

Project Management A1

Student's ID: 2112590

Student Name :Maya Boteva

Hinkley Point C

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Time	5
COVID- 19.....	5
Supply chain disruptions	6
Designs and Approval Processes.....	6
Technical difficulties	7
Environmental Concerns and Project Delays	7
Safety and Regulatory Compliance	8
Budget	8
Design Changes	8
Inflation	9
More and Additional Material Requirements.....	9
Inaccurate Estimation	9
Poor Onsite Management	10
Hidden Costs	10
Quality stakeholders.....	10
Collaborative Decision-Making Process	10
Stringent Quality criteria	11
Quality Assurance and Control	11
Environmental Impact Mitigation	11
Quality Assurance Audits and Reviews	11

Risk factors	12
Risk Assessment.....	12
Uncertain development Environment.....	12
Dependency on External Factors.....	12
Complex Regulatory and Approval Processes	12
Geopolitical and Socioeconomic Factors	13
Inadequate Contingency Planning.....	13
Insufficient Project Oversight and Monitoring	13
Conclusion	13
References.....	15

Introduction

Hinkley Point C, a breakthrough nuclear power plant facility in Somerset, UK, was intended to provide low-carbon electricity for 6 million homes. This ambitious project sought to boost the UK economy by creating thousands of jobs and apprenticeships. Over its 60-year lifespan, the project's two EPR reactors were intended to offset 9 million tons of carbon dioxide annually, helping the UK reduce carbon emissions (Bridgwater, 2011). Despite the set project goals and objectives, Hinkley Point C has faced financial overruns and delays caused by various factors. Being the world's most expensive nuclear power facility, it is predicted to cost £22 billion. However, the cost has risen to £25–£26 billion. Major delays and cost overruns have slowed progress, pushing it from 2017 to 2025 and then to 2027. These delays have stalled the project and prompted questions about its management. Cost overruns plagued Hinkley Point C. Costs have skyrocketed, calling the project's financial and economic viability into doubt. This report will focus on Hinkley Point C's budget, time, quality stakeholders, and risk concerns. The report will analyse the initial project plan and its changes to determine what caused the large overruns and delays. Understanding these challenges is essential for assessing the project's inadequacies and identifying how to address them in future similar projects. To efficiently execute future large-scale infrastructure projects, must examine the Hinkley Point C project's obstacles and lessons. By closely examining its delays and cost overruns, project management, companies and countries can learn and build solutions to avoid similar issues in future projects.

Figure 1: Hinkley Point C project



Time

The project was to be complete by 2017; however, it has been pushed to 2025 and recently pushed again to 2027. This has led to it not meeting the set timelines and interfering with the whole project schedule and plan (Terlikowski and Terlikowski, 2020). The delays have been caused by the following:

COVID- 19

The COVID-19 epidemic affected the construction sector worldwide, including Hinkley Point C. Lockdown, social isolation, and safety regulations slowed project development. COVID-19 Reduced Workforce and Productivity leading to delays in the expected time for completion. As a result, the project has been pushed and is now expected to be completed by 2027. The project reduced its onsite crew to comply with government regulations and protect worker safety. Productivity was affected by this reduction and social distance. Fewer personnel hampered construction, delaying project milestones. COVID-19 prevention methods added complexity and delays. The project required regular testing, sanitisation, and worker PPE. Workflow changes, training, and collaboration caused project delays.

Supply chain disruptions

Global demand for nuclear power station building also hampered supply chains. The project had to wait in line for supplies as competition increased, delaying component delivery. The COVID-19 pandemic disrupted global supply networks, making Hinkley Point C project components and materials unavailable. Manufacturing, transportation, and logistics were hampered by lockdowns and trade restrictions (Thomas, 2016). Supply chain issues plagued Hinkley Point C. Specialised materials were harder to find than expected. The project has required h More Materials than Expected in the planning phase; as of this, more time has been needed in sources and supply of the materials. Global nuclear power plant construction demand increased competition for limited supply (Thomas, 2016). Due to competition from other large-scale projects domestically and globally, crucial components and supplies were delayed. Travel restrictions and border closures complicated the use of international suppliers. Supply problems slowed construction timeframes. The project also has been delayed due to lengthy supplier evaluations and contract discussions to secure material supply.

