

ID Concern [reg.]	Category / Element	Risk Short Title	Description	Desired Outcome	Current Situation	Proposed Strategy	Risk (three-part) Statement			Current Risk			Response	Mitigating Action / Response				Manageability	Residual Risk	Risk Owner	Target Review Date	Close Date	Last Review Date		
							Cause	Risk Event [uncertainty]	Consequence	Probability	Impact	Score (PxI)		ID	Action	Action Owner	Due Date							Close Date	Notes
C00539	R6 Approvals / Permits / Licenses	Licensing Strategy Fragmentation	The overall licensing and permissions strategy may become fragmented across safety, environmental, planning, security, and site-specific workstreams, leading to inconsistent assumptions and late discovery of gaps.	A single integrated licensing roadmap is maintained, with clear owners, dependencies, evidence requirements, and review dates across all consent streams. Could Go Wrong? A required consent, licence condition, or supporting evidence package is missed, delayed, or found to be inconsistent with the current project baseline.	The project is likely to involve multiple assurance and consent pathways that will evolve over time and may be managed by different parties unless deliberately integrated.	Create a master permissions and obligations register linked to key deliverables, design assumptions, review gates, and named owners; review it routinely at project level and escalate slippage early.	Multiple regulatory and consent routes are being developed in parallel without full integration.	A dependency or evidence requirement is overlooked or addressed too late.	Design, procurement, construction, or commissioning activity is delayed or exposed to rework.	4	3	12	Mitigate	#1	Create a master permissions and obligations register linked to key deliverables, design assumptions, review gates, and named owners	Winter, David	23May26	Open	4	9	Winter, David	23Apr27	Open	24Mar26	
														#2	Review MPR routinely at project level and escalate slippage early.	Winter, David	23May26	Open							
C00540	T2 Design / Eng.	Safety Case and Design Baseline Misalignment	The evolving safety case may drift out of alignment with the engineering design baseline, creating uncertainty over whether the physical plant and the justified plant are still the same thing.	The safety case, design baseline, requirements set, and change records remain aligned and demonstrably traceable throughout the project lifecycle. Could Go Wrong? Construction or procurement proceeds against a baseline that no longer matches the assumptions in the safety case or key safety submissions.	Major projects often develop design and safety narratives in adjacent teams, and alignment can degrade as changes accumulate.	Maintain explicit traceability between safety claims, requirements, system design, procurement packages, and approved changes; require visible reconciliation at each key maturity gate.	Design evolution and safety justification are controlled through partially separate processes.	One or more design changes are incorporated without full safety case reconciliation.	The project faces approval delay, design rework, or loss of confidence in the integrity of its assurance basis.	4	4	16	Mitigate	#1	Establish MOC system.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	5	12	Winter, David	07Nov26	Open	24Mar26	
														#2	Build safety case into the Concerns Action Tracking System.	Winter, David	23May26	Open							
C00541	T2 Design / Eng.	Design Maturity Behind Procurement Commitment	Procurement commitments may be made before design maturity is sufficient, locking the project into premature decisions on equipment, layout, interfaces, or construction sequence.	Procurement is released only when design maturity, interface definition, and technical acceptance criteria are credible for the package concerned. Could Go Wrong? Long-lead items are ordered against immature or unstable requirements, leading to change, concession, delay, or unusable equipment.	Pressure to protect headline schedule dates can encourage early release of packages before full design confidence exists.	Define package-specific maturity criteria before commitment; make design readiness visible; distinguish genuine long-lead necessity from avoidable early commitment.	Schedule pressure and commercial pressure are driving early procurement decisions.	Equipment or services are committed against incomplete or unstable information.	Cost growth, claims, redesign, and schedule disruption increase.	3	4	12	Mitigate	#1	Establish Maturity criteria for use in procurement registers.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	3	8	Winter, David	09Aug26	Open	24Mar26	
