Financial and organizational models of international nuclear power plant projects

Content

Introduction: The Global Nuclear Energy Renaissance and Macroeconomic Shifts

In 2025–2026, the global energy landscape is undergoing a historic turning point, characterized by an unprecedented structural transformation and a renewed interest in peaceful nuclear energy. Global nuclear electricity production has reached record highs, driven by the convergence of several fundamental macroeconomic trends .

On the one hand, the international community is facing a pressing imperative to deeply decarbonize the industrial and transportation sectors. On the other hand, the explosive development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems and Hyperscale Data Centers (HDCs) has created a colossal demand for high-density, continuous generation. With a single modern AI computing cluster capable of consuming up to 100 MW of baseload power, intermittent generation from Renewable Energy Sources (RES) without astronomical investments in storage systems is physically incapable of providing the required grid reliability .

Against the backdrop of these global processes, the Republic of Serbia made a strategically calculated, historic decision in 2024 to lift the 35-year moratorium on the construction of nuclear power plants. [1] This moves moved Serbia into the category of "newcomer countries" under the strict classification of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

This status means that the state must not simply acquire a complex engineering facility, but rather build a complex multi-layered institutional, legal, human resources, and financial ecosystem from scratch. [1] This analytical report presents a comprehensive study of the architecture of Financial and Organizational Models (FOMs) for nuclear power plant construction in the global market.

The document examines in detail the contracting mechanisms, macroeconomic risk sharing, and capital expenditure management strategies. Particular attention is paid to the practical adaptation of best international practices for the Republic of Serbia, including an analysis of the critical role of an independent expert and analytical infrastructure—in particular, the NuclearSerbia digital platform—as a fundamental tool for consolidating national nuclear consensus and cross-border engineering consulting.

1. Transformation of the performance evaluation paradigm: From the LCOE metric to the concept of System Value

Over the past decades, the Levelized Cost of Electricity (LCOE) has served as the key, and often the only, indicator of the competitiveness of generating technologies in the energy sector. However, in the realities of modern energy systems, characterized by an increasingly high share of stochastic (intermittent) generation based on solar and wind, relying solely on the LCOE indicator at the individual plant level has been recognized by the global expert community as methodologically inadequate and economically dangerous .

1.1 Limitations of LCOE and the implementation of the SCBOE methodology

An analysis conducted by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) expert group in 2025 convincingly demonstrates that relying solely on LCOE leads to a systemic underestimation of true costs. [6] Traditional LCOE completely ignores the enormous associated costs of physically integrating a facility into the power system, including extending high-voltage networks, creating hot reserve capacity, and constantly balancing frequency. [8] In response, global energy regulators, including the International Energy Agency (IEA), are pushing for a transition to the concept of System Value and the Value-Adjusted LCOE (VALCOE), which mathematically accounts for the contribution of a specific technology to the overall reliability and resilience of the entire power system. [9]

To operationalize this approach, UNECE has introduced an innovative analytical framework, SCBOE (System Cost Breakdown of Electricity). This framework decomposes total system costs, creating a bridge between the cost of an individual plant and the tariff for the end consumer .

SCBOE Methodology Component	Economic content and impact on the energy system	Specifics for nuclear generation
Technical and economic constraint (Curtailment)	Financial losses from forced shutdown of generation during periods of excess power in the network (typical for solar peaks).	Nuclear power plants provide baseload power; in countries with a high share of nuclear energy (France), reactors are capable of operating in load-following mode.
Power balancing	Capital and operating costs for maintaining the network frequency in real time, purchasing spinning reserve	Synchronous generators at nuclear power plants have enormous physical inertia, providing the grid with frequency and voltage

SCBOE Methodology Component	Economic content and impact on the energy system	Specifics for nuclear generation
	services.	stabilization services free of charge.
Grid costs	Large-scale investments in the construction of new high-voltage power lines and the modernization of distribution substations.	The high energy density of nuclear power plants minimizes the need to build thousands of kilometers of new power lines, unlike distributed offshore wind farms.
Externalities and reliability	Assessing the hidden impact on ecology, consumption of critical minerals, land use volumes and overall resilience to blackouts.	Nuclear power plants exhibit the smallest land footprint and the lowest requirement for critical minerals per megawatt of installed capacity. [11]

The practical importance of considering system value was dramatically demonstrated during the blackout on the Iberian Peninsula. According to studies conducted in 2025, the initial loss of generation in southern Spain led to cascading outages precisely because of the shortage of synchronous generating resources (such as hydropower and nuclear power plants) capable of providing the necessary voltage support and the physical inertia of the network .

Renewable energy inverter technologies failed to contain the voltage drop, confirming the thesis that nuclear generation provides critical ancillary services whose cost is not reflected in the standard LCOE metric. [10]

1.2 Cost estimates based on rigorous AACE methodology

The complexity of macroeconomic assessment of system costs is compounded by the pressing need to accurately forecast direct Capital Expenditures (CAPEX) for nuclear island construction and the plant's balance sheet. The nuclear industry has historically been subject to the phenomenon of so-called "optimism bias," whereby vendors consciously or unconsciously underestimate estimates in the early stages to gain political and public approval for megaprojects .

To mitigate this risk, modern international practice, supported by consulting and engineering firms, relies heavily on the standards of the International Association for the Advancement of Cost Engineering, in particular AACE International Recommended Practice No. 115R-21, developed specifically for the nuclear industry. [1] The AACE standard introduces a strict estimate classification matrix consisting of five levels, linked to the project's maturity.

