

Proposal for PHC Service

Springfield Nuclear New-Build Initiative

The Springfield Nuclear New-Build Initiative is a fictional major-project governance and assurance model developed within PHC Port. It imagines the replacement or augmentation of Springfield's famously idiosyncratic generating station through a modern nuclear new-build programme covering strategic definition, consenting, financing, engineering, procurement, construction, commissioning, operational readiness and eventual benefits realisation. The model is designed as a shadow programme rather than a technical reactor design. Its emphasis is the management system surrounding delivery: how leaders obtain reliable information; how uncertainty is identified and assessed; how actions and decisions remain traceable; how interfaces are controlled; how schedule and cost pressures are prevented from overwhelming safety, quality and assurance; and how contributors at every level can provide evidence without the programme disappearing beneath layers of polished but uninformative reporting. PHC provides the organising framework. Concerns are used to describe conditions requiring attention, CLAMPED entities provide structured project records, Timechunks evidence contribution, and reports draw from maintained source information rather than being reconstructed at the end of each reporting period. The intention is to show how a continuously maintained evidence base could support challenge, escalation, intervention and accountable decision-making throughout a complex programme. The setting is knowingly playful: Springfield politics may be volatile, the plant owner may regard governance as an avoidable overhead, and the control room may occasionally be distracted by confectionery. The controls, however, are intended to be recognisable, transferable and serious.

PHC Proposal

This proposal offers the **Project Health Control (PHC) Service** for the Springfield Nuclear New-Build Initiative: a fictional project created to test and demonstrate disciplined project-health control in a memorable major-infrastructure setting.

The Springfield setting is intentionally humorous, but the service proposition is serious. Nuclear new build creates a demanding combination of strategic uncertainty, regulatory scrutiny, technical and contractual interfaces, long decision chains, major cost and schedule exposure, and a continuing need to distinguish evidence from optimism. In such an environment, important Concerns can become fragmented across meetings, registers, correspondence, reports and individual memories. Actions may remain technically open while becoming organisationally invisible, and reassuring summaries can conceal weak ownership or unresolved assumptions.

The PHC Service provides a maintained project-health layer across those existing arrangements. It brings together Concerns, actions, decisions, people, locations, events, deliverables, commentary and supporting evidence so that the project can see what requires attention, who is responsible, what has changed and what remains unresolved. It supports structured review, exception reporting, escalation and traceability without attempting to take over the responsibilities of the sponsor, project team, nuclear licensee, design authority, regulator or specialist assurance functions.

The proposed PHC support is delivered through three phases:

- Phase 1 — Verification Preview (7-Day Review):** a focused review of the available project information, stakeholder landscape, principal Concerns, current controls and readiness for further PHC deployment. The review may support a green-light recommendation, but it may equally identify conditions requiring pause, correction or further evidence.
- Phase 2 — Setup and Mobilisation:** a 2-month period establishing the PHC information structure, working routines, ownership rules, reporting arrangements and practical interfaces with the project's existing management systems.
- Phase 3 — Embedded Oversight:** a renewable 3-month operational period providing continuing project-health review, evidence maintenance, exception visibility, escalation support and reporting as the project environment changes.

Conditional project-enabling provisions

Although the core offer is the PHC professional service, some projects cannot participate effectively unless a minimum working environment is also established. Where justified by the project context, the PHC Service contract may therefore include modest computer equipment, display equipment, power protection, connectivity support, training or other practical facilities needed for authorised project personnel to access PHC records, maintain spreadsheets, prepare documents, take part in online reviews and perform routine management work. These items are enabling provisions rather than general donations and may be omitted entirely where suitable facilities already exist.

The contract may also include a defined allocation of paid hours for essential members of the host project team where those people would otherwise be expected to carry management, coordination, evidence or reporting responsibilities without dependable remuneration. Such hours are intended to provide limited implementation-period stability so that agreed responsibilities can be performed reliably. They must be linked to defined roles, recorded contribution, authorised hours and identifiable outputs, and should not duplicate funding already provided from another source.

These provisions are project-specific and optional. A well-resourced programme may require only PHC consultant hours. A humanitarian, educational or community project may need modest equipment and temporary local capacity support before meaningful project control is possible. Their inclusion does not broaden the proposal beyond the PHC Service; it recognises that project health depends partly upon whether the people expected to manage the work have the basic tools and security needed to do so.

The proposal therefore buys neither a collection of documents nor a comforting dashboard. It offers a continuously maintained evidence base and the people needed to keep it useful—preferably before an important decision is approved merely because somebody at the head of the table says "Excellent".

Project Summary

The Springfield Nuclear New-Build Initiative is an illustrative major-project model examining how a new source of dependable, long-term, low-carbon electricity might be developed for Springfield while maintaining credible control of safety-related interfaces, programme uncertainty, stakeholder obligations and investment decisions.

