



University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

200
1822 - 2022

Project management A1

The Hinkley Point C Project of the UK

Student's Name: Miroslava Georgieva

Student Number: 2112588

Course: Project Management LCBB5005

Lecturer: Md Sadeque Imam Shaikh

Date: 06/08/2023

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Budget.....	3
Time	5
Stakeholders.....	7
EDF Energy (Electricité de France).....	7
UK Government and Regulatory Authorities.....	7
Local Communities and Residents.....	8
Investors and Financial Institutions.....	8
Environmental and Public Interest Groups	8
Quality.....	8
Stringent Safety Standards and Regulatory Compliance	8
Design Adjustments and Rework.....	8
Coordination and Communication Challenges	9
Learning Curve and Adaptation	9
Communication.....	9
Scope integration	9
Risks factor	10
Conclusion	11
References.....	12

Introduction

The Hinkley Point C nuclear power facility is one of the UK's most ambitious and significant projects. The project sought to deliver low-carbon electricity to 6 million homes, enhance the economy by creating jobs and apprenticeships, and strengthen the UK's nuclear power industry (Armenia et al., 2019). Although it is the laid project goals, objectives and possible benefits, the project has had budget overruns and delays. This paper will examine the Hinkley Point C project, focusing on the initial project design and identifying the causes of the enormous cost overruns and delays. The project was designed to meet UK energy needs while lowering carbon emissions. The world's most expensive nuclear power plant, at £25–£26 billion, was supposed to revolutionise the nuclear industry (Smyth et al., 2018). Two European Pressurized Reactors (EPR) were built to create low-carbon electricity and offset 9 million tons of carbon dioxide yearly, contributing to the UK's climate targets. The main goals were to create thousands of jobs and 1,000 apprenticeships and stimulate the UK economy by encouraging local companies to take 64% of the construction value (Chawla et al., 2018). Despite careful planning and cost estimation, Hinkley Point C's budget has faced budget overruns. This paper will examine the causes of these overruns and the budget-to-expenditure gap and aims to find out why there were delays and suggest recommendations for future projects. It will also assess the impact of stakeholders on the Hinkley Point C project's cost and timeline, including government agencies, investors, contractors, and legal and inspection bodies.

Budget

The initial cost of this project was £20.5 billion; however, this increased to £22.6 when the project was confirmed in autumn 2016; it then rose to £25–£26 billion in 2021 and is now expected to cost around £33 billion., has undergone substantial budget overruns. Data from the EDF Energy, the Nuclear Regulation Authority, BBC News, NS Energy Business, and Power Technology shows that different factors cause budget overruns.

One of the primary factors contributing to budget overruns in the Hinkley Point C project is the technological complexity of deploying the advanced European Pressurized Reactor (EPR) technology. Hinkley Point C's superior European Pressurized Reactor (EPR) is technologically

complicated technology. Construction and commissioning were complicated by complex design and engineering (Chawla et al., 2018). These challenges needed creative solutions and revisions, which delayed the project. Delays raised labour costs and added costs to meet project deadlines. As the project encountered unexpected challenges, accommodating the unique EPR technology caused budget overruns.

Inflation has also caused Hinkley Point C budget overruns. Inflation, a prolonged rise in the price of goods and services in an economy, affected the project over its several-year lifespan. Inflation affected labour prices the most. Due to inflation, qualified personnel and labour-intensive nuclear power plant construction jobs cost more. Inflation also raised the cost of raw materials and equipment, which are essential for complicated projects like Hinkley Point C (Daniel & Daniel, 2019). The project needed help to account for increased material and equipment costs in its early budget estimates.

Inflation also created market uncertainty and unexpected supply chain expenses. Supplier contracts can become unstable as prices fluctuate, causing supply chain interruptions and higher procurement expenses. Inflation mitigation needs financial planning and risk management (Smyth et al., 2018). Project stakeholders must evaluate inflationary trends throughout the planning and ensure that budget estimations are flexible enough to allow for cost swings. Inflation buffers, cost estimations, and procurement plan optimisation may be needed.