AACE 115R-21 Rating Class	Project maturity level	Expected error range	The assessment methodology used
Class 5 (Conceptual Assessment)	from 0% to 2%	from -50% to +200%	Parametric models, expert assessments, and the analogy method. Used for initial screening.
Class 4 (Feasibility Study)	from 1% to 15%	from -30% to +100%	Estimate based on aggregated equipment specifications and historical data.
Class 3 (Budget Authorization)	from 10% to 40%	from -20% to +60%	Semi-detailed unit prices at the assembly unit level. The basis for allocating initial funding.
Class 2 (Tender Evaluation/Control)	from 30% to 75%	from -15% to +40%	Detailed unit prices with mandatory detailing of work volumes.
Class 1 (Working Estimate/Verification)	from 65% to 100%	from -10% to +30%	The most accurate estimate based on final working drawings and firm quotes from subcontractors. [14]

For the Republic of Serbia, strict adherence to the AACE methodology, starting with Class 5 in the current pre-project studies (PTI) phase, is absolutely critical. Understanding that the initial estimate of €10 billion can legitimately vary by up to €30 billion (within the margin of error of +200% for Class 5) allows finance ministries [to] build adequate reserve funds and avoid catastrophic cash flow shortfalls when structuring long-term investment budgets.

2. Financial and organizational models (FOM): Architecture of MMM levels and Integrated sales

Given the colossal capital intensity of nuclear infrastructure projects, the modern international nuclear power plant construction market has finally shifted from the concept of simple technological supply of reactor equipment to a paradigm of comprehensive integrated sales. [1] Today's customers are purchasing not just blueprints and metal, but a viable, functioning business ecosystem encompassing the entire 100-year lifecycle of a facility—from uranium mining to decommissioning and spent nuclear fuel disposal. Moreover, the global vendor's proposal is formed as a direct mathematical and political derivative of the recipient country's unique strategic needs. [1]

For a deep academic and practical structuring of such mega-projects, the report introduces the methodological construct of "MMM levels," which decomposes the financial and organizational model into three interconnected planes: Macrolevel, Mesolevel, and Microlevel. [1]

The first level is **the Macro Level** . This focuses on issues of national sovereignty, the provision of sovereign state guarantees for external loans, the project's impact on overall gross domestic product (GDP) growth, and commitments to achieving carbon neutrality. The cornerstone of macro-level negotiations for Serbia is the requirement for offset contracts (counter-investments). International experience demonstrates that the client country should strictly stipulate the choice of vendor with guarantees of deep localization of component production, the transfer of non-critical technologies, and the large-scale involvement of national construction consortia. Only deep localization can ensure a multiplier macroeconomic effect that justifies the withdrawal of billions of euros from the national economy .

The second layer is **the Meso-Level** . This plane describes the highly complex architecture of the design consortium and global supply chains. It is at the meso-level that the colossal risks of cost overruns and catastrophic construction delays are distributed. [1] The architecture encompasses the interactions between the general designer, the general contractor (EPC or EPCM contractor), international export credit agencies (ECAs), a pool of insurers, and the future operating operator. At this level, decisions are made regarding who bears the physical financial responsibility if the pouring of the nuclear concrete falls behind schedule by several months.

The third level is **the Micro level** . This represents the internal financial mathematics of the generation facility itself. Classic investment indicators are calculated at the micro level: net present value (NPV), internal rate of return (IRR), discounted payback periods, and, most importantly, the tariff structure for the end industrial or residential consumer. [1] Without understanding the economics at the micro level, a project will never pass the bankability process for project financing.

3. Innovative contracting mechanisms: From classic EPC to Collaborative Contracting

Global experience over the past decade (particularly Generation III+ projects in the US and Western Europe, such as the Vogl and Olkiluoto-3 NPPs) has clearly demonstrated the fatal vulnerabilities of classic turnkey general contracting (EPC – Engineering, Procurement, Construction) contracts. [1] Given the loss of industrial expertise in the Western bloc, rigid fixed-price EPC contracts led to endless litigation between the client and contractor in the event of any force majeure delays, which ultimately resulted in costs exceeding the original estimates many times over. [1]

Recognizing this systemic crisis, the IAEA issued a fundamentally important updated standard, IAEA-TECDOC-1750 (Rev. 1), in 2024–2025, which formalized the nuclear industry's transition to alternative ownership models and collaborative contracting mechanisms. [1]

Joint contracting models such as Integrated Project Delivery (IPD) or Alliance contracts fundamentally change the psychology and economics of a project. [15] Unlike the traditional approach with isolated areas of responsibility, IPD involves all key stakeholders (the client, the designer, the builder, and the supplier of key equipment) in a single legal alliance before the start of physical construction. Work is conducted according to the "open-book" principle, where each participant's profit is strictly tied to the success of the project as a whole. Cost overrun risks are shared among alliance members, as are financial bonuses in the event of early commissioning of the NPP or budget savings. [15] This eliminates the basis for corporate conflicts and focuses all efforts on optimizing engineering solutions.

At the same time, alternative ownership models, such as BOO (Build-Own-Operate), are developing. A prime example of this model's feasibility is the Akkuyu Nuclear Power Plant in Turkey, where the first power unit entered the full-scale commissioning stage (cold and hot testing) by 2025. [1] Under the BOO model, the Russian consortium assumes 100% of the investment, construction, and operational risks, remaining the majority owner of the plant, while the Turkish Republic guarantees only the long-term buyout of the clean electricity generated. This success has significantly strengthened global investor confidence in direct foreign ownership of critical infrastructure. [1]

For the Republic of Serbia, hybridization appears to be the optimal path: partial use of joint contracting principles to maintain budget control, combined with the attraction of sovereign financing through the Export Credit Agencies (ECAs) of vendor countries. At the same time , the partial participation of the Serbian state in the project's equity will significantly reduce the interest rate on the loans.

