

Document Version

Final published version

Citation (APA)

Heumassej, Y., Cervone, A., & Vincent-Bonnieu, S. (2025). Recycling space debris for lunar applications: A mission design and energy analysis perspective. *Journal of Space Safety Engineering*, 13(1), 202-211.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsse.2025.11.007>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

In case the licence states "Dutch Copyright Act (Article 25fa)", this publication was made available Green Open Access via the TU Delft Institutional Repository pursuant to Dutch Copyright Act (Article 25fa, the Taverne amendment). This provision does not affect copyright ownership.
Unless copyright is transferred by contract or statute, it remains with the copyright holder.

Sharing and reuse

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Recycling space debris for lunar applications: A mission design and energy analysis perspective

Y. Heumassej^{a,c}, A. Cervone^b, S. Vincent-Bonnieu^{c,*}

^a Department of Space Systems Engineering, Delft University of Technology, Kluyverweg 1, 2629 HS Delft, The Netherlands

^b Department of Astrodynamics & Space Missions, Delft University of Technology, Kluyverweg 1, 2629 HS Delft, The Netherlands

^c European Space Agency, Directorate Human and Robotic Exploration, Keplerlaan 1, NL-2200 AG Noordwijk-ZH, The Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 12 September 2025
Received in revised form 27 November 2025
Accepted 27 November 2025
Available online 3 December 2025

Keywords:

Space debris
Moon
Lunar exploration
Recycling
In-orbit servicing
Low-thrust propulsion

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the feasibility of using space debris as a supplemental resource for Lunar infrastructure, with a particular focus on the mission design and energy requirements of debris transfer operations. While recycling methods themselves remain at a conceptual stage, this work establishes a technical baseline for how orbital debris—specifically upper stages in GTO could be captured and transported for Lunar processing. The analysis highlights the central challenge of orbital transfer alignment under long-term perturbations and evaluates multiple capture and transfer scenarios, comparing them against direct material delivery missions. Both chemical and electric propulsion architectures are assessed, demonstrating potential energy savings of up to 30 % per kilogram of material, with further reductions when rideshare configurations are employed. By quantifying the mission energy expenditure, this study clarifies the role that efficient transfer design can play in making debris recycling a viable supplement to In-Situ Resource Utilization and reducing reliance on costly terrestrial launch. The results are intended to inform future research on processing methods by first establishing the transfer architectures under which recycling missions could realistically operate.

© 2025 International Association for the Advancement of Space Safety. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights are reserved, including those for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

1. Introduction

1.1. The lunar campaign and its technical drivers

For the first time since the end of the Apollo programme in 1972, a regain of interest for human space flight to the Moon emerged with the Artemis programme in USA, but also with others lunar exploration programmes in China and India, the establishment of a permanent human presence on the Moon is a crucial milestone for the advancement of human space exploration [1]. The Argonaut, the European Space Agency's [2] Lunar lander, is envisioned to be Europe's autonomous access to the Lunar surface in the near future. With a 2100 kg payload mass [2] and a 115 €M launch cost for Ariane 64 [3], even minimal infrastructure on the Moon will demand significant mass delivery capabilities, driving costs into billions. Reducing the launch burden using raw material recycled from space debris could be a key enabler for sustainable Lunar development.

1.2. Nature and urgency of the space debris problem

In parallel with Lunar development, Earth's orbital environment has become congested mostly by satellite constellations with about 10 times more active satellites now compared to a decade ago [4]. The space industry has grown, with launch traffic increasing by over 130 % since 2020, and over 4300 % since 2010 [5]. Old rocket stages and inactive satellites now constitute a critical threat to the use of space. Although international initiatives addressed the mitigation and removal of space debris, the scale of the problem requires long term strategy beyond disposal alone.

1.3. Recycling as a potential solution

Instead of focusing only on the removal of debris, space debris could be considered as a resource. Recycling spent stages and defunct satellites has the dual benefit of reducing collision risk in orbit while supplying valuable raw materials for space infrastructure. Compared to In-Situ Resource Utilization (ISRU) on the Moon, which require scarce metals like zinc and copper in the Lunar regolith (53 and 18 ppm, respectively) [6], - recycling of space debris may provide an initial step for the establishment of a Lunar base.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: sebastien.vincent-bonnieu@esa.int (S. Vincent-Bonnieu).