C00542	M3 Communication	Interface Breakdown Across Major Plant Areas	Critical interfaces between reactor island, conventional plant, balance of plant, grid connection, utilities, and site infrastructure may not be owned and controlled with enough precision.	Every major interface has named ownership, boundary definition, data exchange requirements, and visible action tracking through to closure. Could Go Wrong? Unresolved boundary issues emerge late in construction or commissioning, with each party assuming the other had responsibility.	Large complex plants are vulnerable to gaps between package boundaries, especially when different designers, contractors, and assurance teams are involved.	Create a formal interface register with boundary drawings, assumptions, action owners, due dates, and status by area; review it routinely alongside schedule and change.	Multiple package boundaries and organizational boundaries exist across the programme.	An interface ambiguity or omission remains unresolved until physical work or testing exposes it.	Installation, testing, or handover is delayed and disputes increase.	3	3	9	Mitigate	#1	Establish an interface register	Winter, David	23May26	Open	5	6	Winter, David	20Sep26	Open	24Mar26	
														#2	Establish an interface review meeting schedule.	Winter, David	23May26	Open							

ID Concern [reg.]	Category / Element	Risk Short Title	Description	Desired Outcome	Current Situation	Proposed Strategy	Risk (three-part) Statement			Current Risk			Response	Mitigating Action / Response				Manageability	Residual Risk	Risk Owner	Target Review Date	Close Date	Last Review Date		
							Cause	Risk Event [uncertainty]	Consequence	Probability	Impact	Score (Pxl)		ID	Action	Action Owner	Due Date							Close Date	
																									Notes
C00543	T1 Project Scope	Configuration Control Weakness	Engineering, procurement, and site teams may work to different revisions of drawings, specifications, models, or instructions, undermining plant integrity and trust in the record.	A single, disciplined source of truth exists for current approved information, superseded information is controlled, and revision status is visible to all affected parties. Could Go Wrong? Fabrication, installation, or testing is carried out to the wrong revision, creating physical non-conformance and expensive recovery work.	High document volume and frequent design updates create strong risk of version drift without disciplined control.	Enforce configuration management rules, controlled issue routes, revision visibility, field verification, and periodic audit of critical documents and model status.	Document updates and field use of information are not perfectly synchronized.	Work is executed using obsolete or inconsistent information.	Plant quality, schedule, and safety confidence are damaged.	3	3	9	Mitigate	#1	Implement configuration management.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	5	6	Winter, David	11Sep26	Open	24Mar26	
C00544	C5 Suppliers / Vendors	Supply Chain Qualification and Nuclear Traceability Gaps	Suppliers may be engaged or progressed without sufficiently robust qualification, surveillance, material traceability, or understanding of nuclear-quality expectations.	Only appropriately qualified suppliers progress critical scope, with traceability, hold points, records, and surveillance defined up front and maintained through delivery. Could Go Wrong? A vendor cannot demonstrate pedigree, process control, quality compliance, or full traceability for critical items or materials.	The supply chain for a nuclear new-build programme is broad, pressured, and uneven in capability.	Apply graded supplier assurance, pre-qualification, surveillance planning, manufacturing record requirements, and early verification of traceability expectations before work starts.	Supplier capability and documentation requirements are not fully proven before commitment.	A critical package arrives with non-conforming records, weak traceability, or unresolved quality concerns.	Acceptance, installation, or regulatory confidence is delayed or compromised.	3	3	9	Mitigate	#1	Establish supplier assurance procedure.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	3	6	Winter, David	06Jun26	Open	24Mar26	
C00545	C5 Suppliers / Vendors	Long-Lead Manufacturing Slippage Hidden Too Long	Slippage in long-lead manufacturing may remain hidden behind optimistic reporting until recovery options are limited and downstream schedule damage is unavoidable.	Long-lead packages are monitored through evidence-based milestone visibility, early warning triggers, and realistic forecast dates. Could Go Wrong? Manufacturing delay emerges late, after downstream works, logistics plans, and site sequence have already been built around an unrealistic date.	Distance from suppliers and reliance on summary status updates can mask real production issues.	Track critical packages through detailed manufacturing milestones, quality release points, inspection dates, and logistics readiness rather than headline dates alone.	Management visibility into vendor progress is too coarse or too optimistic.	A long-lead package misses its true required date with limited warning.	Construction and commissioning sequences are disrupted and recovery cost rises.	4	3	12	Mitigate	#1	Establish a Critical Packages register	Winter, David	23May26	Open	4	9	Winter, David	17Oct26	Open	24Mar26	
