55th International Conference on Environmental Systems
12-16 July 2026, Rio Grande, Puerto Rico
ICES-2026-513

Ultra-Rapid Establishment of a Permanently Crewed Lunar Industrial Base Using Existing Commercial Systems: A Case Study in Extreme Mission Tempo

Kristin Savage[*]
Luna-One Project, Tampa, FL 33607

This study examines the theoretical feasibility of transitioning from zero lunar surface assets to a continuously inhabited, industrially capable outpost in under a year using only flight-proven or near-flight-ready commercial systems. Employing SpaceX Starship from dual U.S. pads (Starbase and LC-39A) at ~10-12-day launch cadence, the architecture delivers all elements to the lunar surface within a calendar year. Mission architecture includes: (1) acceptance of higher mission risk for drastically reduced program duration, (2) strict uncrewed cargo and robotic precursor sequencing, and (3) aggressive ISRU stand-up within weeks of landing. Surface elements consist of prefabricated habitats, robotic regolith overburden for radiation shielding, and two 40 kWe fission reactors delivering continuous, redundant power. ECLSS is built around flight-certified ISS physicochemical loops with >90% water recovery and atmospheric revitalization; initial water is delivered, with no reliance on lunar ice. Oxygen is supplied via dual molten regolith electrolysis and molten salt electrolysis plants, enabling co-production of metals for structural and industrial applications. Habitability analysis assumes short crew rotations with psychological and volumetric standards exceeding Artemis Ph1 base goals through commercial modular outfitting. Crewed operations are deliberately restricted to the 14-day lunar daylight period ("day-staffed" conops). This sharply reduces initial cryogenic storage and life-support closure demands while successive rotations mature ECLSS, ISRU plants, and key technologies. After multiple validated daylight tours and full shielding certification, the outpost would transition to permanent 24/7 occupation with multi-month stays. This study deliberately stresses existing or near-term technology (TRL 5-9) to explore the outer envelope of what is physically and logistically achievable when political, financial, and certification constraints are minimized - with a timeline driven by a risk-sharing commercial consortium rather than government-led procurement - offering a provocative reference architecture for ultra-rapid cis-lunar infrastructure insertion and potential benchmark for future Mars missions.

Acronyms and Nomenclature

3GPP = 3rd Generation Partnership Project
CLPS = Commercial Lunar Payload Services
CO_2 = Carbon Dioxide
ECLSS = Environmental Control and Life Support System
EVA = Extravehicular Activity
FAA = Federal Aviation Administration
FSP = Fission Surface Power
GNSS = Global Navigation Satellite System
HLS = Human Landing System
IPEx = ISRU Pilot Excavator
ISRU = In-Situ Resource Utilization
ISS = International Space Station
ITAR = International Traffic in Arms Regulations
kWe = Kilowatt Electric
KRUSTY = Kilopower Reactor Using Stirling Technology
KSC = Kennedy Space Center
LC-39A = Launch Complex 39A
LIFE = Large Integrated Flexible Environment
LTE = Long-Term Evolution
MRE = Molten Regolith Electrolysis
MSE = Molten Salt Electrolysis
NIB = Network In a Box
O_2 = Oxygen
PNT = Position, Navigation, and Timing
ROM = Rough Order of Magnitude
TRL = Technology Readiness Level

---

[*] Director, vPM Pro, 3030 N Rocky Point Dr. W Ste 150, Tampa, FL 33607

I. Introduction

THE current Artemis program projects the first continuous human presence on the Moon no earlier than the early 2030s, with industrial-scale operations expected a decade or so later. This paper challenges that paradigm by asking the deliberately provocative question: If only existing or near-flight-ready commercial hardware (TRL 5-9) were used, how quickly could a permanently crewed, industrially capable lunar base be established if the schedule is prioritized above all else?

The answer proposed here: From program start to first permanent crew, it can be accomplished in a year or less.

This is achieved through five major decisions:

1) Lunar operations focuses on establishing basic infrastructure, placing and shielding a habitat system, and beginning in-situ resource utilization (ISRU) at an equatorial site.
2) Stakeholder acceptance of significantly higher mission risk (comparable to early commercial spaceflight demo programs).
3) Utilize SpaceX Starship at maximum demonstrated flight rate from two launch facilities.
4) Initial "day-staffed" operations restrict crewed activities to the 14-day lunar daylight period, while only allowing robotic systems to continue through the lunar night for risk reduction and system maturation.
5) A risk-sharing commercial consortium model drives the timeline via private funding and execution, eliminating the traditional cost-plus overhead model and multi-year certification cycles.

II. Launch Cadence and Delivery Architecture

A. Starship Flight Rate Assumption

As of March 2026, SpaceX has demonstrated monthly-to-bi-monthly Starship launch cadence at Starbase using new hardware following eleven test flights through October 2025, with full Ship + Booster reuse targeted for V3 vehicles beginning with the upcoming Flight 12, and aims for rapid reusability enabling sub-weekly operations by 2027-2028 amid ongoing Flight 12 preparations and testing. For this study, we conservatively assume a sustained 10-12 day cadence initially from Starbase, yielding 30-36 Earth launches per year (including tankers).

In addition, LC-39A at Kennedy Space Center received FAA environmental approval for up to 44 Starship launches annually and is under construction to support a comparable launch cadence to Starbase, with operations anticipated to begin in late 2026, enabling dual-site (Florida and Texas) launch capability. Assuming 4-6 tanker launches per lunar mission for refueling in low Earth orbit, this baseline translates to 5-9 lunar surface deliveries annually from Starbase alone, scaling to ~18 in a twelve-month period through aggressive ramp-up, risk-sharing, and dual-pad use for tanker/crew flights.

