Ports Going Nuclear? A TCO and Risk-Based Assessment of SMRs and Microreactors

Paul E. Kent, PhD[1]

I. Introduction – A New Source of Power

Centuries ago, windmills like those seen along Dutch rivers symbolized a leap in technology, turning natural energy into industrial output. Today, they serve as a visual reminder that energy transitions are not new; they are milestones in how societies adapt and advance. As ports now stand on the edge of another energy transformation, today's choices may prove just as defining as those of the past. As ports pursue decarbonization, port leaders must choose from wind, sun, grid, or nuclear. The future of clean energy in ports may rest on how bold port leaders are in the face of uncertainty.

Figure 1. Windmill at Wijk bij Duurstede

Source. Rijks Museum, Netherlands. Jacob Isaacksz van Ruisdael, *The Windmill at Wijk bij Duurstede*, c. 1668- c. 1670 (https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/object/The-Windmill-at-Wijk-bij-Duurstede--fb2b57919550092bf709472f81426eab?query=windmill&collectionSearchContext=Art&page=1&sortingType=Popularity&tab=data).

When people think of ports today, they think of cranes, containers, and cargo—not control rooms and cooling rods. Yet, as ports face intensifying pressure to decarbonize while maintaining reliability, conversations once reserved for utilities and research labs have begun to reach the waterfront. The World Bank's 2025 policy shift to finance nuclear power, including small modular reactors (SMRs)[2], signals a broader willingness to rethink clean energy at scale.[3,4] More recently, attention has turned to even smaller "microreactors", a class of modular, factory-built systems designed for rapid deployment.

This article explores whether nuclear technologies, SMRs and microreactors, might play a role in powering port operations and industrial logistics zones. Rather than advocate or oppose nuclear

© 2025 Paul Kent

[1] Senior Vice President, Ports and Logistics, Monument Economics Group, pkent@megconsulting.com.

[2] A relatively new technology, SMRs are being planned or built in Argentina, Canada, Netherlands, Slovakia, South Korea, and Turkey, while large-scale nuclear power plants as of end 2023 are also being built in 18 countries, among them Bangladesh, Egypt, and India. See World Nuclear Association, *World Nuclear Performance Report 2024*, available at https://world-nuclear.org/images/articles/World-Nuclear-Performance-Report-2024.pdf.

[3] NuclearNewswire, "World Bank to fund SMRs and nuclear life extensions", 13 June 2025, available at https://www.ans.org/news/2025-06-13/article-7111/world-bank-to-fund-smrs-and-nuclear-life-extensions/ and WNN Word Nuclear News, "World Bank ends ban on funding nuclear energy", 12 June 2025, available at https://www.world-nuclear-news.org/articles/world-bank-agrees-to-end-ban-on-funding-nuclear-energy.

[4] This follows the COP28 climate change conference in Dubai, UAE where 25 countries signed a declaration aimed at tripling global nuclear capacity by 2050. Among them are countries that have never had nuclear energy, including Ghana, Jamaica,

energy, our objective is analytical: to examine how these technologies compare with other power options in cost, emissions, reliability, and feasibility, especially for ports undergoing electrification.[5]

To ground this journey in the analytical tools port authorities actually use, we incorporate a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) framework and a comparative evaluation of SMRs and microreactors, including Table 1, which offers a concise early reference point for readers. Through the eyes of "Maria," a fictional but informed port planning executive, we illustrate how a decision-making process grounded in TCO analysis, risk assessment, and long-term energy planning might realistically unfold.

Table 1. Comparison of Small Modular Reactors and Microreactors for Port Electrification

Category	Small Modular Reactors (SMRs)	Microreactors (1–20 MW)
Capacity Range	50–300 MW	1–20 MW
Technology Profile	• Stationary nuclear plant • Factory-fabricated modules assembled on-site • Nuclear-grade regulatory pathway well-established	• Factory-built, portable/transportable unit • Delivered as a sealed or semi-sealed module • Simplified, emerging licensing frameworks
Deployment & Use Case	• Long-term baseload for large ports, SEZs, or industrial clusters • Multi-year construction timelines • Requires stable, high, predictable demand	• Rapid deployment for immediate clean power needs • Installed in months once licensed • Modular growth: additional units added as demand increases
Operational Characteristics	• High output suitable for hydrogen/ammonia production or grid integration • Requires nuclear-trained operators	• Autonomous or low-staffing operation • Suitable for distributed/localized power within the port • Relocatable or redeployable if demand shifts
Capital & Financing	• CapEx: $1–2 billion per unit • Financing feasible only with SEZ-scale or grid-integration demand • Requires sovereign, utility, or multilateral backing	• CapEx: $20–50 million per unit • Within reach of port authorities, PPPs, green bonds, or SLLs • Vendor-operated PPA models available
Best Fit	• Ports with large-scale industrial integration and long-term baseload needs	• Ports seeking early decarbonization, modular growth, flexible scaling, or off-grid resilience

Mongolia, and Morocco. See World Nuclear Association, *World Nuclear Performance Report 2024*, available at https://world-nuclear.org/images/articles/World-Nuclear-Performance-Report-2024.pdf.