C00546	T4 Construction	Civil Works and Equipment Readiness Out of Sequence	Civils, structural readiness, embedded items, and access arrangements may not be aligned to the actual equipment delivery and installation sequence.	Site readiness and equipment arrival are aligned area by area, with visible constraints and timely release of workfronts. Could Go Wrong? Equipment arrives to an area that is not physically ready, forcing storage, resequencing, rehandling, or deterioration of installed confidence.	Programme logic often treats area readiness too generically unless broken down into usable workfront conditions.	Define area readiness criteria, link them to installation windows and equipment forecasts, and manage them as visible deliverables, not vague assumptions.	Site readiness is being tracked at too high a level or by disconnected teams.	A planned installation window is reached but the workfront is not actually ready.	Schedule efficiency deteriorates and the risk of damage, congestion, and claims increases.	4	3	12	Mitigate	#1	Define area readiness criteria in an Area Register (attach to PBS)	Winter, David	23May26	Open	4	9	Winter, David	13Nov26	Open	24Mar26	
														#2	Track Areas as deliverables set.	Winter, David	23May26	Open							
C00547	T3 Technical Processes	Change Control Without Full Consequence Visibility	Project changes may be approved locally without a full view of safety, design, licensing, schedule, cost, quality, and operational consequences.	Every material change is assessed through a proportionate but integrated process before implementation, with consequences made visible and accepted. Could Go Wrong? A seemingly local change creates wider implications that are discovered only after commitment or field execution.	Complex projects generate many changes whose cross-discipline impact is easy to underestimate.	Strengthen the change process so that each change record carries explicit cross-functional review, affected deliverables, linked actions, and decision authority.	Change decisions are being made faster than integrated impact assessment is being performed.	A change is implemented on partial information.	Unexpected downstream rework, delay, or assurance challenge occurs.	4	4	16	Mitigate	#1	Implement Change Control process.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	4	12	Winter, David	17Oct26	Open	24Mar26	

ID Concern [reg.]	Category / Element	Risk Short Title	Description	Desired Outcome	Current Situation	Proposed Strategy	Risk (three-part) Statement			Current Risk			Response	Mitigating Action / Response				Manageability	Residual Risk	Risk Owner	Target Review Date	Close Date	Last Review Date		
							Cause	Risk Event [uncertainty]	Consequence	Probability	Impact	Score (Pxl)		ID	Action	Action Owner	Due Date							Close Date	Notes
C00548	M4 Project Resourcing	Nuclear-Competent Resource Shortfall	The project may lack enough suitably experienced people in key safety, quality, engineering, manufacturing, commissioning, and assurance roles at the times they are needed.	A realistic resource strategy is in place, with critical roles identified early, succession planned, and competence gaps addressed before they become blockers. Could Go Wrong? Key reviews, approvals, inspections, or decisions stall because the right competent people are unavailable or overloaded.	Nuclear new-build work places unusual demand on scarce specialist capability and independent oversight.	Maintain a critical-roles heatmap, forecast demand by phase, monitor overload, and trigger recruitment, training, or specialist support before bottlenecks form.	The programme depends on scarce specialist competence across multiple simultaneous workstreams.	Critical roles become vacant, overloaded, or thinly spread.	Decision quality, pace, and confidence deteriorate.	3	3	9	Mitigate	#1	Create a resource plan tracking critical roles.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	3	6	Winter, David	13Feb27	Open	24Mar26	
