative architecture?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Evidence and Decision Gates

Learning objectives

- Explain strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: evidence and decision gates, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Evidence and Decision Gates
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Evidence and Decision Gates describes a practical part of Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design. 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: evidence and decision gates?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: evidence and decision gates?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: evidence and decision gates be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: evidence and decision gates?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: evidence and decision gates?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: evidence and decision gates?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: evidence and decision gates. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: evidence and decision gates contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: evidence and decision gates?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: evidence and decision gates?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Petroleum policy and institutional governance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy and institutional governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum policy and institutional governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Policy sets objectives, institutions assign authority, and governance creates accountability for decisions and resources. Explain government, regulator and state enterprise roles conceptually without asserting an unverified current Namibian structure.

Decision logic. Separate commercial participation from regulatory judgement and manage conflicts transparently. Define decision rights, disclosure, assurance and challenge. A strong governance design includes implementation capacity and an audit trail, not just an organisation chart.

Worked example. A fictional institution both promotes investment and evaluates its own project compliance, creating a conflict to manage.

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. Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

Model answer guide. Identify segregated decisions, independent review, declarations and public accountability where applicable.

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

Activity

Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy and institutional governance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy and institutional governance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy and institutional governance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design. 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Applied Case describes a practical part of Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design. 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design. 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design. 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design: Competence Review describes a practical part of Strategic Petroleum Licensing and Fiscal Design. 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in strategic petroleum licensing and fiscal design: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X14 | Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains.
- 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.

Module 1: Refining gas processing and product markets

Learning objectives

- Explain refining gas processing and product markets, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Refining gas processing and product markets
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Refining separates crude into fractions and upgrades them to meet product needs. Distillation, conversion and treating perform different functions. Explain simple versus more complex configurations and the role of hydrogen, utilities and environmental controls.

Decision logic. A refinery investment requires feedstock security, product demand, scale, logistics, finance and regulatory feasibility. Local crude production does not by itself justify a refinery. Compare netbacks from export and processing under explicit assumptions.

Worked example. A fictional simple refinery produces fractions that do not match the domestic demand mix, requiring imports or exports anyway.

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 a refinery-versus-export decision matrix.

Model answer guide. Include product specifications, market size, capital, utilities, emissions, feed assurance and logistics.

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

Activity

Develop a refinery-versus-export decision matrix.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of refining gas processing and product markets?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about refining gas processing and product markets?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about refining gas processing and product markets be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating refining gas processing and product markets?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in refining gas processing and product markets?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning refining gas processing and product markets?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for refining gas processing and product markets. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on refining gas processing and product markets contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about refining gas processing and product markets?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in refining gas processing and product markets?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Crude oil quality and assay interpretation

Learning objectives

- Explain crude oil quality and assay interpretation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Crude oil quality and assay interpretation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Crude properties include density, sulfur, acidity, metals, salt, water and distillation behaviour. API gravity is a density scale, not a complete quality grade. Explain how crude assay and sampling representativeness affect refinery fit and valuation.

Decision logic. A light crude can still present processing or materials challenges. Compare whole-crude properties with fraction yields and contaminants. Distinguish a laboratory result, a contractual specification and a refinery's acceptable feed envelope.

Worked example. Two hypothetical crudes have similar API gravity but very different sulfur and metals contents.

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 the two fictional assays and list additional data needed for refinery selection.

Model answer guide. Include contaminant management, fraction yields, blending and sampling quality; avoid ranking by API gravity alone.

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

Activity

Compare the two fictional assays and list additional data needed for refinery selection.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about crude oil quality and assay interpretation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for crude oil quality and assay interpretation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on crude oil quality and assay interpretation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in crude oil quality and assay interpretation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Global petroleum markets and price formation

Learning objectives

- Explain global petroleum markets and price formation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Global petroleum markets and price formation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Crude markets connect producers, traders, refiners and transport providers. Prices often reference benchmarks adjusted for quality, location and contract terms. OPEC is a producers' organisation, not a buyer qualification or an assurance of payment.

Decision logic. Separate physical delivery, price exposure and credit exposure. A high headline price can be offset by freight, quality discounts, finance or default risk. No company is labelled reliable without current due diligence and an approved transaction basis.

Worked example. Offer A is USD 75/barrel with USD 5 freight; offer B is USD 73 with USD 1 freight, before other terms.

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 simplified netbacks and identify non-price checks.

Model answer guide. A gives 70 and B gives 72 USD/barrel; check credit, delivery, sanctions and quality terms before selection.

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

Activity

Compare simplified netbacks and identify non-price checks.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about global petroleum markets and price formation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for global petroleum markets and price formation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on global petroleum markets and price formation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Evidence and Decision Gates

Learning objectives

- Explain energy security, refining and domestic value chains: evidence and decision gates, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Evidence and Decision Gates
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Evidence and Decision Gates describes a practical part of Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains. 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy security, refining and domestic value chains: evidence and decision gates?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: evidence and decision gates?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: evidence and decision gates be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy security, refining and domestic value chains: evidence and decision gates?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy security, refining and domestic value chains: evidence and decision gates?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy security, refining and domestic value chains: evidence and decision gates?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy security, refining and domestic value chains: evidence and decision gates. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy security, refining and domestic value chains: evidence and decision gates contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: evidence and decision gates?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy security, refining and domestic value chains: evidence and decision gates?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Local content and national value

Learning objectives

- Explain local content and national value, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local content and national value
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local content can include employment, skills, supplier participation and durable industrial capability. Distinguish domestic ownership, local expenditure and actual value retained locally. A purchase from a locally registered importer may contain little domestic production.