Nomenclature

C_p	Specific heat coefficient
E	Energy
H	Enthalpy
Q	Heat
i	Inclination
J_2	J_2 coefficient
L	Latent heat
M	Mass
N	Mass
n	Mean motion
p	Semi-latus rectum
R_E	Radius of Earth
T	Temperature
V	Velocity
Δ	Change
Ω	Right Ascension of the Ascending Node
ω	Argument of periapsis

Acronyms/Abbreviation

API	Application Programming Interface
AoP	Argument of Periapsis
DISCOS	Database and Information System Characterising Objects in Space
ESC-A	Etage Supérieur Cryotechnique de type A
ESA	European Space Agency
GTO	Geostationary Transfer Orbit
GEO	Geosynchronous Earth Orbit
ISRU	In-Situ Resource Utilization
IADC	Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee
LEO	Low-Earth Orbit
LLPM	Lower Liquid Propulsion Module
LTO	Lunar Transfer Orbit
MON	Mixed Oxides of Nitrogen
MMH	Monomethyl Hydrazine
MMT	MiniMegaTORTORA
NIST	National Institute of Standards of Technology
NTO	Nitrogen Tetroxide
NORAD	North American Aerospace Defense Command
RAAN	Right Ascension of the Ascending Node
TLE	Two-Line Element
ULPM	Upper Liquid Propulsion Module

1.4. Gaps in prior work and contribution of this study

Previous studies have discussed the concepts of debris recycling, but technical drivers and scenarios remain unexplored. In particular, no attention has been given to the energy expenditure required for such missions compared to direct delivery from Earth. This paper addresses that gap by establishing a baseline analysis of energy-efficient debris capture and transfer architectures for Lunar applications. By quantifying the mission energy requirements and comparing them to conventional delivery, this study clarifies the role of transfer mission design as a key enabler of debris recycling for future Lunar infrastructure.

2. Methodology & mission architecture

The recycling of space debris is a novel and relatively unexplored concept, especially within the context of Lunar exploration activities. In order to investigate the merit of such a mission concept, this paper presents an exploratory study which focuses on both mission feasibility as well as viability. Feasibility represents whether a mission can be performed at all, while viability represents whether the mission is sustainable. Regarding a concept as




Fig. 1. Space debris recycling mission architecture.

novel as recycling space debris, strong evidence for feasibility as well as viability is required for such a mission concept to be considered for further study.

This work focuses primarily on single-target space debris return missions as a baseline. That is, a single mission targets a single space debris object for recycling. The overall mission architecture is presented in Fig. 1. Various mission scenarios were analyzed in order to capture a broad potential solution space within this defined mission architecture.

Rather than relying on economic cost estimations, it was chosen to compare mission scenarios based on total energy expenditure as the defining metric for mission viability assessment. Here, energy expenditure represents the total energy spent throughout the entire process of turning space debris into raw materials. Whereas economic cost is complex to quantify for novel missions and is subject to significant uncertainty over longer periods of time, the energy “cost” is a more objective and readily accessible metric. Considering the exploratory nature of this study, energy cost is particularly powerful as a comparative metric to assess the merit of various mission scenarios that, though being substantially different, are similar in their core architecture. A space debris recycling mission can in many ways be seen from the perspective of a manufacturing process rather than a traditional space mission. The mission, here, is the transportation and recycling of space debris into raw materials. Energy, particularly embodied energy, is a metric often used for the study and comparison of such manufacturing processes [7]. Additionally, the use of energy, or exergy, has been demonstrated for the analysis of advanced space mission concepts [8]. As such, it was chosen to adopt this approach to assess the recycling of space debris from a global mission perspective.