4. Market risk management and long-term guarantee mechanisms

Bankability (the ability of a project to attract debt financing) for mega-infrastructure projects costing over €10 billion is absolutely impossible without providing the lender pool with ironclad long-term sales guarantees. In today's liberalized energy markets, where electricity prices are subject to enormous volatility due to weather factors and fluctuations in natural gas prices, investors in nuclear power plants demand the creation of highly reliable, redundant financial and legal structures. An analysis of best international practices identifies three dominant quasi-market mechanisms for hedging price risks .

The first mechanism is **the PPA (Power Purchase Agreement) . This is a classic contract for the direct guaranteed purchase of all electricity generated by a state regulator or a pool of major corporate consumers. The tariff is fixed for a period of 15 to 20 years** and typically includes an indexation formula for consumer inflation. The PPA generates a crystal-clear and predictable cash flow, which is the main condition for servicing syndicated bank loans.

The second, more innovative mechanism is **the Contract for Difference (CfD)** . Initially used to finance the construction of the Hinkley Point C nuclear power plant in the UK, this mechanism was adopted as the basis for Sweden's new nuclear strategy in 2024–2025. [1] The architecture of a bilateral CfD works as follows: the government and the generator agree on a fixed base "strike price" that guarantees the plant's minimum profitability. The nuclear power plant sells energy on an open exchange (e.g., Nord Pool). If the wholesale market price falls below the strike price, the state budget compensates the generator for the difference, protecting it from bankruptcy. However, if the market price soars above the strike price (as happened during the European gas crisis), the generator is obligated to return all excess profits to the state. This symmetrical mechanism ideally protects investors from market collapses and the ultimate taxpayer from price shocks and monopolist excess profits. In the Swedish version, the CfD is supplemented by direct government loans, which dramatically reduces the Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) .

The third approach is implemented through the cooperative corporate models **of Mankala (Finland) and Exeltium (France)** . In these jurisdictions, market risk is mitigated at the structural level. A pool of the largest energy-intensive industrial consumers (steel plants, pulp and paper mills, chemical clusters) is formed, uniting into a non-profit consortium. This consortium acts as a collective shareholder and finances the capital expenditures for the construction of the nuclear power plant. In exchange, shareholders receive the exclusive right to take the generated electricity strictly at the net cost of generation (OPEX + depreciation), proportional to their shares in the authorized capital. [1] In this model, the nuclear power plant is not built to generate commercial profits from selling energy on the spot market, but functions as a giant "internal energy factory" to provide the national industry with a stable and affordable resource, ensuring its global competitiveness. [1]

5. Specifics of "Hidden Costs" (Owner's Costs) in the structure of capital investments in Serbia

One of the most deeply analyzed and critically important aspects of Serbian nuclear discourse—particularly in the materials of the NuclearSerbia digital platform—is the issue of owner's costs. [4] In strict international practice, as enshrined in IAEA documents (Account 70), owner's costs represent the massive financial obligations incurred by the contracting state beyond the main EPC contract with a foreign vendor. [23]

Historical experience shows that newcomer countries regularly fall into a destructive "price trap." Inexperienced governments mistakenly perceive the vendor's commercial offer for reactor construction (the so-called overnight capital cost) as the final cost of the entire nuclear program. [4] Politicians tend to understate the actual costs to demonstrate an attractive tariff (LCOE) during the program approval process in parliament. In practice, owner costs consistently range from 15% to 30% of the total project capital investment (TCI = CEPC + COwner + CContingency). [4]

A breakdown of Serbia's hidden costs (according to IAEA Account 70) reveals the scale of the challenges ahead:

- **Institutional Framework and Regulation:** Creating an independent and competent nuclear regulatory body from scratch requires an astronomical amount of effort—approximately 400 man-years just for the preparatory phase. Direct regulatory fees are estimated at $60 million per reactor unit, and mandatory adaptation of vendor design to local and European standards will cost an additional $180–240 million .
- **Human capital (HR engineering):** Safely operating a 1,200 MW power plant requires between 500 and 1,000 highly qualified specialists. While the vendor's EPC contract only covers basic simulator training for control room operators, the training of senior technical management, scientific

directors, and a corps of regulatory inspectors falls entirely within the Serbian budget. International benchmarks (such as targeted programs in the UK) indicate that state investments in national research centers and doctoral programs range from $80 million to $130 million .

- **Heavy-Duty Logistics ("The Last Mile"):** Modern reactor vessels (such as the VVER-1200 or APR-1400) are monolithic structures weighing between 330 and 500 tons. [4] For the Republic of Serbia, the Danube River is the only viable logistics artery. However, a thorough audit reveals that the country's current port facilities (including the ports of Belgrade and Smederevo) do not have crane equipment with a lifting capacity exceeding 150 tons. The costs of dredging, bridge reinforcement, land acquisition (costing 300-600 euros per square meter in coastal areas), and crane modernization often become a shocking discovery already at the construction stage. [4]
- **Security and Back-end:** Owner costs include perimeter physical security systems, land acquisition for a 16-kilometer emergency planning zone (which limits economic activity in the region), and strategic funding for spent nuclear fuel (SNF) management funds. [4] The UAE's experience shows that providing dry SNF storage infrastructure throughout the entire lifecycle is estimated to cost up to $4.3 billion. [4]