Decision logic. Measure outcomes with a defined boundary, baseline and evidence. Avoid assuming a proposed policy target is current law. Supplier development must protect quality and safety while building realistic capacity and fair access.

Worked example. A fictional USD 1 million local invoice contains USD 850,000 imported equipment and USD 150,000 local services.

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 the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

Model answer guide. Fifteen percent in this simplified boundary; employment, skills and retained value need separate evidence.

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

Activity

Calculate the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content and national value?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content and national value?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content and national value be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content and national value?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content and national value?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content and national value?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content and national value. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content and national value contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content and national value?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content and national value?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain energy security, refining and domestic value chains: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains. 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy security, refining and domestic value chains: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy security, refining and domestic value chains: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy security, refining and domestic value chains: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy security, refining and domestic value chains: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy security, refining and domestic value chains: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy security, refining and domestic value chains: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy security, refining and domestic value chains: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain energy security, refining and domestic value chains: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Applied Case describes a practical part of Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains. 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy security, refining and domestic value chains: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy security, refining and domestic value chains: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy security, refining and domestic value chains: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy security, refining and domestic value chains: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy security, refining and domestic value chains: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy security, refining and domestic value chains: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy security, refining and domestic value chains: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain energy security, refining and domestic value chains: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains. 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy security, refining and domestic value chains: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy security, refining and domestic value chains: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy security, refining and domestic value chains: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy security, refining and domestic value chains: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy security, refining and domestic value chains: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy security, refining and domestic value chains: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy security, refining and domestic value chains: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain energy security, refining and domestic value chains: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains. 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy security, refining and domestic value chains: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy security, refining and domestic value chains: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy security, refining and domestic value chains: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy security, refining and domestic value chains: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy security, refining and domestic value chains: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy security, refining and domestic value chains: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy security, refining and domestic value chains: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain energy security, refining and domestic value chains: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains: Competence Review describes a practical part of Energy Security, Refining and Domestic Value Chains. 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy security, refining and domestic value chains: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy security, refining and domestic value chains: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy security, refining and domestic value chains: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy security, refining and domestic value chains: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy security, refining and domestic value chains: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy security, refining and domestic value chains: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy security, refining and domestic value chains: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy security, refining and domestic value chains: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy security, refining and domestic value chains: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X15 | Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty.
- 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.

Module 1: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Core Concepts

Learning objectives

- Explain executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Core Concepts
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Core Concepts describes a practical part of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty. 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts. 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: core concepts?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Volumetric estimation

Learning objectives

- Explain volumetric estimation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Volumetric estimation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Oil initially in place can be estimated from bulk rock volume, net-to-gross, porosity and hydrocarbon saturation, divided by oil formation volume factor. Keep all units consistent. In-place oil is different from recoverable resources, which require recovery and development assumptions.

Decision logic. Avoid combining unrelated optimistic parameters into an unlabelled base case. Preserve dependence between area, thickness and reservoir quality. Present ranges and indicate which measurements drive uncertainty. Recovery factor is a scenario assumption until supported by reservoir evaluation.

Worked example. Using SI volumes: 1 million cubic metres bulk rock, NTG 0.5, porosity 0.2, oil saturation 0.7 and Bo 1.2 gives about 58,333 stock-tank cubic metres in place.

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. Recalculate after halving net-to-gross and interpret the result.

Model answer guide. The estimate halves to about 29,167 cubic metres; this remains in-place oil, not booked reserves.

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

Activity

Recalculate after halving net-to-gross and interpret the result.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of volumetric estimation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about volumetric estimation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about volumetric estimation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating volumetric estimation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in volumetric estimation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning volumetric estimation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for volumetric estimation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on volumetric estimation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about volumetric estimation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in volumetric estimation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Production forecasting

Learning objectives

- Explain production forecasting, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Production forecasting
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Forecasts combine reservoir behaviour, well availability, ramp-up, capacity constraints and downtime. Distinguish potential reservoir production from saleable output. State units, time basis and whether rates are instantaneous, daily averages or annual totals.

Decision logic. Build low, base and high cases with internally consistent constraints. Bottlenecks can shift as water production rises. Compare forecast to observed history when available and track revisions with reasons. Do not assign actual Namibian first-oil dates from classroom scenarios.

Worked example. A system with 100,000 barrels/day potential and 90% availability yields 90,000 barrels/day average before other constraints.

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 one-year forecast with availability falling to 80% for three months.

Model answer guide. Calculate period-weighted output and explain facility versus reservoir constraints separately.

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

Activity

Prepare a one-year forecast with availability falling to 80% for three months.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of production forecasting?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about production forecasting?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about production forecasting be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating production forecasting?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in production forecasting?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning production forecasting?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for production forecasting. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on production forecasting contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about production forecasting?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in production forecasting?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Sensitivity and scenario analysis

Learning objectives

- Explain sensitivity and scenario analysis, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Sensitivity and scenario analysis
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Sensitivity changes one input to understand model response; scenarios change coherent sets of assumptions. A tornado chart ranks tested effects, not the probability of events. Distinguish uncertainty ranges from forecasts and assigned probabilities.

Decision logic. Check dependencies: schedule delay may increase cost and defer revenue together. A correlated downside should not be represented as independent optimistic inputs. Identify decision-changing variables and the evidence that could narrow them.

Worked example. Price down 20% and CAPEX up 20% are separate sensitivities; combined delay, inflation and low price is a downside scenario.