Designs and Approval Processes

The Hinkley Point C project required more materials than expected. Technical specifications, design revisions, and long-term safety and reliability necessitated these additional requirements. Hinkley Point C required advanced technical concepts to meet safety standards. Design and approval slowed project implementation. The project revised designs and other components of its procurement processes due to growing material needs as well as stakeholder quality (Daniel and Daniel, 2019). Revaluating supplier capabilities, negotiating contracts, and integrating these additional supplies into the building timeframe were required. Nuclear power plant development often necessitates design changes due to their complexity. Safety and plant performance require these changes. Design revisions required technical and regulatory compliance reviews. These processes delayed the project. Regulatory approvals need several

stakeholders and extensive cooperation. Stakeholder concerns, regulatory compliance, and environmental and safety requirements lengthen approval processes. Regulatory bodies, municipal authorities, and environmental agencies must be consulted and reviewed. These steps take time, delaying the project.

Technical difficulties

Technical issues delayed Hinkley Point C. Nuclear power plant construction's magnitude, complexity, and modern technologies caused these issues. Engineering Complexity. To optimise performance, nuclear power plant installations require complex engineering designs. The selection and integration of specialised components, systems, and equipment are technical factors during design. The sophisticated design made execution difficult. Integrating and making systems compatible was difficult (Thomas, 2016). The project team had to handle these complicated technical issues to ensure the plant's safe and efficient operation, which caused delays. In the Hinkley Point C project, modern technologies like the European Pressurized Reactor (EPR) added technological obstacles. EPR technology improved safety and efficiency but required careful planning and implementation. New technologies require testing and learning. These complex systems may experience technical issues during installation, commissioning, and integration, delaying engineers and technicians.

Environmental Concerns and Project Delays

The project needed extensive environmental impact evaluations to identify risks and offer mitigation. The project team worked with environmental experts and regulatory organisations to comply with environmental rules, causing delays. Stakeholder discussions and mitigation refinement delayed the project (Sears et al., 2015). Ecologically significant habitats surround Hinkley Point C. Planning and following environmental restrictions were essential to protecting these habitats and their biodiversity. Protected bats, birds, and marine life required specific procedures to reduce disturbance. Habitat restoration, noise mitigation, and wildlife

protection were incorporated. These requirements added difficulties and delays. Construction coordination and changes were needed to minimise the project's environmental impact, these have caused delays too of the project.

Safety and Regulatory Compliance

Nuclear power plant developments prioritise safety and compliance. Strict legislation and oversight protect the public, workers, and environment. Nuclear power stations have strict safety regulations to prevent mishaps. These standards require rigorous safety studies, system validations, and regulatory inspections. During design and construction, Hinkley Point C underwent extensive safety checks (Dyrda and Morrison, 2021). Technical issues and safety concerns necessitated additional safety precautions and delays. Nuclear power plants need regulatory compliance. The project team had to follow several safety, environmental, and construction laws. Inspections and regulatory clearances require a multi-stakeholder procedure. Regulators, project managers, and contractors must coordinate, which can delay projects. Regulatory inspections have caused unanticipated issues that require design changes or corrective activities, significantly delaying the project.

Budget

The budget overruns have caused the project to cost about £25-£26 from the expected initial cost, which is at £22.

Design Changes

Alterations to the design of a project during construction can have a major effect on its total cost. Design changes were necessary as the Hinkley Point C project developed due to new requirements, better technology, and unexpected technical hurdles. Costs may rise because of the need to reinvest in resources such as materials, machinery, and manpower to accommodate

these modifications (Walker, 2015). Construction delays and disruptions brought on by design alterations also contribute to cost overruns.

Inflation

The general rise in prices caused by inflation can have a significant effect on project budgets. Inflation may have contributed to higher labour, material, and service costs during the life of the Hinkley Point C project. Overruns in the budget are possible if the project's duration causes inflationary pressures to increase the original cost projections (Smyth et al., 2018). Long-term, massive projects make it difficult to foresee and effectively account for inflationary effects, which can lead to substantial budget differences if not properly planned for.

More and Additional Material Requirements

Overruns in the budget might occur as more and more materials are needed than originally anticipated. It became apparent early on in the Hinkley Point C project that more materials would be required than had been anticipated. Reasons for this may include design improvements, technology improvements, or the necessity to adhere to strict safety and regulatory standards. Costs, such as those for purchasing, transporting, and storing, can rise if more resources need to be sourced. Budget overruns may occur if these supplementary materials are not properly anticipated and accounted for.