The third factor that has led to budget overruns is Supply Chain Disruptions. Hinkley Point C overspent due to supply chain delays. Access to critical materials and components was crucial to the project's success. Unexpected supply chain interruptions slowed procurement and raised costs. Critical equipment and material delays slowed construction and increased labour costs (Heagney, 2016). The project timeframe was affected by delays in material delivery for construction activities. Supply chain disruptions required seeking other suppliers, which could have also raised the cost of materials and labour. Switching suppliers or materials have also increased procurement costs due to less favourable agreements.

Design Changes and Uncertainties have caused budget overruns of the project. As the project developed, fresh information and technical challenges required design changes. These adjustments were necessary to increase safety and efficiency but added costs that needed to be budgeted (Lock, 2020). Design adjustments that improve safety are essential in a nuclear power plant project.

Retrofitting safety measures or modifying components can increase material, labour, and engineering expenses. New technologies like the European Pressurized Reactor (EPR) introduced implementation and performance uncertainties (Putti & Tóth, 2017). During construction, unexpected issues may have required design changes and added expenditures. Construction-related risks like ground and weather conditions also caused project execution changes and cost increases; this increase was associated with labour and raw material cost increase.

Lastly, the initial estimated cost was underestimated. Budget overruns resulted from Hinkley Point C's underestimation of the initial plan. The initial budget underestimated the difficulties of implementing sophisticated European Pressurized Reactor (EPR) technology and building a large nuclear power facility. Underestimating costs during project planning might determine the project's financial structure (Heagney, 2016). The project's budget overran when actual expenses exceeded earlier forecasts. Other factors leading to cost overruns include Regulatory Compliance and Quality Management in the projects that have demanded more cost than expected.

Time

There have been delays while the project was expected to be completed in 2025. However, this has been pushed due to delays and overruns. The project is expected to be completed by 2027. The project phases have also faced delays. Financing and Investment Challenges of the project have caused this. Hinkley Point C was delayed by funding, budget, and investment issues. Funding a large nuclear power plant takes time and effort. Due to its Large-scale projects, financing and investment issue have delayed the projects. Companies and governments invested much in Hinkley Point C (Meredith et al., 2017). Negotiating investment arrangements, collecting financing, and persuading investors have taken time, especially for this being a complex, capital-intensive nuclear power facility. Investment agreements and financial assistance delays slowed project progress. Insufficient budget allocation at project start-ups has made cost management challenging. Project managers must seek additional funds or change the project scope if the initial budget estimate needs to be higher, which might have delayed the project.

Construction Labor Shortages and Skills Gap has also caused delay in the project. Nuclear power plant projects require trained people (Meredith et al., 2017). Before Hinkley Point C, the building industry needed more competent workers in many trades. The project's workforce was hard to find due to the skills gap. Recruiting and training skilled people to satisfy project needs requires time.

Hiring and training delays delayed construction progress. The skills deficit intensified competitiveness for competent workers among regional construction projects. Due to competition from other big building projects, the Hinkley Point C project encountered labour shortages and delays.

Brexit Uncertainties have also caused delays. Brexit uncertainty hampered project planning and delayed Hinkley Point C. After the UK left the EU, trade restrictions and agreements changed, creating tension for regional firms and projects. These concerns influenced Hinkley Point C's component and material procurement, potentially delaying construction. Negotiations could affect UK-EU trade legislation during the transition period. Tariffs, customs, and regulatory uncertainty hampered cross-border trade (Kerzner, 2017). Thus, EU suppliers' crucial equipment and materials were delayed, delaying the project's completion. Brexit also affected labour availability. EU accession required UK-EU labour mobility. Brexit could have harmed skilled labour availability, primarily if the project relied on EU personnel. Project delays may have resulted from immigration restrictions limiting eligible workers. Brexit uncertainty affected financing and investment decisions. Investors and financial institutions may have been wary of long-term projects like Hinkley Point C due to post-Brexit economic uncertainty. Delayed finance and investment thus affected the project's financial feasibility and timeline.

Another cause of delays has been Supply Chain Disruptions: The Hinkley Point C project was delayed by supply chain disruptions, including the COVID-19 pandemic. Supplier production and logistics issues caused significant component and material delays. A nuclear power plant requires complicated, specialised equipment from a few suppliers. Suppliers have production concerns or component delays, leading supply chain disruptions has led to delays (Young, 2016). Though necessary to mitigate supply chain interruptions, locating alternate vendors or commodities from different regions led to delayed procurement. Finding new suppliers, negotiating contracts, and guaranteeing quality have also delayed construction. The project required shipping significant components, and transportation and logistics issues have emerged. Customs clearance, port congestion, and weather have caused project delays.