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 sensitivity table and one coherent downside scenario.

Model answer guide. Preserve the base case, document changed inputs, and explain causal links in the combined case.

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

Activity

Prepare a sensitivity table and one coherent downside scenario.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about sensitivity and scenario analysis be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for sensitivity and scenario analysis. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on sensitivity and scenario analysis contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in sensitivity and scenario analysis?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Work Planning

Learning objectives

- Explain executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: work planning, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Work Planning
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Work Planning describes a practical part of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty. 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: work planning?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: work planning?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: work planning be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: work planning?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: work planning?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: work planning?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: work planning. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: work planning contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: work planning?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: work planning?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty. 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Applied Case describes a practical part of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty. 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty. 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty. 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty: Competence Review describes a practical part of Executive Decision-Making Under Resource Uncertainty. 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive decision-making under resource uncertainty: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X16 | National Oil Company Governance and Performance

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on National Oil Company Governance and Performance, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for National Oil Company Governance and Performance.
- 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.

Module 1: Petroleum policy and institutional governance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy and institutional governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum policy and institutional governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Oil Company Governance and Performance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Policy sets objectives, institutions assign authority, and governance creates accountability for decisions and resources. Explain government, regulator and state enterprise roles conceptually without asserting an unverified current Namibian structure.

Decision logic. Separate commercial participation from regulatory judgement and manage conflicts transparently. Define decision rights, disclosure, assurance and challenge. A strong governance design includes implementation capacity and an audit trail, not just an organisation chart.

Worked example. A fictional institution both promotes investment and evaluates its own project compliance, creating a conflict to manage.

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. Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

Model answer guide. Identify segregated decisions, independent review, declarations and public accountability where applicable.

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

Activity

Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy and institutional governance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy and institutional governance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy and institutional governance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Risk Controls

Learning objectives

- Explain national oil company governance and performance: risk controls, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Risk Controls
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Oil Company Governance and Performance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Risk Controls describes a practical part of National Oil Company Governance and Performance. 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 national oil company governance and performance: risk controls. 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 national oil company governance and performance: risk controls 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 national oil company governance and performance: risk controls: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national oil company governance and performance: risk controls: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national oil company governance and performance: risk controls?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national oil company governance and performance: risk controls?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national oil company governance and performance: risk controls be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national oil company governance and performance: risk controls?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national oil company governance and performance: risk controls?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national oil company governance and performance: risk controls?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national oil company governance and performance: risk controls. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national oil company governance and performance: risk controls contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national oil company governance and performance: risk controls?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national oil company governance and performance: risk controls?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Project finance and funding structure

Learning objectives

- Explain project finance and funding structure, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Project finance and funding structure
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Oil Company Governance and Performance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Financing links investors, lenders, project cash flows and contractual risk allocation. Explain equity, debt, debt service, covenants and security conceptually. Financing availability depends on credible technical, commercial and environmental evidence.

Decision logic. Distinguish project economics from shareholder returns and loan serviceability. Debt can amplify returns and risk. Check downside cash available for debt service rather than assuming forecast revenue is free cash. No financing commitment is implied.

Worked example. Cash available for debt service of 120 and scheduled debt service of 100 gives a coverage ratio of 1.2.

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. Stress the ratio when available cash falls by 25% and discuss consequences.

Model answer guide. Coverage falls to 0.9; the project may not meet scheduled service without remedies under its actual agreements.

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

Activity

Stress the ratio when available cash falls by 25% and discuss consequences.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of project finance and funding structure?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about project finance and funding structure?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about project finance and funding structure be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating project finance and funding structure?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in project finance and funding structure?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning project finance and funding structure?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for project finance and funding structure. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on project finance and funding structure contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about project finance and funding structure?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in project finance and funding structure?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Petroleum legislative architecture

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum legislative architecture, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum legislative architecture
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Oil Company Governance and Performance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Distinguish legislation, regulations, licence conditions, contracts and internal procedures. Public-law obligations and private agreements serve different functions. A commercial agreement cannot be assumed to waive a statutory requirement. Identify which authority and jurisdiction govern each issue.

Decision logic. Teach a verification method rather than unverified current legal rules: locate the official instrument, record amendment and commencement status, confirm applicability, and obtain qualified review. Classroom comparisons of concessions and PSAs are not statements of Namibia's adopted system.

Worked example. A contract refers to an old environmental instrument; the legal register must check current requirements before relying on it.

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. Create a legal-register template for exploration, development and operations.

Model answer guide. Include instrument, version, duty, applicability, owner, evidence and next review date.

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

Activity

Create a legal-register template for exploration, development and operations.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum legislative architecture?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum legislative architecture?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum legislative architecture be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum legislative architecture?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum legislative architecture?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum legislative architecture?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum legislative architecture. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum legislative architecture contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum legislative architecture?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum legislative architecture?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Work Planning

Learning objectives

- Explain national oil company governance and performance: work planning, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Work Planning
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Oil Company Governance and Performance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Work Planning describes a practical part of National Oil Company Governance and Performance. 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national oil company governance and performance: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national oil company governance and performance: work planning?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national oil company governance and performance: work planning?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national oil company governance and performance: work planning be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national oil company governance and performance: work planning?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national oil company governance and performance: work planning?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national oil company governance and performance: work planning?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national oil company governance and performance: work planning. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national oil company governance and performance: work planning contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national oil company governance and performance: work planning?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national oil company governance and performance: work planning?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain national oil company governance and performance: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