The project is fictional. It is not based on confidential information, does not reproduce any live nuclear scheme and does not claim that a reactor technology, site, licensee, financing model or construction strategy has been selected. Its purpose is to provide a realistic governance environment in which project information, Concerns, plans, decisions, actions, reports and assurance evidence can be created, reviewed and connected.

The underlying challenge is recognisable across real major programmes: information exists, but not always in a form that allows leaders to understand the current condition of the project, the evidence behind reported confidence or the consequences of matters that remain dormant. P471 provides a controlled setting in which the PHC Service can demonstrate how those gaps may be exposed and managed.

The yellow-tinted presentation makes the project approachable and memorable. The capability being demonstrated beneath it is the serious one: converting dispersed project activity into an evidence-based account of project health before smoke emerging from expensive equipment becomes the most reliable form of status reporting.

Involved Parties

The PHC Service would operate across, and in support of, a wide stakeholder environment. The precise organisations and named participants would be confirmed during mobilisation, but the principal interfaces are expected to include:

- **Project Sponsor and Investment Authority** — accountable for strategic purpose, funding decisions and the conditions under which the initiative may proceed.
- **Client and Programme Leadership** — responsible for directing the programme, integrating delivery and responding to matters escalated through the PHC process.
- **Nuclear Licensee and Duty-Holders** — retaining all statutory responsibilities for nuclear safety, security and licensed-site arrangements.
- **Engineering and Design Authorities** — responsible for technical definition, configuration, design integrity and acceptance of engineering evidence.
- **Safety, Security, Quality and Independent Assurance Functions** — providing specialist challenge and assurance within their authorised remits.
- **Planning, Cost, Risk, Change and Information-Control Functions** — maintaining the formal controls with which PHC information must interface rather than compete.
- **Commercial, Procurement and Supply-Chain Teams** — managing contracts, supplier obligations, package interfaces and commercial exposure.
- **Construction, Testing, Commissioning and Operations Representatives** — ensuring that delivery decisions recognise buildability, handover, operability and whole-life consequences.
- **Government, Regulators and Public Authorities** — providing policy, statutory oversight, approvals and external scrutiny.
- **Local Authorities, Communities, Workforce Representatives and Environmental Stakeholders** — contributing legitimate concerns, evidence and expectations regarding the project's local and wider effects.
- **The PHC Team** — providing the agreed review, information-structuring, facilitation, reporting, follow-up and project-health support described in this proposal.

PHC does not absorb or redistribute the formal authority of these parties. It helps make their concerns, commitments, decisions, evidence and outstanding actions visible across organisational boundaries. A named owner remains accountable; the PHC team helps ensure that ownership does not become a polite synonym for disappearance.

Operational Strategy

P471 will be supported through the standard three-phase Project Health Control deployment model. The proposal is for the PHC Service only, delivered through forecast hours assigned to the agreed PHC roles. The service will use the project's available information and work alongside existing client systems, meetings and governance routes.

- **Phase 1 — Verification Preview (7-Day Review)** — a rapid, structured examination of the project environment, available records, stakeholder arrangements, live Concerns, assumptions, decisions and existing control practices.

PHC tooling and review activity will be used to produce a concise project-health report and a recommendation on whether, and under what conditions, Setup and Mobilisation should proceed. A "green light" is a possible conclusion, not a pre-purchased result.

- **Phase 2 — Setup and Mobilisation** — establishment of the PHC data structures, project interfaces, review routines, ownership rules, comment and evidence pathways, reporting arrangements and escalation protocols required for continuing operation.

This is a rapid 2-month deployment of the core PHC working system, tailored to the information, governance and participation needs identified during the review.

- **Phase 3 — Embedded Oversight** — continuing maintenance and review of project-health evidence, including exception identification, action follow-up, dormancy review, narrative reporting, escalation support and incorporation of authorised stakeholder input.

This is a renewable 3-month operational period. Continuation should depend on demonstrated usefulness, agreed priorities and the project's evolving need—not on allowing the service itself to become an unquestioned institution.

Throughout all three phases, PHC will remain proportionate to the assignment. It will seek to reduce duplicated reconstruction of information, not create a parallel bureaucracy. The operating test is whether the service helps the project identify, understand and act upon material conditions sooner and with better evidence.

Enabling resources will be treated as controlled implementation inputs. Any equipment provision will be based on demonstrated need, minimum viable specification, authorised use, custody and agreed end-of-assignment ownership. Any funded host-project hours will be based on defined responsibilities, appropriate rates, recorded time and agreed outputs. Both may be reduced to zero where the host organisation already has suitable equipment, staffing and financial capacity.

