



Consultant and Contractor Governance Course

3 – 7 May 2027
Prague

Consultant and Contractor Governance Course

Ref: 586_145094 **Date:** 3 – 7 May 2027 **Location:** Prague **Fees:** 6000 Euro

Overview

Consultant and Contractor Governance Course is a five-day intermediate course for client-side contract, project, procurement, commercial, technical, and governance teams who leave with a Consultant and Contractor Governance File. Participants connect consultant and contractor governance with a role authority matrix, deliverable acceptance controls, a performance evidence scorecard, and an evidence-based negotiation file. The course resolves blurred roles and inconsistent interventions through lifecycle gates and documented decisions. Agile Leaders Training Center presents external-party governance as a client-side management discipline.

Who Should Attend

- Teams defining consultant and contractor roles, outputs, and authority boundaries
- Functions mobilizing external parties and governing delivery interfaces
- Groups measuring performance and directing corrective action
- Personnel preparing negotiation positions and escalation decisions
- Leaders approving relationship changes, acceptance, and closeout

The course assumes participants already oversee consultants or contractors and leaves out legal advice, contract drafting, contractor-only site supervision, general negotiation foundations, and vendor selection procedures.

Departments and Industries

The course supports departments and industries that rely on consultants and contractors for professional or delivery work.

- Projects, contracts, commercial, procurement, and governance functions
- Construction, engineering, infrastructure, and facilities management
- Energy, utilities, manufacturing, and industrial services
- Technology, telecommunications, and professional services
- Healthcare, transport, hospitality, and outsourced operations

Learning Objectives

By the end of this course, participants will be able to:



- Compare consultant and contractor governance needs
- Build role, authority, deliverable, and interface controls
- Apply mobilization and relationship risk gates
- Analyze performance evidence and corrective responses
- Use issue files for negotiation and escalation
- Evaluate acceptance, transition, and closeout readiness

Course Agenda

Day 1: Relationship and Role Architecture

- External-Party Segmentation and Criticality Matrix
- Consultant and Contractor Role Boundary Map
- Terms-of-Reference and Scope Alignment Check
- Authority, Decision, and Instruction Grid
- Relationship Risk and Dependency Register

Day 2: Appointment and Mobilization Controls

- Capability Evidence and Evaluation Matrix
- Deliverable and Acceptance Criteria Schedule
- Mobilization Readiness Gate Checklist
- Interface and Communication Route Map
- Governance Meeting and Reporting Calendar

Day 3: Performance and Corrective Action

- Performance Measure and Evidence Scorecard
- Output Quality and Timeliness Review Method
- Early-Warning and Exception Triage Log
- Corrective Action and Recovery Plan
- Escalation Threshold and Decision Ladder

Day 4: Negotiation and Relationship Decisions

- Negotiation Issue and Evidence File
- Interest, Constraint, and Trade-Off Map
- Change Position and Authority Checklist
- Meeting Record and Decision Confirmation Method
- Relationship Reset, Replacement, and Exit Options



Day 5: Governance Practice and Closeout

- Exercise: Diagnose Consultant and Contractor Role Gaps
- Exercise: Test Mobilization and Interface Readiness
- Exercise: Evaluate Performance and Corrective Evidence
- Exercise: Prepare a Negotiation and Escalation Position
- Capstone Exercise: Consultant and Contractor Governance File

Practical Exercises

The course uses suggested activities to test client-side governance decisions across external relationships.

- Suggested activity: distinguish consultant authority, contractor responsibility, and client decisions in an engineering scenario.
- Suggested activity: assess mobilization evidence and delivery interfaces for an outsourced technology service.
- Suggested activity: convert performance exceptions into a documented corrective-action and escalation route.
- Suggested activity: negotiate a change position using issue evidence, authority limits, and relationship effects.

FAQs

Who suits consultant and contractor governance and what does it assume?

Consultant and contractor governance suits client-side professionals who already coordinate external parties and need a structured method for roles, evidence, interventions, negotiation, and closeout.

How does consultant and contractor governance differ from supplier relationship management?

Consultant and contractor governance addresses professional authority, project deliverables, instructions, acceptance, and external-party interventions, while supplier relationship management covers broader ongoing supplier value and collaboration.

Why do consultant and contractor roles need separate governance controls?

Consultant and contractor roles need separate controls because advice, design, certification, supervision, execution, and delivery responsibilities create different authority boundaries, evidence needs, and conflict risks.



What evidence supports consultant and contractor performance decisions?

Performance decisions are supported by agreed outputs, acceptance criteria, dated records, quality findings, progress measures, instructions, issue history, corrective actions, and confirmed meeting decisions.

How should consultant and contractor negotiations be governed?

Negotiations should be governed through defined authority, an evidence-based issue statement, interests and constraints, evaluated options, approval limits, documented trade-offs, and a confirmed decision record.

Conclusion

Participants take back a Consultant and Contractor Governance File covering roles, mobilization, performance, negotiation, correction, escalation, and closeout. The file gives client-side teams a consistent basis for intervening in two different external relationships. It helps teams separate responsibilities, use evidence in decisions, and preserve a clear route from appointment to closure.