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Grant Summary

The research in support of this grant was performed by the PI, Dr. John Olds, and graduate students in the Space Systems Design Lab (SSDL) at Georgia Tech over the period December 1999 to December 2000. The work was sponsored by Dr. Ted Talay, branch chief of the Vehicle Analysis Branch at the NASA Langley Research Center. The objective of the project was to examine the characteristics of future space tourism markets and to identify the vehicle requirements that are necessary to enable this emerging new business segment.

Approach

As reported in the following documentation, the team first performed a literature search to collect background information on the size and price elasticity of the space tourism market, information on previous studies, and examples of space vehicles that could service this market. Once the literature search was completed, the team created a new computer simulation of space tourism markets called "Launch Markets for Normal People" — LMNoP. LMNoP was then used to evaluate a range of vehicle options for entering the space tourism market and for evaluating the key design and economic prerequisites of each. Key economic conclusions were drawn and are documented in the attached material.

LMNoP

"Launch Markets for Normal People" (LMNoP) is a custom, probabilistic space tourism market simulation tool created for this study at Georgia Tech. It models the economic performance of a fictitious new company entering the space tourism business. LMNoP is a multi-sheet Excel® workbook with dynamic links between cells on various pages. The model contains a price elastic market size simulation that is used to predict the number of annual space tourism passengers as a function of ticket price in any given year between 2005 and 2030. The base market data was collected from a number of published sources. Adjustment factors to the base market size were made to account for vehicle characteristics, orbital destinations, and the consequences of unreliability. For example, a vehicle that is only capable of suborbital flight would tend to enable a smaller than normal market at a given price. A vehicle with multiple launch/recovery sites or one with multiple windows for Earth viewing would produce a higher number of passengers at a given price. A vehicle with a complementary orbital destination (e.g. a space hotel) would produce still more passengers.

Of particular note is the treatment of vehicle failure in LMNoP. A loss-of-vehicle failure event in a given year is assumed to temporarily shut down the space tourism business for two years after which recovery is assumed to slowly ramp back up to pre-accident passenger levels over a user defined period of time (nominally 2 - 3 years). If a second failure occurs before the market is fully recovered, the market is assumed to collapse completely with no subsequent recovery.
Given a year-by-year pricing strategy, vehicle development costs, vehicle production costs, vehicle operations cost, vehicle design features (suborbital vs. orbital capability, number of passengers, arrangement of windows, etc.), and loss-of-vehicle reliability, the LMNOP model estimates the key economic metrics expected from the corresponding space tourism business. Internal Rate of Return (IRR) and Net Present Value (NPV) of the project at a user-specified discount rate are typical metrics available.

Due to the significant uncertainties that exist in many of the key assumptions input into LMNoP (most notably, the passenger market size at a given ticket price), the model is run probabilistically in order to generate statistical distributions of the key output metrics. The distributions are determined using 3000 - 5000 direct Monte Carlo simulations for each economic scenario. Crystal Ball® is used to perform the probabilistic analysis. Given triangular input distributions for vehicle-level costs and a weighted normal distribution for expected the market size (decreasing uncertainty with increasing price), the Monte Carlo simulation produces mean, standard deviation, and confidence levels for NPV and IRR. For economic scenarios with similar mean IRR's, the scenario with the lower standard deviation represents lower uncertainty and risk. 80% or 90% confidence levels are also commonly used as a single comparison metric.

**Space Tourism Vehicles Considered**

As documented in the attached presentations and technical papers, the research team considered four different space tourism scenarios that spanned the range of near-term and far-term vehicle options.

1. Near-term Existing Passenger Capsule on an ELV system (Soyuz)
2. Near-term Sub-orbital RLV (X-prize follow-on class)
3. Mid-term Space Tourism Carrier for "Pre-existing" Gen2 RLV
4. Far-term Custom Gen3 Space Tourism RLV

With the exception of the Soyuz vehicle, representative performance and economic data for the candidate vehicle approaches was extracted from previous vehicle design work performed by the Space Systems Design Lab. Key data included vehicle reliability, orbital capability, number of passengers, initial operational year, vehicle non-recurring cost, and vehicle recurring cost.
Sub-Orbital Vehicles
Orbital Vehicles
Space Tourism Categorized Reference List
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Activity Reports


Business Predictions


- Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, "What the United States Must Do To Realize the Economic Promise of Space," The Aerospace Research and Development Policy committee of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. (IEEE), -- United States Activities, December 17, 1993.


Databases


• Space Future, http://www.spacefuture.com/

• Space Tourism information as part of Jim Kingdon’s space markets page, http://www.panix.com/~kingdon/space/tourism.html

• Space Tourism Initiative with bibliography, http://www.hfni.gsehd.gwu.edu/~sptour/index.html


• Space Travel and Tourism Division of the Space Transportation Association, http://www.spacetransportation.org/travelandtourism.htm
Government Incentives


Legal Impacts


Market Research


**Organizations**


- Space Travel and Tourism Division of the Space Transportation Association, http://www.spacetransportation.org/travelandtourism.htm


**Similar Advertising**


**Similar Ventures**


**Space Architecture Synergy**


• Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, "What the United States Must Do To Realize the Economic Promise of Space," The Aerospace Research and Development
Policy committee of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. (IEEE), -- United States Activities, December 17, 1993.


Technology Research


- Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, "What the United States Must Do To Realize the Economic Promise of Space," The Aerospace Research and Development Policy committee of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. (IEEE), -- United States Activities, December 17, 1993.


Tourism Modeling


**Travel Business Modeling**


**Vehicle Designs**


Space Tourism: Making It Work for Fun and Profit

http://www.ssdl.gatech.edu/~gt3562b/ST_Update.html
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Overview

- Motivation
- LMNoP Model Development
  - Market Model
  - Reliability
  - Economics
- Evaluation of Four "Current" Candidate Concepts
- Ranked Identification of Economic Drivers
- "What If" Economic Scenarios
- Conclusions
LMNoP Design Structure Matrix

- Excel Workbook (1.2 Meg)
- Multiple Sheets, Links, Equations
- Crystal Ball Probabilistic Simulation
Base Market Curves

- Basic curves
- Cross section interpolation
- Normal distribution representation
- Mean and std. deviation interpolation
Sample Cash Flow w/ Reliability

Year

Cash Flow/Year
Cash Flow/Cum.
Reliability Multiplier

2005 2010 2015 2020 2025 2030 2035 2040 2045 2050 2055

$M

$1,500 $1,000 $500 $0 $-500 $-1,000 $-1,500

Reliability Multiplier

0.00 0.10 0.20 0.30 0.40 0.50 0.60 0.70 0.80 0.90 1.00
Model Test:
Example Vehicles
Example: Soyuz Purchase

- Russian ELV/Capsule
- 3 passengers (<5 flights/year)
- $0 DDT&E, $0 TFU
- $28M recurring (launch fee)
- Overall Market Multiplier of 0.2

NPV ($M, 15% discount rate)

Price ($M)

Reliability (# nines)
Example: Sub-Orbital RLV

- X-Prize Class Vehicle
- 10 passengers (<2 flights/year)
- Single LOX/Kerosene engine
- $3B DDT&E, $1B TFU
- Overall Market Multiplier of 0.5
Example: SpaceCab for RLV

- 75 Passengers
- Carried by 2nd generation RLV
- Used for orbital trip
- Incremental DDT&E $800M
- $40M/flt to use RLV
- Overall Market Multiplier of 1.0
Example: Advanced RLV

- 3rd generation RLV
- 27 passengers
- HTHL RBCC SSTO
- $5B DDT&E, $4B TFU
- Recurring Costs $7M/flight
- Overall Market Multiplier of 6.0