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

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Data and Performance describes a practical part of National Oil Company Governance and Performance. 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national oil company governance and performance: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national oil company governance and performance: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national oil company governance and performance: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national oil company governance and performance: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national oil company governance and performance: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national oil company governance and performance: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national oil company governance and performance: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national oil company governance and performance: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national oil company governance and performance: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national oil company governance and performance: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national oil company governance and performance: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain national oil company governance and performance: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Oil Company Governance and Performance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Applied Case describes a practical part of National Oil Company Governance and Performance. 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national oil company governance and performance: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national oil company governance and performance: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national oil company governance and performance: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national oil company governance and performance: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national oil company governance and performance: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national oil company governance and performance: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national oil company governance and performance: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national oil company governance and performance: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national oil company governance and performance: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national oil company governance and performance: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national oil company governance and performance: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain national oil company governance and performance: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Oil Company Governance and Performance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of National Oil Company Governance and Performance. 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national oil company governance and performance: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national oil company governance and performance: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national oil company governance and performance: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national oil company governance and performance: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national oil company governance and performance: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national oil company governance and performance: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national oil company governance and performance: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national oil company governance and performance: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national oil company governance and performance: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national oil company governance and performance: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national oil company governance and performance: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain national oil company governance and performance: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Oil Company Governance and Performance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of National Oil Company Governance and Performance. 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national oil company governance and performance: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national oil company governance and performance: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national oil company governance and performance: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national oil company governance and performance: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national oil company governance and performance: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national oil company governance and performance: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national oil company governance and performance: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national oil company governance and performance: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national oil company governance and performance: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national oil company governance and performance: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national oil company governance and performance: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain national oil company governance and performance: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: National Oil Company Governance and Performance

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. National Oil Company Governance and Performance: Competence Review describes a practical part of National Oil Company Governance and Performance. 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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 national oil company governance and performance: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for national oil company governance and performance: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of national oil company governance and performance: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about national oil company governance and performance: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about national oil company governance and performance: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating national oil company governance and performance: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in national oil company governance and performance: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning national oil company governance and performance: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for national oil company governance and performance: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on national oil company governance and performance: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about national oil company governance and performance: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in national oil company governance and performance: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X17 | Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability.
- 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.

Module 1: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Core Concepts

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Core Concepts
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Core Concepts describes a practical part of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability. 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts. 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: core concepts?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Risk Controls

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Risk Controls
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Risk Controls describes a practical part of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability. 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls. 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: risk controls?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Systems and Interfaces

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: systems and interfaces, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Systems and Interfaces
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Systems and Interfaces describes a practical part of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability. 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: systems and interfaces?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: systems and interfaces?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: systems and interfaces be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: systems and interfaces?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: systems and interfaces?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: systems and interfaces?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: systems and interfaces. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: systems and interfaces contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: systems and interfaces?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: systems and interfaces?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Project finance and funding structure

Learning objectives

- Explain project finance and funding structure, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Project finance and funding structure
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Financing links investors, lenders, project cash flows and contractual risk allocation. Explain equity, debt, debt service, covenants and security conceptually. Financing availability depends on credible technical, commercial and environmental evidence.

Decision logic. Distinguish project economics from shareholder returns and loan serviceability. Debt can amplify returns and risk. Check downside cash available for debt service rather than assuming forecast revenue is free cash. No financing commitment is implied.

Worked example. Cash available for debt service of 120 and scheduled debt service of 100 gives a coverage ratio of 1.2.

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. Stress the ratio when available cash falls by 25% and discuss consequences.

Model answer guide. Coverage falls to 0.9; the project may not meet scheduled service without remedies under its actual agreements.

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

Activity

Stress the ratio when available cash falls by 25% and discuss consequences.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of project finance and funding structure?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about project finance and funding structure?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about project finance and funding structure be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating project finance and funding structure?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in project finance and funding structure?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning project finance and funding structure?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for project finance and funding structure. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on project finance and funding structure contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about project finance and funding structure?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in project finance and funding structure?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Work Planning

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: work planning, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Work Planning
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Work Planning describes a practical part of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability. 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: work planning?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: work planning?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: work planning be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: work planning?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: work planning?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: work planning?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: work planning. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: work planning contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: work planning?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: work planning?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability. 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Applied Case describes a practical part of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability. 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability. 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability. 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability: Competence Review describes a practical part of Offshore Decommissioning and Long-Term Liability. 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore decommissioning and long-term liability: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X18 | Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption.
- 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.

Module 1: Artificial intelligence in operations

Learning objectives

- Explain artificial intelligence in operations, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Artificial intelligence in operations
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. AI can support classification, anomaly detection and forecasting when data and evaluation match the intended task. Explain training data, validation, error and drift. A confident output is not evidence of correctness.

Decision logic. Use a decision-impact assessment and compare against a simpler baseline. Keep humans accountable for consequential choices. Avoid sensitive data in prompts and do not connect models to live controls through this course. Define fallback when data shift.

Worked example. A model trained on one pump type gives frequent false alarms on a different design.

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. Create an evaluation plan with error costs and a human review route.

Model answer guide. Include representative test data, false positives and negatives, drift monitoring and clear limits.

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

Activity

Create an evaluation plan with error costs and a human review 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of artificial intelligence in operations?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about artificial intelligence in operations?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about artificial intelligence in operations be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating artificial intelligence in operations?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in artificial intelligence in operations?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning artificial intelligence in operations?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for artificial intelligence in operations. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on artificial intelligence in operations contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about artificial intelligence in operations?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in artificial intelligence in operations?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Industrial data architecture and governance

Learning objectives

- Explain industrial data architecture and governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Industrial data architecture and governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Industrial data flows from sensors through historians and integration platforms to analysis and decisions. Define asset identity, units, timestamps, quality status and ownership. A large dataset is not necessarily fit for purpose.