[5] The comparative analyses presented here are illustrative rather than prescriptive; they reflect the types of tools and frameworks ports would apply, though actual feasibility studies would necessarily be far more detailed.

II. Electrification and the Port Energy Challenge

Terminal operators and port authorities worldwide are investing in electrification to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve air quality, and meet regulatory and commercial expectations. For a typical mid-sized container port (say, 2 million TEUs per year), energy demand is driven by:

- Shore power for vessels at berth
- Electrified yard equipment (e.g., RTGs, AGVs, reach stackers)
- Ship-to-shore cranes
- Gate and security systems
- Reefer container storage
- Administrative and logistics facilities

As diesel equipment is phased out, electric load can rise sharply. For a large port transitioning fully to electric operations and providing shore power to 50% of vessel calls, annual energy demand could reach 100–150 MW;[6] in considering multiple sources, we assume

- 2–3 vessels simultaneously on shore power: 60–90 MW
- RTGs, yard tractors, reefer stacks: 10–20 MW
- Admin, lighting, data, security: 5–10 MW
- Cold chain, logistics, EV charging: 10–20 MW

Add adjacent logistics and industrial zones, and demand climbs even higher.

While grid-supplied power is the default, many ports face capacity constraints, reliability issues, or rising prices. Though onsite solar and wind help, they require large footprints and cannot fully meet demand due to intermittency. This gap between rising loads and limited local generation capacity is widening, which is why Maria, port planning head at Puerto Nueva Esperanza, started considering other options—including SMRs and eventually microreactors after being encouraged the World Bank's policy shift towards financing nuclear power projects.

III. What Are Small Modular Reactors?

SMRs are compact nuclear reactors designed for modular construction, often ranging from 50 to 300 MW per unit. Unlike conventional gigawatt-scale nuclear plants, SMRs can be factory-built, delivered in segments, and installed at sites with lower energy footprints.

Advantages include:

- Smaller land footprint

[6] Estimates of total port energy demand under electrification scenarios are based on observed and projected requirements for both shoreside operations and vessel shore power. According to the Port of Los Angeles, shore power provision for three berthed vessels can require up to 90 MW of connected capacity (Port of Los Angeles, *Shore Power Program*, 2022). Additional electrification of terminal equipment, reefer yards, gate operations, and administrative facilities can contribute 10–20 MW or more, depending on port size and operational intensity (Argonne National Laboratory, *Port Electrification and Decarbonization Opportunities*, 2022). Comparable scenarios are also discussed in the World Ports Climate Action Program (WPCAP) technical reports by the International Association of Ports and Harbors (IAPH), which cite peak electrification loads exceeding 100 MW in major gateway ports.

- Potential for faster permitting and construction than conventional nuclear plants[7]
- Lower upfront capital investment than giga-watt-scale plants
- Intrinsic safety features (e.g., passive cooling)[8]

Some designs are already approved in countries like the U.S., Canada, and China. Others are under development, targeting commercial operation between 2027 and 2035.[9] For ports, SMRs offer the appeal of long-duration, high-output clean power capable of supplying both terminal operations and energy-intensive users in nearby industrial clusters.

IV. Microreactors – A Smaller, Faster Nuclear Alternative

Alongside SMRs, a new generation of nuclear power plants, microreactors (typically 1-10 MW), is emerging. These units are factory-built and small enough to be transported by truck in ISO containers, enabling deployment in remote or infrastructure-limited areas. While few designs are yet commercially licensed, several vendors have advanced well into testing and early regulatory engagement, positioning microreactors as realistic near-term options for specific industrial applications. Examples include:

Examples include:

- Nano Nuclear Energy's designs—Zeus (a solid-core "battery reactor") and Odin (a low-pressure coolant microreactor), both positioned as transportable systems suitable for modular deployment.[10]
- Radiant Industries and Oklo, which are pursuing prefabricated 5–20 MW systems designed for rapid setup and limited onsite construction. [11]
- The U.S. Army's Project Pele (Janus reactor), aimed at developing deployable microreactors for energy resilience, with the first unit expected to reach initial test operation in 2026. [12]

Key advantages for ports include:

- Rapid deployment: potentially operational in months rather than years once a national licensing framework is in place.
- Modularity: ports can scale capacity incrementally rather than committing to large up-front capacity.

---

[7] The phrase "faster permitting and construction" refers to the modular and standardized design of SMRs compared with traditional, gigawatt-scale nuclear plants. Because SMRs are factory-fabricated and use pre-approved, repeatable designs, regulatory reviews and site-specific construction can be completed more quickly. However, SMR permitting remains more complex and time-consuming than that for renewable sources such as solar or wind, which typically face simpler environmental and safety approval processes.