![Graph showing NPV and Reliability](image)
Identify Driving Factors: Screening Array
Screening Method

- Two level Design of Experiments array
  - Linear model
  - Testing for effects
- 32 Run fractional factorial for 24 variables selected
  - Provides all first order effects
  - Provides some highly confounded second order effects
- Discriminate using 80% confidence level of NPV
# Screening Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Near Term</th>
<th>Far Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (-1)</td>
<td>High (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine TFU</td>
<td>$6M</td>
<td>$10M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine Life</td>
<td>75 fts.</td>
<td>125 fts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engines per AF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity market offerings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital on hand</td>
<td>$1.5B</td>
<td>$2.5B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax rate</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rate</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity financing offerings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed SG&amp;A expense</td>
<td>$22.5M</td>
<td>$37.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable SG&amp;A expense</td>
<td>$100K</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDT&amp;E duration</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for production</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to depreciate assets</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Capacity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Reliability</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe life</td>
<td>375 fts.</td>
<td>625 fts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnaround time</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in flight</td>
<td>0.5 days</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe DDT&amp;E</td>
<td>$2.25B</td>
<td>$3.75B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe TFU</td>
<td>$750M</td>
<td>$1.25B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount at equity offering</td>
<td>$375M</td>
<td>$625M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine DDT&amp;E</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising fee</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Appeal Factor</td>
<td>0.25x</td>
<td>0.5x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2000 Space Systems Design Lab Open House and Review Day*
Near Term Results: 80% NPV

- Based on Sub-orbital RLV
- Pareto Analysis
- Interactions make sense
- Scheduling factors important
Far Term Results: 80% NPV

- Based on 3\textsuperscript{rd} Gen RLV
- Pareto Analysis
- Much different result
- Scheduling factors still important
Identify Economic Goals
Near Term Results: Cost Goals

- $8M Ticket Price
- Change input variables to attain 80% confidence of positive NPV
- Error equation used

$$\text{Error} = \sum_{\text{all variables}} \left( \frac{\text{Variable}_{\text{setting}} - \text{baseline}}{\text{Variable}_{\text{min}} - \text{Variable}_{\text{max}}} \right)^2$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Idealized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engine TFU</td>
<td>$8M</td>
<td>$6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital on hand</td>
<td>$2B</td>
<td>$5B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Rate</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rate</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDT&amp;E duration</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production duration</td>
<td>3 year</td>
<td>4 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe DDT&amp;E</td>
<td>$3B</td>
<td>$1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe TFU</td>
<td>$1B</td>
<td>$200M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add-on Contribution</td>
<td>$77M</td>
<td>$1M/7$M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Appeal</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>1st class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NPV ($M, 25% discount rate)
Far Term Results: Optimistic Scenario

- **$15,000 Price**
- ~600,000 Flights per Year
- Change input variables to a low-price, high volume scenario
- Results in large variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airframe DDT&amp;E</td>
<td>$20B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe TFU</td>
<td>$100M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine DDT&amp;E</td>
<td>$3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine TFU</td>
<td>$20M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurring Cost</td>
<td>$10,000 per flight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engines per airframe</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>99.999999%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe &amp; Engine Life</td>
<td>3,000 flights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed SG&amp;A expenses</td>
<td>$15M per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable SG&amp;A expenses</td>
<td>$10,000 per flight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn around time</td>
<td>0.1 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in flight</td>
<td>0.5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch site fee</td>
<td>$10,000 per flight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Appeal</td>
<td>7/7 of Orbital Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital on hand</td>
<td>$10B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Price</td>
<td>$15,000 per seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Capacity</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Growth Rate</td>
<td>5% per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation Rate</td>
<td>3% per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of failure</td>
<td>$200M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NPV ($M, 25% discount rate)
Unconsidered Benefits

- Local and Federal government incentives
  - Training
  - Tax Breaks

- Lottery marketing

- Theme park integration

- Space Sports / Reality Television
  - CBS recently paid $6.2B for NCAA Tournament rights
  - $40M for Destination Mir
Conclusions

- Up-front cost critical for high ticket price, low flight rate ventures, even with $3B on hand
  - SpaceCab using separately developed RLV looks promising

- Best pricing scenario is platform dependent
  - Optimization favors high price, low flight rate solution
  - High Reliability (>0.999999) required to benefit from low ticket price

- Marked uncertainty at low price (high flight rate) creates unacceptable spread (risk) in expected NPV
Space Tourism: Making it Work for Fun and Profit

Dr. John R. Olds*, David McCormick†, Ashraf Charania# and Leland Marcus*
Space Systems Design Laboratory
School of Aerospace Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332-0150

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes the findings of a recent study of space tourism markets and vehicles conducted by the Space Systems Design Laboratory at Georgia Tech under sponsorship of the NASA Langley Research Center. The purpose of the study was to investigate and quantitatively model the driving economic factors and launch vehicle characteristics that affect businesses entering the space tourism industry. If the growing public interest in space tourism can be combined with an economically sound business plan, the opportunity to create a new and profitable era for space flight is possible. This new era will be one in which human space flight is routine and affordable for many more people. The results of the current study will hopefully serve as a guide to commercial businesses wishing to enter this potentially profitable emerging market.

NOMENCLATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>airframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDT&amp;E</td>
<td>design, development, testing and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2000</td>
<td>fiscal year 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC</td>
<td>initial operating capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>internal rate of return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMNoP</td>
<td>Launch Marketing for Normal People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV</td>
<td>net present value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLV</td>
<td>reusable launch vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG&amp;A</td>
<td>Selling, General and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAT</td>
<td>turn around time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFU</td>
<td>theoretical first unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF</td>
<td>time in flight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTRODUCTION

Study Overview

The present research was conducted in four distinct phases. Phase 1 consisted of the development of a new flexible modeling tool for simulating the future space tourism launch market. This new tool, LMNoP, predicts the number of passengers (space tourists) available to the market in any given year as a function of ticket price, expanding market size, perceived reliability, number of launch sites, orbital vs. sub-orbital capabilities, passenger accommodations, airframe lifetime, and other variables. Coupled with launch vehicle characteristics such as development cost, turnaround time, recurring cost, and number of passengers, the LMNoP model allows an analyst to model the economic attractiveness of any proposed space tourism scenario. LMNoP is a stochastic model and directly treats uncertainty in market size and growth using Monte Carlo simulation techniques. The economic results are therefore distributions of expected return on investment, net present value, etc. for an optimized ticket pricing strategy. Phase 2 has tested this new tool is tested on several proposed space tourism transportation options to determine if any makes a strong business case. Phase 3 of the project has identified and prioritized the major economic drivers for a profitable business case and has useful established goals/targets for the most important
vehicle characteristics (e.g. reliability > 0.9999, investment cost < $1.5B). Phase 4 used the sensitivities generated by Phase 3 to find an economically viable space tourism transportation option.

Background

As regular Space Shuttle and Soyuz flights make spaceflight seem routine to many people, the subject of private space tourism is making appearances in the popular press with increasing regularity.

Figure 1 - Space Tourism Theme Park.

The conclusions of many studies to date are that this business area will be lucrative. Penn and Lindley conclude that with near-term reusable technology, a viable space tourism business can be created using very high flight rates and inexpensive propellants. They also conclude that the market size is adequate to support the industry. The argument was a the extremely high flight rates, the cost of expensive cryogens actually became a driving factor in cost, contrary to current launch vehicles, where propellant costs are small enough compared to other costs that they can essentially be overlooked. To further bolster reusable launch vehicle flight rates, synergies between a high flight rate space tourism model and a high flight rate cargo market like space solar power were also identified. A similar conclusion is reached by Rogers who supports a shift in mindset for future launch vehicle projects to vehicles with high operability and low costs for launch.