Cost category	Share in the project	Indicative volume for a 1000-1200 MW unit	Key components (according to the IAEA Account 70 methodology)
EPC contract (Vendor)	70% – 85%	$6.0 – $10.0 billion	Design, nuclear island, turbine hall, switchgear, commissioning. [4]
Owner's Costs (Serbia)	15% – 30%	$1.0 – $2.0 billion	Licensing, modernization of ports on the Danube, personnel training, legal and financial consulting, risk insurance, site infrastructure. [4]

Analysts from the NUCON consulting group (NuclearSerbia platform) sternly warn that Serbia's attempt to finance these 40-50% of "invisible" soft costs on a residual basis will inevitably lead to a catastrophic technological default. [4] The lack of funds to maintain a competent Customer service will force Serbia to delegate critical project management functions to a foreign vendor, which would mean a complete loss of sovereignty over the national energy facility. The proposed anti-crisis strategy is the creation of a Special Project Company (SPV), removed from the jurisdiction of line ministries and directly subordinate to the Prime Minister of the Republic of Serbia. This will allow for the strict consolidation of all Account 70 budgets and their secure inclusion in the national budget, with active financing commencing as early as the Preliminary Technical Studies (PTI) stage in 2026–2027. [4]

6. Geopolitical determinants and the global landscape of NPP vendors

By 2025–2026, the global nuclear power generation market will have completely transformed into an arena of fierce geopolitical competition. The market is highly consolidated around a few key macro-regional players, and the entry barrier for new technology developers remains prohibitively high ·

The national competitive advantage model (known as Porter's Diamond) perfectly explains the current balance of power in the nuclear power plant export market. [1] The undisputed leaders in expansion into the emerging markets of the Global South are corporations from the non-Western bloc.

The Russian State Corporation Rosatom is demonstrating stable growth in export revenue, offering newcomer countries a comprehensive product—from preferential intergovernmental lending to the supply of fresh fuel and the collection of spent fuel. [1]

At the same time, China (CNNC and CGN corporations) has demonstrated phenomenal capabilities in reverse engineering, relying on colossal domestic demand (construction of dozens of units simultaneously), which is able to offer generation III+ reactors at dumping prices. [1]

South Korea (KEPCO consortium) occupies a unique position, whose triumph in the construction of the Barakah NPP in the UAE is due to the continuity of the production cycle: in Korea, the supply chains for heavy engineering and shipbuilding were not interrupted, which allows them to build the stations on time and within the stated budgets. [1]

At the same time, traditional Western giants (French EDF, American Westinghouse) are going through a painful period of restructuring and restoring engineering expertise lost over decades of stagnation. However, the Western bloc is actively rebuilding: the full launch of the Flamanville-3 (EPR) power unit in France at the end of 2025 has become a powerful psychological signal of the revival of the European industry. [1] Moreover, the United States is employing a strategy of political lobbying and the formation of trilateral partnerships, attempting to integrate efficient South Korean builders under the umbrella of American reactor technology to displace competitors from strategic markets such as Turkey (the Sinop project). [1]

In the reality of 2026, the negotiation process for international nuclear power plant sales is critically complicated by geopolitical instability. US, EU, and UK sanctions against maritime logistics and certain financial institutions have led to the emergence of a phenomenon known as "ad hoc consortia." [1] These are adaptive, temporary alliances of subcontractors, banks from neutral countries, and alternative logistics operators (the so-called "shadow fleet"), formed by vendors solely to circumvent sanctions barriers and ensure the physical implementation of EPC contracts.1 For Serbia, located in the center of Europe, taking these geopolitical risks and mechanisms for circumventing them into account becomes a central element in structuring any FOM.

7. Economics of Small Modular Reactors (SMRs): A New Financial Paradigm

The aggressive market launch of Small Modular Reactor (SMR) projects with electrical capacity of up to 300 MW is fundamentally changing the classical financial mathematics of the nuclear industry. [1] According to the latest research and the updated IAEA document TECDOC-2104 (2025), the key driver of SMR competitiveness is not so much the potential reduction in absolute capital costs (which, in specific terms per megawatt, still exceed the cost of large units), but rather a radical reduction in physical construction timelines. [1]

The long construction cycle of traditional gigawatt-scale units (7 to 10 years) generates colossal interest during construction (IDC) for investors. Small-Scale Power Plants (SMPs), based on factory-assembled modules, followed by transportation and rapid installation on a prepared site, allow for construction to be reduced to 3-4 years. This provides a triple financial benefit:

1. Dramatic reduction in IDC burden.
2. Accelerated cash flow generation (early revenue generation).
3. Possibility of using the staggered construction model. [1]

Phased construction means that in a cluster of several SMRs, revenue from the operation of the first launched modules is used to finance the installation of subsequent modules, which dramatically reduces the need to attract expensive external equity or debt capital. [1]

An unprecedented example of adapting a product line to market needs was Rosatom's project in Uzbekistan in 2025. For the first time, an agreement was signed to create a hybrid configuration on a single site: the construction of small ground-based stations based on proven RITM-200N icebreaker reactors in combination with long-term development of high-power VVER-1000 units ·

For countries like Serbia, this hybrid approach solves two strategic problems: small-scale power plants provide rapid deployment of flexible capacity for local grid balancing in the medium term, while large-scale power plants guarantee the foundation of energy sovereignty for the next 80 years. [1]

8. Dynamics of Emerging Markets: Experiences from African Countries

The development of the FOM cannot be analyzed in isolation from the expansion of nuclear energy on the African continent, which, according to forecasts from the International Energy Agency (IEA), will face a sevenfold increase in electricity demand by 2050. [27] The experience of Africa demonstrates how countries are overcoming financing barriers.