The purpose is not to make PHC responsible for solving every underlying social or organisational problem. It is to avoid creating a nominal governance system that depends upon under-equipped or financially insecure people performing essential work through personal sacrifice. A project coordinator trying to maintain reports, evidence and spreadsheets on a mobile telephone is not merely inconvenienced; the project is carrying an avoidable control weakness.

Phase 1: 7-Day Review

Verification Preview (7-Day Review) — conduct a focused, evidence-led review of the project's current position, principal stakeholders, available documentation, active Concerns, assumptions, decisions, interfaces and control arrangements. The output will be a project-health report identifying strengths, gaps, immediate priorities and the conditions under which further PHC mobilisation is—or is not—justified.

Phase 2: Setup Phase

Setup and Mobilisation — establish the agreed PHC information architecture, project records, ownership and review rules, reporting cadence, stakeholder contribution routes, evidence links and interfaces with existing project systems. The purpose is to make continuing PHC operation practical, understood and sustainable rather than dependent upon repeated manual reconstruction.

Phase 3: Continuation Phase

Embedded Oversight — provide continuing project-health support through maintained records, structured review, exception reporting, action follow-up, dormancy checks, escalation and decision-ready narratives. The service will adapt to the project's changing priorities while preserving traceability of what was known, raised, decided and completed.

Expected Outcomes

The expected outcomes of applying the PHC Service to P471 include:

- **A maintained project-health evidence base** connecting Concerns, actions, decisions, stakeholders, events, deliverables, commentary and supporting records.
- **Earlier visibility of emerging weakness** before technical, regulatory, commercial, schedule or stakeholder conditions become more difficult and expensive to address.
- **Clearer ownership and follow-through** through named responsibility, visible next actions, review dates and evidence-based closure.
- **Improved continuity between meetings and daily work**, reducing the loss of context when information moves between teams, systems, reports or personnel.
- **More useful project-health reporting** focused on exceptions, uncertainty, decisions and intervention needs rather than the production of status material for its own sake.
- **Better control of dormancy** by identifying Concerns and actions that remain formally open but have ceased to receive meaningful attention.
- **Stronger decision traceability** showing the evidence considered, the authority exercised, the conditions attached and the actions resulting from important decisions.
- **More disciplined escalation** where consequence, uncertainty or lack of progress exceeds agreed tolerances.
- **Greater stakeholder confidence** that legitimate concerns can be recorded, reviewed and answered without being lost in informal exchanges or selectively summarised.
- **A workable minimum digital environment** where needed, enabling authorised project personnel to use a suitable screen, spreadsheets, word processing, browsing, online meetings and PHC records rather than attempting to manage the assignment through a mobile telephone alone.
- **Greater implementation stability for essential host-project personnel** where defined paid hours are justified, reducing the delivery risk created when people carrying core management responsibilities are simultaneously struggling to meet basic personal needs.
- **A practical demonstration of PHC capability** in a complex, high-consequence project environment while remaining clear about the fictional status of P471 and the limits of the service.

The expected result is not a project without bad news. It is a project better able to see bad news early, retain the evidence around it and act before Springfield's emergency services become the principal assurance provider.

FINANCIALS & FORECAST

Cost Structure - Overall		
Category	Description	Total Cost
IT Services and Tooling	Filemaker, Mindmanager, Conferencing, Development Apps (one off contribution)	£1,900
PHC Start Pack - Hardware (*1)	A set of 5 Single Board Computers, Monitor and UPS	£1,442
PHC 7-Day Review (*2)	PHC Service for Pre-start Review (7 days)	£1,421
PHC Setup (*2)	PHC Service during 2-month Setup Phase	£21,684
PHC Continuation (*2)	PHC Service during 3-month Continuation Phase	£76,230
Miscellaneous	Travel, training, insurance, and other variable costs	£1,000
		£103,677

Cost Breakdown - Hardware		
(*1) Hardware Breakdown		
Category	Description	Total Cost
Single Board Computer Set x5	Raspberry Pi 500, Mouse, hdmi cable, power cable)	£722
Monitor x5	Mini-Monitor (for RP500)	£480
Site UPS	Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS) for site computers.	£240
		£1,442

Cost Breakdown - People

(*2) PHC People Costs [Review=M1, Setup=M2,3, Continuation=M4,5,6]

Role	People	Hourly Rate	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	Total (GBP)
PHC Strategist	David Winter	£69.30	8	40	40	40	40	40	£14,414
PHC Analyst	Abubakr Harakat	£46.20	10	80	80	120	120	120	£24,486
PHC Admin	Victor Williams [name2]	£26.95	15	80	80	360	360	360	£33,822
PHC Trainee	[name1] [name2] [name3]	£9.24	0	240	240	800	800	800	£26,611
Project People	[name1] [name2] [name3]	£46,20	0	0	0	0	0	0	£0
			£1,421	£10,842	£10,842	£25,410	£25,410	£25,410	£99,333

Footnote - People Costs and PICS Eligibility:

The people-related costs shown above relate to funded governance, delivery, leadership, and trainee roles agreed at the outset of the project. These paid hours are **not** eligible for PICS (Pro Bono Social Impact Credits). PICS applies only to unpaid or underpaid service contributed outside funded roles. PHC Service maintains a clear, auditable separation between funded work and any pro-bono contribution, preventing double recognition while ensuring transparency to funders.