B. Surface Elements Selection

To align with the ultra-rapid tempo, surface hardware was selected based on TRL 5-9 status, commercial availability, and minimal mass/power footprints. The mass of the core stack (Table 1), plus ~80 t initial water and consumables, is distributed across multiple Starship payloads (nominal 80 - 100 t to lunar surface per landing). The focus was on selecting for flight heritage where possible, robotic deployability, and compatibility with equatorial sites (dry regolith for ISRU, avoiding polar ice uncertainties). Primary selections include the following:

Table 1. Core Surface Hardware Stack

System	Vendor	Mass (t)	Power (kWe)	Output/Status
2×40 kWe FSP	NASA/DOE/Westinghouse	12	80	TRL 5-6; Phase 2
MRE (LR-1)	Lunar Resources	2.5	15	TRL 6; 2 kg O_2/hr + Fe-Si
MSE (ROXY)	Metalysis	3	15	TRL 6; 1.2 kg O_2/hr + rare earth elements
Sierra LIFE Hab	Sierra Space	15	-	300 m^3; TRL 9 heritage (lunar adaptation study May 2025)
Robotics	GITAI + KSC IPEx	8	5	Semi-auto; TRL 5-6

C. Mission Sequencing (Example 12-Month Manifest)

Starship's expected lunar surface delivery capacity of 80-100 t tempts the limits of payload maximization plans, however the chosen architecture sequences flights with lighter loads (eg: 15-40 t each) to prioritize uncrewed precursor testing and commissioning - including validating flight cadence. The intent is to mitigate risks through iterative validation and ensuring foundational systems (such as communications, PNT and power) are set prior to complex buildout. This justifies accepting higher per-flight costs (~$100M) for reduced overall program duration and managing failure probability. The result is ~18 flights to a Lunar equatorial site in twelve months. Masses are estimates and amount to ~1,000-1,200 t cumulative (hardware + consumables); actuals will depend on TRL optimizations and commercial sourcing.

Table 2. Example 12-Month Manifest with Outpost Buildup Activities

Month	Flights	Critical Payload	Primary Activities/Objectives	Est. Total Mass (t)
1-2	#1 - #4 Uncrewed	-FSP reactor #1 -GITAI rover -Comms, PNT relays -Initial water tanks (~40 t)	1) Staging comms/nav/positioning 2) Initial site survey and regolith analysis 3) Prepare for FSP deployment 4) Validate rapid launch cadence	~50-70
3	#5, #6 Uncrewed	-FSP reactor #2 -IPEx robotics (regolith movers)	1) Robotic deployment of first FSP 2) Site survey continuation 3) Basic regolith moving & testing	~40-50
4-5	#7 - #10 Uncrewed	-Sierra LIFE Hab modules (prefabricated, modular) -ECLSS -MRE/MSE ISRU plants -Remaining water (~40 t)	1) Robotic deployment of second FSP 2) Site prep for habitation 3) Habitat landing and initial setup 4) ISRU landing and placement	~70-90
6	#11, #12 Uncrewed	-Robotic arms for shielding -ISRU feed materials -Redundant ECLSS loops	1) Robotic inflation/berthing of habitat 2) Initiate radiation shielding (regolith overburden) 3) Commission ISRU pilot plant (MRE/MSE) 4) Integrated pre-crew validation (uncrewed tours)	~30-40
7	#13 Crew (4)	-Oversight tools -Short-rotation provisions	First crewed ~14-day “Day 1” mission: 1) Crew oversight of robotics/ISRU maturation 2) Validate habitability	~40-50
8-11	#14-#17 Crew (4)	-Additional outfitting -Crew provisions -Metal processing tools from ISRU	Up to four additional daylight rotations: 1) Maturing systems (ECLSS, ISRU) 2) Full shielding completion 3) Escalating crew procedures	~120-160
12	#18 Crew (4) +Sustainment	-Multi-month stay provisions -Final cargo for 24/7 ops	Final certification mission: 1) Establish rotating shifts for continuous occupation 2) Scale to industrial ops	~40-50

III. Power System

The selection of fission surface power (FSP) over solar arrays with battery storage or regenerative fuel cells is driven by the higher anticipated needs of industrial operations and the ability to provide consistent power through the lunar environment’s 354-hour night, during which solar generation ceases and storage mass grows prohibitively with mission duration. Previous NASA architecture studies have repeatedly shown that nuclear systems deliver continuous, high-reliability power without the mass, volume, and complexity penalties of night-survival systems, while providing higher output precisely when heating and lighting demands peak [1], 2]. Selecting FSP over solar also allows uninterrupted robotic ISRU and construction during the initial daylight-only phase, while supporting the transition to permanent 24/7 occupation with minimal equivalent system mass impact, making it the only near-term technology capable of meeting the ultra-rapid tempo and industrial-scale objectives of this architecture [3].

Dual 40 kWe KRUSTY-derived FSP units (scaled from 10 kWe flight-tested designs) were therefore selected to provide 80 kWe total, ensuring redundant power for simultaneous habitation, MRE/MSE ISRU plants, site-preparation robotics, and continuous uncrewed operations through the lunar night. Each ~3.5 t unit (including shielding and heat rejection) is robotically off-loaded via GITAI arms, moved ~50 m to a pre-surveyed area for installation. Remote siting at this distance, combined with a shadow shield, limits crew exposure while permitting ease of access for maintenance, power distribution via buried cables to minimize dust ingress and Earth-commanded activation within 48 hours of placement [3].

Each unit is covered with 1.5-2 m of regolith overburden for micrometeoroid and radiation protection, consistent with both early evolution strategies for lunar nuclear power and modern deployable 40 kWe concepts [1], [3]. Vacuum-rated radiators (~20 m² per unit) provide thermal management, with fuel life exceeding 10 years for base growth. This rapid deployment approach, informed by NASA FSP evolution strategies, eliminates the cryogenic and battery mass penalties of lunar-night survival and quickly enables uncrewed operations in advance of habitation delivery and initial crew rotations [1], [2].

IV. Habitat and Radiation Shielding

Of the currently available habitat technologies, the Sierra Space LIFE (Large Integrated Flexible Environment) module was found to be the most viable solution for near-term, ultra-rapid deployment. This TRL 9 heritage hybrid inflatable provides approximately 300 m³ of pressurized volume upon deployment while stowing into a standard fairing, delivering 5-15× greater habitable volume per launch mass than rigid modules [5]. The 2022 NASA reference Surface Habitat design explicitly adopts a hybrid inflatable configuration-rigid aluminum lower deck with inflatable upper decks-precisely because rigid structures are volume-limited by lander and launch constraints, whereas inflatables achieve superior packing efficiency and volumetric mass efficiency [4]. The LAT-2 structural analysis further confirm that larger hybrid and expandable habitats provide improved floor area and lower volumetric mass than monolithic rigid options, where most of the mass is driven by fixed structural elements such as domes and frames [5]. This selection also relies on the NASA-funded lunar adaptations of the LIFE module, including upgrades to Vectran fabric over the BEAM/TransHab design, and the recent successful demonstrations of the LIFE hypervelocity impact and burst-tests.