The continent's flagship country is South Africa (South Africa), which holds the unique status of operator of the operating Koeberg Nuclear Power Plant. In 2025, South Africa approved its ambitious Integrated Resource Plan (IRP 2025), a $128 billion investment strategy (almost 30% of the country's GDP). The strategy calls for the introduction of 5.2 GW of new nuclear capacity by 2039. This document demonstrates that nuclear energy can and should be more than just a line item in the energy balance, but a core macroeconomic driver [of] national GDP growth.

At the same time, other countries are adapting their strategies to technological realities: Egypt is successfully implementing the El Dabaa project (4.8 GW) with 85% Russian state funding , [28] while Nigeria officially adjusted its national policy in 2025, prioritizing the implementation of small modular reactors over the construction of traditional gigawatt units, given the limitations of its own power grid. [31] This experience confirms the universality of the technological shift toward SMRs for economies with developing infrastructure, which is also highly relevant to Serbia's energy strategy.

9. The role of the NuclearSerbia digital platform in the architecture of the national nuclear ecosystem

In the process of a large-scale restart of the Republic of Serbia's nuclear program after the lifting of the moratorium, independent expert and information institutions are beginning to play a critical, consolidating role. [33] The industry's revival involves not only the construction of engineering structures but also the formation of a transparent professional ecosystem capable of overcoming social skepticism and a talent vacuum. The flagship and unique phenomenon in this process is the **NuclearSerbia digital platform (nuclearserbia.rs)** , owned and curated by the Belgrade-based engineering and consulting company NUCON doo. [33]

9.1. The platform as a “neutral bridge” and a hedging instrument

As Belgrade pursues a complex, multi-vector strategy to hedge geopolitical risks, while simultaneously negotiating technology and finance with leading vendors from Russia, France, China, and South Korea, there is a pressing national need for a technically competent and politically neutral information environment. [5]

[(] content in Serbian, English, and Russian), allowing the platform to function as a cross-border "neutral bridge" between the Serbian government, local businesses, and global corporations.

NUCON's engineering base allows the platform to go far beyond industry journalism: it provides comprehensive services in a cross-jurisdictional environment, including analytical support, regulatory harmonization with IAEA and Euratom standards, and acts as a potential Technical Support Organization (TSO) for national regulators. [5]

9.2. The Opinions Section as a Brain Center for Strategy

The platform's intellectual core is the specialized **"Opinions" section** . This space functions as an industrial thought leadership platform, publishing in-depth analytical reports that directly link global nuclear trends to Serbia's local challenges. [5] A detailed analysis of this section's publications demonstrates a systematic approach to addressing the challenges facing the country:

1. Modernization of the Regulatory Framework and Adaptation of the Baraka Model. The platform publishes comprehensive roadmaps for creating a regulatory framework for Serbia. Experts propose avoiding reinventing the wheel and instead directly copying templates from the IAEA Handbook on Nuclear Law and the NHSI (Regulatory Cooperation Toolkit) initiative. [4] A separate body of research is devoted to adapting the so-called "Baraka" model (based on the UAE experience) for Serbia. [36] This model demonstrates the effectiveness of transferring construction management to a strong international consortium while maintaining strict oversight by an independent national regulator.

2. Addressing the Talent Shortage: The University of Belgrade Program Recognizing the critical shortage of engineers, the platform's analysts developed and published a detailed "Concept for a Multi-Tier Specialized Program in Nuclear Engineering at the University of Belgrade." [37] This three-tier academic model (bachelor's, master's, and doctoral) is based on the principle of vendor *neutrality* . The program focuses on fundamental physics and systems engineering, which will provide Serbia with the freedom to choose between any global reactor technology in the future. [37] The program brings together the faculties of mechanical engineering, physics, and electrical engineering with the Vinča Institute and involves a synthesis of the best practices of French (EDF/INSTN) and Chinese partners. [37]

3. Analysis of Government Actions: Analysis of the 2024 Memorandum . The Opinions section provides an in-depth audit of government actions. Specifically, the Memorandum of Understanding on the Development of Nuclear Energy (July 2024), which unprecedentedly united five ministries and 20 scientific institutes, was subjected to a detailed analysis. [NuclearSerbia] analysts assess the architecture of this agreement as a step toward the creation of a full-fledged Specialized Coordination Body (analogous to NEPIO according to the IAEA classification), necessary for the integration of science, the state, and energy companies (EPS, EMS) into a single entity. [38]

4. Social Engineering and the "Kostolac Economic Miracle." Any nuclear program inevitably faces fierce local resistance (the NIMBY syndrome—Not In My Back Yard). To address this problem and build public loyalty, the platform developed a brilliant political economy concept: "The Kostolac Economic Miracle: Strategic Transformation of a Coal-Mining City into a Global Model of Nuclear Renaissance." [39] The model is based on the real-life success of the Finnish municipality of Eurajoki (Olkiluoto Nuclear Power Plant)—"A Finnish Secret That Became a Serbian Reality." [40] The essence of the concept lies in the direct reinvestment of the colossal property taxes from the future nuclear power plant ("nuclear rent") directly into the municipal budget (for example, Kostolac or Kovin). This allows the city to abolish local taxes, create a cutting-edge social infrastructure, and use excess heat from the nuclear power plant's cooling towers to provide free central heating for residents and create innovative greenhouse agricultural complexes. Coupled with the environmental reclamation of old open-pit coal mines , this futurological model provides Serbian politicians and PR specialists with a powerful arsenal of arguments to transform local residents' fears into economic incentives.