C00549	M4 Project Resourcing	Contractor Quality Culture Drift	Under cost or schedule pressure, parts of the project may begin to treat quality paperwork, inspection discipline, and defect prevention as obstacles rather than essential control mechanisms.	The project culture consistently reinforces that quality, traceability, and right-first-time delivery are core enablers of success, not optional overhead. Could Go Wrong? Teams normalise concession-seeking, late record completion, superficial checks, or build-now-fix-later behaviour.	Behaviour on pressured programmes can drift unless leadership visibly rewards disciplined compliance and honest reporting.	Use leadership messaging, targeted audits, trend review, stop-the-line authority, and practical close-out routines to reinforce quality-first behaviour.	Commercial and schedule pressure are eroding discipline on the ground.	Poor-quality behaviours become normalized in one or more work areas.	Defects, rework, latent issues, and confidence loss increase.	3	4	12	Mitigate	#1	Implement a Quality Plan	Winter, David	23May26	Open	5	8	Winter, David	18Oct26	Open	24Mar26	
C00550	M1 Project Management	Testing and Commissioning Strategy Not Integrated Early Enough	Testing, pre-commissioning, commissioning, operations input, and completions logic may be developed too late or too separately from design and construction planning.	An integrated completions and commissioning strategy is established early, with systemization, test prerequisites, turnover logic, and operations involvement built into delivery planning. Could Go Wrong? Physical completion is reached in fragmented form, but system handover and progressive testing cannot proceed efficiently.	Projects often underestimate how early completions logic and system turnover discipline need to start.	Create system-based completions planning early, define prerequisites and evidence requirements, map testing sequence by system and area, and link this to construction priorities.	Completions and commissioning requirements are not fully driving earlier project stages.	Construction progresses without enough regard to turnover sequence and test readiness.	Commissioning becomes congested, slow, and unpredictable.	4	4	16	Mitigate	#1	Set Completions milestones.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	4	12	Winter, David	15Aug26	Open	24Mar26	
														#2	Establish construction meeting schedule to address completions.	Winter, David	23May26	Open							
C00551	M2 Project Organisation	Digital Information Environment Fragmentation	Key project information may be split across disconnected systems, spreadsheets, contractor tools, and local records, making it hard to trust status, evidence, or decision history.	The project can see one coherent picture of status, obligations, actions, revisions, and deliverables across key workstreams. Could Go Wrong? Teams spend excessive effort reconciling conflicting records and cannot easily prove what is current, complete, approved, or overdue.	Large programmes often accumulate parallel systems faster than they integrate them.	Identify the minimum critical information set for programme control, assign system-of-record ownership, and remove unmanaged shadow reporting where practical.	Information is being managed in multiple partially connected places.	Decision-makers receive inconsistent or late information.	Control weakens and issues remain hidden for longer than they should.	4	3	12	Mitigate	#1	Establish Digital information Plan	Winter, David	23May26	Open	5	9	Winter, David	07Nov26	Open	24Mar26	
C00552	M1 Project Management	Schedule Logic Does Not Reflect Real Construction and Assurance Constraints	The master schedule may appear complete but fail to represent genuine physical, assurance, hold-point, interface, and access constraints in enough detail to support credible decisions.	The schedule reflects realistic logic, constraints, dependencies, and uncertainty at the level needed for meaningful control and forecasting. Could Go Wrong? Headline dates are defended even though the underlying logic does not support them, masking emerging delay until it becomes severe.	Complex projects can drift into presentation scheduling rather than decision-grade scheduling.	Review critical paths and near-critical paths using evidence from design, procurement, site readiness, quality hold points, interface actions, and commissioning prerequisites.	The schedule baseline has gaps between formal logic and real delivery conditions.	Forecast dates remain optimistic despite deteriorating field reality.	Management action is delayed and recovery becomes harder.	3	4	12	Mitigate	#1	Establish schedule review programme.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	3	8	Winter, David	21Aug26	Open	24Mar26	
														#2	Establish interface review programme.	Winter, David	23May26	Open							

ID Concern [reg.]	Category / Element	Risk Short Title	Description	Desired Outcome	Current Situation	Proposed Strategy	Risk (three-part) Statement			Current Risk			Response	Mitigating Action / Response				Manageability	Residual Risk	Risk Owner	Target Review Date	Close Date	Last Review Date		
							Cause	Risk Event [uncertainty]	Consequence	Probability	Impact	Score (Pxl)		ID	Action	Action Owner	Due Date							Close Date	Notes