Habitat deployment is expected to be performed robotically after offloading from the Starship cargo lander. Site surveying and preparation can be completed by robotics prior to the LIFE module being positioned. The core is inflated using onboard gas reservoirs and once pressure is confirmed, the habitat is covered with 1.5-2 m of lunar regolith overburden, applied via semi-autonomous robotics - to be inspected by crew during the first rotation. The intent of this sequence is minimize EVA requirements and provide full solar particle event and galactic cosmic ray shielding while the internal pressure supports the soil load [6], [4]. The hybrid design retains a rigid core for critical systems and docking ports, allowing immediate connection to power, ECLSS, and ISRU/O2 lines. Future growth requiring subsequent modules can be berthed via inflatable tunnels, allowing for modular expansion without the need of heavy-lift crane operations that would be required for rigid module mating.

Outfitting the habitat is use dependent, therefore the initial configuration will maximize the use of modular, reconfigurable racks and partitions that can be rearranged to support evolving needs-from private crew quarters and galley to laboratory workstations and maintenance bays. This open-volume approach, inherent to inflatable architectures, eliminates the fixed geometry constraints of rigid modules and supports multi-use functionality across habitation, science, and logistics roles [4], [5]. Combined with the 80 t of initial water and consumables, the LIFE habitat is expected to achieve >90% ECLSS closure while effectively minimizing surface assembly time and EVA exposure. Logged 14-day “day-staffed” rotations will largely focus on systems maturation before permanent long-term occupation.

V. Environmental Control and Life Support System

The Environmental Control and Life Support System (ECLSS) needed to support an ultra-rapid lunar base buildout is based on flight-certified ISS physicochemical hardware to achieve >90% closure, scaled for 4-8 crew with redundant loops. Regenerative components include the Water Recovery System (>93% recovery from urine and brine), Carbon Dioxide Removal Assembly combined with Sabatier reactors for carbon dioxide-to-methane/oxygen conversion, and the Oxygen Generation System for electrolysis makeup. Habitat atmospheric revitalization uses a 4-bed molecular sieve for trace contaminant control, delivering an estimated >98% O_2 recovery. The system is also expected to maintain cabin conditions of CO_2 <0.5%, at 30-70% relative humidity, and at a comfortable range of 18-24°C. Initial water (80 t) is expected to be delivered via Starship-derived wet-lab modules to eliminate early dependence on uncertain polar ice deposits, thereby reducing risk and simplifying precursor robotic operations. This approach aligns with an ultra-rapid deployment timeline by focusing on readily available and proven regenerative architectures validated for long-duration missions, ensuring independent operation with minimal Earth resupply and providing meaningful crew work volume for science and maintenance [7]. In addition, habitat waste management will incorporate composting to enable later transition to hydroponics, while system redundancy and fault tolerance minimizes single-point failures during the initial daylight-only rotations.

Integration with ISRU oxygen production requires piping O_2 from the dual-redundant molten-regolith-electrolysis (MRE) and molten-salt-electrolysis (MSE) plants directly into the ECLSS oxygen makeup loop. ISRU selections are expected to supply well in excess of the ~4 kg/day required for the 4-8 crew life-support demands. Nuclear FSP provides ample power for the expected ~10 kWe average draw for the full ECLSS loop with ISRU feed. This reference design is expected to take full advantage of the 24/7 robotic capabilities to support activation and maturation before permanent crew arrival [8], [9]. Robotics will prioritize habitation shielding and early oxygen extraction, minimizing crew EVA exposure and radiation dosage while achieving the high closure needed for sustainable 30-60 day rotations [10] anticipated immediately after the first year of operations.

Table 3. ECLSS Integration Parameters

Subsystem	Closure/ Recovery	Power (kWe)	Mass Benefit vs. Open-Loop	Heritage/Source
Water Recovery System	>93%	~3.5	80 t initial water offset	ISS flight-certified
CO_2 Removal + Sabatier	>98% O_2	~2.5	Reduces O_2 resupply	ISS CO_2 removal assembly + Sabatier
ISRU O_2 Feed (MRE/MSE)	~4kg/day	10	Life support	Robotic support
FSP Power (40 kWe firm)	Continuous	N/A	Enables 24/7 ops	KRUSTY-derived

VI. In-Situ Resource Utilization Systems

Given an equatorial site selection and commercial-industrial drivers, oxygen was selected as the primary function of an industrial lunar base, as it has the most immediate and high-cost-leverage uses for propulsion and life support. After a review of potential ISRU pilot plant options, dual-redundant ISRU plants were selected - molten regolith electrolysis (MRE) and molten salt electrolysis (MSE) systems - to maximize oxygen production for life support and propellant while generating high-value metallic by-products for on-site construction and manufacturing. MRE directly electrolyzes molten lunar regolith to yield oxygen at the anode and ferrosilicon alloys at the cathode, requiring no consumable reductants and demonstrating robustness across both Highlands and Mare regolith compositions. MSE complements this by enabling aluminum-silicon alloy recovery via vacuum distillation, diversifying feedstock outputs. Holistic system analyses confirm MRE as the highest-performing option for combined oxygen and metal production, with a full-plant hardware mass of 6,776 kg delivering approximately 25 t/yr ferrosilicon alloys, plus an estimated 23.9 t/yr oxygen (for a mass payback ratio of 0.14kg product per year) [11]. MSE provides complementary alloy chemistry, enhancing redundancy against potential reactor degradation, or regolith variability [11]. High TRL selections were made based on 2024-25 demos and their ability to produce the NASA-targeted ISRU commodity priorities of oxygen, raw/refined metals (Al, Fe, Ti), silicon/ceramics, and dedicated construction/manufacturing feedstocks [12].

Sizing models show strong economies of scale and favorable power requirements. An integrated MRE system scales from an estimated 400 kg/ 14 kW (approx. 1,000 kg O_2/yr) to 1,593 kg/ 56.5 kW (approx.. 10,000 kg O_2/yr) using Highlands regolith [13]. Robotic deployment, excavation, beneficiation, hopper feeding, and reactor commissioning is well supported by this reference architecture. ISRU can initiate within the first 30 days of landing using semi-autonomous robotics, with continuous operation supported by localized FSP [11]. Combined steady-state output exceeds ~80 kg O_2/day at maturity (well above the estimated 4-8 crew requirements) while supplying structural alloys and supporting the growth of base / tenant services. Dual-process redundancy mitigates single-point of failure for oxygen production, lowers Earth-import dependency, maximizes total ISRU yields, while providing significant by-product alloys to support future mission needs [11].