[8] Passive cooling refers to a reactor safety design that removes heat from the reactor core without relying on external power, pumps, or operator intervention. Instead, it uses natural physical processes such as convection, gravity, and heat conduction to transfer heat away from the core. This "intrinsic safety" feature ensures that, even in the event of a total power loss, the reactor remains in a stable, self-cooling condition, reducing the risk of overheating or core damage.

[9] World Nuclear Association, World Nuclear Performance Report 2024, available at https://world-nuclear.org/images/articles/World-Nuclear-Performance-Report-2024.pdf.

[10] ZEUS NANO Reactor, NANO Nuclear Energy, available at https://nanonuclearenergy.com/zeus/.

[11] Nuclear Engineering International, "Radiant signs microreactor deal with USAF", 13 August 2025, available at https://www.neimagazine.com/news/radiant-signs-microreactor-deal-with-usaf/?cf-view.

[12] U.S. Army, "Army leaders applaud TRISO fuel delivery as Project Pele moves toward first microreactor demonstration", 3 December 2025, available at https://www.army.mil/article/289323/army_leaders_applaud_triso_fuel_delivery_as_project_pele_moves_toward_first_microreactor_demonstration.

- Mobility: units can be relocated or redeployed, allowing ports to adapt as terminal layouts or energy strategies evolve.
- Lower absolute cost exposure: even if $/kW is higher than SMRs, total dollar investment is far lower—an important consideration for mid-size ports.
- Alignment with uncertain or phased demand: microreactors reduce the risk of "over-building" before SEZ or industrial loads materialize.

Because of these attributes, microreactors are particularly attractive for medium-sized ports, ports with uncertain long-term demand trajectories, and off-grid or constrained-grid environments. Their smaller scale does not preclude meaningful impact: a single 5–10 MW unit can power cranes, reefers, cold storage, security systems, and a sizable portion of yard equipment.

For Maria's team, microreactors represented a bridge technology—commercially closer than many envisioned five years ago, yet flexible enough to align with a port whose demand was growing but not yet large enough to justify an SMR.

V. Maria's Dilemma – A Port at a Crossroads

Maria was no stranger to infrastructure investment. Her port had neo-Panamax cranes, automated storage, extended berths, and automated gates. But her latest full carbonization by 2040 mandate posed a challenge that traditional planning tools could not solve alone. Electrification was central to this transition, yet so was securing a resilient and scalable power supply.

Maria's team had previously considered:

- Expanding solar PV installations
- Procuring renewable grid power through PPAs[13]
- Installing battery energy storage systems (BESS)
- Evaluating hydrogen or ammonia co-generation

And then SMR and micronuclear options emerged. The national government, backed by a multilateral bank, was launching an SMR pilot program. Sites near coastal industrial zones were being considered. Maria saw a chance to lead, but she also saw the risks.

To understand the magnitude of the challenge, Maria's team prepared a detailed assessment of the port's future electricity demand. The analysis projected 5% annual growth from its current 2 million TEU throughput with average ship calls of 8,000 TEUs and approximately 1,200 containers per call (including reefers). Reefer dwell time averaged four days—an important driver of load. Their findings (Table 2) were sobering:

[13] A PPA (Power Purchase Agreement) is a long-term contract between an electricity generator and a buyer—typically a utility, large business, or public entity—specifying the price per megawatt-hour (MWh), contract duration, delivery terms, and transmission responsibilities. PPAs provide pricing stability to buyers while helping generators secure financing for energy infrastructure. In the port context, a PPA may be used to purchase electricity from an SMR, solar farm, or other dedicated source.

Table 2. Estimated 2035 MW Load

Feature	Microreactors (1–10 MW)
Ship-to-shore cranes (10 units)	10 MW
Yard RTGs (30 electrified)	6 MW
Reefers (avg. 400 active)	4 MW
Shore power (3 berths, avg.)	40 MW
Cold storage and logistics	15 MW
Admin and security facilities	5 MW
Total (current load)	**80 MW**
2035 projected load	**~110 MW**

The team mapped this projected growth against available power options. Solar and wind could supplement the load but could not serve as reliable anchors due to intermittency and site constraints. Grid expansion was uncertain and risked becoming a bottleneck. Nuclear, microreactors or potentially an SMR, offered the reliability, scalability, and carbon-free profile needed, but with very different implications.

This analysis sharpened Maria's dilemma. If the port were to remain a container-handling facility with moderate growth, a 1–2 MW microreactor—or multiple units added over time—could match demand flexibly. But if the port pursued an adjacent Special Economic Zone (SEZ) with energy-intensive tenants, electricity demand could exceed 50 MW, making an SMR a more fitting long-term anchor. Thus, Maria faced not only a technology decision, but also a strategic land-use decision about the port's future role in regional development.

What followed was a structured decision process that blended economics, engineering, politics, and public relations. Maria prepared a simple tradeoff matrix contrasting microreactors and SMRs. The table (Table 3) summarized key parameters (capacity, cost, deployment time, and suitability) so that decision-makers could visualize the trade-offs between flexibility and scale.