To assist the space tourism segment of the industry, there are many other synergies with ground-based industries such as theme parks and advertising. These could help reduce some of the economic burden when compared to an exclusive passenger carrier activity. These ground-based industries could also be enablers for space tourism.

Factors such as this combined with the promises of certain new technologies intended to make human space flight both safer and more cost effective, make private space flight seem more likely than ever.

Motivation

Point - Spaceflight has intrigued the popular consciousness since before mankind even knew of its possibility. The vastness of the cosmos combined with the feeling of discovery is an experience enjoyed by most only vicariously through astronauts. Just as atmospheric flight was first only experienced by few onlookers gawking at early barnstorming and select members of the military, then progressed to be experienced by only the very wealthy to the current day or routine air travel, space travel should eventually progress to the average person. It is the destiny of spaceflight to follow this same paradigm and open the heavens to the masses.

Counterpoint - That's all great, but I want to make money.

To date, it has been hard to get around Counterpoint. Certainly, as evidenced by government programs, it is technically feasible to send humans into space for extended periods of time and return them safely to earth. Thus, the economic challenge is the only thing standing in the way of the enjoyment of space for orders of magnitude more people than enjoy it today. What cost goals do the aerospace community
have to meet in order to bring this industry to fruition?

To answer those questions as well as aid future inquiries into the business of space tourism is essential to its emergence. At the center of this research is a stochastic cost analysis used to evaluate several concepts, identify driving factors in the economic viability in selected areas of the design space and then use this information in a cost-as-an-independent-variable analysis to determine the "break points" for the values of the input variables for the cost analysis. These "break points" should show how far this industry must go to be successful.

**LAUNCH MARKETING FOR NORMAL PEOPLE (LMNOP)**

**Overview**

LMNOP is a new stochastic Microsoft Excel® business simulation for space tourism created during the course of this research. It takes vehicle economic characteristics such as design, development, testing and evaluation (DDT&E), theoretical first unit (TFU) cost, reliability, etc. and inserts these data into a random process simulation. This simulation then does a life cycle cost analysis on the vehicle based on input from a stochastic market demand model, a consequence-based vehicle failure simulation and a customer-appeal analysis module.

These then use pseudo-random number generation to create a different scenario for each recalculation of the model. The model is run on the order of one thousand trials and a distribution for economic evaluation parameters is generated. These distributions provide economic feasibility information in the form of probability distributions.

**Life Cycle Cost**

LMNOP builds a vehicle development program around projected space tourism market demand. The financial qualities of that program are determined from user defined programmatic and cost variables. The company that is building the vehicle is assumed to be the same as the provider of launch service for the space tourists.
LMNoP does not have the capability to cost concepts given a particular vehicle definition. The costs in the model come from other sources (such as from literature reviews for existing concepts like the Soyuz or cost estimating relationships for Hyperion). These costs are integrated into the LMNoP financial engine in order to determine the full financial scope of the project. LMNoP is robust enough to handle different vehicle concepts, development schemes, financing plans, and pricing structures. LMNoP is also well suited to handle new developments in operations through its use of a site fee. A built in assumption is that no vehicle will build its own indigenous launch facility (with associated capital expenditures) but rather pay user fees at some future spaceport or lease operations at existing facilities.

The economic and financial portions of the LMNoP model obtain inputs from the program definition, flight reliability, and multipliers section of the model. Financial metrics like internal rate of return (IRR) and net present value (NPV) are determined through calculation of specific program costs. These are then coupled with user-defined pricing with associated multipliers that originate in other parts of the model. Five sets of program definition inputs are needed. These are broken into economic, financing, schedule, fleet, and pricing.

Program Definition

The economic variables that need to be defined for each analysis include the dollar year that all subsequent values are based upon, inflation rate, tax rate, discount rate, and average annual interest rate (used for calculation of the interest that needs to be paid on deferred liability or debt).

The financing variables include those that determine both the frequency and amount of equity (i.e. stock) offered as well as the per-year fixed and per-flight variable selling, general, and administrative (SG&A) expense.

The scheduling variables include user determination of initial operating capability (IOC), program termination, years for vehicle development, and years to ramp up to full operability. Before any flights can occur, LMNoP (based upon user input) segments airframe and engine development into appropriate years before IOC.

The model can handle up to three new, separate vehicle sub-developments in the program (with the capability of modeling up to two stages for each vehicle). This can account for the same company building a sub-orbital vehicle and then transitioning in a future year to an orbital vehicle. For each stage of the vehicle (as well as where appropriate its associated propulsion module) the following fleet definition variables are needed: passenger capacity per launch, overall reliability, flight lifetime, turn-around time, time in orbit, DDT&E cost, TFU cost, learning effects, and government contribution percentages.

The pricing variables include insurance definitions, charges for failures, and site fee costs per flight. Insurance in this case refers only to vehicle liability insurance per flight based upon the expected probability of failure (1- overall reliability) multiplied by the TFU cost of the vehicle's airframe and engine. If there is a failure in any particular year, two economic effects instantly result: namely the company is out of business for a specified number of years (accepting a user defined one-time charge to account for program recovery and victim redress) and all subsequent insurance charges per flight increase by a certain user defined percentage.

If the vehicle is modeled as an already existing development (i.e. like a Soyuz) a set recurring cost per flight can be set. Yearly pricing options include both static and varying (based upon either a linear or quadratic pricing). Up to five different revenue types can be used to account for additional revenues from non-direct sources (i.e. advertising on vehicle, television revenue, etc.).
Financials
A separate mission and costs section determines the spread of flights dependent upon market captured for various prices. This translates into non-recurring costs (booster/propulsion development and government contribution), recurring costs (launch site fees and business failure charges), and revenues (from static/variable pricing and revenue add-ons). Equity calculations are then determined along with associated depreciation schedules. Depreciation is defined using U.S. government standards based upon a 5-year depreciation of fixed assets. A separate debt calculation is made with the assumption that negative cash flows in any given year (after accounting for revenue and equity infusion) are paid off using either long or short-term bonds (20, 15, 10, 5, or 1 year varieties). For this financial analysis, the free cash flow is defined in Eqn. 1.

\[
\text{Earnings before Interest and Taxes (EBIT)}
\]

- Taxes (tax shields from negative income years carried over until exhausted by tax liability)

- Capital Expenditures (airframe and engine acquisition)

+ Depreciation

\[
= \text{Free Cash Flow}
\]

All the above information is aggregated to obtain the discounted cash flows and associated summary metrics like NPV (for NPV, based upon user defined discount rates).

---

Figure 3 – LMNoP Schematic.
Market Demand Model

The pre-adjusted market demand is based on a literature search. This search focused on survey results that specified launch market demand as a function of ticket price. It resulted in two market surveys that are used in LMNoP.

The primary source for market information is the Commercial Space Transportation Study conducted by a consortium of aerospace companies for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). This provides information based on worldwide incomes and the likelihood of those with sufficient income interested in a space trip purchasing a ticket. This represents a more bottom-up approach. The second is a top-down approach by Nagatomo and Collins. This provides market survey data to augment the CSTS information. All market information used is for worldwide demand.

![Figure 4 - Market Curves for LMNoP.](image)

This results in a population of results for each of the price points of the investigation. To account for this population spread, a normal distribution is fitted to the data at selected price cross-sections. From this, the model interpolates the mean and variance of the normal distribution to obtain the probability distribution for the number of customers at a specified price. Then for each year of the simulation, a random member of that distribution is selected to be the number of customers for that particular year. This results in a randomly fluctuating customer base for each simulation that tests the robustness of a project against changing market conditions.