C00553	M8 Project Quality	Security and Cyber Requirements Integrated Too Late	Physical security, cyber security, and operational technology assurance may be treated as later specialist topics rather than embedded design and delivery requirements.	Security and cyber requirements are built into architecture, supplier expectations, testing, and acceptance from the outset.	Specialist assurance areas are often deferred until systems become more concrete, by which time change is expensive.	Define security and cyber requirements early, flow them into packages, monitor evidence production, and include them explicitly in design and test reviews.	Security and cyber assurance are not fully embedded in mainstream project controls.	A late-stage review exposes gaps in design, configuration, or supplier evidence.	Systems acceptance and operational readiness are delayed.	3	4	12	Mitigate	#1	Implement a Cyber Security Procedure (as part of the integration plan)	Winter, David	23May26	Open	5	8	Winter, David	23Oct26	Open	24Mar26	
				<p>Could Go Wrong?</p> <p>Late security findings force redesign, retesting, segregation changes, or re-approval of digital and control systems.</p>																					
C00554	M2 Project Organisation	Emergency Planning and Site Resilience Not Mature Enough for Delivery Phase	Emergency arrangements, site resilience, and contingency planning for construction and early operations may lag behind the practical risk profile of the evolving site.	Emergency and resilience planning remains proportionate, current, exercised, and aligned to actual site conditions and project phase.	Site conditions, contractor numbers, temporary works, and hazard profile change over time and require active updating.	Maintain a live emergency preparedness review tied to project phase changes, major site transitions, and exercises with accountable follow-up.	Emergency arrangements are not being refreshed at the same pace as site evolution.	A significant event occurs under conditions not well covered by current plans.	Response effectiveness is reduced and consequences escalate.	3	3	9	Mitigate	#1	Establish an Emergency Preparedness plan.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	5	6	Winter, David	28Oct26	Open	24Mar26	
				<p>Could Go Wrong?</p> <p>An incident exposes that emergency response assumptions, access routes, roles, communications, or mutual aid arrangements are not fit for current site reality.</p>																					
C00555	M3 Communication	Stakeholder Trust Erodes Through Inconsistent Communication	Relations with regulators, local communities, authorities, supply chain partners, or internal sponsors may deteriorate if communication is inconsistent, defensive, or not supported by evidence.	Stakeholders receive timely, honest, evidence-based communication, with concerns acknowledged early and tracked to resolution.	High-profile projects attract intense attention and can lose trust quickly when narrative outruns evidence.	Maintain a stakeholder concerns and commitments log, align messaging with verified status, and escalate unresolved commitments before they sour relationships.	Communication and follow-through are not fully aligned across stakeholder groups.	A commitment is missed or a concern is left to fester without clear response.	Approval pace slows and opposition or scrutiny intensifies.	4	4	16	Mitigate	#1	Establish a Stakeholder Register	Winter, David	23May26	Open	4	12	Winter, David	10Sep26	Open	24Mar26	
				<p>Could Go Wrong?</p> <p>Confidence declines, objections harden, and routine discussions become more adversarial, slowing decisions and amplifying scrutiny.</p>																					
C00556	M8 Project Quality	Waste, Spent Fuel, and End-of-Life Assumptions Not Anchored Early Enough	Assumptions about waste handling, spent fuel strategy, interim storage, decommissioning interfaces, and lifetime obligations may remain too abstract during early project decisions.	Lifecycle obligations are visible early enough to influence design, space allocation, logistics, commercial strategy, and long-term credibility.	Projects can focus heavily on build and startup while treating end-of-life and waste pathways as distant matters.	Maintain explicit lifecycle assumptions and interfaces in the project baseline, test them during design reviews, and assign ownership for the evidence behind them.	Lifecycle obligations are not yet fully embedded in near-term project control.	A key design or strategic choice is made on incomplete lifecycle assumptions.	Future compliance, operability, or cost is impaired.	3	3	9	Mitigate	#1	Establish an Assumptions Register as part of RAID process.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	5	6	Winter, David	19Sep26	Open	24Mar26	
				<p>Could Go Wrong?</p> <p>Short-term design or layout decisions create long-term operational, regulatory, or commercial constraints that are expensive to unwind.</p>																					