6-Month Forecast

Category	Month 1	Month 2	Month 3	Month 4	Month 5	Month 6	Total
IT Tooling	0	0	0	1,900	0	0	1,900
PHC Start Pack	0	0	1,442	0	0	0	1,442
People - Review	1,421	0	0	0	0	0	1,421
People - Setup	0	10,842	10,842	0	0	0	21,684
People - Continuation	0	0	0	25,410	25,410	25,410	76,230
Miscellaneous	0	1,000	0	0	0	0	1,000
TOTAL	1,421	11,842	12,284	27,310	25,410	25,410	103,677

APPENDICES & METHODOLOGY

Appendices

Appendix Highlights

The linked supporting material provides background on PHC, its development history, its diagnostic approach and examples of the service in operation. These documents are supplementary to the proposal and do not expand the offered scope beyond the PHC Service described in the main narrative.

Project-specific commercial tables, resource names, hourly rates, forecast hours, totals and implementation assumptions should be reviewed and agreed before issue. Where a linked calculator or supporting document relates to an earlier illustrative project, it should be replaced or updated before the P471 proposal is treated as a controlled commercial submission.

Links & Documents

- The Story of PHC (Founder's Vision) - https://phcport.com/media/profile/The_Story_of_PHC.pdf
- Project Gap Analysis - https://phcport.com/openplan/plan.php?project_id=471
- Rate Calculator (xlsx) - https://phcport.com/phcprojects/P470_Houses_of_Parliament/_PHC_Data/P470_Rate_Calculator.xlsx
- Rate Calculator - 7-Day Review - https://phcport.com/phcprojects/P470_Houses_of_Parliament/_PHC_Data/P470_Rate_Calculator_7_Day_Review.pdf
- Rate Calculator - Setup Phase - https://phcport.com/phcprojects/P470_Houses_of_Parliament/_PHC_Data/P470_Rate_Calculator_Setup_Phase.pdf
- Rate Calculator - Continuation Phase - https://phcport.com/phcprojects/P470_Houses_of_Parliament/_PHC_Data/P470_Rate_Calculator_Continuation_Phase.pdf
- Approach to Project - https://phcport.com/phcprojects/P470_Houses_of_Parliament/Project_Approach_from_OE.pdf
- Order Efficiency Ltd - Company Profile (Overview) - https://phcport.com/media/profile/01_Company_Profile.pdf
- Order Efficiency Ltd - Company Brochure - https://phcport.com/media/profile/02_Company_Brochure.pdf
- Order Efficiency Ltd - Presentation - <https://phcport.com/media/Order-Efficiency-Presentation-L.pdf>
- PHC 7-Day Review Proposal Framework - <https://phcport.com/media/PHC-7-Day-Review-Proposal-Framework-9.pdf>
- Incorporation Package (Structure & Governance) - https://phcport.com/media/profile/03_Incorporation_Package.pdf
- Evolution of PHC (History & Development) - https://phcport.com/media/profile/04_Evolution_of_PHC.pdf
- Why Projects Break Budgets (PHC Diagnostic Lens) - https://phcport.com/media/profile/05_Why_Projects_Break_Budgets.pdf
- PHC Concerns Management (A Railway Travesty) - https://www.phcport.com/media/PHC_Concerns_Management_Scope.pdf
- The PHC Value Proposition (Video - 3m) - https://www.phcport.com/media/QA13_The_PHC_Value_Proposition.mp4
- PHC in Action (Video - 20min) - https://www.phcport.com/media/PHC_in_Action.mp4
- Seven PHC Lists (Video - 10min) - https://www.phcport.com/media/Seven_PHC_Lists.mp4

PHC vs PICS vs Common Planet

This proposal offers the PHC Service only.

PHC is the project-health control and evidence-maintenance service described throughout this proposal. PICS and Common Planet are not included as deliverables, pricing components or conditions of this assignment unless they are separately defined and agreed in writing.

Any wider social-impact, contribution-recognition or community-participation concepts may be considered independently where relevant, but they must not obscure the commercial proposition presented here: agreed PHC people providing agreed PHC hours to review, establish and maintain project-health control.

For clarity, optional equipment and funded host-project hours remain part of the PHC Service where they are necessary to establish a viable implementation environment. They are not separate charitable products. They are controlled, removable cost elements whose purpose is to enable the agreed PHC process to function. Where the project already has adequate equipment and properly funded personnel, those elements should be excluded.