Decision logic. Check time synchronisation, missing values, calibration changes and access permissions before analysis. Keep provenance and revision history. Avoid transferring confidential operational data into exercises; all datasets in this package are fictional.

Worked example. A trend combines pressure in bar and kilopascals under one label, producing a false step 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. Create a data dictionary and quality checks for a fictional dataset.

Model answer guide. Define units, time basis, validity flags, owner and transformations; resolve inconsistent units before interpretation.

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

Activity

Create a data dictionary and quality checks for a fictional dataset.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of industrial data architecture and governance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about industrial data architecture and governance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about industrial data architecture and governance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating industrial data architecture and governance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in industrial data architecture and governance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning industrial data architecture and governance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for industrial data architecture and governance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on industrial data architecture and governance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about industrial data architecture and governance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in industrial data architecture and governance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: SCADA DCS and integrated control systems

Learning objectives

- Explain scada dcs and integrated control systems, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of SCADA DCS and integrated control systems
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Control systems acquire signals, execute logic and support operator actions. SCADA, DCS and integrated control architectures differ by context; safety functions require appropriate separation and assurance. Explain sensor, controller, final element and human interface.

Decision logic. Alarm and control design must match process needs and human capability. More alarms do not necessarily improve safety. Changes to logic require controlled review, testing and approval. This course uses simulation only and provides no live-system modification instructions.

Worked example. An alarm floods the operator screen during a simulated upset, obscuring the initiating condition.

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. Map a control loop and evaluate an alarm list for prioritisation questions.

Model answer guide. Identify measurement, logic, final element and feedback, with rationalised alarms and change control.

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

Activity

Map a control loop and evaluate an alarm list for prioritisation questions.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of scada dcs and integrated control systems?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about scada dcs and integrated control systems?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about scada dcs and integrated control systems be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating scada dcs and integrated control systems?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in scada dcs and integrated control systems?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning scada dcs and integrated control systems?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for scada dcs and integrated control systems. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on scada dcs and integrated control systems contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about scada dcs and integrated control systems?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in scada dcs and integrated control systems?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Petroleum policy and institutional governance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy and institutional governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum policy and institutional governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Policy sets objectives, institutions assign authority, and governance creates accountability for decisions and resources. Explain government, regulator and state enterprise roles conceptually without asserting an unverified current Namibian structure.

Decision logic. Separate commercial participation from regulatory judgement and manage conflicts transparently. Define decision rights, disclosure, assurance and challenge. A strong governance design includes implementation capacity and an audit trail, not just an organisation chart.

Worked example. A fictional institution both promotes investment and evaluates its own project compliance, creating a conflict to manage.

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. Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

Model answer guide. Identify segregated decisions, independent review, declarations and public accountability where applicable.

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

Activity

Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy and institutional governance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy and institutional governance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy and institutional governance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Work Planning

Learning objectives

- Explain energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: work planning, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Work Planning
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Work Planning describes a practical part of Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption. 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: work planning?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: work planning?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: work planning be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: work planning?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: work planning?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: work planning?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: work planning. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: work planning contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: work planning?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: work planning?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption. 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Applied Case describes a practical part of Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption. 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption. 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption. 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption: Competence Review describes a practical part of Energy Innovation, AI and Responsible Adoption. 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in energy innovation, ai and responsible adoption: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X19 | Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation.
- 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.

Module 1: Global petroleum markets and price formation

Learning objectives

- Explain global petroleum markets and price formation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Global petroleum markets and price formation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Crude markets connect producers, traders, refiners and transport providers. Prices often reference benchmarks adjusted for quality, location and contract terms. OPEC is a producers' organisation, not a buyer qualification or an assurance of payment.

Decision logic. Separate physical delivery, price exposure and credit exposure. A high headline price can be offset by freight, quality discounts, finance or default risk. No company is labelled reliable without current due diligence and an approved transaction basis.

Worked example. Offer A is USD 75/barrel with USD 5 freight; offer B is USD 73 with USD 1 freight, before other terms.

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 simplified netbacks and identify non-price checks.

Model answer guide. A gives 70 and B gives 72 USD/barrel; check credit, delivery, sanctions and quality terms before selection.

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

Activity

Compare simplified netbacks and identify non-price checks.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about global petroleum markets and price formation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for global petroleum markets and price formation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on global petroleum markets and price formation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in global petroleum markets and price formation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Risk Controls

Learning objectives

- Explain regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Risk Controls
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Risk Controls describes a practical part of Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation. 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls. 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: risk controls?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Contract strategy and risk allocation

Learning objectives

- Explain contract strategy and risk allocation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contract strategy and risk allocation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Contracts define scope, deliverables, payment, acceptance, change and remedies. Lump sum, reimbursable and target-cost arrangements allocate uncertainty differently. Begin with scope maturity and market capability rather than choosing a familiar contract label.

Decision logic. Risk should be allocated to parties able to manage it, with realistic pricing and assurance. Unclear interfaces create disputes despite detailed clauses. Actual indemnity, liability, insurance and governing-law terms require qualified legal and commercial review.

Worked example. A supplier prices an undefined offshore interface as an exclusion; the owner's total risk remains unresolved.