This market information is then fed to the reliability and customer appeal modules for adjustment before it is sent to the life cycle cost model.

Reliability Module

The reliability module contributes to LMNoP by placing a multiplier on the baseline customer demand information provided by the market module. When there are no failures, this multiplier is unity and there is no change to the remaining sections of LMNoP. Once a failure occurs, the module begins to modify the market demand as well as affect cash flow. Whether or not a failure occurs is modeled by a constant hazard rate for each year based on the number of flights in that year. There is no break-in period or age effects on reliability.

The most immediate impact of a failure in LMNoP is a fixed charge to the operating expenses of the company. This represents the liability associated with carrying members of the general public. This charge can be user-specified and should be in line with the expenses associated with an airline accident involving loss of life. The one time charge should be punitive enough so as to discourage reliability low enough to cause failure.

The second aspect of a launch failure is a complete shutdown of market demand and therefore flight operations while the cause of the failure is investigated and remedied. This period of time can be more than a year and significantly affects the profitability of a space tourism concept.

The third impact of a failure is a slow linear ramp-up in customer demand following a failure. This is designed to simulate the rebuilding of trust in the company over time after operating successfully.
The final impact of failure results from the possibility of a second failure during the ramp-up period. It is expected that this would completely obliterate public confidence in the project, driving market demand and therefore the flight rate of the project to zero. In LIVINoP, this results complete business shutdown and halts life cycle cost analysis.

Fig. 3 shows an example of the market multiplier effect of a failure. There is a failure in year 25 and then another in year 30 during the recovery period. This is fatal to the business and the analysis of this case ends at that time.

![Figure 5 - Consequences of Failure.](image)

**Customer Appeal Market Multipliers**

It is obvious that certain entertainment value factors of a space tour will increase desirability. LIVINoP divides these factors into comfort, visibility, duration and availability. Unfortunately, the literature search did not reveal the quantitative effects of these intangible items on customer demand, so engineering judgment determined the values for each of these factors.

**Comfort**

Comfort is divided into four categories, all directly modeled after airline comfort levels. Comfort level for this model is primarily defined by the amount of volume afforded each passenger. LIVINoP recognizes the following categories of passenger comfort:

- **Sub-Coach** – This level of comfort is less than that of the average Coach-level airline flight. There is a minimal amount of room with no amenities. This has a market multiplication factor of 0.5.
- **Coach** – This level is the same as that for airline coach class, with the exception of food and beverage service. It is doubtful this will be possible during an earth-to-orbit ascent. This has a market multiplication factor of 1.0.
- **Business Class** – This offers more room than coach, with the possibility of flight crew service during extended flights. This has a market multiplication factor of 1.5.
- **First Class** – This is everything a first class passenger might expect on a major airline. This has a market multiplication factor of 2.0.

**Visibility**

Visibility provides a better passenger experience and affects the market model as follows:

- **Multiple people per window** – 0.5 times standard market.
- **One window per person** – 1.0 times standard market.
- **One large window per person** – 1.5 times standard market.
- **“Glass ceiling” view** – 2.0 times standard market

**Duration**

Duration of the flight also influences passenger experience and therefore affects the market as:

- **Sub-Orbital** – 0.5 times standard market
- **Single Earth Orbit** – 1.0 times standard market
- **Multiple Earth Orbits** – 1.5 times standard market
Space Hotel – 2 times standard market

Availability
The number of global launch sites can affect the market size for a space entertainment venture. Here it is assumed that 3 launch sites enables global market capture. This is based on the assumptions of the market surveys that make up the base global market model that the three main markets for space tourism will be Europe, North America and the Pacific Rim. A curve fit to the market capture for 1, 2 and 3 sites was extracted and this is used as a multiplier for the base market model. This given in Eqn. 2:

\[0.57735 \sqrt{\text{Number _ sites}}\]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

CONCEPT RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overview
To both test the LMNoP model and see where several concepts stand as far as their profitability in a space tourism environment, LMNoP was run on four concepts. They vary from currently flying (Soyuz) to many years into the future using a representative third generation launch vehicle concept. All analyze the business case for an owner/operator of some type of hardware component for carrying people into space.

Soyuz Purchase

The Soyuz (Fig. 6) test is designed to test current space tourism opportunities using the LMNoP model.\textsuperscript{7,8} Because trips to Mir via Soyuz capsules are already being marketed to an elite clientele, this should give a relative idea of how our modeling technique would evaluate such a plan. The basic idea is to purchase a Soyuz flight for a fixed price for 3 passengers from the Russian government in exchange for an orbital flight for paying passengers. This is a low up-front investment space tourism strategy.

Concept Assumptions
Soyuz was selected to represent using a current expendable launch vehicle in the space tourism market. Because it used existing technology DDT&E and TFU were assumed to be zero. Also, because there was no risk associated with developing a new launch system, the discount rate for calculating NPV was chosen as 15%, the lowest of all the candidate designs. The fee paid to the Russian government is assumed to be $28M.

Price Sweep
As is evident from Fig. 7, the optimal pricing strategy is largely determined by the price paid to the Russian government for the Soyuz launch. This optimal price is very close to the maximum of $10M per passenger for the LMNoP market model. It is to be expected as the cost to the space tour company is $9M per person on the flight. This profit margin does not compare well to the 15% discount rate. The price also means this is not the gateway to space for the average person.
Reliability Sweep

Fig. 8 is a very interesting result. Here, the lower the reliability, the better the business case. This is because the project does better when it is driven out of business early by the failure model. Obviously, this should not be taken as encouraging low launch vehicle reliability, but it may indicate a proper time limit on this particular project. This trade was done for a constant $10M ticket price.

Sub-orbital Reusable Rocket

The inclusion of this vehicle is designed to test the feasibility of near-term sub-orbital Reusable Launch Vehicles (RLV’s) at providing entertainment class space transportation. When compared to an orbital rocket of similar design, the sub-orbital rocket is much smaller, with lower up front and operating costs. It also performs a less stressful mission profile than a comparable orbital RLV.

Table 1 - Sub-Orbital Vehicle Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Weight</td>
<td>265 klb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Weight</td>
<td>35 klb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum Thrust</td>
<td>370 klb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Thrust</td>
<td>330 klb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Ratio</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Price Sweep

It is evident from Fig. 10 that there is an optimum price at around $8M. This is not surprising since there is a recurring cost associated with this vehicle on the same order of magnitude as this ticket price.
Concept Assumptions

SpaceCab uses a 2nd Generation (RLV) to carry a specially designed passenger cabin in its payload bay, similar to the way the Space Lab module rides in the payload bay of the Space Shuttle. The defining characteristics for this module are the number of passengers and total time on internal power. The number of passengers is determined by a gross mass constraint of 40 klb., the estimated payload capacity of a typical 2nd Generation RLV concept. Based on these weights, development costs are estimated at 912 M$ DDT&E and 208 M$ TFU. Because of this additional financial risk, the discount rate is 20%.

Second Generation RLV Add-on Module

There is a chance that in the near future, there will be a commercial RLV with the capability to return payload from orbit. If the reliability of this RLV is high enough, a low cost option for space tourism might be to use this existing platform with the addition of a passenger pod, or SpaceCab. This concept represents minimal up-front cost with low recurring cost for an orbital vehicle.
Reliability Sweep

The curves for reliability in Fig. 14 show that the concept is fairly insensitive to the possibility of failure. This is most likely due to its low flight rate and high ticket price. Only when the chance of failure is greater than one percent does the NPV begin to suffer.