Technological Complexity and Design Changes: Hinkley Point C's European Pressurized Reactor (EPR) technology brought engineering hurdles. Creative solutions were needed to meet this advanced nuclear technology's demanding design and operating needs. Safety, efficiency, and

power plant reliability required design adjustments (Glasson et al., 2021). These changes delayed construction and commissioning. Engineers found design tweaks that might improve safety early in construction. These changes were meant to strengthen the plant's resistance to earthquakes, floods, and other disasters. While necessary for safety, these design changes required more technical research, simulations, and approvals, delaying the project timetable.

Regulatory and Environmental Compliance: The nuclear plant follows tight regulations to protect the public and the environment. The Hinkley Point C project followed these strict standards and took extra safety precautions (Jenkins et al., 2017). These criteria affected construction and operation, extending timescales. Regulatory compliance slowed the project's licensing procedure. The nuclear power plant's operation required extensive licensing before construction. This approach included rigorous safety assessments, environmental impact studies, and public consultations. Regulatory approval's comprehensive review delayed the project's pre-construction phase. Safety inspections and management during construction ensured regulatory compliance. Discrepancies required correction actions, which also led to delayed construction. Environmental compliance added further complications (Jenkins et al., 2017). The project required safeguarding local ecosystems, responsibly managing garbage, and limiting habitat effects. Environmental considerations required careful planning and coordination, potentially delaying construction.

Stakeholders

Stakeholders in the Hinkley Point C project had different interests, concerns, and contributions. These stakeholders include.

EDF Energy (Electricité de France)

As the project's developer and investor, EDF Energy helped plan, finance, and execute it. EDF Energy's primary purpose was to build and operate the nuclear power station, aligning with its strategic goals of creating renewable energy solutions and improving UK energy security.

UK Government and Regulatory Authorities

The BEIS and ONR were crucial stakeholders. They monitored safety, enforced regulations, and issued licenses. The administration prioritised energy security, economic benefits, and environmental concerns.

Local Communities and Residents

The project's impact on Somerset and adjacent communities was a significant worry. These towns wanted jobs, economic growth, and environmental impacts. Maintaining local support requires engaging stakeholders, addressing concerns, and limiting negative impacts.

Investors and Financial Institutions

Investors and financial institutions contribute critical finance for the project's considerable budget. They care about the project's financial sustainability, ROI, and budget. Maintaining investor confidence requires continuous and transparent project progress and financial communication.

Environmental and Public Interest Groups

The project's ecological impact are interests of the environmental groups. They prioritised environmental assessments, regulatory compliance, and ecosystem protection. These stakeholders address ecological issues and maintain public trust.

Quality

With this being a nuclear plant project, the Hinkley Point C quality stakeholders have been on the top frontline to ensure the highest safety standards. Quality factors affected the timelines and budget of the project in the following ways.

Stringent Safety Standards and Regulatory Compliance

Meeting safety and regulatory standards have delayed project execution. Like regulatory authorities, quality stakeholders implement comprehensive nuclear safety procedures to protect public health and the environment. These procedures might include design revisions/ changes, construction requirements, and extensive inspections, extending project timelines and costs (Armenia et al., 2019).

Design Adjustments and Rework

Quality stakeholders in different phases have also suggested design adjustments or rework to achieve the highest quality. Safety, efficiency, and regulatory compliance can drive these adjustments. While necessary for quality, design revisions and rework have delayed construction and extended the project timetable and the cost needed for the whole project (Kerzner, 2017).

Coordination and Communication Challenges

Project teams and quality stakeholders must communicate well. Failure in requirements or delays in project milestone approvals have caused delays. Communication gaps can be avoided with good collaboration and responsiveness. Project Inspections and Audits: Quality stakeholders check and audit projects to ensure compliance with quality standards leading to more time in the phase (Lock, 2020). These audits provide quality but may also reveal non-compliance concerns or anomalies that delay project implementation.