Inaccurate Estimation

Budget overruns resulted from inaccurate estimates made during the project's planning phase. Underestimating the amount of money needed to finish a project is possible if inaccurate estimates of project costs, labour, materials, and other expenses are used. These errors can be made much worse by things like market swings, unforeseen events, or modifications to the project's scope. Problems with finances and overruns in the budget might arise from insufficient due diligence and incomplete cost estimation.

Poor Onsite Management

Ineffective management on site is a major contributor to the project going over budget. Overruns in budgets are often the result of ineffective management strategies, such as inadequate oversight, poor coordination, and misallocation of resources (Gido and Clements, 2014). Delays, rework, and waste caused by inefficient use of labour, equipment, and materials all add to the project's overall cost. Cost overruns are possible at any point in the building process due to poor cost management and delayed problem-solving.

Hidden Costs

The budget for a project was also impacted by hidden costs, which are expenses that were either not anticipated or planned for. Unanticipated technological difficulties, legal or permit expenses, or regulatory compliance requirements can all add to these expenditures (Walker, 2015). Overruns and stress on the budget also occurred from failing to account for these unseen expenses.

Quality stakeholders

Quality stakeholders delayed the Hinkley Point C project. Their engagement in quality, regulatory, and environmental compliance positively and negatively affect project timelines.

Collaborative Decision-Making Process

Quality stakeholders' approval and alignment are essential to the project's success. Regulators, environmental agencies, and independent auditors communicate, negotiate, and coordinate during this process. While vital, collaborative decision-making can delay (Černoch and Zapletalová, 2015). Obtaining quality stakeholder approval delays decision-making. Priorities, perspectives, and requirements have slowed the projects causing delays.

Stringent Quality criteria

Regulatory organisations and independent auditors set strict quality criteria for nuclear power plant projects like Hinkley Point C. These standards ensured facility safety, reliability, and compliance. While vital, these quality requirements delayed the process. Quality stakeholders require extensive evaluations, inspections, and adjustments, which takes time. Non-compliances and corrections lengthen the project.

Quality Assurance and Control

Quality stakeholders emphasise robust quality assurance and control systems to assure compliance with standards and prevent risks. Documentation, testing, inspections, and verification ensure quality and compliance. These precautions have delayed projects. Documentation, testing, and inspections can delay project phases. During quality assurance, deviations or non-compliances may require rework, corrective actions, or further investigation, delaying the project.

Environmental Impact Mitigation

Quality stakeholders, especially environmental agencies and regulators, help mitigate Hinkley Point C's environmental impact. They encourage sustainability, environmental compliance, and resource protection. Environmental mitigation is vital but can delay the project. Environmental impact evaluations, stakeholder discussions, and mitigation strategies took time and coordination. Noise mitigation, habitat restoration, and environmental monitoring also delayed construction.

Quality Assurance Audits and Reviews

Stakeholders audit and review quality standards, rules, and project requirements. These operations ensured project quality and safety. Quality assurance audits and reviews caused delays. Preparation, paperwork, and audit team coordination takes time. Non-compliances or

locations requiring corrective actions required further investigations, changes, or rework, increasing project time.

Risk factors

Risk factors have contributed to Hinkley Point C project overruns and delays throughout the project's construction.

Risk Assessment

The initial project plan lacked a thorough risk assessment. Early risk identification and analysis could improve risk mitigation and contingency planning (Thomas, 2016). Unexpected occurrences and problems have caused delays as well as increased costs of the project.

Uncertain Development Environment

A dynamic and uncertain environment has affected Hinkley Point C's massive and complicated development (Jenkins et al., 2017). Weather, geology, and ground conditions have slowed the project and increased costs. The initial project plan also underestimated these uncertainties, causing delays and extra costs.

Dependency on External Factors

The Hinkley Point C project relied on trained workers, specialised equipment, and resources. These dependencies are delayed and cost more. Insufficient supplier collaboration, failure to procure resources, or delays in crucial component delivery has slowed development and delayed the project (Orayeva, 2017). Additionally, COVID has affected external factors such as national and international labour market availability.

Complex Regulatory and Approval Processes

Nuclear power industry laws and clearances are complex. While the project plan had governmental approvals, permits, and licenses. Project delays due to increased regulatory and compliance issues might increase costs.