Table 3. Microreactor and Small Modular Reactor Tradeoff Analysis

Feature	Microreactors (1–10 MW)	Small Modular Reactors (50–300 MW)
Capital Cost	$20–50M per unit	$1–2B per unit
Cost per kW	Targeting <$5,000/kW	$2,000–$6,000/kW
LCOE[14]	TBD; estimates <$100/MWh with mass production	$100–$200/MWh (sensitive to utilization)

[14] LCOE – levelized cost of electricity.

Feature	Microreactors (1–10 MW)	Small Modular Reactors (50–300 MW)
Deployment Timeline	Prototypes 2026–2027; commercial by 2030–31; install in weeks–months	First units 2030–35; 3–7 years build time
Regulatory Complexity	Moderate; simplified licensing expected	High; extensive permitting and safety reviews
Operating Costs	Low; autonomous, minimal staffing	Moderate; nuclear-trained workforce required
Best Fit	Small/remote terminals; Scenario 1 (0.32 MW) ideal; Scenario 2 possible with multiple units	Large terminals + SEZs; Scenario 2 fit if industrial clustering

The comparison clarified that microreactors aligned with near-term port needs, while SMRs aligned with a future SEZ. Maria thus advanced both as sequential but not competing options. With this high-level comparison in hand, Maria's leadership team decided to move from concept to feasibility. The next phase would quantify costs, risks, and sustainability impacts and determine whether nuclear power could truly compete with other energy pathways for her port.

VI. From Vision to Viability – Building the Business Case

Following her initial comparison between microreactors and SMRs, Maria's CFO proposed a deeper look at long-term economics through a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) analysis. The feasibility work evolved into five analytical elements: cost, risk, emissions, regulation, and finance. To manage this multidisciplinary effort, Maria convened a working group (Table 4) drawn from the port's key departments and also engaged consultants to support the analyses.

Table 4. Nuclear Energy Working Group

Port Department	Role in Assessment
Finance	Evaluated total cost of ownership, structured funding models, and lead SLL discussions
Operations	Assess power demands, equipment conversion plans, and resilience trade-offs
Sustainability/ESG	Model emissions reductions and monitored alignment with sustainability goals
Legal and Compliance	Review nuclear regulatory frameworks, permitting, liability, and advise on PPA contract terms
Communications and Public Affairs	Develop stakeholder messaging and community engagement strategy
Engineering/Infrastructure	Evaluate physical integration, siting feasibility, and energy delivery systems
Procurement	Review vendor credentials and possible PPA/contracting terms

1. Total Cost of Ownership

Maria's team included SMRs and microreactors in the TCO framework. SMRs had high CapEx, often exceeding $5,000 per kilowatt, but microreactors, though still pre-commercial, showed early estimates in the $20–50 million range for 1–10 MW units. While SMRs benefited from long operating life and low fuel costs, microreactors offered advantages through factory fabrication, rapid installation, and minimal staffing requirements, potentially lowering lifecycle O&M costs.

When levelized over a 40-year horizon, the cost of SMR electricity fell between $70–$120/MWh, whereas preliminary benchmarks for microreactors, assuming mass production and modular replication, suggested the potential for achieving <$100/MWh over time. Although microreactor cost projections carry higher uncertainty due to their newness, their scalability and speed of deployment created an attractive trajectory for ports with phased or moderate demand growth.

To provide a clearer comparison, Maria's team included Table 5 summarizing typical power costs and lifespans. Maria found herself learning more nuclear acronyms than she ever expected—SMR, PPA, NRC, and now MR ("microreactor"), not to mention her own creation: TBC—To Be Clarified.

Table 5. Comparison of Power Generation Options

Power Source	LCOE[15] ($/MWh)	Avg. Lifespan (yrs)	CapEx ($/kW)	Reliability	Emissions
Diesel	150–300 *(IEA, DOE)*	15–20 *(DOE)*	1,000–1,500 *(DOE)*	Medium	High
Grid Electricity	90–180 *(IEA, region-specific)*	—	—	Variable	Variable
Solar PV	25–60 *(Lazard 2024)*	25–30 *(IEA, DOE)*	1,000–1,500 *(IEA, DOE)*	Intermittent	None
Wind (onshore)	30–70 *(Lazard 2024)*	20–25 *(IEA, DOE)*	1,200–1,800 *(IEA, DOE)*	Intermittent	None
Microreactor (1–10 MW)	<100 (benchmarks, projected)	8–20 (design-dependent)	~5,000–10,000 (est., early units)	High	None
SMR	70–120 *(DOE, IEA projections)*	40–60 *(DOE/IEA)*	4,000–8,000 *(DOE/IEA)*	High	None

Note: IEA – International Energy Agency; DOE – U.S. Department of Energy; Lazard -- Levelized Cost of Energy Analysis 2024.
Sources: International Energy Agency, *Projected Costs of Generating Electricity 2020 Edition*, available at https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/ae17da3d-e8a5-4163-a3ec-2e6fb0b5677d/Projected-Costs-of-Generating-Electricity-2020.pdf; International Energy Agency, *World Energy Outlook 2024*, available at https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/140a0470-5b90-4922-a0e9-838b3ac6918c/WorldEnergyOutlook2024.pdf; U.S. Department of Energy, *SMR Cost and Deployment Analysis Reports (2023–2024)* and *Annual Energy Outlook* (used for diesel, SMR CapEx, and lifespan figures; SMR projections reflect early deployment-phase costs with anticipated learning curve reductions.