Learning Curve and Adaptation

Quality stakeholders in complex technical projects like Hinkley Point C may experience a learning curve as they adjust to the new systems. Adjustments to procedures and work practices throughout this learning phase delayed productivity and efficiency. Dispute Resolution and Legal Processes Quality stakeholders dispute project features which caused delays (Fewings and Henjeweile, 2019).

Communication

Communication and scope integration issues caused delays and overruns in the Hinkley Point C project. The initiative involved government agencies, local communities, investors, and contractors. Coordinating and harmonising their interests and expectations took time, causing decision delays and conflicting priorities (Armenia et al., 2019)—nuclear regulatory compliance requires excellent attention to detail and clear communication between the project team and regulatory authorities. Delays in securing approvals and passing strict compliance criteria could have slowed the project.

Scope integration

Engineers had to integrate existing project components with sophisticated European Pressurized Reactor (EPR) technology. The intricacy of incorporating this modern technology into the project's design and construction caused unexpected issues (Demirkesen & Ozorhon, 2017). Safety and operational efficiency required design adjustments, which could delay scope integration. Throughout construction and operation, uncertainty hindered scope integration, necessitating project scope reassessments. Scope issues delayed and overran Hinkley Point C.

Risks factors

Several other elements in the initial project plan contributed to the substantial overruns and delays experienced in the Hinkley Point C project. The project's advanced EPR technology introduced uncertainties that were hard to predict. Novel nuclear power station construction and commissioning pose risks and obstacles, resulting in unexpected complications. Uncertainties have delayed engineering and execution, affecting the project's timeframe and budget (Armenia et al., 2019).

There have also been Geotechnical issues; the project's Somerset location presented geotechnical issues that needed to be addressed in the initial proposal. Soil, groundwater, and geological stability required further technical and construction adjustments (Padalkar & Gopinath, 2016). Geotechnical issues have slowed project development and increased modification expenses.

Stakeholder Management: The project strategy may have underestimated stakeholder management's complexity. Hinkley Point C has many stakeholders with different goals (Demirkesen & Ozorhon, 2017). Approvals, public concerns, and local community issues may have caused delays—stakeholder participation and management speed up project progress. Extreme weather and seasonal constraints have slowed the project. Weather delayed and cost building. A thorough review of previous weather data may have improved planning and risk reduction. Large-scale projects require sufficient finance and investment. The initial project plan underestimated the time and funds needed to complete the project. Funding delays can delay the project and increase costs (Demirkesen & Ozorhon, 2017). Good project governance and decision-making help manage complexities and obstacles throughout the project's lifecycle. The initial plan to some extent needed more governance or quick-resolution procedures. Delaying important decisions or coordinating project parties may have caused delays. The initial project also underestimated construction labour productivity fluctuations. Worker tiredness, turnover, and labour disputes slow production and increase costs.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the Hinkley Point C project study budget overruns and delays have been caused by various factors. The factors caused delays and budget overruns, necessitating careful analysis and proactive management in future large-scale projects. Advanced EPR deployment was complicated. Underestimating the complexity caused design adjustments and construction and commissioning issues. Regulatory compliance and safety standards required extensive examinations and clearances, extending the project's timetable. The COVID-19 pandemic and Brexit uncertainty caused delays. COVID-19 limits disrupted crucial component deliveries, while Brexit concerns hampered trade regulations and labour availability, affecting project planning and execution. The project plan also underestimated construction labour shortages and skills gaps. Hiring qualified staff took time, delaying project implementation. Budget overruns were worsened by financing issues and investment delays, underscoring the importance of financial planning and finance. Inadequate contingency planning exposed the project to unexpected risks and obstacles, increasing costs and timelines. Geotechnical obstacles, stakeholder management issues, weather and environmental conditions, and project governance issues must be adequately addressed, compounding the project's problems. The Hinkley Point C project is a crucial case study for future large-scale projects, underlining the significance of careful planning, risk assessment, and proactive management. To succeed, project stakeholders must use thorough contingency planning, tight engagement with quality stakeholders, and clear communication. By applying Hinkley Point C lessons, future projects can reduce delays and financial overruns and improve efficiency and success.