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. Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

Model answer guide. Include deliverables, acceptance evidence, owner interfaces, change control and exclusions.

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

Activity

Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about contract strategy and risk allocation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for contract strategy and risk allocation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on contract strategy and risk allocation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Marine aviation and offshore logistics

Learning objectives

- Explain marine aviation and offshore logistics, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Marine aviation and offshore logistics
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Marine and aviation logistics move people and materials through different capacity, weather and regulatory constraints. Explain planning, manifests, interfaces and contingency arrangements. Passenger and cargo operations require appropriate specialist authorisation.

Decision logic. Evaluate reliability and total service needs, not only transport price. Emergency arrangements, dangerous goods and communications affect planning. Do not infer STCW, aviation or offshore survival certification from this course. Real limits and booking approvals remain with authorised operators.

Worked example. A fictional weather delay blocks a planned crew change and critical spare delivery.

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 a contingency plan that protects personnel welfare and operating limits.

Model answer guide. Include accommodation, revised schedules, priority cargo, communications and approved alternatives.

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

Activity

Develop a contingency plan that protects personnel welfare and operating limits.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of marine aviation and offshore logistics?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about marine aviation and offshore logistics?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about marine aviation and offshore logistics be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating marine aviation and offshore logistics?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in marine aviation and offshore logistics?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning marine aviation and offshore logistics?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for marine aviation and offshore logistics. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on marine aviation and offshore logistics contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about marine aviation and offshore logistics?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in marine aviation and offshore logistics?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Petroleum policy and institutional governance

Learning objectives

- Explain petroleum policy and institutional governance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Petroleum policy and institutional governance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Policy sets objectives, institutions assign authority, and governance creates accountability for decisions and resources. Explain government, regulator and state enterprise roles conceptually without asserting an unverified current Namibian structure.

Decision logic. Separate commercial participation from regulatory judgement and manage conflicts transparently. Define decision rights, disclosure, assurance and challenge. A strong governance design includes implementation capacity and an audit trail, not just an organisation chart.

Worked example. A fictional institution both promotes investment and evaluates its own project compliance, creating a conflict to manage.

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. Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

Model answer guide. Identify segregated decisions, independent review, declarations and public accountability where applicable.

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

Activity

Draft a responsibility matrix and conflict-management controls.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about petroleum policy and institutional governance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for petroleum policy and institutional governance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on petroleum policy and institutional governance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in petroleum policy and institutional governance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation. 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Applied Case describes a practical part of Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation. 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation. 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation. 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation: Competence Review describes a practical part of Regional Energy Trade and Cross-Border Cooperation. 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in regional energy trade and cross-border cooperation: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X20 | Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships.
- 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.

Module 1: Contract negotiation simulation

Learning objectives

- Explain contract negotiation simulation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contract negotiation simulation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Negotiation preparation identifies objectives, alternatives, authority and acceptable tradeoffs. Separate positions from underlying interests. Technical and fiscal terms interact with schedule, investment and risk; avoid negotiating a headline number in isolation.

Decision logic. Use a mandate sheet and issue log. Teams cannot commit outside delegated authority. Explore package trades, test downside consequences and record unresolved points before drafting. This role-play creates no actual offer, agreement or legal advice.

Worked example. The fictional state team values training commitments while an investor values schedule certainty; both need measurable and feasible terms.

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. Run a three-round negotiation and submit an unsigned term sheet plus risk commentary.

Model answer guide. Credit quantified commitments, authority checks, alternatives, clear conditions and documented unresolved issues.

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

Activity

Run a three-round negotiation and submit an unsigned term sheet plus risk commentary.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of contract negotiation simulation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about contract negotiation simulation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about contract negotiation simulation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating contract negotiation simulation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in contract negotiation simulation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning contract negotiation simulation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for contract negotiation simulation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on contract negotiation simulation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about contract negotiation simulation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in contract negotiation simulation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Contract strategy and risk allocation

Learning objectives

- Explain contract strategy and risk allocation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Contract strategy and risk allocation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Contracts define scope, deliverables, payment, acceptance, change and remedies. Lump sum, reimbursable and target-cost arrangements allocate uncertainty differently. Begin with scope maturity and market capability rather than choosing a familiar contract label.

Decision logic. Risk should be allocated to parties able to manage it, with realistic pricing and assurance. Unclear interfaces create disputes despite detailed clauses. Actual indemnity, liability, insurance and governing-law terms require qualified legal and commercial review.

Worked example. A supplier prices an undefined offshore interface as an exclusion; the owner's total risk remains unresolved.

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. Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

Model answer guide. Include deliverables, acceptance evidence, owner interfaces, change control and exclusions.

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

Activity

Draft a scope and interface schedule for a fictional package.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about contract strategy and risk allocation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for contract strategy and risk allocation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on contract strategy and risk allocation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in contract strategy and risk allocation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Systems and Interfaces

Learning objectives

- Explain executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Systems and Interfaces
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Systems and Interfaces describes a practical part of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships. 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: systems and interfaces?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Dispute prevention and resolution

Learning objectives

- Explain dispute prevention and resolution, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Dispute prevention and resolution
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Disputes often begin with ambiguity, undocumented change or inconsistent expectations. Teach contemporaneous records, issue escalation and contractual notice awareness. Separate technical disagreement from entitlement and relationship management.

Decision logic. Map negotiation, mediation, expert determination, arbitration or litigation only as options governed by actual agreements and law. Protect privileged or sensitive information and obtain legal advice where needed. Never invent notice periods or enforceability claims.