[15] The Levelized Cost of Electricity is the average cost of producing one megawatt-hour (MWh) of electricity over the full lifetime of a generating asset. It incorporates all capital costs, operating and maintenance expenses, fuel costs, and financing assumptions, divided by the total electricity the plant is expected to produce. LCOE enables an "apples-to-apples" comparison across technologies with very different cost structures (e.g., solar vs. wind vs. nuclear) by expressing their lifetime economic performance as a single cost metric.

2. Risk and Resilience

Maria's operations lead presented risk matrices comparing SMRs, microreactors, and conventional alternatives (Table 6). The distinctions were important: microreactors introduced new forms of resilience, such as the ability to relocate the unit, add additional modules over time, or rapidly replace a unit after its operational cycle.

- Diesel faced regulatory phase-outs and price spikes
- Grid power suffered from outages and curtailments
- Solar and wind were cost-effective but intermittent
- SMRs offered operational continuity but required longer construction timelines and more complex licensing
- Microreactors, by contrast, offered rapid deployment, lower siting requirements, and factory-built safety assurance, though with higher technological uncertainty due to their pre-commercial status

Maria highlighted Texas' 2023 hailstorm, which destroyed thousands of solar panels, and Ukraine's Zaporizhzhia plant, which reminded everyone of the geopolitical risks of legacy nuclear. But she also noted the U.S. Army's push for deployable microreactors under the Pele Program, an example of resilience being redefined not through size, but through mobility, modularity, and redundancy.

Microreactors introduced a new risk profile: less regulatory complexity and shorter construction timelines than SMRs, but greater uncertainty in cost and financing due to their pre-commercial status. For Maria, this meant balancing short-term agility with long-term bankability.

Table 6. SMR vs. Alternatives Risk Matrix

Power Source	Reliability Risk	Price Volatility	Regulatory Risk	Public Perception	Cost/Financing Risk
Diesel	Medium–High	High	Very High	Poor	Low (mature, but volatile OpEx)
Grid Electricity	Medium	Medium–High	Medium	Moderate	Medium (tariff risk; no control)
Solar/Wind	High	Low–Medium	Low	Very Good	Medium (CapEx low, storage needed)
Microreactors (1-10 MW)	Low–Medium (modularity adds resilience)	Low (fuel stable)	Medium–High (new tech; evolving regulation)	Mixed (improving due to defense and energy industry adoption)	High (pre-commercial; uncertain CapEx/LCOE; financing structures still emerging)
SMRs (50-300 MW)	Low	Low (PPA-backed)	Medium–High	Mixed	Medium–High (high CapEx; long lead times; proven financing tools)

3. Emissions Reductions

From an ESG perspective, both SMRs and microreactors offered significant potential to reduce Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions. Electrifying diesel equipment directly reduced on-site fossil fuel use (Scope 1), while nuclear power, whether from a microreactor or SMR, displaced carbon-intensive grid electricity (Scope 2).

Microreactors had an added advantage for ports pursuing rapid decarbonization: they could be deployed and commissioned within months, enabling immediate emissions reductions while larger-scale SMR planning continued. Their smaller footprint also made them suitable for distributed power configurations, reducing transmission losses and enabling low-emissions power delivery closer to high-demand assets such as reefer yards or cold-chain clusters.

By contrast, SMRs provided the long-term backbone for deep decarbonization, especially if paired with hydrogen or ammonia production for bunkering or industrial use. In scenarios where the port anchored an SEZ, the larger output of an SMR could reduce regional emissions far beyond the port fence line.

Maria's sustainability officer projected that, depending on the configuration, microreactors could enable immediate 15–25% emissions reduction potential within the first three years, while an SMR could support up to 45% GHG reduction by 2035 if paired with industrial decarbonization. Importantly, the inclusion of either technology strengthened the port's eligibility for sustainability-linked loans (SLLs) due to their capacity to deliver traceable, verifiable reductions in carbon intensity.

No solar panel has ever glowed green, but let's just say Texas hail has opinions.

4. Regulatory and Stakeholder Considerations

The port's legal team analyzed the licensing process for inland siting, drawing on the national nuclear agency's emerging frameworks for both SMRs and microreactors. While SMRs required full nuclear-grade licensing with extensive design review, safety case development, and public consultation, microreactors benefited from the agency's preparation of draft regulatory pathways tailored to small, factory-fabricated reactor technologies. Regulators had anticipated rapid innovation in this space. Several nuclear authorities, including the U.S. NRC, Canada's CNSC, and the U.K.'s ONR, had already begun drafting guidance for microreactor siting, transport, and operation. These frameworks emphasized intrinsic safety, passive cooling, sealed-core designs, and simplified emergency planning zones (EPZs) for very small reactors. For Maria's port, these evolving frameworks meant that microreactors could navigate a more streamlined, risk-proportionate regulatory path compared to SMRs, though uncertainties remained until commercial units entered the market.