Table 4. MRE and MSE Performance Comparison

Process	Hardware Mass	Power (kWe)	Est. Output	Key By-Product
Lunar Resources LR-1 (MRE)	2.5 t	~15	2kg O_2/hr + Fe-Si	Ferrosilicon alloys
Metalysis ROXY (MSE)	3 t (salt-ratio dependent)	~15	1.2kg O_2/hr + Al-Si	Aluminum-silicon alloys

VII. Robotics and Site Preparation

The GITAI R1.5 rover with two Inchworm robotic arms (total suite approximately 380 kg, 115-1,500 W) was selected for its proven versatility in lunar base construction tasks, including payload offloading, hardware assembly, regolith scooping, percussive fragmentation, and sample deposition via a tool-changer end-effector [14], [15]. Real-world demonstrations confirm these capabilities, while dedicated lunar-environment testing (July 2023) validated dust-tolerant performance through multi-day operation in regolith simulant chambers. Additional demonstration of wireless charging interfaces to eliminate dust ingress at tool connections, dust-repellent optical coatings, and cryogenic motor validation to -196 °C with full recovery [14] strengthen the selection such that this is among the strongest option to support an aggressive lunar base deployment timeline. In addition, the Earth-teleoperated redundancy helps minimize EVA needs while allowing for the near-continuous site preparation required to achieve ultra-rapid site preparation and equipment deployment.

Complementing the GITAI system is the 30 kg-class NASA KSC IPEx excavator (42 kg/h average rate, estimated 10,000 kg total excavation over an 11-day demonstration). This was chosen for its low-reaction-force and counter-rotating bucket drums, which translate to efficient regolith acquisition and hauling in reduced gravity, as well as its capability to inherit swarm scalability from its advance surface systems predecessor [16], [17]. Four micro-excavators operating in parallel can easily meet the annual 10 t oxygen-equivalent feedstock for habitation demands, with excess capacity for propellant production. This configuration provides built-in redundancy, as well as room for processing degradation if individual units encounter issues [17]. Dust mitigation includes electrodynamic shields on cameras with removable covers, plus actuated radiator cover and the use of phase-change material for thermal resilience [16]. When paired with GITAI for coordinated offloading, manipulation, and swarm autonomy concepts - such as with the Jet Propulsion Laboratory CADRE mesh-networked rovers - the combined 2 t / 5 kWe suite accelerates lunar base construction with reduced risk and allows for on-going robotic operations throughout crew-absent periods [18], [19].

Table 5. Key Specifications of Selected Robotics Systems

System	Mass (kg)	Power (W)	Key Dust Mitigation Features	TRL	Primary Role in Architecture
GITAI R1.5 Rover + (2) Inchworm Arms	280 + 2x 50	115-1500	Repellent coatings, wireless tool changer, multi-day simulant chamber validation	7	Manipulation, assembly, offload, excavation support
(4) NASA KSC IPEx Excavators	4x 30	~120 (scaled)	Electrodynamic camera shields with removable covers, actuated radiator protection	5	Regolith excavation & hauling; swarm feedstock delivery (avg. 42kg/h)

VIII. Communications, Navigation, and Positioning

A commercial-primary communications, naviation and positioning architecture was identified to support the development of an ultra-rapid industrial lunar base. The design intentionally prioritizes local high-bandwidth autonomy and edge processing over reliance on constrainted government infrastructure. Local lunar surface communications will use flight-demonstrated 3GPP/LTE technology (Nokia Lunar Surface Communications System), deployed as a scalable mesh network-in-a-box for <20 km high-throughput links supporting semi-autonomous robotics (for excavation pathing and real-time sensor fusion) and crew/habitat operations [20], [21]. This radiation-hardened system, as proven operational on the IM-2 CLPS mission, integrates with LunaNet-style backbone relays with the intent of keeping dense industrial and commercial data local (mining telemetry, manufacturing streams, pharma experiments), thereby reducing Earth trunk bottlenecks to summaries only [22]. Precision PNT will combine multiple global naviation satellite system receivers with a deployable lunar surface station that provides joint Doppler, range corrections, and local augmented forward signal broadcasts. This coverage combination targets handling <10 m positioning and <15 ns timing, suitable for local EVA's, robotic navigation and construction needs [23], [24]. All core elements are commercially interoperable, with government augmentation available as redundant coverage, per LunaNet standards.

Deployment assumes readily available hardware (TRL 6-8 via recent demos and qualification). The core stack masses ~600-700 kg with ~700 W average draw, enabling integration within the first Starship cargo landings and deployment of a fully operational fabric by month 6, prior to first crew arrival. This timeline supports robotic precursors for site prep and ISRU, followed by daylight crew rotations that validate edge computing before permanent 24/7 occupation (post-year 1).

Table 6. Core Communications, Navigation and Positioning Stack

Component	Mass (kg)	Power (W, avg/peak)	Notes/Source
Global Navigation Satellite System Receivers (×4)	8	15/20	Low-swap lunar receiver; reduces network load for commercial autonomy
3GPP NIB/BTS Mesh (2-3 units)	150-250	400/800	Nokia lunar surface communications heritage; primary local high-rate for robotics/EVA
Enhanced Surface Station Hub	400	200/350	CLPS-deployable with doplar corrections and range relay
LunaNet Onboard/Edge Processing	30	100/150	Local data processing and reduction
Total	~600-700	~700/1,300	Fits 1-2 Starship payloads; <2% of 40 kWe FSP

The intent of this core stack is to directly mitigate the current data bottlenecks through commercial edge processing while ensuring interoperability for broader industry tenants and providing a robust, low-latency foundation for sustained mining and manufacturing on the Moon.

IX. "Day-Staffed" Operations Concept

The lunar daylight-only crewed operations concept proposed in this architecture draws from historical analyses of how to reduce the risks of establishing a lunar base, including consideration for combined robotic and human operations [25], [26]. In addition, a phased operational strategy aligns with prior engineering studies that advocate starting with short-duration human interventions to inspect, repair, and optimize robotic setups before committing to long-duration stays, thereby reducing overall program risks and costs [27].

Initial crewed sorties will be limited to the 10-to-14 day lunar daylight period. Crew will focus on high-value tasks, such as completing habitat and laboratory interior finish-out, conducting final build inspections, and initiating research or commercial tenant activities that are not easily serviced by robotics. This concept also takes advantage of natural lunar daytime visibility and thermal stability to iterate and validate base configuration and operations during each rotation, while the robotics, habitat, life support and any autonomous tenant/ lab work may continue throughout the lunar night.

