

90-Day Plan

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.

OVERALL: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Executive Summary	
A practical 90-day mobilisation plan for the Springfield Nuclear New-Build Initiative. The first 90 days will not attempt to design, licence or authorise construction of a nuclear power station. They will establish the evidence, governance and decision architecture needed to determine whether—and under what conditions—the initiative should proceed to its next development stage. The plan is structured around three phases: Days 1–30: Mobilise, listen and establish the baseline. Days 31–60: Test the strategic case, options and delivery model. Days 61–90: integrate the evidence and prepare the first formal stage decision. The intended outcome is a controlled programme beginning: clear purpose, explicit assumptions, visible Concerns, defined accountabilities and a decision-ready body of evidence. Springfield enthusiasm is welcome; premature certainty is not.	
Purpose	What “Success” Looks Like (by Day 90)
Purpose To move P471 from a memorable concept into a governed early-stage development initiative with: - a confirmed statement of strategic need; - a transparent options framework; - defined sponsor, owner and assurance accountabilities; - an initial integrated baseline of assumptions, Concerns, risks, decisions, interfaces and actions; - a proportionate governance and reporting cadence; - an agreed plan for developing cost, schedule, licensing, technology, site, commercial and stakeholder evidence; and - a documented recommendation at Day 90 to proceed, hold, redirect or stop. The plan will create enough structure to support better decisions without creating the illusion that early paperwork equals project maturity.	By Day 90, success will mean that: - the strategic problem and decision timescale are agreed; - the nuclear option is being assessed against credible alternatives rather than treated as inevitable; - the sponsor, programme leadership, technical authority, assurance and stakeholder roles are defined at an initial level; - material assumptions and uncertainties are visible and owned; - the top Concerns, risks, dependencies and interfaces have active owners and next actions; - the first governance cadence, decision log and escalation route are operating; - an initial lifecycle map links strategy, licensing, design, procurement, construction, commissioning and operation; - a range-based approach to cost and schedule development has been agreed; - the programme has explicit entry criteria for the next phase; and - the investment authority receives a concise evidence pack supporting a real decision. Success will not be measured by the number of meetings held, dashboards coloured green or times Mr Burns describes progress as “excellent”.

PHASE 1: DAYS 1–30 (STABILISE & BASELINE)

Summary (Days 1–30)	
Phase 1 establishes control of the starting position. The first 30 days will focus on understanding the strategic need, confirming what is known and unknown, identifying key stakeholders and creating the minimum viable governance needed to prevent assumptions from becoming invisible commitments.	
Objectives	Measures
• Confirm the purpose, boundaries and status of P471 as an illustrative early-stage initiative. • Establish the strategic energy question that the programme is expected to answer. • Identify the decision-makers, duty-holder roles, technical authorities and affected stakeholders. • Create an initial evidence baseline covering assumptions, Concerns, risks, actions, decisions and interfaces. • Introduce a lightweight but firm governance and reporting rhythm.	• 100% of identified material Concerns and risks have a named owner or an explicit escalation for ownership. • All major early assumptions are recorded, classified and assigned a validation route. • The sponsor has approved the initial strategic question, project boundaries and governance cadence. • The first weekly project-health review and first sponsor review have been completed. • No material item is reported as “green” solely because evidence has not yet been collected.
Actions	Deliverables by Day 30
• Sponsor and stakeholder mobilisation: conduct structured interviews with the sponsor, prospective owner organisation, operations representatives, engineering, safety, security, finance, commercial, environment, local authorities, workforce and community-facing stakeholders. • Strategic need framing: define the capacity, resilience, decarbonisation and asset-replacement problem, including the consequences and timing of inaction. • Evidence inventory: identify existing studies, assumptions, asset-condition evidence, demand forecasts, regulatory correspondence, site information, technical concepts and prior decisions. • Governance baseline: draft the initial sponsor, programme board, technical authority, assurance and escalation model. • PHC mobilisation: establish the first structured records for Concerns, actions, decisions, stakeholders, locations, events, deliverables and key milestones. • Initial risk and Concern workshops: capture major threats, opportunities, uncertainties, constraints, interface risks and matters requiring early executive attention. • Reporting cadence: begin weekly project-health reviews and a monthly evidence-based sponsor review.	• Project Definition Pack v1: purpose, boundaries, strategic question, assumptions and exclusions. • Stakeholder and Accountability Map v1: initial sponsor, owner, technical, regulatory, delivery and community interfaces. • Strategic Need Statement v1: the problem, consequences of inaction and required decision timescale. • Integrated PHC Baseline v1: initial Concerns, risks, actions, decisions, interfaces, milestones and evidence references. • Top Executive Matters: the ten issues, uncertainties or decisions requiring immediate leadership attention. • Minimum Governance Set: meeting cadence, decision log, escalation route, ownership rules and reporting cut-off.