Worked example. A contractor requests extra payment for changed access conditions but the instructions and impact records are incomplete.

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. Assemble an issue chronology and identify evidence gaps.

Model answer guide. Separate established facts, disputed facts, contract questions and commercial options.

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

Activity

Assemble an issue chronology and identify evidence gaps.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of dispute prevention and resolution?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about dispute prevention and resolution?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about dispute prevention and resolution be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating dispute prevention and resolution?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in dispute prevention and resolution?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning dispute prevention and resolution?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for dispute prevention and resolution. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on dispute prevention and resolution contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about dispute prevention and resolution?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in dispute prevention and resolution?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: 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: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about stakeholder engagement and communication be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for stakeholder engagement and communication. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on stakeholder engagement and communication contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships. 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Applied Case describes a practical part of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships. 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships. 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships. 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships: Competence Review describes a practical part of Executive Negotiation in Petroleum Partnerships. 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in executive negotiation in petroleum partnerships: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X21 | Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation.
- 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.

Module 1: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Core Concepts

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Core Concepts
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Core Concepts describes a practical part of Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation. 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts. 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: core concepts?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Risk Controls

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

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

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Risk Controls describes a practical part of Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation. 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls. 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: risk controls?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

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: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about risk assessment and uncertainty management be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for risk assessment and uncertainty management. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on risk assessment and uncertainty management contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in risk assessment and uncertainty management?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: 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: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of capex opex and estimating?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about capex opex and estimating?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about capex opex and estimating be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating capex opex and estimating?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in capex opex and estimating?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning capex opex and estimating?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for capex opex and estimating. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on capex opex and estimating contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about capex opex and estimating?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in capex opex and estimating?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: 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: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of planning scheduling and critical path?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about planning scheduling and critical path?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about planning scheduling and critical path be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating planning scheduling and critical path?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in planning scheduling and critical path?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning planning scheduling and critical path?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for planning scheduling and critical path. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on planning scheduling and critical path contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about planning scheduling and critical path?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in planning scheduling and critical path?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore project portfolio prioritisation: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation. 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore project portfolio prioritisation: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore project portfolio prioritisation: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore project portfolio prioritisation: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore project portfolio prioritisation: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore project portfolio prioritisation: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Applied Case describes a practical part of Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation. 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore project portfolio prioritisation: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore project portfolio prioritisation: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore project portfolio prioritisation: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore project portfolio prioritisation: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore project portfolio prioritisation: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation. 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore project portfolio prioritisation: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore project portfolio prioritisation: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore project portfolio prioritisation: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore project portfolio prioritisation: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore project portfolio prioritisation: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

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

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation. 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore project portfolio prioritisation: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore project portfolio prioritisation: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore project portfolio prioritisation: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore project portfolio prioritisation: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain offshore project portfolio prioritisation: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

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

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation: Competence Review describes a practical part of Offshore Project Portfolio Prioritisation. 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of offshore project portfolio prioritisation: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating offshore project portfolio prioritisation: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning offshore project portfolio prioritisation: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for offshore project portfolio prioritisation: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on offshore project portfolio prioritisation: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about offshore project portfolio prioritisation: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in offshore project portfolio prioritisation: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

EX-X22 | Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response

Level: EX | Duration: 2-3 days | Audience: Boards, executives, public officials and senior managers

2-3 days EX programme focused on Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response, using energy-sector cases and applied decisions.

Learning outcomes

- Explain core principles and terminology for Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response.
- 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.

Module 1: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Core Concepts

Learning objectives

- Explain social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Core Concepts
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Core Concepts describes a practical part of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response. 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts. 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: core concepts?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 2: 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: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response

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%).

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about stakeholder engagement and communication be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for stakeholder engagement and communication. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on stakeholder engagement and communication contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in stakeholder engagement and communication?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 3: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Systems and Interfaces

Learning objectives

- Explain social licence, community benefit and grievance response: systems and interfaces, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Systems and Interfaces
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Systems and Interfaces describes a practical part of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response. 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of social licence, community benefit and grievance response: systems and interfaces?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: systems and interfaces?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: systems and interfaces be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating social licence, community benefit and grievance response: systems and interfaces?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: systems and interfaces?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning social licence, community benefit and grievance response: systems and interfaces?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: systems and interfaces. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on social licence, community benefit and grievance response: systems and interfaces contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: systems and interfaces?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: systems and interfaces?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 4: Local content and national value

Learning objectives

- Explain local content and national value, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Local content and national value
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Local content can include employment, skills, supplier participation and durable industrial capability. Distinguish domestic ownership, local expenditure and actual value retained locally. A purchase from a locally registered importer may contain little domestic production.

Decision logic. Measure outcomes with a defined boundary, baseline and evidence. Avoid assuming a proposed policy target is current law. Supplier development must protect quality and safety while building realistic capacity and fair access.

Worked example. A fictional USD 1 million local invoice contains USD 850,000 imported equipment and USD 150,000 local services.

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 the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

Model answer guide. Fifteen percent in this simplified boundary; employment, skills and retained value need separate evidence.

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

Activity

Calculate the local-service share and propose more meaningful indicators.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of local content and national value?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about local content and national value?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about local content and national value be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating local content and national value?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in local content and national value?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning local content and national value?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for local content and national value. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on local content and national value contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about local content and national value?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in local content and national value?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 5: Environmental and social impact assessment

Learning objectives

- Explain environmental and social impact assessment, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Environmental and social impact assessment
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. An ESIA identifies project alternatives, baseline conditions, potential impacts, mitigation and monitoring. Social assessment includes affected livelihoods, access, distribution of benefits and grievance processes. Assessment should inform choices before they are fixed.