Key benefits include:

- Accelerate site build and maturation via semi-autonomous robotics to handle regolith shielding, infrastructure maintenance, and ISRU processes uninterrupted (less any preventative maintenance).
- Faster validation of technologies like oxygen production, without the need for the cryogenic storage required for extended crew stays.
- Human operations focus on strategic oversight (eg: tenant integration) during daylight, building confidence in dust mitigation, ECLSS closure, and system reliability for eventual 24/7 occupation (post-year 1).

X. Risk Posture

To enable an ultra-rapid deployment timeline, this architecture adopts an elevated risk tolerance, emphasizing mission tempo over the conservative margins inherent in traditional government-led programs - and more akin to early commercial demonstration missions. The feasibility of which requires assumptions to be made to underpin the approach (Appendix A), including reliable Starship refueling with via four to six transfers and boil-off below 10%, robotic overburden stability ensuring habitat pressure loss under 5%, and ISRU yields achieving ≥80% oxygen extraction at 70% uptime. Risks are categorized as technical (35%, eg: dust mitigation challenges), programmatic (25%, eg: launch cadence delays), financial (15%, eg: budget overruns), legal/regulatory (10%, eg: Outer Space Treaty compliance), and operational (15%, eg: crew safety during EVAs), with mitigations such as dual-sourcing, redundancies, and contingencies potentially increasing costs by $200-300M while still facilitating a pre-2030's operation outpost (stabilized 2028-2029). This risk posture utilizes near-term TRL 5-9 technologies in combination with a shift to commercial agility – in direct contrast with historically protracted plans for return to the Moon - and is supported by studies recommending robotic precursors for environmental hazard reduction [25] and advance ISRU prototype testing/ deployment to address yield uncertainties and operational risks [12] that are tied to a sustained human presence and viable Lunar economy.

XI. Consortium Model

Fundamental to the success of this mission is shifting from traditional government-led procurement model to a risk-sharing, privately funded commercial consortium model. The entity structures and agreements would draw on precedents from terrestrial mega-projects such as the North Sea oil exploration consortia and domestic Smart City infrastructure developments. This combination is driven by private capital and multi-stakeholder partnerships to pool resources, distribute risks, and accelerate execution. Financial alignment helps minimize the multi-year delays inherent in federal budgeting, congressional approvals, and sequential contracting typical of government-led space programs. In a commercial consortium model, a lead commercial entity coordinates investors, suppliers, and operators - including aerospace firms, mining companies, and international partners - to fund and execute the defined architecture. Developments of this size typically proceed in phases, starting with minimally viable elements (eg: uncrewed precursors and initial ISRU pilots), progressing to scalable infrastructure build-out and validation, then culminating with self-sustainment and commoditized services [28]. Private funding would potentially be raised through venture capital, lunar bonds (tax-exempt debt vehicles modeled on U.S. spaceport financing [30]), or special purpose vehicles, to cover program cost (excluding launches), with returns generated from early ISRU-derived products (eg: oxygen propellant sales, rare earth metals, etc.) and tenant leasing of outpost infrastructure services and lab space.

A commercial consortium model benefits from enhanced agility in decision-making, as private entities can pivot rapidly to incorporate emerging technologies (eg: promising sub-TRL 5 prototypes) without lengthy regulatory reviews, reducing overall program duration from decades to years. Risk-sharing distributes financial and technical burdens across members, mitigating the impact of any single failure (eg: through redundant suppliers for critical components) while incentivizing innovation through performance-based milestones. Investments can also be layered by component to align with phased growth, rather than waiting for full project budget funding:

- Dedicated funds target power infrastructure as a utility service (eg: FSP providing redundant energy to tenants can be scaled when business demand justifies the investment) [28],
- Separate tranches for ISRU plants that produce oxygen and rare earth metals for tenant use while targeting propellant sales to NASA or other commercial operators [29], and
- Distinct equity/debt layers for habitation and lab facilities rented to high-value tenants (eg: research firms or international agencies) [31].

This approach mirrors successful mega-projects where consortia have achieved rapid scale-up and mobilized multi-billion-dollar infrastructure development through shared private investments. Commercial-led certification, informed by FAA guidelines rather than NASA human-rating processes, have shaved significant amounts of time off typical timelines, as demonstrated by Nokia's rapid deployment of lunar 4G networks via NASA's Tipping Point initiative [21]. Furthermore, commercial deployment of LunaNet-compatible infrastructure [22] can result in additional service revenue, attracting early tenants and creating a self-sustaining economic ecosystem within a few years, as envisioned in historical fast-track studies like Human Lunar Return [32]. This not only minimizes upfront costs through revenue-sharing, but also positions the outpost as a benchmark for Mars standup, where a similar consortia structure could enable more ambitious development and tempos.

XII. Cost Estimate

This section provides a rough-order-of-magnitude (ROM) cost estimate for the proposed ultra-rapid lunar industrial base architecture, assuming a late 2026 start and completion within one calendar year. Estimates emphasize use of a commercial consortium model (Section XI), which is meant to minimize certification and procurement delays through risk-sharing and use of available TRL 5-9 hardware. The scope includes procurement, integration, and operations throughout the transition to permanent 24/7 occupation. Costs are derived from the mission manifest (Section II.C, ~18 Starship deliveries), core hardware stack (Table 1), risks and assumptions (Appendix A), and include scaling considerations from lunar economy benchmarks [28] and financing frameworks [31].

Additional ROM drivers include:

- Currency is adjusted to 2026 dollars using a 3-5% annual inflation rate.

- Per-flight costs (~$100M) includes tanker refueling (4-6 per mission, per Section II.A).
- Higher mission risk is accepted, reducing anticipated development costs versus government-led programs.
- Contingency: 20% overall, to address risks like Starship slips or ISRU maturation.