![Figure 14 - Reliability Sweep of RLV Add-On Module](image)

Third Generation Dedicated RLV

An advanced third generation RLV was tested to determine how well a dedicated space tourism vehicle designed to ferry passengers to and from low earth orbit would fare economically. This vehicle has a considerable non-recurring cost with low recurring cost. It also has a high level of customer appeal, which helps the market demand.

Concept Assumptions

Here a modified third generation launch vehicle (Fig. 15) is considered. It is an RBCC-engined SSTO vehicle with horizontal takeoff and landing capability. It is assumed to be the transportation segment of an orbiting space hotel project and therefore has more market appeal than a simple orbital vehicle.

For the business analysis in LMNoP, an owner/operator is assumed for the launch vehicle and the passengers pay the transportation segment of their journey independently from the hotel stay. This somewhat isolates the business plan for the shuttle from the business plan for the hotel.

![Figure 15 - Advanced RLV Three View](image)

Price Sweep

To get an idea of far future business opportunities, an advanced RLV concept was analyzed with LMNoP across a range of prices. Apparently, the low recurring cost estimate for this vehicle was not enough to overcome the high nonrecurring costs. This vehicle loses money for all price ranges relative to a 25% discount rate.

![Figure 16 - Price Sweep of Advanced RLV](image)

Reliability Sweep

![Figure 17 - Reliability Sweep of Advanced RLV](image)
At the constant price of $8M, it does not appear that the reliability required is any different from any other vehicle in this price range. Fig. 17 shows there is again a significant penalty for going below 99%, but reliability above that is more than able to support the flight rate.

**ECONOMIC PARAMETER SCREENING ARRAY**

**Purpose**

To determine the economic drivers for a successful space tourism business, a screening array was conducted on the inputs to LMNoP. These include the vehicle performance and cost characteristics as well as the business scheduling information, such as the amount of time for DDT&E and time to build the first vehicle. This test yields valuable information regarding where cost cutting efforts should be directed in commercial RLV technology for space tourism.

**Procedure**

The screening array used for this test was a 32 run, 2 level fractional factorial design for 24 variables. This test yields unconfounded first order effect information with a small number of highly confounded second order effects. The final effect test was run both with and without the two level effects and showed little difference in the magnitude and ordering of the driving factors. This indicates that there is probably little interaction between the input variables.

The primary ranking criterion is the 80% confidence-level on NPV. This was chosen because it is a conservative measure of the profitability of the project being screened.

**Variables**

The inputs variables for the screening arrays and a brief definition of each are described below:

- **Engine TFU** - The theoretical first unit (TFU) cost of the first operational engine of the vehicle program. This value is irrespective of any learning curve effect.
- **Engine Life** - The number of total flights before replacement of an engine on the vehicle is necessary.
- **Engines/ airframe (AF)** - The number of engines per airframe for the vehicle.
- **Equity market access count** - The number of rounds (years) during the life of the program when equity in the commercial entity is sold. Financing is accomplished by selling common stock or preferred stock to investors.
- **Capital on hand** - The amount of capital possessed by the company at the beginning of the project. This value is irrespective of the project being evaluated for investment.
- **Tax Rate** - The governmental tax rate on the commercial entity's net income.
- **Interest Rate** - The basic value of the interest rate for long-term debt for the commercial entity (cost of debt capital).
- **Equity financing frequency** - The number of years from one round of equity financing to the next (if multiple offerings are desired) starting from the second round of equity financing.
- **Equity-offering amount** - The amount of equity in the commercial entity sold in each round (year) of financing.
- **Fixed SG&A expense** - Balance sheet item, which combines base salaries, commissions, and travel expenses for executives and salespeople, advertising costs, and payroll expenses per year.
Variable SG&A expense - Balance sheet item, which combines incremental salaries, commissions, and travel expenses for executives and salespeople, advertising costs, and payroll expenses per launch.

Time for DDT&E - The number of years required for the vehicle airframe/ engine design, development, testing, and evaluation (DDT&E).

Time from Production to IOC - The number of years from start of initial rate vehicle airframe and engine production to initial operating capability (IOC).

Time to depreciate fixed assets - The number of years used to depreciate all fixed assets in the program.

Passengers per Launch - The passenger capability of the vehicle.

Reliability - The overall system reliability of the vehicle (includes airframe and engine.)

AF life - The number of total flights before replacement of the airframe on the vehicle is necessary.

Turn around time (TAT) - The number of elapsed days it takes for a vehicle returning from a mission to be recycled in preparation for the next launch.

Time in flight (TIF) - The number of elapsed days for a typical vehicle mission.

AF DDT&E - The cost for design, development, testing, and evaluation (DDT&E) of the airframe of the vehicle.

AF TFU - The theoretical first unit (TFU) cost of the first operational airframe of the vehicle program.

Engine DDT&E - The cost for design, development, testing, and evaluation (DDT&E) of the engine of the vehicle.

Add-on contribution per launch - The additional revenue per launch obtained through non-primary sources.

Customer Appeal - Multiplier placed on baseline market demand to account for factors such as comfort, flight duration and visibility.

Vehicle Test Variable Ranges

For the test on the near term sub-orbital and third generation orbital RLV's, the variables described in the variables section were used. All monetary values are for fiscal year 2000 (FY2000.) Their levels for these tests were as follows:

Table 2 - Settings for Sub_Orbital RLV Screening Array

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engine TFU</td>
<td>$6M</td>
<td>$10M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine Life</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engines per AF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity market offerings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital on hand</td>
<td>$1.5B</td>
<td>$2.5B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax rate</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rate</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity financing offerings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed SG&amp;A expense</td>
<td>$22.5M</td>
<td>$37.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable SG&amp;A expense</td>
<td>$100K</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDT&amp;E duration</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for production</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to depreciate assets</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Capacity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Reliability</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe life</td>
<td>375 flt.</td>
<td>625 flt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnaround time</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in flight</td>
<td>0.5 days</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe DDT&amp;E</td>
<td>$2.25B</td>
<td>$3.75B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe TFU</td>
<td>$750M</td>
<td>$1.25B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount at equity offering</td>
<td>$375M</td>
<td>$625M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine DDT&amp;E</td>
<td>$0M</td>
<td>$0.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising fee</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Appeal Factor</td>
<td>0.25x</td>
<td>0.5x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results