Stakeholder engagement was important for both technologies. Early transparency, clear safety protocols, and communication of co-benefits, such as cleaner air, energy sovereignty, and grid resilience, were central to the communications strategy. Maria's public affairs team crafted messaging emphasizing that microreactors were not like traditional nuclear plants, but highly compact, self-contained, next-generation energy systems.

In short, SMRs required a more mature regulatory commitment, while microreactors required more communication clarity, given their novelty and pre-commercial status. Both needed careful alignment with community expectations, but neither was infeasible with a thoughtful stakeholder plan. Maria's communications team proposed a narrative of energy sovereignty and climate leadership and not just "going nuclear."

5. Financing Strategy

Financing emerged as one of the most decisive differentiators between SMRs and microreactors. While both technologies could qualify for sustainability-linked finance, their scale, cost profiles, and partnership models created fundamentally different pathways for Maria's port.

For microreactors, the economics aligned more naturally with the scale of a typical port authority relative to the scale of Maria's port. With capital costs in the $20–50 million range for a 1–10 MW unit, microreactors fell within the reach of:

- traditional port financing envelopes
- multilateral climate and resilience lending
- green bonds or SLLs tied to rapid emissions reduction
- structured PPAs with private microreactor developers

Their smaller scale also enabled phased financing, allowing the port to add units over time as demand grew. Microreactors therefore offered a practical option for ports seeking off-grid resilience or modest, flexible power capacity without the burden of a multi-billion-dollar capital program.

By contrast, SMRs required a substantially larger financing scope and scale. With capital costs between $1–2 billion per unit, SMRs were realistically financeable only when:

- the port was to be a part of a broader SEZ or industrial cluster
- multiple large offtakers (cold storage, manufacturing, hydrogen/ammonia plants) could guarantee long-term power demand
- the port could sell excess power to the national grid, creating a diversified revenue base
- sovereign guarantees or multilateral backing (World Bank, IFC) were available to support long-tenor financing

If the port required a fully off-grid solution, SMRs were still possible, but only if co-located industries or government partners shared the capital burden. In such cases, SMRs functioned less as a port asset and more as a national or regional energy infrastructure project.

Maria's team outlined potential financing structures for each technology:

For Microreactors:

- Small-Scale PPAs with private operators (fixed block tariffs; modular expansion)
- Public or blended finance for early-stage units tied to resilience and decarbonization
- Green bonds or SLLs linked to immediate Scope 1 and 2 reductions
- Lease-or-operate models, where the vendor retains ownership and the port pays for delivered energy

For SMRs:

- Large-scale PPAs anchored by multiple industrial users and the port authority
- PPP structures where the port co-invests alongside utilities or industrial tenants
- Sovereign-backed loans or guarantees for long-tenor project finance
- Grid-integrated revenue models, selling excess power into the national system

Ultimately, Maria concluded that financing feasibility was inseparable from the port's development vision. A port-only operation could finance microreactors. A port-plus-SEZ development framework could finance an SMR. The board, she noted, was not just choosing a power source; they were choosing the future scale of their economic base.

Maria smiled at her team: "We may not be launching a reactor tomorrow, but we're finally speaking the same financial language."

Section VII. Making the Decision – Frameworks for Choosing a Clean Power Path

After months of comparative analysis, Maria reframed the dilemma. The port did not need to choose between microreactors and SMRs—it needed to choose when each technology would become appropriate. Microreactors represented a right-sized, financeable, low-risk option that could be deployed in a timeframe consistent with the port's decarbonization goals. SMRs, by contrast, were a long-term infrastructural commitment only justified if an SEZ or industrial cluster materialized and created sustained multi-megawatt baseload demand.

Her team applied the decision criteria—cost, grid availability, scalability, siting feasibility, environmental impact, and political acceptability—and an answer emerged clearly: a microreactor was the only technology that matched the port's near-term operational needs and financial capacity. It also enabled immediate emissions reductions and improved energy resilience. At the same time, it preserved the option of an SMR should the SEZ strategy advance.

Maria summarized the outcome for her board: "A microreactor gets us clean, reliable power exactly when we need it. An SMR becomes viable only when demand grows. Our job is to prepare for both without committing prematurely."

Section VIII. Institutional Models – Who Builds, Who Pays, Who Operates?

Now that Maria's team had identified microreactors as the immediate pathway, the procurement landscape shifted significantly. Microreactors offered more flexible institutional models than SMRs due to their smaller size, lower capital cost, and vendor-operated designs.

For microreactors, Maria evaluated three principal models:

1. **Vendor-Owned, Vendor-Operated (VOVO).** The developer owns and operates the microreactor, selling electricity to the port under a block-energy PPA[16]. This minimized CapEx and eliminated nuclear-operations risk for the port.
2. **Port-Financed, Vendor-Operated.** The port finances the reactor, but operation, licensing, and maintenance remain with the nuclear vendor under a long-term concession. This offered price control while avoiding technical risk.