References

- Armenia, S., Dangelico, R.M., Nonino, F. and Pompei, A., 2019. Sustainable project management: A conceptualization-oriented review and a framework proposal for future studies. *Sustainability*, 11(9), p.2664. Available at <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/11/9/2664>
- Chawla, V., Chanda, A., Angra, S. & Chawla, G. (2018). The Sustainable project management: A review and future possibilities. *Journal of Project Management*, 3(3), pp.157–170. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323864422_The_sustainable_project_management_A_review_and_future_possibilities
- Demirkesen, S. and Ozorhon, B., 2017. Impact of integration management on construction project management performance. *International journal of project management*, 35(8), pp.1639-1654. Available at <https://isiarticles.com/bundles/Article/pre/pdf/82827.pdf>
- 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. Available at <https://pdf.sciencedirectass.com>
- Fewings, P. and Henjewe, C., (2019). *Construction project management: an integrated approach*. Routledge. Available at <https://www.routledge.com/Construction-Project-Management-An-Integrated-Approach/Fewings-Fewings-Henjewe/p/book/9780815358657>
- Glasson, J., Durning, B., Broderick, M. and Welch, K., 2021. Monitoring and auditing the local socio-economic and environmental impacts of the early stage construction of Hinkley Point C Nuclear Power Station, UK. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 39(2), pp.84-95. Available at <https://radar.brookes.ac.uk/radar/file/161c8877-2e5c-405a-821c-a5803022c6e0/1/Impacts%20of%20Hinkley%20Point%20C%20-%202020%20-%20Glasson%20Durning%20Broderick%20Welch.pdf>
- Heagney, J., 2016. *Fundamentals of project management*. Amacom. <https://www.power-technology.com/news/hinkley-point-c-project-costs-rise-again/>

<https://www.edfenergy.com/energy/nuclear-new-build-projects/hinkley-point-c/about>

<https://www.onr.org.uk/hinkley-point-c/assessment-reports.htm>

<https://www.newcivilengineer.com/archive/hinkley-point-c-quality-management-needs-improvement-says-nuclear-regulator-16-03-2018/>

<https://www.nsenergybusiness.com/projects/hinkley-point-c-nuclear-power-station-uk/>

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-somerset-58724732>

Kerzner, H., 2017. *Project management: a systems approach to planning, scheduling, and controlling*. John Wiley & Sons. Available at <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Project+Management%3A+A+Systems+Approach+to+Planning%2C+Scheduling%2C+and+Controlling%2C+13th+Edition-p-9781119805373>

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. Available at <https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/handle/10023/13629>

Lock, D., 2020. *Project management*. Routledge. Available at <https://www.routledge.com/Project-Management/Lock/p/book/9781409452690>

Meredith, J.R., Shafer, S.M. and Mantel Jr, S.J., 2017. *Project management: a strategic managerial approach*. John Wiley & Sons. Available at <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Project+Management%3A+A+Managerial+Approach%2C+11th+Edition-p-9781119803836>

Padalkar, M. and Gopinath, S., 2016. Six decades of project management research: Thematic trends and future opportunities. *International journal of project management*, 34(7), pp.1305-1321. Available at <https://www.scirp.org/%28S%28lz5mqp453edsnp55rrgict55%29%29/reference/referencepapers.aspx?referenceid=2884347>

Prabhu, S., 2016. Chinese Nuclear Renaissance at Hinkley Point-a Perspective. *IndraStra Global*, (10), p.3. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309607390_Chinese_Nuclear_Renaissance_at_Hinkley_Point_A_Perspective

- Putti, K. and Tóth, Z., 2017, June. Based on the available data, economic analysis of the Hinkley Point C nuclear power plant. In *2017 6th International Youth Conference on Energy (IYCE)* (pp. 1–7). IEEE. Available at <https://cris.brighton.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/484589/Jenkins+et+al.+2017+%28Submitted%29.pdf>
- Smyth, H., Lecoeuvre, L. and Vaesken, P., 2018. Co-creation of value and the project context: Towards application on the Hinkley Point C Nuclear Power Station case. *International journal of project management*, 36(1), pp.170-183. Available at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0263786317300157>
- Young, T.L., 2016. *Successful project management*. Kogan Page Publishers. Available at <https://www.worldcat.org/title/successful-project-management/oclc/829460135>