ID Concern [reg.]	Category / Element	Risk Short Title	Description	Desired Outcome	Current Situation	Proposed Strategy	Risk (three-part) Statement			Current Risk			Response	Mitigating Action / Response				Manageability	Residual Risk	Risk Owner	Target Review Date	Close Date	Last Review Date	
							Cause	Risk Event [uncertainty]	Consequence	Probability	Impact	Score (PxI)		ID	Action	Action Owner	Due Date							Close Date
C00557	M1 Project Management	Commercial Pressure Distorts Governance Decisions	Commercial or political pressure to preserve headline dates or budget positions may discourage honest escalation of concerns and weaken decision quality.	Governance forums reward timely truth-telling, realistic forecasting, and disciplined escalation rather than cosmetic protection of status. Could Go Wrong? Teams delay surfacing bad news, soften forecasts, or present unresolved issues as under control in order to avoid challenge or reputational damage.	Large flagship programmes can create strong pressure to protect narrative over reality.	Make decision forums evidence-based, require stated confidence levels and assumptions, track forecast drift, and protect escalation routes for uncomfortable truths.	The programme is exposed to strong external and internal pressure to look on track.	Important concerns are reported late or in diluted form.	Corrective action is delayed and outcomes worsen.	4	3	12	Mitigate	#1	Establish programme of governance meetings.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	4	9	Winter, David	14Nov26	Open	24Mar26
C00558	M1 Project Management	Action Closure Discipline Too Weak	Important actions from reviews, audits, design meetings, incidents, and assurance processes may remain open too long, close without evidence, or disappear between owners.	Actions are visible, prioritized, owned, reviewed, and closed only on evidence, with overdue items escalated promptly. Could Go Wrong? Known issues recur because follow-up is weak and lessons are not converted into completed actions.	Projects generate many actions, but value is lost when there is no disciplined closure routine.	Use a single visible action system linked to source, due date, evidence, dependencies, and escalation thresholds; review overdue and near-due items routinely.	Action generation is stronger than action follow-through.	Actions are missed, weakly evidenced, or repeatedly deferred.	Risk exposure remains higher than reported and preventable issues reappear.	4	4	16	Mitigate	#1	Establish Action Tracking System to include Issues and Risk Actions.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	4	12	Winter, David	15Aug26	Open	24Mar26
C00559	M3 Communication	Progress Reporting Masks Physical Reality	Reported progress may reflect document issue, earned percentage, or optimistic narrative more than verifiable physical readiness and usable completion.	Progress reporting is tied to evidence-based completion criteria that reflect real workfront readiness and usable turnover. Could Go Wrong? Management believes an area or package is further advanced than it really is, leading to flawed decisions on sequence, resources, and external commitments.	Different parties may measure progress differently unless completion definitions are explicit and auditable.	Define completion criteria by package and system, link reported status to evidence, and challenge reporting that cannot show what is truly complete and usable.	Progress metrics are vulnerable to interpretation and local optimism.	A management decision is made on overstated progress.	Downstream work is disrupted and confidence in reporting declines.	4	3	12	Mitigate	#1	Establish package completion within the schedule and review process.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	4	9	Winter, David	16Jul26	Open	24Mar26
C00560	M1 Project Management	Independent Assurance Becomes Reactive Rather Than Preventive	Assurance activity may become a late-stage checking function instead of an active mechanism for early challenge, learning, and prevention.	Independent assurance is planned and used early enough to influence outcomes, not just record defects after the fact. Could Go Wrong? Issues that could have been intercepted earlier are discovered only after commitment, installation, or formal review.	Assurance teams can be drawn into retrospective checking when delivery pressure is high.	Plan assurance interventions against the real risk profile, major package maturity points, and upcoming irreversible decisions; track findings through to demonstrable closure.	Independent assurance is not fully aligned to decision timing and emerging risk.	Challenge comes after key commitments or physical work have already occurred.	Preventable rework, delay, and confidence loss increase.	4	3	12	Mitigate	#1	Implement Project Assurance plan.	Winter, David	23May26	Open	4	9	Winter, David	24Jul26	Open	24Mar26