PHASE 2: DAYS 31–60 (ALIGN & STANDARDISE)

Summary (Days 31–60)	
Phase 2 turns the baseline into a tested development proposition. Days 31–60 will compare strategic options, explore the feasibility of the nuclear route and expose the conditions that would need to be satisfied before more substantial investment could be justified.	
Objectives	Measures
• Test whether nuclear new build remains a credible option within the wider energy strategy. • Define the principal development pathways, dependencies and decision gates. • Establish the first integrated view of licensing, technology, site, commercial, financing and delivery considerations. • Develop a realistic range-based approach to cost and schedule. • Identify where owner capability and independent assurance must be strengthened.	• The options appraisal includes at least one credible non-nuclear comparator and one life-extension scenario. • All proposed next-stage decisions have stated evidence requirements and authorised decision-makers. • Major licensing, site, technology and commercial uncertainties are recorded and linked to actions. • The initial cost and schedule model clearly states scope, assumptions, exclusions and confidence limitations. • Leadership can identify where lack of capability—not merely lack of funding—could prevent safe and credible progress.
Actions	Deliverables by Day 60
• Options appraisal: compare do-nothing, life-extension, non-nuclear alternatives and nuclear new-build development using agreed strategic, safety, security, environmental, affordability, deliverability and resilience criteria. • Lifecycle and gate mapping: map the development path from strategic definition through licensing, design, procurement, construction, commissioning, operation and eventual decommissioning. • Site and technology framing: identify evaluation criteria, evidence needs and disqualifying conditions without prematurely selecting a preferred answer. • Licensing and regulatory roadmap: define the likely regulatory interfaces, submissions, hold points, consultation needs and areas requiring specialist advice. • Delivery and commercial strategy: examine potential owner, architect-engineer, technology-provider, construction and supply-chain arrangements, including interface and risk-allocation implications. • Cost and schedule framework: create an initial work breakdown, milestone logic, cost categories, assumptions register and uncertainty model. • Capability assessment: identify critical owner, operator, engineering, controls, assurance, safety, security and commercial competencies. • Assurance design: define proportionate independent reviews and entry/exit evidence for the next stage.	• Strategic Options Appraisal v1 with documented criteria, evidence gaps and provisional findings. • Integrated Lifecycle and Decision-Gate Map v1. • Licensing, Site and Technology Evidence Plan v1. • Delivery and Commercial Strategy Options v1. • Owner Capability and Resource Gap Assessment v1. • Initial Cost and Schedule Framework expressed as ranges and maturity assumptions, not false precision. • Assurance Plan v1 showing reviews, authorities and evidence expected at each gate. • Updated PHC Baseline v2 reflecting workshops, evidence received, decisions and unresolved matters.

PHASE 3: DAYS 61–90 (EMBED & IMPROVE)

Summary (Days 61–90)	
Phase 3 integrates the evidence and prepares the first formal stage decision. Days 61–90 will convert the emerging studies, workshops and governance records into a coherent recommendation. The purpose is not to force approval, but to make the consequences of proceeding, holding, redirecting or stopping visible to the investment authority.	
Objectives	Measures
• Integrate strategic, technical, regulatory, commercial, schedule, cost and stakeholder evidence. • Resolve, escalate or explicitly carry forward the most important Concerns and assumptions. • Test the readiness of the governance and owner organisation for the next phase. • Define measurable entry criteria, scope, resources and controls for the next 90–180 days. • Produce a documented stage recommendation supported by traceable evidence.	• The investment authority receives a recommendation that can be traced to supporting evidence and unresolved uncertainty. • Every next-phase entry criterion has an owner, evidence requirement and target date. • Material dissenting views are recorded rather than edited out of the final narrative. • There is a credible next-phase cost and resource range, with no implied construction authorisation. • The governance cadence can continue without dependence on one heroic individual or one unusually persuasive billionaire. • The programme can explain, in plain language, why it proposes to proceed—or why it should not.
Actions	Deliverables by Day 90
• Integrated challenge reviews: hold cross-functional reviews of the strategic case, options, interfaces, cost, schedule, capability and stakeholder position. • Concern and risk resolution: close matters only where evidence supports closure; otherwise define treatment, acceptance authority or carry-forward conditions. • Decision-readiness assessment: test the programme against agreed Day-90 and next-gate criteria. • Scenario testing: examine the effect of delay, technology change, regulatory challenge, financing constraint, site failure, supply-chain weakness and existing-plant deterioration. • Governance rehearsal: run a mock investment review using the actual evidence pack, decision log and unresolved Concerns. • Next-phase planning: define the scope, deliverables, budget range, resources, assurance and reporting required for the next development stage. • Lessons and improvement: review which controls produced insight and which merely produced activity; simplify where necessary.	• Day-90 Integrated Evidence Pack covering strategic need, options, governance, lifecycle, licensing, site, technology, commercial strategy, capability, cost, schedule, Concerns and risk. • Stage Recommendation: proceed, hold, redirect or stop, with reasons and conditions. • Next-Phase Definition Document: scope, deliverables, resources, budget range, milestones, assurance and decision gates. • Updated Business Case and Strategic Plan Inputs. • PHC Project Health Report: material Concerns, actions, decisions, dormancy, evidence gaps and ownership status. • Governance and Assurance Playbook v1: roles, cadence, escalation, reporting, change, decision and evidence-control rules. • Lessons and Improvement Record v1.