#### Sub-orbital Reusable Rocket Variable Effects

The results for the sub-orbital RLV effect screening are interesting. As expected, the cost and scheduling variables are quite important to the response. However, the major player is the government tax rate. This is likely due to the fact that the bottom value of the experiment design for this variable was zero percent. Zero tax rate would reflect a potential tax-free policy for space tourism enterprises to help the industry get started. It is important to note that these rankings depend a great deal on the area of the design space being explored.
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Figure 18– Pareto Plot for 80% Confidence
NPV for Sub-Orbital RLV
```
Looking subjectively at this Pareto plot, the major variable players are:

- Tax rate
- Number of years for DDT&E
- Airframe TFU
- Airframe DDT&E
- Add-on revenue per launch
- Number of years from unit production to IOC
- Engine TFU

Engine TFU must be considered because of its interaction with engines per airframe. This information will serve as a guideline when conducting the space tourism economic goal search.

**Third Generation RLV Variable Effects**

The advanced RLV has customer appeal as its major factor. This translates to increased importance of the market prediction model variance for this concept. It should be noted that the overall effect of Engines/AF is to change the cost values for the engines. Therefore, the importance of all these variables can be considered linked.

Again looking subjectively at the Pareto plot, the major drivers are:

- Customer appeal
- Engines per airframe
- Number of years for DDT&E
- Engine TFU
- Turn around time
- Number of years from unit production to IOC

Most of the other effects are likely due to noise.

**PRIORITIZED GOALS FOR SELECTED CONCEPTS**

**Procedure**

For this part of the research, the variable inputs of LMNoP are changed until a viable space tourism project is attained (defined as 80% confidence of positive NPV.) This is done for the purpose of identifying an example of what cost goals will result in a viable project. Of course, it must be said the settings that result in a viable vehicle are not unique.

This is done for two vehicle projects. The first is the near term technology sub-orbital rocket from...
the screening array. This viability search is based on changing the variable values from their baseline values. This is possible because of the near feasibility of the screening array results.

The test for the far term vehicle is somewhat different. Using contemporary estimates, the economic parameters for this vehicle were insufficient to yield a workable concept. This means the results of the screening array are not valid for this low price, high flight rate scenario.

**Sub-Orbital Rocket**

**Problem Statement**

In order to ensure a reasonable final set of design variables, an error function (Eqn. 3) has been introduced. This function includes a reasonable range for each variable to make sure that each term is weighted properly.

\[
\text{Error} = \sum \left( \frac{\text{Variable setting} - \text{baseline}}{\text{Reasonable min} - \text{Reasonable max}} \right)^3
\]  

(3)

Using this, the problem statement for this part of the research is to minimize the Error function while maintaining a viable design. To be viable, all of the input variable settings must be physically possible and the 80% confidence level of NPV must be positive.

The variable set for this problem can be inferred from the results in Table 4.

**Results**

Several large changes from the initial baseline values were required to attain a positive NPV for 80% of the cases. The largest adjustment was the Capital on hand. Higher capital on hand tended to lower the spread on NPV by reducing the chances of having financing costs dominate the LCC.

**Table 4 – Variable Setting Results of Goal Analysis for Sub-Orbital RLV.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engine TFU</td>
<td>$8M</td>
<td>$6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital on hand</td>
<td>$2B</td>
<td>$3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Rate</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rate</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDT&amp;E duration</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production duration</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>3 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe DDT&amp;E</td>
<td>$3B</td>
<td>$1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe TFU</td>
<td>$1B</td>
<td>$200M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add-on Contribution</td>
<td>$0 / fit.</td>
<td>$1M / fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Appeal</td>
<td>Sub-coach</td>
<td>1st class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 20, the final distribution of NPV, shows a large spread, but 80% of the distribution is positive. This shows that if these cost goals can be met, there is a high probability of a project like this succeeding.

![Figure 20 – Final Distribution of NPV for Sub-Orbital Rocket.](image)

**Third Generation RLV**

The baseline values for the third generation RLV did not provide any chance for this concept to become feasible. Therefore, an example using the assumption of low ticket price as well as airline-like operations and recurring cost was run as an example goal for this market segment.
Assumptions
To attempt to simulate the performance of a far-future space tour airline, some rather optimistic assumptions were made. These are documented below in Table 5. All dollar values are for FY2000.

Table 5 – Third Generation RLV Optimistic Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airframe DDT&amp;E</td>
<td>$20B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe TFU</td>
<td>$100M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine DDT&amp;E</td>
<td>$3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine TFU</td>
<td>$20M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurring Cost</td>
<td>$10,000 per flight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engines per airframe</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>99.9999999%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe &amp; Engine Life</td>
<td>3,000 flights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed SG&amp;A expenses</td>
<td>$15M per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable SG&amp;A expenses</td>
<td>$10,000 per flight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn around time</td>
<td>0.1 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in flight</td>
<td>0.5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch site fee</td>
<td>$10,000 per flight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Appeal</td>
<td>1st class w/ Orbital Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital on hand</td>
<td>$10B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Price</td>
<td>$15,000 per seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Capacity</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Rate</td>
<td>30% per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation Rate</td>
<td>3% per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of failure</td>
<td>$200M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results
Fig. 21 shows that the assumptions above do provide for the possibility of a viable vehicle according to the requirements of this test. However, the variance of the NPV is so large that it is still uncertain whether this business will be boom or bust.

CONCLUSIONS
The conclusions of this research cover the areas of feasibility and technology areas for future concentration. These should be considered as recommendations.

1. Space tourism as a concept could be feasible. With maturation of certain technologies, there might be a concept capable of supporting a feasible space tourism business.

2. Large leaps in cost metrics will be required to make space tourism a reality for the average person. This type of operation requires truly airline-like operation, something out of reach for current launch vehicle approaches.

3. Design and construction cycle times are important to the feasibility of the concepts observed here. This means that advanced design and construction planning techniques are just as important as other technologies to the success of space tourism.

4. Government policy is vital to the growth of this industry. Incubation policies are important to the near term industries, while
strict safety guidelines will be needed as flight rates rise.

FUTURE WORK

Several items for potential future work have been identified during the course of this work.

1. LMNoP Market Model – The market model in LMNoP randomly selects a point from an uncertainty distribution every year. This point is unrelated to the point selected for the previous year. It would be more realistic to assume that there is a large uncertainty the first year, with small dispersions in subsequent years. This large randomness in demand causes problems with purchasing schedules, etc. that would likely not be as extreme in a real business.

2. Computational Speed – The computational cost of the LMNoP spreadsheet is significant. It currently consumes about one hour on a 500 MhZ Pentium III to complete a full Monte Carlo simulation of one vehicle. This is a hindrance to trade studies or optimization. There is a possible future effort to translate CABAM\textsuperscript{11} (Cost and Business Analysis Module, the Space System Design Lab cost model) into a compiled code. Since LMNoP and CABAM share a few components, it might be possible to also compile LMNoP with minimal effort.