Table 7. Ultra-Rapid Architecture Cost Breakdown (in 2026 dollars)

Category	Description	ROM Estimate
Launches (Starship Lunar Missions)	18 Lunar surface deliveries (~12 uncrewed + ~6 crewed rotations, per Section II.C manifest). Unit cost: $100-120M each, inclusive of refueling and dual-pad operations.	$1.8-2.16B
Surface Assets (Habitats, Reactors, ISRU, Robots)	Core stack ~40.5 t (Table 1), with cumulative manifest ~1,000-1,200 t including redundancies and consumables (Section II.C). -Habitats (~$200-300M) -Dual KRUSTY reactors (~$300-400M) -ISRU plants (~$250-350M) -Robots/comms/nav (~$150-250M) -ECLSS/water/other (~$200-300M).	$1.1-1.6B
Operations and Crew Training	Training for 20-30 personnel across rotations (~$400-500M), plus mission control and simulations (~$100-200M).	$0.5-0.7B
Subtotal		~$3.4-4.46B
Contingency (20%)	Per identified risks (Appendix A)	~$0.68-0.89B
Total		~$4.08-5.35B

XIII. Discussion and Future Work

While this study demonstrates the theoretical feasibility of an ultra-rapid lunar industrial base using existing commercial systems, several avenues for refinement and expansion warrant further exploration to bridge the gap between conceptual architecture and operational reality. In future work, the author intends to publicise a more detailed trade study evaluating propulsion, power, and ISRU technologies - such as comparing MRE and MSE efficiencies against emerging hybrid electrolysis methods - to optimize mass, cost, and risk profiles under varying launch cadences. Additionally, the author is developing a comprehensive Concept of Operations (ConOps) to delineat phased mission timelines, crew-robotics interfaces, and contingency protocols, ensuring seamless integration of daylight-staffed rotations with automated precursors – and anticipated transition to long-duration and lunar night stays. To address potential objections and enhance mission viability, the author is actively modelling frameworks for regulatory compliance, environmental impact, and ethical considerations around lunar resource sovereignty, including initial stakeholder discussions required for multi-agency coordination. The author invites collaborations from the ICES community, particularly on the execution and practical implementation of an ultra-rapid architecture.

XIV. Conclusion

By ruthlessly prioritizing schedule, accepting higher near-term risk, and leveraging commercial tempo and hardware, a permanently crewed lunar industrial base with continuous power, closed-loop life support, and bulk oxygen production is achievable before 2030 using only systems that exist or are in late-stage development today. This “extreme tempo” architecture serves as both a provocative alternative to traditional government-led timelines and a potential template for Mars.

Appendix A: Assumptions, Risks, and Validation Roadmap

This section outlines the key assumptions underpinning the proposed architecture, associated risks, and a prioritized validation roadmap to de-risk the program. Assumptions are categorized by domain and include brief reasoning based on current industry benchmarks (eg: SpaceX Starship progress, NASA TRL assessments). Risks are assessed qualitatively (probability: Low/Medium/High; impact: Medium/High/Critical) with mitigations and residuals. The validation roadmap focuses on the top 5-7 assumptions/risks, with an early spend of $80-110M (6-8% of total budget) to confirm viability before major commitments.

A. Key Assumptions

Assumptions are derived from TRL 5-9 technologies and commercial timelines, emphasizing speed over conservatism. Table 1 serves as a summary of assumptions for the ultra-rapid deployment.

Appendix Table 1. Key Assumptions by Category

Category	Assumption	Reasoning
Strategic/Architectural	Direct-to-surface delivery via Starship HLS cargo (no orbital staging/Gateway)	Avoids mass/complexity penalties; saves 30-50% vs. multi-step; leverages NASA-contracted HLS.
	Commercial-only model (no government funding/prime)	Enables faster, risk-tolerant execution; focuses on revenue (O_2/metals/tenants).
	Equatorial mare site (no polar ice)	Simpler terrain/ilmenite-rich regolith; avoids uncertain polar logistics/politics.
	Aggressive timeline: precursor 2026-2027, revenue ops in 12-18 months	Starship cadence est. 25-50/year by 2027; commercial projects typically 3-5× faster than government.
Launch/Logistics	Starship HLS delivers ~100 t usable per flight	Conservative baseline after refueling/margins; 80% utilization.
	Delivery cost ~$100M per 100 t (incl. 4-6 tankers/depot)	Mature SpaceX ops; early missions $150-200M with 20% contingency.
	Dual sites (Starbase + KSC) enable multi-ship waves	Prepares for high cadence; avoids bottlenecks.
Hardware/Technology	Sierra LIFE habitat deployable with robotic 2m overburden	NASA NextSTEP-2 study; high-fos Vectran shell; semi-autonomous burial (GITAI/IPEx).
	80 kWe fission power (2×40 kWe FSP) available/deployable by 2027	NASA/Westinghouse contract; nuclear essential for lunar night.
	MRE + MSE ISRU: 3.2 kg O_2/hr at 70-95% uptime	TRL 5-6 prototypes; redundant kilns; 20% yield buffer.
	Semi-autonomous robotics for burial/ISRU maintenance	TRL 5-6; Earth teleops + sufficient for onsite artificial intelligence (2.6s latency).
Operational/Human	Daytime-only human rotations to prove systems before long stays	Nuclear/robotics enable uncrewed ISRU; minimizes early psych/medical risks.
	Dust mitigation <20% downtime (ports/curtains/pre-clean)	NASA/ESA studies; layered redundancies.
	Crew of 4 cross-trained specialists	Proven on ISS/analogs; reduces logistics.
Financial/Commercial	$1.5B budget sufficient (incl. 20% contingency)	CLPS/Axiom benchmarks; no cost-plus overhead.
	Revenue starts 2027-2028 at $50-100M, scales to $500M+/yr	O_2 at $1M/kg; tenants $8-12M/slot; de-risks program.
	$350M private funding raisable in 2026	Growing space market; attractive first-mover story.

B. Key Risks

Technical and programmatic risks dominate the ultra-rapid architecture (60%), but mitigations (eg: redundancies, contingencies) reduce overall residual risks to a Medium level.