Conclusion

A comprehensive analysis of global data for 2025–2026 demonstrates that the global nuclear energy industry has entered a phase of profound technological and financial transformation. For states joining the nuclear club, such as the Republic of Serbia, the success of a mega-NPP project depends not on the choice of a specific reactor type, but on the flawless structuring of financial and organizational models (FOM) at all levels of interaction.

Evaluation of technology efficiency should be based not on the outdated metric of LCOE, but on the system value of generation (System Value), confirmed by analytical tools at the SCBOE level. [6]

To minimize the risk of technological and sovereign default, Serbia needs to implement a comprehensive institutional strategy:

1. **Isolation and protection of Owner's Costs:** Establishment of a Special Project Vehicle (SPV) under the Prime Minister with immediate allocation of budget funding for IAEA Account 70 (15-30% of TCI), including training, establishment of a regulator and modernization of port infrastructure on the Danube River. [4]
2. **Innovative contracting and hedging:** Moving away from rigid EPC contracts towards hybrid Collaborative Contracting models and introducing mechanisms to protect against market volatility, such as bilateral contracts for difference (CfD), which have proven effective in the UK and Sweden. [1]
3. **Reliance on national intellectual platforms:** Extensive use of the potential of independent digital hubs, such as NuclearSerbia, to generate analytics, train personnel (based on the University of Belgrade), harmonize standards and conduct effective dialogue with society through the adaptation of socio-economic development models (the Eurajoki/Kostolac experience). [5]

The revival of the nuclear program is a geopolitical and technological bridge to the future, capable of ensuring energy security, industrial growth, and the technological sovereignty of the state for a century to come.

List of sources

[1] Translation of the document on nuclear energy (3).docx (Analytical report: Financial and organizational models of international NPP projects, Conceptualization of MMM levels, Porter's Diamond, Situational consortia).
[34] NuclearSerbia.rs (About the NUCON doo platform and the digital advocacy mission).
[5] NuclearSerbia.rs / About (Multi-vector hedging strategy, the role of a "neutral bridge").
[3] IEA. The path to a new era for nuclear energy (Demand from data centers and AI).
[2] ADL Small modular reactors 2025 (Global demand up to 800 GW of new capacity).
[16] IAEA TECDOC-1750 Rev. 1 (2024). Contracting and Ownership Approaches for New Nuclear Power Plants (Collaborative Contracting, BOO, BOOT Models).
[22] NuclearSerbia.rs. Strategic management of Owner's Costs in Serbia's nuclear energy sector (Structure of hidden costs, IAEA Account 70, the problem of Danube ports).
[36] NuclearSerbia.rs. Global analysis and adaptation of the "Barakah" model for the Republic of Serbia.
[24] World Nuclear Industry Status Report (Adaptation of Barak's model).
[23] IAEA TRS-396 / Account 70 (Determining Owner's Costs).
[22] IAEA NG-T-4.4 Methodology (TCI Calculation = CEPC + COwner + CContingency).
[13] AACE International Recommended Practice No. 115R-21. Cost Estimated Classification System for the Nuclear Power Industries.
[14] AACE 115R-21 Matrix (Value Assessment Classes 5 to 1).
[6] LSE Grantham Institute. Beyond the Levelised Cost of Electricity (System Value Metrics).
[9] IEA Projected Costs of Generating Electricity (VALCOE and Life Extension Assessment).
[7] Odondebuenr. Levelized Cost of Electricity (LCOE Limits in Renewable Energy Systems).
[37] NuclearSerbia.rs. The concept of creating a multilevel specialized science-education program in Nuclear Engineering based at the University of Belgrade.
[19] NuclearSerbia.rs News. (Hot-cold testing of the Akkuyu NPP).
[17] Collaborative contracting models in IAEA TECDOC-1750.
[39] NuclearSerbia.rs. The Economic Miracle of Kostolac (Transformation of a single-industry town, the Kostolac model).
[40] NuclearSerbia.rs. The Finnish secret that has become a Serbian reality (The experience of the Eurajoki municipality).
[39] NuclearSerbia.rs Opinions (Arguments for politicians and PR specialists on dealing with NIMBYs).
[42] Demographic data for Kostolac and Kovin (Reinvestment of "nuclear rent").
[41] NuclearSerbia.rs (Mass communication tools for public loyalty).
[4] NuclearSerbia.rs. Establishment of a Special Project Organization (SPV) under Prime Minister.
[22] NuclearSerbia.rs. Financial risks of the PTI phase (Details of Serbia's budgets).
[10] UNECE. Understanding FSCOES Report (Systemic Value and SCBOE).
[11] EY. Capital costs challenge in CESA nuclear power projects (Comparison of LCOE and system value).
[25] IAEA-TECDOC-2104. Considerations to Facilitate the Accelerated Deployment of Small Modular Reactors.
[12] The Breakthrough Institute. Advancing Nuclear Energy (Comparing Ecological Footprint and Land Use).
[31] World Nuclear Outlook Report (Nigeria's Transition to SMRs).
[32] Africa Nuclear Business Platform (Niger and Nigeria Politics).
[27] World Nuclear Industry Status Report / Africa (WNA forecasts for Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya).