The Lunar surface was identified as the ideal location for a recycling infrastructure, avoiding the complexities of establishing and operating an orbital recycling station. The presence of gravity and the wealth of space available on the Lunar surface allow for the adaptation of well understood Earth-based recycling practices from the metal industry. Additionally, proposed space debris recycling missions for Earth orbit applications typically leave debris behind in orbit, as not every piece of a space debris object can be recycled. By moving the recycling operations to the Lunar surface, a true net-zero orbital debris operation can be achieved. Through extensive literature review, it was concluded that design of the Lunar segment is subject to immense complexity and uncertainty. Colonization of the Moon is characterized not by enormous technical challenges, but political ones as well. The work presented in this paper is in many ways a feasibility study, establishing a fundamental though preliminary baseline of understanding regarding the entire design space for a space debris Lunar recycling mission. Considering the novel and unexplored nature of the Lunar recycling concept in existing literature, the establishment of the Lunar segment, including design, build-up and operations was considered




Fig. 2. Visualization of debris orbits for all actively tracked space debris objects.

beyond the scope of this study. It was therefore assumed that the required recycling infrastructure was already present on the Lunar surface. As a result of this assumption, the energy analysis represents only the energy cycle of the complete recycling process and not the establishment of the required infrastructure.

Finally, in order to facilitate a meaningful assessment of the merit of a space debris recycling mission, an adequate reference case must be established as an alternative to be compared against. For this study, the direct delivery of raw materials to the Moon using a Lunar lander mission was considered for direct comparison. In particular, the use of ESA’s Argonaut lander was studied.

3. Space debris identification & analysis

In order to establish a baseline understanding of the space debris population currently in orbit around Earth, a comprehensive space debris dataset was generated and analyzed. Based in this analysis, an optimal space debris target was selected.

3.1. Generating a space debris dataset

The Database and Information System Characterising Objects in Space (DISCOS), as published by ESA’s Space Debris Office [9], was used as the basis for the space debris dataset, using the Application Programming Interface (API). Other databases such as the Celestrak [10] database were used as supplementary resources to create a comprehensive dataset of all debris in orbit. Through the analysis of this dataset, a total debris mass of 6887.4 metric tons was found to orbit Earth as of the data acquisition date (June 2023). Rocket bodies make up the majority of this debris with a mass fraction of 58.1 %, with inactive satellite platforms making up a combined 39.5 %. The remaining 2.4 % consists of a wide range of objects typically low in mass, including payload adapters, radiator covers, de-spin weights etc.

Two-Line Element (TLE) sets published by the United States Space Command [11] were used to extract orbital tracking data. Using this data, orbital analysis of the entire dataset could be performed. A simulation of the orbits of all space debris objects is shown in Fig. 2.

Two main regions of high density can be observed, specifically around Low-Earth Orbit (LEO) and in a band near Geostationary Orbit (GEO). This band is inclined at approximately 15° as a result of Luni-Solar interactions [12]. In order to get an overview of the




Fig. 3. Cumulative mass distribution of the space debris dataset mapped onto debris semi-major axis.

spatial mass distribution of debris, Fig. 3 presents a mapping of the space debris cumulative mass distribution as a function of the semi-major axis up to a value of 50000 km. Debris in higher orbits does exist, but represents such little mass that it is comparatively negligible.

Once again, two main areas of localized mass can be observed around LEO and GEO, located at semi-major axis values of <8378 km and 42164 km, respectively. Debris accumulation in LEO is limited through the 25-year rule mandated by the Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee [13]. While the 25-year rule, and the newer 5-year rule under ESA’s Zero Debris initiative, formally applies to most missions, compliance remains partial. Many objects remain stranded in orbits with lifetimes well beyond 25 years, particularly at high altitudes where natural decay is negligible. This is not the case for GEO, where despite its much lower launch cadence, more than 1600 tons of debris has accumulated over time. This sheer amount of mass highlights that the GEO graveyard orbit is an inherently unsustainable measure.

Beyond LEO and GEO, another region of clustered mass can be observed in Fig. 3 between semi-major axis values of 22000 km and 30000 km. The majority of these debris objects are spent launch vehicle upper stages drifting in highly elliptical Geostationary Transfer Orbits (GTO) after delivering their payloads. The small number of inactive satellites in this orbital regime are primarily Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) and military satellites including GPS, Galileo, GLONASS, and BeiDou.