[16] A block-energy Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) is a contract in which the buyer purchases a fixed quantity of electricity, specified in "blocks" of megawatts or megawatt-hours, at a predetermined price over a defined period. Unlike PPAs indexed to variable demand or market prices, block-energy PPAs provide stable, predictable revenue to the generator and predictable costs to the buyer. This structure is well-suited to modular technologies like microreactors, where capacity can be added in increments and priced as discrete energy blocks.

3. **Hybrid PPP.** The port and a private partner co-invest, with the vendor operating. Suitable for phased expansion (adding multiple microreactor units over time).

For future SMRs, institutional structures remained very different:

1. **Utility-Integrated SMR Development.** The SMR is built and operated by a utility or national partner, with the port as a large anchor customer.
2. **SEZ-Anchor PPP**. An SMR's cost is shared among industrial tenants, the SEZ authority, and the port.
3. **National Infrastructure Model.** If the central government prioritizes industrial decarbonization, the SMR is treated as strategic infrastructure.

These institutional options helped Maria position microreactors as an achievable Phase 1 solution and SMRs as an optional Phase 2 solution that depended on regional economic development.

Section IX. From Plan to Reality – Implementation Roadmap

With the decision made, Maria's team developed a roadmap reflecting a two-phase strategy: deploy microreactors now and prepare for the possibility of an SMR in the future if demand grows through SEZ development.

Phase 1 – Microreactor Deployment (Years 1–4)

- Conduct feasibility studies and environmental/social scoping
- Engage with nuclear regulators under the emerging microreactor licensing framework
- Issue RfQs to microreactor vendors capable of providing vendor operated or hybrid PPP models
- Select a vendor and finalize site design and safety protocols
- Install and commission the first microreactor—typically in months once approvals are in place. Depending on demand growth, Maria anticipated adding one or two additional microreactor units during the next decade, providing modular scalability without committing prematurely to an SMR.
- Begin emissions reductions and resilience improvements immediately

Phase 2: SEZ and Industrial Demand Assessment (Years 3–5, overlapping)

- Conduct market sounding for cold chain, manufacturing, and hydrogen/ammonia production tenants
- If warranted, develop SEZ master plan integrating long term energy demand forecasts
- Explore grid tie options to enable future SMR monetization through electricity sales

Phase 3: SMR Feasibility and Decision Point (Years 5–10)

- If industrial tenants commit and baseload demand exceeds 50 MW, initiate SMR siting and regulatory studies
- Engage national government, utilities, and multilaterals for financing structures
- Determine whether SMR development is justified or whether additional microreactor units suffice

This roadmap allowed the port to act immediately while maintaining strategic flexibility. Maria described it as: "Start clean. Stay resilient. Grow when the market tells us to."

Conclusion: A Brave New Current

Ports are not merely gateways for goods—they are now laboratories for the energy transition. Maria proved that nuclear power does not have to be a monolithic, high-stakes commitment. Instead, nuclear can be modular, flexible, incremental, and aligned with real-world demand.

By choosing a microreactor today, the port secured near-term emissions reductions, energy sovereignty, and resilience. By preparing for a future SMR, the port preserved its ability to scale into a regional logistics-industrial hub if market conditions evolve.

Maria's leadership showed that nuclear energy in ports is not a leap of faith; it is a phased, evidence-based strategic choice.

Epilogue: Maria at the Ribbon Cutting

Ten years later, Maria, now the port director, stood before the port's expanded microreactor complex—housing two compact, quiet, shielded units generating clean power. The first unit had been operating reliably for several years, but today marked the commissioning of the full dual-module microreactor complex. Cranes swung overhead, container yard lights glowed steadily, and the cold-chain facilities ran on carbon-free electricity. Schoolchildren on a field trip toured the site in bright yellow helmets, marveling at how something so small could power something so large.

Flyers were distributed that announced the next step: **"SEZ Feasibility Study – Exploring the Future of Clean Industrial Growth."** The option for an SMR remained open, but only if demand warranted it.

Maria smiled as she cut the ribbon. Decarbonization had not required a giant leap; it just required the right first step.

The port had taken it.

References

Argonne National Laboratory, *Port Electrification and Decarbonization Opportunities*, 2022.

International Energy Agency, *Projected Costs of Generating Electricity 2020 Edition* (https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/ae17da3d-e8a5-4163-a3ec-2e6fb0b5677d/Projected-Costs-of-Generating-Electricity-2020.pdf)

International Energy Agency, *World Energy Outlook 2024* (https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/140a0470-5b90-4922-a0e9-838b3ac6918c/WorldEnergyOutlook2024.pdf)

U.S. Department of Energy, *SMR Cost and Deployment Analysis Reports (2023–2024)* and *Annual Energy Outlook* (used for diesel, SMR CapEx, and lifespan figures; SMR projections reflect early deployment-phase costs with anticipated learning curve reductions.