[30] World Nuclear Association. South Africa Country Profile (IRP 2025 and 5.2 GW of capacity).
[29] Africa Nuclear Business Platform (South Africa's $128 billion strategy).
[28] Energy for Growth Hub. Who in Africa is Ready for Nuclear Power (Analysis of African Country Readiness).
[20] World Nuclear Association. Sweden (Swedish funding model 2024, CfD contracts).
[21] Government of Sweden. Financing and risk-sharing for investments in new nuclear power (Government loans and CfD).
[43] World Nuclear News. Sweden's roadmap (Tidö Agreement and legislative changes).
[33] NuclearSerbia.rs / Strategy for developing the regulatory framework (The role of the platform in the ecosystem).
[36] NuclearSerbia.rs Opinions (Adaptation of the Barak model, opinion aggregator).
[36] NuclearSerbia.rs (Strategic roadmap for program deployment).
[6] LSE. SCBOE framework (Balancing and Network Cost Components).
[8] UNECE GECES-21/2025. Understanding the Full System Cost of the Electricity System.
[8] UNECE (Detailing the SCBOE and the limitations of the traditional LCOE).
[10] UNECE FSCOES Report (The Nordic Energy System and the Role of Swedish Nuclear Power).
[35] NuclearSerbia.rs Opinions (Ideological leadership platform in Serbia).
[33] NuclearSerbia.rs (Using IAEA and Euratom templates for the Serbian regulator).
[38] NuclearSerbia.rs. Comprehensive analysis of Serbia's Nuclear Energy MoU (Analysis of the July 2024 memorandum).
[36] NuclearSerbia.rs. UAE Nuclear Cooperation (Barak model details).
[26] NuclearSerbia.rs News. (Construction of RITM-200N and VVER in Uzbekistan).
[41] NuclearSerbia.rs (Olkiluoto NPP experience for Serbia).
[15] ANS. Collaborative Contracting (Integrated Project Delivery and Risk Allocation Transparency).
[18] Infrastructure BC (Comparison of Alliance contracts, IPD and Progressive Design-Build).
[5] NuclearSerbia.rs About (Bridging the Academic Gap, development of competencies).
[4] NuclearSerbia.rs. Strategic management of Owner's Costs (Price trap analysis, Danube infrastructure constraints, HR costs).
[37] NuclearSerbia.rs. The concept of creating a multilevel specialized science-education program (Detailing the academic structure in Belgrade).

Sources

1. Translation of a document on nuclear energy (3).docx
2. THE GROWTH & FUTURE OF SMALL MODULAR REACTORS - Arthur D. Little, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.adlittle.com/sites/default/files/reports/ADL%20Small%20modular%20reactors%202025_3.pdf
3. Executive Summary – The Path to a New Era for Nuclear Energy – Analysis - IEA, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.iea.org/reports/the-path-to-a-new-era-for-nuclear-energy/executive-summary
4. Strategic management of Owner's Costs in Serbia's nuclear energy sector - NuclearSerbia, accessed April 25, 2026, https://nuclearserbia.rs/opinions/strategic-management-of-owners-costs-in-serbias-nuclear-energy-sector
5. About Us - NuclearSerbia, last accessed: April 25, 2026, https://www.nuclearserbia.rs/about
6. Beyond the Levelized Cost of Electricity: why policymakers need better metrics for the energy transition - Grantham Research Institute on climate change and the environment - LSE, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/news/beyond-the-levelised-cost-of-electricity-why-policymakers-need-better-metrics-for-the-energy-transition/
7. Beyond LCOE: A Systems-Oriented Perspective for Evaluating Electricity Decarbonization Pathways, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.odondebuenr.com.mx/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/Levelized-Cost-of-Electricity.pdf
8. Technology-focused cost metrics, like LCOE, fail to capture system perspective - UNECE, accessed April 25, 2026, https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2025-09/GECES-21_2025_INF.2%20-%20Understanding%20the%20Full%20System%20Cost%20of%20the%20Electricity%20System.pdf
9. Projected Costs of Generating Electricity 2020 – Analysis - IEA, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.iea.org/reports/projected-costs-of-generating-electricity-2020
10. Understanding FSCOES Report - Quantified Carbon.pdf - UNECE, accessed April 25, 2026, https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2025-12/Understanding%20FSCOES%20Report%20-%20Quantified%20Carbon.pdf
11. Capital Costs Challenge: How to Overcome the Issue in CESA Nuclear Power Projects | EY, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.ey.com/content/dam/ey-unified-site/ey-com/en-pl/insights/power-utilities/documents/ey-capital-costs-challenge-in-cesa-nuclear-power-projects.pdf
12. ADVANCING NUCLEAR ENERGY - imgix, accessed April 25, 2026, https://thebreakthrough.imgix.net/Advancing-Nuclear-Energy_v3-compressed.pdf
13. Professional Guidance Document No. 01 - Guide to Cost Estimate Classification Systems, accessed April 25, 2026, https://library.aacei.org/pgd01/pgd01.shtml
14. 115R-21: Cost Estimate Classification System - As Applied in Engineering, Procurement, and

Construction for the Nuclear Power Industry - AACE International, accessed April 25, 2026, https://web.aacei.org/docs/default-source/toc/toc_115r-21.pdf