Decision logic. Apply avoidance before mitigation and consider cumulative impacts. Consultation needs accessible information and documented responses. A study's completion does not guarantee regulatory approval or community agreement. Actual scope follows applicable requirements and specialist review.

Worked example. Two fictional supply-base sites differ in transport distance and fishing-community access impacts.

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 alternatives and prepare a consultation and mitigation plan.

Model answer guide. Show impact pathways, alternatives, affected groups, residual impacts and monitoring commitments.

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

Activity

Compare alternatives and prepare a consultation and mitigation plan.

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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of environmental and social impact assessment?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about environmental and social impact assessment?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about environmental and social impact assessment be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating environmental and social impact assessment?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in environmental and social impact assessment?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning environmental and social impact assessment?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for environmental and social impact assessment. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on environmental and social impact assessment contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about environmental and social impact assessment?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in environmental and social impact assessment?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 6: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Data and Performance

Learning objectives

- Explain social licence, community benefit and grievance response: data and performance, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Data and Performance
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Data and Performance describes a practical part of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response. 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of social licence, community benefit and grievance response: data and performance?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: data and performance?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: data and performance be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating social licence, community benefit and grievance response: data and performance?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: data and performance?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning social licence, community benefit and grievance response: data and performance?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: data and performance. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on social licence, community benefit and grievance response: data and performance contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: data and performance?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: data and performance?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 7: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Applied Case

Learning objectives

- Explain social licence, community benefit and grievance response: applied case, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Applied Case
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Applied Case describes a practical part of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response. 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of social licence, community benefit and grievance response: applied case?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: applied case?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: applied case be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating social licence, community benefit and grievance response: applied case?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: applied case?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning social licence, community benefit and grievance response: applied case?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: applied case. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on social licence, community benefit and grievance response: applied case contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: applied case?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: applied case?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 8: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Communication and Escalation

Learning objectives

- Explain social licence, community benefit and grievance response: communication and escalation, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Communication and Escalation
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Communication and Escalation describes a practical part of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response. 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of social licence, community benefit and grievance response: communication and escalation?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: communication and escalation?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: communication and escalation be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating social licence, community benefit and grievance response: communication and escalation?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: communication and escalation?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning social licence, community benefit and grievance response: communication and escalation?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: communication and escalation. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on social licence, community benefit and grievance response: communication and escalation contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: communication and escalation?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: communication and escalation?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 9: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Knowledge Check

Learning objectives

- Explain social licence, community benefit and grievance response: knowledge check, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Knowledge Check
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Knowledge Check describes a practical part of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response. 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of social licence, community benefit and grievance response: knowledge check?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: knowledge check?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: knowledge check be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating social licence, community benefit and grievance response: knowledge check?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: knowledge check?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning social licence, community benefit and grievance response: knowledge check?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: knowledge check. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on social licence, community benefit and grievance response: knowledge check contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: knowledge check?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: knowledge check?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

Module 10: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Competence Review

Learning objectives

- Explain social licence, community benefit and grievance response: competence review, interpret a case, select appropriate controls and justify a documented decision.

Lessons

1. Purpose and key terms of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Competence Review
2. Systems and operating context
3. Evidence, assumptions and decision gates
4. Hazards, safeguards and escalation
5. Applied case: Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response

Teaching notes

Teaching notes

Core explanation. Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response: Competence Review describes a practical part of Social Licence, Community Benefit and Grievance Response. 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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%).

Activity

Prepare a decision brief for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: 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 questions

1. What is the main purpose of social licence, community benefit and grievance response: competence review?

A. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

2. What should be established before a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: competence review?

A. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

3. How should a material uncertainty about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: competence review be handled?

A. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

4. Which evidence is most useful for evaluating social licence, community benefit and grievance response: competence review?

A. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

5. Which action best controls risk in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: competence review?

A. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

6. Why should interfaces be checked when planning social licence, community benefit and grievance response: competence review?

A. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

7. A proposed shortcut bypasses an approved safeguard for social licence, community benefit and grievance response: competence review. What is the best response?

A. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

8. What should a strong case exercise on social licence, community benefit and grievance response: competence review contain?

A. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

9. How should the team communicate a decision about social licence, community benefit and grievance response: competence review?

A. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

10. What demonstrates competence in social licence, community benefit and grievance response: competence review?

A. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.

B. Proceed using an unverified assumption and omit the record.

C. Transfer the decision to an unqualified person.

D. Ignore interfaces and continue without checking safeguards.

Answer key

1. To support a safe, evidence-based decision within the defined operating context. | 2. Scope, applicable requirements, evidence, assumptions and decision authority. | 3. Record it, identify the evidence or competent review needed, and use the approved hold point when necessary. | 4. Current, traceable, fit-for-purpose evidence reviewed by competent people. | 5. Use approved controls, verify safeguards, and stop or escalate when limits are exceeded. | 6. Interactions between disciplines, equipment, schedules and stakeholders can create hazards or invalidate assumptions. | 7. Do not bypass it; stop and use the formal review and approval route. | 8. An objective, evidence, assumptions, hazards, stakeholders, decision gates, owners and review criteria. | 9. State the decision, evidence, assumptions, controls, owner, limits and escalation trigger. | 10. A reasoned, documented decision that is accurate, controlled, within authority and open to review.