3. Vehicle Design – A more in-depth vehicle design process may yield new insight into lucrative areas of the design space.
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Overview

- Motivation
- LMNoP Model Development
  - Market Model
  - Reliability
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- Example Vehicles
- Screening Array
- Economic Goal Analysis
- Conclusions
Space Tourism Motivation

- Launch Marketing for Normal People (LMNoP)
- Tool for simulating space tourism business scenarios
- Find driving factors in space tourism vehicle design
- Use factors to find goals for a space tourism vehicle
LMNoP Module Schematic

Program Definition
- Economic
- Financing
- Schedule
- Fleet Definition
- Pricing

Market Model
- Price Regressed Data
- Stochastic Reliability Multipliers
- Comfort and Appeal Multipliers

Economic Analysis
- Mission and Costs
- Equity, Cash Flows and Depreciation
- Debt
- Financial Statements

Summary Metrics
- IRR
- ROI
- Revenue
- NPV
- Max. Exposure
- Total Number of Failures
Model Development:

Market Research
Base Market Curves

- Basic curves
- Interpolate mean and standard deviation
- Randomly select from normal distribution to get number of passengers in a year
Number of Launch Sites

- Assumes three launch sites for a base multiplier of one
- Can vary over time
- Multiplier Expression: $0.57735 \sqrt{\text{Number of Sites}}$
Market Expansion

- Random process simulation
- Each year, market grows by a random percent
- Variable defined by a normal probability density function
- User inputs mean and standard deviation

Random # generator

One year market growth
Comfort Overlay

Simulates Effect of Volume per Passenger on the Market Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Market Multiplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Coach</td>
<td>Sub-Orbital</td>
<td>Multiple People per Window</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>One Orbit</td>
<td>Window per Person</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Class</td>
<td>Multiple Orbits</td>
<td>Large Window per Person</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Class</td>
<td>Space Hotel</td>
<td>Transparent Ceiling</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Reliability Analysis

- Modeled as Exponential Distribution
- Business temporarily closes after failure
- Resumes at half market size
- Ramps up to full capacity over recovery period
- If a failure occurs in recovery period, out of business

 Constant Hazard Rate =
(1-Flight Reliability) x (# flights in year)
Model Development.

Economics
Economic Modeling Overview

LMNoP

- Market Definition Module
- Reliability Module
- Economic Modeling Module

Programmatic Definition
Mission Production Plan and Costs
Equity, Cash Flow and Depreciation
Debt
Statements
Summary
Economic Modeling Detail

Programmatic Definition
Economic, financing, start years, vehicle cost definition, vehicle learning and rate effects, government contribution, fleet lifetime, turn-around time, time-in-orbit, vehicle reliability, insurance premium, and revenue add-ons

Mission Production Plan and Costs
Flights per year, failure years, price per passenger per year, DDT&E and fleet acquisition schedule, non-recurring cost, site fee, and additional cost per launch input

Equity, Cash Flow and Depreciation
Equity financing occurrence, revenue and cash flow, and depreciation schedule w/o salvage value

Debt
Debt scheduling options for 20, 15, 10, 5, and 1 year bonds

Statements
Income statement, cash flow, balance sheet, and NPV calculation

Summary
Financial metrics, LCC summary, cash flow diagram, price diagram
Economic Module Description

- 50 year maximum program life with user definable program schedule and up to three separate input vehicles
  - DDT&E / TFU / learning effect / rate effect / govt. contribution level / fleet lifetimes / reliabilities all adjustable (airframe and propulsion)

- Economic interface with multipliers
  - Identify base year when tourism market demand begins
  - Demand during vehicle DDT&E / TFU years is captured and distributed over first few years of flight (pre-ordering seats)
  - Integer vehicle flights, excess passengers / year onto next year's manifest

- Insurance penalty for failures, for 1st failure and recurring

- Can have up to five revenue add-ons (advertising, etc.)

- Propulsion / airframe acquired one year before program need
Vehicle Development Schedule

- Economic module determines appropriate number of vehicles to build and exact years of acquisition

- Determines acquisition schedule for both airframes and engines

  Economic Model

  - Vehicle Lifetime
  - Time on Station
  - Turn-Around Time

  Actual Number of Vehicles Needed per Each Program Year
Financial Irregularity: Multiple IRRs

- IRR = the rate that causes project's Net Present Value (NPV) to be zero
- Program failures in out years result in zero revenue, but costs continue
- Program cash flow fluctuate, flipping from (+) to (-) and back many times
- Result is multiple, legitimate IRRs

\[
NPV = C_o + C_1/(1 + IRR) + ... + C_N/(1 + IRR)^N = 0
\]
where \( C_i \) is cash flow in year \( i \)
if \( x = 1/(1 + IRR) \)

\[
NPV = C_o + C_1 x + C_2 x^2 + ... + C_N x^N = 0
\]

- Thus this nth order polynomial has n roots
- A stream of n cash flows can have up to M positive IRRs, where M is the number of changes of sign for the cash flows
Use Alternative Financial Criteria

- Net Present Value (NPV)
  - Cash flows discounted to present with a hurdle rate
  - Assumed a 25% hurdle rate for this analysis

- Return on Investment (ROI)
  - \([\text{net revenue} - \text{operating cost}] / \text{capital investment}\)
  - Total net cash after taxes / [recurring + non-recurring cost]

- Maximum Exposure
  - Most negative year ending cash balance
Sample Cash Flow / Reliability

- Cash Flow/Year
- Cash Flow/Cum.
- Reliability Multiplier

Year

$1,500
$1,000
$500
$0
$(500)
$(1,000)
$(1,500)

2005 2010 2015 2020 2025 2030 2035 2040 2045 2050 2055

0.00 0.10 0.20 0.30 0.40 0.50 0.60 0.70 0.80 0.90 1.00

Reliability Multiplier
Model Test:
Example Vehicles
Identify Driving Factors:
Screening Array
Screening Method

- Two level Design of Experiments array
  - Linear model
  - Testing for effects

- 32 Run fractional factorial for 24 variables selected
  - Provides all first order effects
  - Provides some highly confounded second order effects

- Discriminate using 80% confidence level of NPV
## Screening Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Near Term</th>
<th>Far Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (-1)</td>
<td>High (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine TFU</td>
<td>$6M</td>
<td>$10M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine Life</td>
<td>75 flts.</td>
<td>125 flts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engines per AF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity market offerings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital on hand</td>
<td>$1.5B</td>
<td>$2.5B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax rate</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rate</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity financing offerings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed SG&amp;A expense</td>
<td>$22.5M</td>
<td>$37.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable SG&amp;A expense</td>
<td>$100K</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDT&amp;E duration</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for production</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to depreciate assets</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Capacity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Reliability</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.9999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe life</td>
<td>375 flts.</td>
<td>625 flts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnaround time</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in flight</td>
<td>0.5 days</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe DDT&amp;E</td>
<td>$2.25B</td>
<td>$3.75B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airframe TFU</td>
<td>$750M</td>
<td>$1.25B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount at equity offering</td>
<td>$375M</td>
<td>$625M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine DDT&amp;E</td>
<td>$0M</td>
<td>$0.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising fee</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Appeal Factor</td>
<td>0.25x</td>
<td>0.5x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Near Term Results: 80% NPV

- Pareto Analysis
- Interactions make sense
- Scheduling factors important

![Graph showing various factors impacting NPV]
Far Term Results: 80% NPV

- Pareto Analysis
- Much different result
- Scheduling factors still important
Identify Economic Goals
Unconsidered Benefits

- Local and Federal government incentives
  - Training
  - Tax Breaks

- Lottery marketing

- Theme park integration

- Space Sports
  - CBS recently paid $6.2B for NCAA Tournament rights
Conclusions

- High Reliability (>0.999999) required to benefit from low ticket price
- Up-front cost critical for low-capacity ventures, even with $3B on hand
- Best pricing scenario is platform dependent
Future Work

- Continue economic model development
- Identify driving factors
- Produce a specially-tailored space tourism concept
- Future Updates can be found at:
  http://atlas.cad.gatech.edu/~gt3562b/ST_Update.html
Investigation of Space Tourism Business Opportunities

Ashraf Charania
David McCormick
Leland Marcus
Brad St. Germain