Geopolitical and Socioeconomic Factors

Geopolitical and socioeconomic factors can introduce uncertainties and risks into large-scale projects. Government policies, economic volatility, labour problems, and community opposition have also delayed and overspent projects (Černoch and Zapletalová, 2015). These external such as BREXIT, the covid 19, and increased inflation, has also contributed to delays

Inadequate Contingency Planning

To limit risks and respond to unexpected events, a solid contingency plan is required. The initial project plan may have lacked a comprehensive and flexible contingency strategy, leaving it open to risks and obstacles (Daniel and Daniel, 2019). Unexpected incidents can delay and cost more due to inadequate preparation.

Insufficient Project Oversight and Monitoring

Effective project oversight and monitoring help identify and manage hazards quickly. The project has constantly lacked frequent tracking progress, recognising challenges, risks, and mitigation (Ansar and Flyvbjerg, 2016). Insufficient project oversight has led to delays going unrecognised or untreated, aggravating hazards on the project timeframe.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this report has discussed the causes of delays and overruns of The Hinkley Point C project. The initial project plan neglected important elements, causing major issues throughout the project's duration. First, the COVID-19 epidemic slowed Productivity, disrupted the supply chain, and necessitated health and safety compliance. These issues slowed the project. Second, supply chain issues include increased worldwide demand, supplier interruptions, and the need for extra materials caused by budget overruns and timeframe extensions. Obtaining and delivering specialist parts took longer than expected. Thirdly, technical issues such as sophisticated engineering designs, advanced technology integration,

and material needs influenced the project's scheduling and budget. Complexities caused delays and cost overruns. Environmental issues and regulatory compliance added to delays. Environmental impact evaluations, stakeholder discussions and collaboration, and mitigation measures required substantial coordination and modifications, affecting project schedules. Quality stakeholders—regulatory organisations, environmental agencies, and independent auditors—ensured quality standards were met but also caused delays. Quality requirements, collaborative decision-making, quality assurance and control, and quality audits and reviews lengthened the project. Inadequate risk assessment, uncertainties in the construction environment, dependencies on external factors, complex regulatory processes, inadequate contingency planning, and insufficient project oversight caused project overruns and delays. For future or similar projects, there is a need to improve risk assessment, cost and resource estimation, project control and monitoring, and contingency planning to solve these issues and avoid them in future projects. Collaboration, coordination, and early engagement of quality stakeholders are essential for project execution within budget and scheduling restrictions.

References

- Ansar, A. and Flyvbjerg, B., 2016. Big is fragile: Why the UK government should not approve the Hinkley Point C nuclear power station. *Petroleum Review*, 70(834), pp.37-40.
- Bridgwater, C., 2011. Hinkley Point C.
- Černoch, F. and Zapletalová, V., 2015. Hinkley point C: A new chance for nuclear power plant construction in central Europe?. *Energy Policy*, 83, pp.165-168. .
- Daniel, E. and Daniel, P.A., 2019. Megaprojects as complex adaptive systems: The Hinkley point C case. *International Journal of Project Management*, 37(8), pp.1017-1033.
- Dyrda, J. and Morrison, R., 2021. Overview of the Hinkley Point C EPR Project 'J0' and Beyond. In *EPJ Web of Conferences* (Vol. 247, p. 20001). EDP Sciences.
- Gido, J. and Clements, J., 2014. *Successful project management*. Cengage Learning.
- Jenkins, K., McCauley, D. and Warren, C.R., 2017. Attributing responsibility for energy justice: A case study of the Hinkley Point Nuclear Complex. *Energy Policy*, 108, pp.836-843.
- Orayeva, J., 2017. Financing and managing nuclear energy risks: The UK model. *IAEA Bulletin (Online)*, 58(4), pp.14-15.
- Smyth, H., Lecoivre, L. and Vaesken, P., 2018. Co-creation of value and the project context: Towards application on the case of Hinkley Point C Nuclear Power Station. *International journal of project management*, 36(1), pp.170-183.
- Sears, S.K., Sears, G.A., Clough, R.H., Rounds, J.L. and Segner, R.O., 2015. *Construction project management*. John Wiley & Sons.

Terlikowski, M. and Terlikowski, R.P.M., 2020 Straw in the Wind: State Aid for Nuclear Energy in the UK and Lessons for Visegrad Countries.

Thomas, S., 2016. The Hinkley Point decision: An analysis of the policy process. *Energy Policy*, 96, pp.421-431.

Walker, A., 2015. *Project management in construction*. John Wiley & Sons.