Appendix Table 2. Summary of Key Risks

Category	Risk	Probability	Impact	Residual Risk
Technical	Orbital Refueling Failure/Delay	High	Critical	Medium

	Dust & Regolith Challenges	High	High	Medium
	Radiation & Thermal Extremes	Medium	High	Low
	ISRU Yield & Uptime	Medium	High	Medium
Programmatic	Starship Development Slips	High	Critical	Medium
	Integration & Qualification Delays	Medium	High	Low
	Crew Health & Rotation Issues	Medium	Medium	Low
Financial	Cost Overruns	Medium	High	Low
	Funding/Investor Delays	Medium	High	Medium
	Insurance & Liability	Medium	Medium	Low
Legal/Regulatory	Outer Space Treaty & Resource Rights	Medium	High	Medium
	FAA/ITAR Licensing Delays	Medium	Medium	Low
Operational	Crew Safety (EVA/Dust)	Medium	High	Medium
	Tenant Adoption	Low	Medium	Low

- *Technical Risks (35%):* Focus is on hardware and environment, such as with refueling (High prob./Critical), cryo/docking issues. Mitigate via demos/redundancy (+$20M). For dust challenges (High/High), main focus on abrasion. Mitigate with curtains/spares until dust control technology matures. For radiation (Med/High), top concern is human exposure and equipment loss; mitigate with limited daylight ops, dual suppliers. For ISRU (Med/High), main concern is yield. Mitigate via redundant plants and technology demos.
- *Programmatic Risks (25%):* Focus is on execution and timeline, starting with likely Starship slips (High/Critical), including HLS delays. Mitigate via multi-site launch operations, alternative providers (+$100M). For integration (Med/High), main focus is successful qualifications. Mitigate via analogs (+$30M). For crew health concerns (Med/Med), such as dust and solar events; mitigate via emergency operations simulations, onsite emergency suits.
- *Financial Risks (15%):* Focus is on commercial budget/ROI, highlighting overruns (Med/High). Mitigate by doubling standard mega-project contingency ($300M). For funding (Med/High), main focus is on initial raise. Mitigate via phased growth, progress payments, letters of intent. For insurance (Med/Med), main concern is with pemiums. Mitigate with multi-provider policies, special purpose vehicles.
- *Legal/Regulatory Risks (10%):* Focus is on compliance, mainly concerned with treaties (Med/High). Mitigate via Accords, expedited stakeholder reviews ($5M). For FAA/ITAR (Med/Med), focus is approvals. Mitigate with early filings.
- *Operational Risks (15%):* Focus is on day-to-day conops, mainly on crew safety (Med/High), such as habitat degradation. Mitigate with ports and monitoring systems. For tenants (Low/Med), concern is mainly around adoption timing. Mitigate with letters of intent and demos.

Overall: Top risks (refueling/dust/supply) could add $200-300M, but can be mitigated with dual-sourcing and early contracts.

C. Validation Roadmap

This is a high-level validation roadmap that focuses on addressing critical assumptions and risks up-front, covering critical paths around pre-manufacturing, habitation and commercial viability. The goal is to minimize risk by confirming critical components of the ultra-rapid architecture by late 2026 (delaying first surface launch to 2027). Success criteria and potential pivot options are outlined. With an estimated additional spend of ~$70-100M, a rapid validation could be reasonably undertaken in the context of securing additional commercial investment in exchange for a reduced risk environment.

Appendix Table 3. Prioritized Validation Roadmap

Priority	Assumption/Risk to Validate	Method	Timeline	Est. Cost	Success Criteria	Failure Pivot

1 (Showstopper)	Orbital refueling at scale	Observe SpaceX demos + data-sharing	Q2-Q3 2026	$0-$5M	≥8 transfers, <10% boil-off	Delay 6-18 mo; hybrid solar/smaller precursor
2 (Critical)	Robotic overburden + habitat stability	Mojave analog (rovers/mockup) + vac/thermal	Q3-Q4 2026	$30-40M	Stable, <5% pressure loss	Switch to sintered/rigid (+$50-100M)
3 (High)	Dust mitigation <20% downtime	Vac chamber + simulant/EVA tests	Q3-Q4 2026	$15-20M	≥50 cycles, no failure	Redesign suits; reduce EVA
4 (High)	ISRU ≥2.5 kg O_2/hr, ≥70% uptime	Prototype vac runs with simulant	Q2-Q4 2026	$20-25M	≥80% yield, 70% uptime	Scale back revenue; add kiln (+$30M)
5 (Medium)	Early tenant letters of intent ≥$10M	Outreach + Mojave demos	Q4 2026	$2-5M	2-3 signed, totaling $10M+	Focus on O_2; lower valuation
6 (Medium)	FSP nuclear deployable by late 2026	Monitor NASA + partnership	Q4 2026	$0-$5M	2027 delivery confirmed	Interim solar/batteries (+$50-100M)

Acknowledgments

The author extends heartfelt gratitude to Jeffrey Montes, Jim Keravala, Bryan Zetlen, and Mark Hilburger for their generous investment of time in providing encouragement, thoughtful guidance, and constructive criticism that shaped this work. Special thanks are also due to the students and guest critics of THESAS (Fall 2025) for their inspiring encouragement and unique insights throughout the development of this case study. This paper stems from an independent study inspired by a studio course on space architecture, undertaken without external sponsorship. The author's love of a good puzzle and determination to show her sons that anything is possible continues to drive her work in this area and as such, all feedback is warmly welcomed.

References

[1] Mason, L. S., "An Evolution Strategy for Lunar Nuclear Surface Power," NASA Lewis Research Center, 1993.

[2] Mason, L. S., and Poston, D. I., "A Summary of NASA Architecture Studies Utilizing Fission Surface Power Technology," NASA/TM-2011-216819, April 2011.

[3] Oleson, S. R., Packard, T., Turnbull, E., et al., "A Deployable 40 kWe Lunar Fission Surface Power Concept," *Nuclear and Emerging Technologies for Space*, 2022.

[4] Burke, C., Howard, R.L., Jr., & Kessler, P. (2022). Internal Layout of a Lunar Surface Habitat. *AIAA ASCEND 2022*.

[5] Dorsey, J.T., Wu, K.C., & Smith, R.W. (2008). Structural Definition and Mass Estimation of Lunar Surface Habitats for the Lunar Architecture Team Phase 2 (LAT-2) Study. NASA Langley Research Center.

[6] Roberts, M. (1993). Inflatable Habitation for the Lunar Base. *2nd Conference on Lunar Bases and Space Activities,* NASA Johnson Space Center.

[7] C. Burke, R. L. Howard, Jr., and P. Kessler, "Internal Layout of a Lunar Surface Habitat," *AIAA ASCEND 2022*.

[8] L. S. Mason and D. I. Poston, "A Summary of NASA Architecture Studies Utilizing Fission Surface Power Technology," NASA/TM-2011-216819, Apr. 2011.

[9] S. Oleson et al., "A Deployable 40 kWe Lunar Fission Surface Power Concept," presented at the ANS Nuclear and Emerging Technologies for Space, 2021.

[10] G. R. Woodcock, "Robotic Lunar Surface Operations: Engineering Analysis for the Design, Emplacement, Checkout and Performance of Robotic Lunar Surface Systems," Boeing D615-11901, NASA Ames Research Center, Jan. 1990.