15. Lightning Talks: Education, Training, Workforce Development, and Fusion Energy ANS Annual Conference 2025, June 15–18, 2025, accessed April 25, 2026, https://epubs.ans.org/download/?a=58457
16. Contracting and Ownership Approaches for New Nuclear Power Plants | IAEA, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.iaea.org/publications/15682/contracting-and-ownership-approaches-for-new-nuclear-power-plants
17. Contracting and Ownership Approaches for New Nuclear Power Plants, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/TE-1750_Rev1web.pdf
18. Conference | Infrastructure BC, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.infrastructurebc.com/conference/
19. Russia will provide Kazakhstan with a loan for the construction of a nuclear power plant., accessed April 25, 2026, https://nuclearserbia.rs/news/russia-will-provide-kazakhstan-with-a-loan-for-the-construction-of-a-nuclear-power-plant
20. Nuclear Power in Sweden, accessed April 25, 2026, https://world-nuclear.org/information-library/country-profiles/countries-os/sweden
21. Financing and risk-sharing for investments in new nuclear power Prop. 2024/25:150 - Government.se, last accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.government.se/contentassets/415569456a034f22a31b2c8e16f88726/financing-and-risk-sharing-for-investments-in-new-nuclear-power.pdf
22. Strategic Management of Owner's Costs in the Nuclear Energy Sector of Serbia - NuclearSerbia, accessed April 25, 2026, https://nuclearserbia.rs/opinions/strategic-management-of-owners-costs-in-serbias-nuclear-energy-sector/download
23. A Costing Framework for Fusion Power Plants Citation: Authors. Title. Pages…. DOI:000000/11111. - arXiv, accessed April 25, 2026, https://arxiv.org/html/2601.21724v1
24. Status Report 2020, last accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.worldnuclearreport.org/IMG/pdf/wnisr2020-v2_hr.pdf
25. Considerations to Facilitate the Accelerated Deployment of Small Modular Reactors - Scientific, technical publications in the nuclear field | IAEA, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/TE-2104web.pdf
26. The cost of two small nuclear reactors in Uzbekistan is estimated at $1 billion., accessed April 25, 2026, https://nuclearserbia.rs/news/the-cost-of-two-small-nuclear-reactors-in-uzbekistan-is-estimated-at-1-billion
27. Barrier , accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.worldnuclearreport.org/Africa-s-Nuclear-Energy-Aims-Test-Financing-Barrier
28. 2025 Update: Who in Africa Is Ready for Nuclear Power? - Energy for Growth Hub, accessed April 25, 2026, https://energyforgrowth.org/article/2025-update-who-in-africa-is-ready-for-nuclear-power/
29. The $128 Billion Roadmap: South Africa's Nuclear Industrial Strategy, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.nuclearbusiness-platform.com/media/insights/south-africa-nuclear-industrial-strategy
30. Nuclear Power in South Africa, accessed April 25, 2026, https://world-nuclear.org/information-library/country-profiles/countries-os/south-africa

31. World Nuclear Outlook Report, accessed April 25, 2026, https://world-nuclear.org/our-association/publications/global-trends-reports/world-nuclear-outlook-report
32. Africa Nuclear Market in 2025: A Strategic Turning Point, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.nuclearbusiness-platform.com/media/insights/africa-nuclear-market-in-2025
33. Strategy for the Formation of the Regulatory Framework of the Republic of Serbia for Joining the Global Nuclear Club - NuclearSerbia, accessed April 25, 2026, https://nuclearserbia.rs/opinions/strategy-for-developing-the-regulators-and-legal-framework-of-the-republic-of-serbia-for-joining-the-global-nuclear-club-a-comprehensive-analysis-and-roadmap/download
34. NuclearSerbia - Nuclear Energy News and Information, accessed April 25, 2026, https://nuclearserbia.rs/
35. Strategy for developing the regulatory and legal framework of the Republic of Serbia for joining the global nuclear club: A comprehensive analysis and roadmap - NuclearSerbia, last accessed: April 25, 2026, https://nuclearserbia.rs/opinions/strategy-for-developing-the-regulatory-and-legal-framework-of-the-republic-of-serbia-for-joining-the-global-nuclear-club-a-comprehensive-analysis-and-roadmap
36. One more time about Strategic Roadmap for the ... - NuclearSerbia, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.nuclearserbia.rs/opinions/once-again-on-the-deployment-of-a-nuclear-energy-program-global-analysis-and-adaptation-of-the-baraka-model-for-the-republic-of-serbia/download
37. The concept of creating a multilevel specialized science-education ..., accessed April 25, 2026, https://nuclearserbia.rs/opinions/the-concept-of-creating-a-multilevel-specialized-science-education-program-in-nuclear-engineering-based-at-the-university-of-belgrade
38. Comprehensive Analysis: Serbia's Nuclear Energy MoU and National Scientific-Technical Capacity Building - NuclearSerbia, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.nuclearserbia.rs/opinions/comprehensive-analysis-serbias-nuclear-energy-mou-and-national-scientific-technical-capacity-building
39. the Atomic Renaissance . - NuclearSerbia, accessed April 25, 2026, https://nuclearserbia.rs/opinions/the-economic-miracle-of-kostolac-strategic-transformation-of-a-coal-monotown-into-a-global-benchmark-for-the-atomic-renaissance
40. KOSTOLA C 2045: - NuclearSerbia, last accessed: April 25, 2026, https://www.nuclearserbia.rs/opinions/the-finnish-secret-that-has-become-a-serbian-reality/download
41. New publications in the Opinions section - NuclearSerbia, last accessed: April 25, 2026, https://nuclearserbia.rs/news/new-publications-in-the-opinions-section
42. The Economic Miracle of Kostolac: The Strategic Transformation of a Coal-Mining City into a Global Model of Nuclear Renaissance - NuclearSerbia, accessed April 25, 2026, https://nuclearserbia.rs/opinions/the-economic-miracle-of-kostolac-strategic-transformation-of-a-coal-monotown-into-a-global-benchmark-for-the-atomic-renaissance/download
43. Sweden plans 'massive' expansion of nuclear energy, accessed April 25, 2026, https://www.world-nuclear-news.org/articles/roadmap-launched-for-expansion-of-

nuclear-energy-i