KRONOS MMR, NANO Nuclear Energy, available at https://nanonuclearenergy.com/kronos-mmr/.

Nuclear Engineering International, "Radiant signs microreactor deal with USAF", 13 August 2025, available at https://www.neimagazine.com/news/radiant-signs-microreactor-deal-with-usaf/?cf-view.

NuclearNewswire, "World Bank to fund SMRs and nuclear life extensions", 13 June 2025, (https://www.ans.org/news/2025-06-13/article-7111/world-bank-to-fund-smrs-and-nuclear-life-extensions/)

Port of Los Angeles, *Shore Power Program*, 2022).

Rijks Museum, Netherlands. Jacob Isaacksz van Ruisdael, The Windmill at Wijk bij Duurstede, c. 1668- c. 1670 (https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/object/The-Windmill-at-Wijk-bij-Duurstede--fb2b57919550092bf709472f81426eab?query=windmill&collectionSearchContext=Art&page=1&sortingType=Popularity&tab=data)

U.S. Army, "Army leaders applaud TRISO fuel delivery as Project Pele moves toward first microreactor demonstration", 3 December 2025 (https://www.army.mil/article/289323/army_leaders_applaud_triso_fuel_delivery_as_project_pele_moves_toward_first_microreactor_demonstration)

U.S. Department of Energy, *SMR Cost and Deployment Analysis Reports (2023–2024).*

U.S. Department of Energy, *World Energy Outlook (2024).*

WNN Word Nuclear News, "World Bank ends ban on funding nuclear energy", 12 June 2025 (https://www.world-nuclear-news.org/articles/world-bank-agrees-to-end-ban-on-funding-nuclear-energy)

World Nuclear Association, *World Nuclear Performance Report 2024* (https://world-nuclear.org/images/articles/World-Nuclear-Performance-Report-2024.pdf)

World Ports Climate Action Program (WPCAP), International Association of Ports and Harbors (IAPH) (https://sustainableworldports.org/

ZEUS NANO Reactor, NANO Nuclear Energy (https://nanonuclearenergy.com/zeus/)

The *For the Beauty of Logistics* Series

This paper is the twelfth installment in Dr. Kent's *For the Beauty of Logistics* series, a collection of short papers that explores how logistics principles intersect with economic, policy, and infrastructural systems to drive innovation, optimize complex processes, and reveal deeper insights into global dynamics. Previous papers in the Series can be found here:

- Automation on Trial at the Port of Virginia https://www.megconsulting.com/for-the-beauty-of-logistics-automation-on-trial/
- From Blockade to Bridge: TRIPP, Zangezur, and the Economics of Connectivity in the Caucasus https://www.megconsulting.com/for-the-beauty-of-logistics-from-blockade-to-bridge-tripp-zangezur-and-the-economics-of-connectivity-in-the-caucasus/
- Automation for All – How Small Container Ports Can Have a Smarter Future https://www.megconsulting.com/automation-for-all-how-small-container-ports-can-have-a-smarter-future/
- For the Beauty of Logistics- Bit by Bit at the Berth: Can Container Terminal Operators Embrace Cryptocurrency? https://www.megconsulting.com/for-the-beauty-of-logistics-bit-by-bit-at-the-berth-

can-container-terminal-operators-embrace-cryptocurrency-dr-paul-kent-releases-his-8th-installment-in-the-series/

- Revolutionizing SME Trade – A Smart Platform for Global Partnerships https://www.megconsulting.com/for-the-beauty-of-logistics-revolutionizing-sme-trade-a-smart-platform-for-global-partnerships/
- Valuing a Port: Where the Beauty Lies in the Numbers https://www.megconsulting.com/monument-economic-groups-dr-paul-kent-releases-another-article-of-his-for-the-beauty-of-logistics-series-valuing-a-port-where-the-beauty-lies-in-the-numbers/
- The Panama Canal Debate – Sovereignty and Pricing Fairness For the Beauty of Logistics: The Panama Canal Debate – Sovereignty and Pricing Fairness - Monument Economics Group
- Logistics Reimagined: Advancing the Intelligent Logistics System https://www.megconsulting.com/dr-paul-kent-releases-part-1-of-his-paper-logistics-reimagined-advancing-the-intelligent-logistics-system-under-his-for-the-beauty-of-logistics-series/
- Honduras' ICSID Withdrawal and What's at Stake https://www.megconsulting.com/honduras-icsid-withdrawal-and-whats-at-stake/
- Gaza's Port to Prosperity: Building a Sustainable Future Amidst Conflict https://www.megconsulting.com/gazas-port-to-prosperity-building-a-sustainable-future-amidst-conflict/
- From Nobel Laureates to the Cellular Supply Chain: Unveiling Logistics Concepts to Foster Wider Understanding of Scientific Research https://www.megconsulting.com/from-nobel-laureates-to-the-cellular-supply-chain-unveiling-logistics-concepts-to-foster-wider-understanding-of-scientific-research/