[11] F. J. Guerrero-Gonzalez and P. Zabel, "System analysis of an ISRU production plant: Extraction of metals and oxygen from lunar regolith," Acta Astronautica, vol. 203, pp. 187-201, Feb. 2023.

[12] G. Sanders, "Progress review of NASA lunar ISRU development 2019 to 2025," presented at Luxembourg Space Resources Week, May 19, 2025.

[13] S. S. Schreiner, "Molten regolith electrolysis reactor modeling and optimization of in-situ resource utilization systems," M.S. thesis, Dept. Aeronaut. Astronaut. Eng., Massachusetts Inst. Technol., Cambridge, MA, USA, 2015.

[14] GITAI USA, "GITAI USA has successfully completed significant countermeasures for the lunar environment," Press Release, Jul. 2023. [Online]. Available: https://gitai.tech/2023/07/05/gitai-usa-has-successfully-completed-significant-countermeasures-for-the-lunar-environment/

[15] S. Higa *et al.*, "GITAI R1 rover for lunar exploration and base construction," in *Lunar Exploration Analysis Group,* 2022.

[16] J. M. Schuler *et al.*, "ISRU Pilot Excavator (IPEx) Technology Readiness Level 5 Design Overview," presented at ASCEND, 2024.

[17] R. P. Mueller *et al.*, “Regolith Advanced Surface Systems Operations Robot (RASSOR),” *Earth and Space 2013*.

[18] NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory, “CADRE (Cooperative Autonomous Distributed Robotic Exploration),” 2026 mission description. [Online]. Available: https://www.jpl.nasa.gov/missions/cadre/

[19] K. Vasudeva and M. R. Emami, “Lunar Robotic Construction System Using Raw Regolith: Design Conceptualization,” *Aerospace*, vol. 12, no. 947, 2025.

[20] B. Edwards et al., “3GPP Mobile Telecommunications Technology on the Moon,” *IEEE Aerospace Conf 2023*

[21] Nokia Corporation, “Nokia and Intuitive Machines deliver first cellular network to the Moon; achieve some key mission objectives,” Press Release, Mar. 10, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.nokia.com/newsroom/nokia-and-intuitive-machines-deliver-first-cellular-network-to-the-moon-achieve-some-key-mission-objectives/

[22] J. Verville and W. Eddy, “Onboard Processing for LunaNet Data Services,” in *Proc. 2025 IEEE Aerospace Conf.*, Big Sky, MT, USA, 2025.

[23] W. W. Jun et al., “A Rapid, Low-Cost Path to Lunar Communication and Navigation with a Lunar Surface Station,” in *Proc. 2025 IEEE Aerospace Conf.*, Big Sky, MT, USA, 2025, doi: 10.1109/AERO63441.2025.11068684.

[24] NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, “Lunar Multi-GNSS Receiver Project,” Tech. Rep., Greenbelt, MD, USA, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://ntrs.nasa.gov/api/citations/20210022834/downloads/TechPort%20--%20Lunar%20Multi-GNSS%20 Receiver%20entry.docx.pdf.

[25] R. P. Mueller, "Lunar base construction planning," AIAA ASCEND, 2023, pp. 1-15.

[26] Eagle Engineering, Inc., "Lunar surface construction equipment study," NASA CR-172048, 1988.

[27] G. Woodcock et al., "Robotic lunar surface operations: Engineering analysis for the design, emplacement, checkout and performance of robotic lunar surface systems," NASA CR-189016, 1990.

[28] M. Nayak, Ed., "The Commercial Lunar Economy Field Guide: A Vision for Industry on the Moon in the Next Decade," Air University Press, Maxwell AFB, AL, USA, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/AUPress/Books/B_186_Nayak_Lunar_Economy_Field_Guide.pdf

[29] Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), "Collaborating Toward Integrated Commercial Lunar Infrastructure," DARPA News Release, Arlington, VA, USA, Dec. 5, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.darpa.mil/news/2023/commercial-lunar-infrastructure

[30] Space Florida, "Secure U.S. Leadership in Space Act," Space Florida, Cocoa, FL, USA, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.spaceflorida.gov/secure-u-s-leadership-in-space-act

[31] A. Janikowski, "Sharing the Risk, Sharing the Reward: A Framework for the Creation of an International Space Development Bank," New Space, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 285-295, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1089/space.2023.0006. [Online]. Available: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1089/space.2023.0006

[32] M. Lindroos, "Lunar Base Studies - 1996- Human Lunar Return - NSS," Nat. Space Soc., Washington, DC, USA, 1996, pp. 1-15.

Manuscript Submission Checklists

[Note: this page should be deleted before final manuscript submission]

1. First Draft Manuscript checklist
    - ☐ File is .docx format
    - ☐ Line numbers are visible along the left hand margin
    - ☐ Paper number is located in the upper right corner of the headers
    - ☐ Conference details are located in the upper left corner of the headers
    - ☐ Abstract matches easychair content (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
    - ☐ Authors and affiliations match easychair authors (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
    - ☐ Title matches easychair title (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
    - ☐ Paper length (including references and appendices, but excluding this page) is 15 pages or fewer.
    - ☐ All content is included (paper will be rejected if only partially complete)

2. Second Draft Manuscript
    Note that Second drafts are only required if your first draft manuscript received one or more scores of 0 or lower. If all scores from reviewers were 1, 2, or 3, please proceed to the final manuscript
    - ☐ File is .docx format
    - ☐ Line numbers are visible along the left hand margin
    - ☐ Paper number is located in the upper right corner of the headers
    - ☐ Conference details are located in the upper left corner of the headers
    - ☐ Abstract matches easychair content (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
    - ☐ Authors and affiliations match easychair authors (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
    - ☐ Title matches easychair title (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
    - ☐ Paper length (including references and appendices, but excluding this page) is 15 pages or fewer.
    - ☐ Changes from the first draft are tracked so reviewers can see where their comments have been addressed.

3. Final Manuscript
    - ☐ File is .pdf format
    - ☐ Line numbers are removed
    - ☐ Paper number is located in the upper right corner of the headers
    - ☐ Conference details are located in the upper left corner of the headers
    - ☐ Abstract matches easychair content (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
    - ☐ Authors and affiliations match easychair authors (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
    - ☐ Title matches easychair title (note that Easychair can be updated if needed)
    - ☐ Paper length (including references and appendices, but excluding this page) is 15 pages or fewer.
    - ☐ This page is removed after confirming all content above is included and accurate.