3.2. Resources & reserves

The concept of resources and reserves is often used in geology when scoping out deposits of minerals or oil. The U.S. Geological Survey defines resources as “a concentration of naturally occurring solid, liquid, or gaseous material in or on the Earth’s crust in such form and amount that economic extraction of a commodity from the concentration is currently or potentially feasible” [14]. Reserves are defined as “that part of an identified resource that meets specified minimum physical and chemical criteria related to current mining and production practices” [14]. This paper adapts this concept of resources and reserves using the DISCOS database [9], in order to discern what part of the space debris dataset can be considered reserves for a recycling mission. The feasibility of recovery was used as the defining factor between resources and reserves. That is, resources were defined as the material currently in orbit or already on the Lunar surface, with reserves being the subset of these resources that are readily accessible and have potential for feasible recovery.

Fig. 4 presents an overview of the space debris resources and reserves within the context of a recycling mission for Lunar applications.




Fig. 4. Overview of space debris resources and reserves using DISCOS database [9].

Table 1
Characteristics of the three most prevalent Ariane upper stages in GTO [6].

	Ariane 4 H10	Ariane 5 EPS	Ariane 5 ESC-A
Mass [kg]	1754-1920	1190-2850	5000
Orbit	GTO	GTO	GTO
N _{objects}	27	15	63
Principal Materials	AA7020	AA7020	AA2219 & AA7020

The reserves consist primarily of European rocket bodies in higher orbits such as GTO (≈ 523 tons) and inactive, commercial satellites in the GEO graveyard orbit (≈ 1106 tons). The inferred reserves represent debris that is already on the Lunar surface. This includes crashed satellites, old rovers and landers. They are inferred because their exact state is unknown.

The remaining 74 % of the space debris resources in the generated dataset were characterized as nonfeasible, which is a result of two main considerations. First, all non-European objects were for this study as it may be restricted. Military satellites were omitted for similar reasons. Commercially-operated objects were kept as they could potentially be bought after the end of their operational life. Second, all objects in LEO were omitted, as orbital transfer analyses indicated excessive propellant requirements compared to targets in higher energy orbits such as GTO or GEO. Finally, scientific satellites were omitted given that their unique designs would prevent the same debris recycling mission from being performed multiple times.

3.3. The optimal space debris target

Following the identification of space debris reserves, a trade-off process was used to determine the optimal space debris target for a recycling mission for Lunar applications. Within these reserves, it was found that spent Ariane upper stages in GTO are the optimal target for recovery and recycling. These high-mass objects have a high recoverable material mass content (up to 60 % [15]) and their GTO orbits are prime staging points for an efficient transfer to the Moon. Finally, these stages present a substantial risk to operational space assets as they cross through the LEO protected zone at perigee and often also the GEO protected zone at their apogee. As such, removing these objects carries an inherent “value” beyond harvesting their raw materials. Table 1 shows the three most prominent Ariane upper stages drifting in GTO.

Among these three targets, the Ariane 5 ESC-A upper stage was concluded to be the optimal space debris target due to its higher individual object mass and the larger number of objects currently in GTO. The latter is advantageous as it allows for the same recycling mission to be executed multiple times without major changes.

One of the key problems to be solved for debris mitigation missions as a whole is that high potential tumbling rates significantly




Fig. 5. Tumbling behaviour over time for a selected ESC-A upper stage (NORAD 43176). Data from MMT catalogue [17] with added trendline.

complicate debris capture. The Kazan Federal University publishes a catalogue of tumbling rates based on optical observations from its MiniMegaTORTORA (MMT) system [16]. It was found through analysis of the 78 Ariane 5 rocket body objects that the rotation of effectively all of these stages is slowing down over time. Note however that observational data is often incomplete, since the data from the MMT database is based on light curve measurements and ESC-A stages spend the majority of their orbital period far from Earth due to the highly elliptical nature of their orbit, which limits observation opportunities from ground-based instruments such as MMT. This affects data completeness without imposing constraints on where objects can be observed. Fig. 5 highlights this increase in rotational period, which seems to follow exponential growth as indicated by the dashed trendline. Since the ESC-A stages are identical and launched to highly similar orbits, their rotational behaviour can be reasonably hypothesized to be comparable. The uncertainty for in-orbit observations was mentioned in the conclusions section. Nevertheless, individual differences due to mission anomalies or fragmentation cannot be excluded.

This natural slowing of the rotation further makes the ESC-A stages ideal targets for a potential recycling mission, as tumbling represents the main issue in active capture of non-cooperative debris targets. Over time this observed braking effect could widen the pool of objects that could be captured safely. The long orbital lifetimes of these stages in GTO substantiate this as a practical consideration.