Sponsored by: NASA-Langley Research Center Vehicle Analysis Branch
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Overview

• Motivation

• LMNoP Model Development
  – Market Model
  – Reliability
  – Economics

• Example Vehicles

• Conclusions
Space Tourism Motivation

- Launch Marketing for Normal People (LMNoP)
- Tool for simulating space tourism business scenarios
- Find driving factors in space tourism vehicle design
- Use factors to design a space tourism specific vehicle
LMNoP Module Schematic

Program & Vehicle Module

Vehicle Costs
Passenger capacity per vehicle
Economic Assumptions

Market Definition Module

Planned Flight rate per year
Planned # of launch sites per year
Planned Passenger capacity per year

Flight Reliability Module

Actual Flight rate per year
Actual # of launch sites per year
Actual Passenger capacity per year
Reliability multiplier
Failure years
Passenger capacity per year

Economic Modeling Module
Model Development:

Market Research
Base Market Curves

- Basic curves
- Cross section interpolation
- Normal distribution representation
- Mean and std. deviation interpolation
Number of Launch Sites

- Assumes three launch sites for a base multiplier of one
- Uses inputs
  - Start date construction
  - End date construction
  - Total number of sites
Market Expansion

- Random process simulation
- Each year, market grows by a random percent
- Variable defined by a normal probability density function
- User inputs mean and standard deviation

Random # generator

One year market growth
Comfort Overlay

Simulates Effect of Volume per Passenger on the Market Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Market Multiplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Coach</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Class</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Class</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visibility Overlay

Simulates Effect of Visibility During Flight on the Market Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Market Multiplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple People per Window</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window per Person</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Window per Person</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent Ceiling</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Duration Overlay

Simulates Effect of Trip Duration on the Market Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Market Multiplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Orbital</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Orbit</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Orbits</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Hotel</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability Analysis

- Random process simulation
- Business temporarily closes after failure
- Resumes at half market size
- Ramps up to full capacity over recovery period
- If a failure occurs in recovery period, out of business

Monthly Reliability = 

(Flight Reliability)^Flights per Month
Market Results: Reliability Sweep

- 5000 Runs
- All market multipliers set to one
- $250,000 Ticket Price
Market Results: Price Sweep

- 5000 Runs
- All market multipliers set to one
- 0.9999999 (6 9's) Reliability
Model Development:

Economics
Economic Modeling Overview

LMNoP

Market Definition Module

Reliability Module

Economic Modeling Module

Programmatic Definition

Mission Production Plan and Costs

Equity, Cash Flow and Depreciation

Debt

Statements

Summary
Economic Modeling Detail

Programmatic Definition
Economic, financing, start years, vehicle cost definition, vehicle learning and rate effects, government contribution, fleet lifetime, turn-around time, time-in-orbit, vehicle reliability, insurance premium, and revenue add-ons

Mission Production Plan and Costs
Flights per year, failure years, price per passenger per year, DDT&E and fleet acquisition schedule, non-recurring cost, site fee, and additional cost per launch input

Equity, Cash Flow and Depreciation
Equity financing occurrence, revenue and cash flow, and depreciation schedule w/o salvage value

Debt
Debt scheduling options for 20, 15, 10, 5, and 1 year bonds

Statements
Income statement, cash flow, balance sheet, and NPV calculation

Summary
Financial metrics, LCC summary, cash flow diagram, price diagram
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Economic Module Description

- 50 year maximum program life with user definable program schedule and up to three separate input vehicles
  - DDT&E / TFU / learning effect / rate effect / govt. contribution level / fleet lifetimes / reliabilities all adjustable (airframe and propulsion)

- Economic interface with multipliers
  - Identify base year when tourism market demand begins
  - Demand during vehicle DDT&E / TFU years is captured and distributed over first few years of flight (pre-ordering seats)
  - Integer vehicle flights, excess passengers / year onto next year’s manifest

- Insurance penalty for failures, for 1st failure and recurring

- Can have up to five revenue add-ons (advertising, etc.)

- Propulsion / airframe acquired one year before program need
Vehicle Development Schedule

- Economic module determines appropriate number of vehicles to build and exact years of acquisition
- Determines acquisition schedule for both airframes and engines

Vehicle Lifetime

Time on Station

Turn-Around Time

Economic Model

Actual Number of Vehicles Needed per Each Program Year
Financial Irregularity: Multiple IRRs

- IRR = the rate that causes project's Net Present Value (NPV) to be zero
- Program failures in out years result in zero revenue, but costs continue
- Program cash flow fluctuate, flipping from (+) to (-) and back many times
- Result is multiple, legitimate IRRs

\[ NPV = C_0 + C_1/(1 + IRR) + ... + C_N/(1 + IRR)^N = 0 \]

where \( C_i \) is cash flow in year \( i \)

if \( x = 1/(1 + IRR) \)

\[ NPV = C_0 + C_1 x + C_2 x^2 + ... + C_N x^N = 0 \]

- Thus this nth order polynomial has n roots
- A stream of n cash flows can have up to M positive IRRs, where M is the number of changes of sign for the cash flows
Use Alternative Financial Criteria

- Net Present Value (NPV)
  - Cash flows discounted to present with a hurdle rate
  - Assumed a 25% hurdle rate for this analysis

- Return on Investment (ROI)
  - \([ \text{net revenue} - \text{operating cost} ] / \text{capital investment} \)
  - Total net cash after taxes / \([ \text{recurring} + \text{non-recurring cost} ]\)

- Maximum Exposure
  - Most negative year ending cash balance
Sample Cash Flow / Reliability
Model Development:

Test Cases
Test Case Assumptions

- $10M per passenger price
- No government assistance
- $1M in auxiliary income per flight (advertising, t-shirts, etc.)
- Single launch site
- 25% discount rate, 30% tax rate, 3% inflation, 10% interest rate
- $3B on hand at program start, $1.5B total equity financing
- NAFCOM DDT&E & TFU reduced by 50%
- 40% increase in base insurance rate after first failure
- $200M financial penalty for each failure during downtime
Example: WB-004

- purpose-built SSTO
- 54 passengers
- $3.7B DDT&E
- $821M TFU
- $7.25M recurring

**Forecast: wb004 NPV**

**Forecast: wb004 Max. Exposure**
Example: Kistler K-1

- Commercial TSTO RLV
- 4 passengers
- $933M DDT&E (Cabin)
- $273M TFU (Cabin)
- $17M recurring (launch fee)
Example: HL-20

- Commercial ELV/Spaceplane
- 10 passengers
- $1.45B DDT&E (HL-20)
- $269M TFU (HL-20)
- $100M recurring (launch fee)

1999 Space Systems Design Lab Open House and Review Day
Example: Starbird/booster

- Commercial RLV
- 12 passengers
- $2.4B DDT&E
- $1.35B TFU
- $205M recurring
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Example: R-7/Soyuz TM

- Russian ELV/Capsule
- 3 passengers
- $0 DDT&E
- $0 TFU
- $28M recurring (launch fee)
Examples: NPV Comparison

NPV ($M)

Soyuz

K1

HL20

Starbird

WB-004

$0

$1,000

($1,000)

($2,000)

($3,000)

($4,000)

($5,000)

10% confidence

50% confidence

90% confidence
Price Sweep Assumptions

- Same assumptions as example cases except for price
- Low Level = 1.1 * Recurring cost per passenger
- Medium Level = 1.6 * Recurring cost per passenger
- High Level = 2.1 * Recurring cost per passenger
- Only three concepts had recurring cost so that High Level < $10M
  - WB-004 (54 pass., $3.7B DDT&E, $821M TFU, $7.25M Recurring)
  - Kistler K-1 (4 pass., $933M DDT&E, $273M TFU, $17M Recurring)
  - Polaris (suborbital, 3 pass., $375M DDT&E, $54M TFU, $3.25M recurring)
WB-004 Price Sweep

Net Present Value ($M)

Ticket Price ($K)

- 90% Conf.
- 50% Conf.
- 10% Conf.
Kistler K-1 Price Sweep

Ticket Price ($K)

Net Present Value ($M)

- $0
- ($200)
- ($400)
- ($600)
- ($800)
- ($1,000)
- ($1,200)
- ($1,400)

4675 6800 8925

- 90% Conf.
- 50% Conf.
- 10% Conf.
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Polaris Price Sweep

Net Present Value ($M)

Ticket Price ($K)

$0

($100)

($200)

($300)

($400)

($500)

($600)

($700)

1192

1733

2275

90% Conf.

50% Conf.

10% Conf.
Unconsidered Benefits

- Local and Federal government incentives
  - Training
  - Tax Breaks
- Lottery marketing
- Theme park integration
- Space Sports
  - CBS recently paid $6.2B for NCAA Tournament rights
Conclusions

- High Reliability (>0.999999) required to benefit from low ticket price
- Up-front cost critical for low-capacity ventures, even with $3B on hand
- Best pricing scenario is platform dependent
Future Work

- Continue economic model development
- Identify driving factors
- Produce a specially-tailored space tourism concept
- Future Updates can be found at:
  http://atlas.cad.gatech.edu/~gt3562b/ST_Update.html