4. Mission design & energy analysis

With the ideal space debris target selected, the principle required input data and conditions are defined. This allows for the complete mission to be defined and analyzed within three distinct mission phases: launch, orbital transfer and debris processing.

4.1. Launch on Ariane 6

Following its recent maiden flight on the 9th of July 2024, Ariane 6 supersedes Ariane 5 as Europe’s principle heavy-lift launch vehicle. Ariane 6 is capable of launching a high payload mass of 11500 kg directly into GTO [18], where the ESC-A space debris targets are located. This makes the utilization of Ariane 6 a natural choice for a space debris recycling mission concept. It should be noted however that these GTO orbits are not exactly equal. In reality, they cover a range of sizes and orientations based on original launch parameters and the influence of orbital perturbations over the years since the original launch date. Utilizing the generated space debris dataset, Table 2 shows the range of orbital parameters for ESC-A stages in GTO and the standard Ariane GTO [18].

Table 2
Range of orbital elements for ESC-A and standard Ariane GTO.

Orbital Element	GTO ESC-A	Ariane GTO
Semi-major axis [km]	20959–24285	24474.6
Perigee altitude [km]	174–465	250
Apogee altitude [km]	28970–35349	35786
Eccentricity [-]	0.69–0.73	0.73
Inclination [deg]	0.43–6.80	6

Table 3
Energy expenditure analysis results for Ariane 6.

Stage	M_{prop} [kg]	E_{cost} [TJ]
Core stage	150000	1.797
Upper stage	30000	0.360
P120 Booster (4x)	4 × 143600	4 × 0.934
Total		5.893

For this study, it was considered that all energy expended through the launch comes in principle from the combustion of the propellants. That is, the expended energy is equal to the available chemical energy within the propellants which is liberated upon combustion. The stoichiometric reaction for the combustion of liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen as used by Ariane 6 is:



Note that the Vulcain 2.1 and Vinci engines of Ariane 6 operate at non-stoichiometric Oxidizer to Fuel (O/F) ratios. This was accounted for by adapting the reaction for the excess fuel under the assumption of ideal combustion. The energy liberated from this reaction $\Delta_r H$ can be determined by calculating the change in molar enthalpies of reactants H_{react} , and product H_{prod} , while n_{react} and n_{prod} represent their number of moles, as formulated in Eq. (2) [19,20].

$$\Delta_r H = \sum(n_{prod} H_{prod}) - \sum(n_{react} H_{react}) \quad (2)$$

Instead of assessing the total enthalpy $\Delta_r H$, it is common to determine the standard enthalpy of reaction $\Delta_r H^\circ$ utilizing standard heats of formation as shown in Eq. (3) [20]. The standard state here refers to 298.15 K.

$$\Delta_r H^\circ = \sum(n_{prod} \Delta_f H^\circ_{prod}) - \sum(n_{react} \Delta_f H^\circ_{react}) \quad (3)$$

Using this formulation is more practical for calculations as values for standard enthalpy of formation are extensively documented by various sources such as the National Institute of Standards and Technology [21,22]. Adapting for the non-standard conditions of the cryogenic propellants used by Ariane 6 can then be done using Hess' law [18], which states the following:

$$\Delta_r H = \Delta_r H^\circ - \Delta H_{298K} \quad (4)$$

The same approach was used for the solid propellant P120 booster stages, accounting for the appropriate reaction equation for the HTPB 1912 propellants and the O/F ratio of the P120 engine. Converting the molar quantities to mass values of the distinct stages of Ariane 64, the following results were obtained (Table 3).

4.2. Orbital transfers

A zero-patched conics approach was utilized for the orbital mechanics as a foundation to allow for the design and analysis of various orbital transfer strategies [23]. While Earth-Moon transfers are strong 3-body problems, the zero-patched conics approach was found to yield ΔV values within 1 % to 6 % accuracy depending on the transfer scenario, which was considered adequate for this preliminary study. While Table 2 shows a range of orbital parameters




Fig. 6. GTO orientation of actual Ariane upper stages.

for the ESC-A stages, the standard Ariane GTO was taken as a representative baseline for the orbital transfer. Considering the standard orbit is of larger overall size than the actual ESC-A orbits, it was assumed that Ariane 6 is capable of putting the transfer vehicle directly into the debris orbit, maintaining an appropriately safe distance. Note that this assumption does not influence the ability for a potential rideshare mission to enter GEO. The transfer vehicle dry mass was set at 1500 kg for the transfer analyses, along with a debris mass of 5000 kg for the ESC-A stage. This was based on the analysis of similar vehicles and extrapolating their payload mass to match the ESC-A. Two feasible transfer strategies were found: a direct, quasi-impulsive transfer using chemical propulsion, and a hybrid propulsion transfer using low-thrust propulsion.

4.2.1. Quasi-impulsive chemical transfer

A standard, quasi-impulsive Hohmann transfer to the Moon was taken as the first baseline mission scenario to be analyzed. Though whereas the launch of traditional Moon missions can be targeted to facilitate favourable alignment for reaching the Moon, this is not the case for a space debris recycling mission. The capturing of debris prior to transfer imposes significant constraints on the transfer geometry, as the initial orbit is fixed by the specific targeted debris object. These upper stages in GTO have been subject to orbital perturbations for years, which have shifted their orbits continuously. This creates an alignment problem, highlighted in Fig. 6, which shows the actual orbital orientation of two Ariane upper stages currently in orbit, in relation to a momentarily fixed Moon orbit.

Indeed, a standard transfer manoeuvre applied at perigee, shown in red, could miss the Moon entirely. The baseline assumption of an optimal aligned transfer geometry is therefore invalid for a space debris recycling mission. This orbital alignment problem was found to be one of the primary complications for a debris recycling mission targeting Lunar applications. The principle orbital perturbation in GTO was found to be the non-spherical shape of Earth's gravity field: the J2 effect. The average secular rate of change in Argument of Periapsis (AoP) and Right Ascension of the Ascending Node (RAAN) can be determined using Eq. (5) and 6 [24].

$$\dot{\omega} = \frac{3}{4} n J_2 r \left(\frac{R_E}{p} \right)^2 (4 - 5 \sin^2(i)) \quad (5)$$

$$\dot{\Omega} = -\frac{3}{2} n J_2 \left(\frac{R_E}{p} \right)^2 (\cos(i)) \quad (6)$$

This perturbing force can actually be used to create a favourable alignment by initiating a phasing period after debris capture in GTO. Propagation of the GTO orbit revealed that these rotations in




Fig. 7. Lunar transfer orbit orientation after J2 phasing propagation in GTO, interval = 10 days.

Table 4
Orbital manoeuvre performance budgets for quasi-impulsive transfer mission scenario.

Manoeuvre	ΔV [km/s]	M_{prop} [kg]	E_{cost} [GJ]
Rendez-vous	0.182	498.3	3.2
TLI	0.747	2823.5	18.3
Lunar capture	0.919	2667.8	17.3
Descent injection	0.025	63.0	0.4
Landing termination	0.565	1281.1	8.3
Total	2.437	7333.7	47.5

AoP and RAAN create a combined motion in which the orbit path moves in a saddle-like shape, as shown in Fig. 7.

It was found that, given any set position of the Moon, there are two unique combinations of RAAN and AoP for any particular debris orbit in GTO that lead to a suitable transfer alignment. The required phasing time depends on the initial conditions of the debris orbit, but is bound by a worst-case value of approximately 380 days to precess through half of a complete J2 revolution. Additionally, since the line of apsides for this transfer may lie outside of the equatorial plane, the inclination difference between the transfer orbit and the Moon changes. This additional inclination change, in the worst case, is bound by a value equal to the GTO inclination. Also In the GEO region, Luni-solar and J2 perturbations are comparable in magnitude and can cause notable long-term changes in RAAN and inclination. These effects may alter alignment periods and relative inclination with the lunar plane, possibly extending phasing duration beyond the estimated 380 days.

Accounting for these worst-case situations, the transfer performance is summarized in Table 4. The energy cost for these manoeuvres was determined using the same method used for Ariane 6, though utilizing a Monomethyl Hydrazine (MMH) & Nitrogen Tetroxide(NTO) bi-propellant system. While toxic, MMH remains commonly used for Lunar missions, such as the European Service Module (ESM) and Chandrayaan 2 & 3. The ΔV values in Table 4 were derived using a patched-conics orbital model based on the methodology described by [23] and [24], assuming standard GTO parameters for Ariane 6 and a nominal lunar transfer geometry. Where relevant, results were validated against FreeFlyer numerical simulations to confirm consistency within 5 %.

Performing a soft landing was found to be infeasible due to excessive propellant mass requirements imposed by the large debris mass exceeding the launch capacity of Ariane 6. Instead, a final termination burn was applied to slow down the stack in a controlled crash onto the Lunar surface. A baseline value of 1200 m/s was

used for the crash velocity, based on the range of 800 to 1600 m/s proposed by Koch [15], which facilitates debris break-up without vaporizing it. Through further analysis, presented in Section 5.3, it was found that this crash velocity could be reduced significantly without exceeding launch mass restrictions. An environmental concern is the production of lunar dust ejecta during impact events, as it may temporarily contaminate the local exosphere and present risks to low-altitude assets. Although comprehensive modelling of ejecta dispersion is beyond the current study’s scope, previous analyses (e.g., [15]) indicate that using shallow impact angles and predetermined landing zones can mitigate ejecta distribution. Utilizing shallow impact angles as well as landing in craters as a designated “space debris Lunar landing zone”, as proposed by the Lunar Resource Registry [25], could further aid to preserve the state of the debris and limit impact ejecta. This topic merits further dedicated investigation in future research. Furthermore, since the landing termination burn is performed by the transfer vehicle shortly before impacting the surface, the transfer vehicle will by definition be lost, acting instead as a shock absorber to potentially protect the debris from the initial impact energy. The characteristics of such hyper-velocity impacts on the Moon are as of yet not well understood. Though satellites currently in Lunar orbit, like the Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter, could already be used to make observations of known crash sites of rocket stages on the Lunar surface to start filling this gap in knowledge.

4.3. Low-thrust electric hybrid transfer

The implementation of low-thrust electric propulsion, with its substantially higher specific impulse, is an attractive way of reducing the propellant mass. Due to their low thrust levels, manoeuvre times are much longer in order to facilitate the total required impulse. This generally makes low-thrust propulsion unsuitable for manoeuvres that require high impulse over a short time, like Lunar capture. As such, a hybrid propulsion transfer was formulated based on the previous quasi-impulsive mission scenario though this time with the implementation of low-thrust propulsion for the orbit-raising from GTO to Lunar intercept, where chemical propulsion was used to perform the required Lunar capture manoeuvre.

As low-thrust manoeuvres are substantially more complex to analyze than traditional impulsive manoeuvres, these were modelled using the FreeFlyer orbital simulation suite [26]. It was chosen to use 4 Busek BHT-6000 thrusters for the propulsion system, also used by the Lunar Gateway [27]. The simulated low-thrust trajectory from an initial GTO is presented in Fig. 8.

However, Fig. 8 shows that the alignment problem is also present for the low-thrust manoeuvre, as the apogee passage point is misaligned from the Moon’s orbit by an angle φ . In order to solve this problem, a thrust-arc approach was implemented in which thrust is only applied for true anomaly values $\theta < 180^\circ$. This effectively phases the apogee forward within the orbital plane over time and allows for the manipulation of the orbit’s orientation throughout the orbit-raising manoeuvre. Thrusting in the first half of the orbit compared to the second half is more efficient as it adds to the natural J2 revolution early in the trajectory.

Fig. 9 shows this method applied for the maximum required shift angle φ of 180° which ensures orbital transfer alignment can be achieved irrespective of the initial debris orbit orientation.

This worst-case scenario yielded a total flight time of 636 days. While long flight times reduce the operational lifetime of conventional satellites, this is not a problem for a debris recycling mission. Since the transfer vehicle has no operational lifetime beyond the transfer phase, a long flight time is not an inherent problem. Using less engines reduces vehicle power requirements without changing ΔV , though at the cost of longer flight time.




Fig. 8. Simulated low-thrust trajectory from GTO to Lunar altitude at apogee, adapted to show alignment.




Fig. 9. Simulated thrust-arcing trajectory from GTO to Lunar altitude at apogee, with 180° apogee shift.

Table 5
Orbital manoeuvre performance budgets for low- thrust hybrid transfer mission scenario.

Manoeuvre	ΔV [km/s]	M_{prop} [kg]	E_{cost} [GJ]
Rendez-vous	0.182	393.2	2.5
Low-thrust orbit raising	3.368	1379.0	0
Lunar capture	0.823	2354.3	15.3
Descent injection	0.025	63.0	0.4
Landing termination	0.565	1281.1	8.3
Total	4.963	5470.6	26.5

Following optimization of the simulation for minimum propellant usage and adapting the outputs into the defined zero-patched conics approach, the transfer performance results for this mission scenario is shown in Table 5. The efficiency gains of the low-thrust manoeuvre are highlighted by the significantly lower propellant mass, despite realizing a much larger ΔV . Note that the energy cost of the low-thrust orbit raising manoeuvre is by definition equal to zero as the solar electric power used to operate the electric propulsion is obtained effectively for free from the Sun.

4.4. Debris processing on the lunar surface

For this study, it was assumed that following the controlled crash onto the Lunar surface, space debris scrap of moderate size could be collected in a way that is suitable for rover transportation to the recycling site for further processing and final utilization at least in a semi- autonomous fashion. Re-melting the debris is an important step to reshape the material, drawing heavily upon well-understood terrestrial recycling processes for metals. As such, simple thermal re-melting processes were considered ideal. Inductive heating was concluded to be the most suitable re-melting technique, as it only uses electrical energy and is widely used in the terrestrial recycling industry, which makes it readily adaptable to the conditions of the Moon, as highlighted also by Koch [13]. The former makes it attractive for leveraging solar- electric power stations which could already be used for Lunar colonization.

To assess the energy required for the inductive heating of the salvaged debris, Eq. (7) was set up. This heat equation details the determination of the total theoretical energy required for heating and melting a material mass M from an initial temperature T_0 to a final pouring temperature T_{pour} .

$$Q = M [C_{p_{solid}} (T_{melt} - T_0) + L_{fusion} + C_{p_{liquid}} (T_{pour} - T_{melt})] \quad (7)$$

The specific heat C_p is not constant, but rather it varies with temperature and phase, which was estimated using the Shomate equation shown in Eq. (8) [21].

$$C_p = A + BT + Ct^2 + Dt^3 + E/t^2 \quad (8)$$

Where t is the temperature in Kelvin divided by 1000. The variables A, B, C, D and E in this formulation are experimentally determined constants obtained from the NIST [21]. Using an initial Lunar surface temperature of

48.5°C based on measurements by Chandrayaan-3 [28], a pouring temperature of 960°C for aluminium alloys [7] and a furnace efficiency of 90 %, a heat value of 1.548 MJ/kg of aluminium was found.

Finally, the casting of molten aluminium into feedstock material was chosen as the utilization to complete the creation of new raw materials. A value of 0.211 kWh (0.760 MJ) per kg of aluminium was taken from terrestrial primary recycling industry. As such, a total output energy of 2.31 MJ/kg is required for the complete recycling process. Accounting for an assumed electrical circuit efficiency of 25 %, including solar cell efficiency, a total solar energy usage of 9.23 MJ/kg of aluminium. Given a dry mass of 5000 kg for the ESC-A target and a 60 % usable raw material fraction, a total energy of 27.7 GJ is required for the recycling of a complete ESC-A upper stage.

4.5. Alternative argonaut mission scenario

While a direct raw material delivery mission to the Lunar surface does not have to rely on any in-situ recycling operations, the energy cost associated with the manufacturing of the delivered raw materials must not be omitted. The overall process cycle for this primary production is well understood and documented. Choate and Green [7] report a total required onsite energy of 89.42 MJ/kg for the primary production aluminium. Note however that a distinction was made between onsite energy usage (i.e. the energy used within the production facilities) and "tacit" energy. This tacit or gross energy includes secondary energy required for producing electric energy and raw materials expended in the production. Accounting for sustainable energy generation, the US grid for the aluminium industry consumes on average 3.01 kWh of chemical (fuel) energy to supply 1 kWh of electrical energy [7]. With this in mind, the total tacit energy cost of primary aluminium production is equal to 224.14 MJ/kg. Therefore, a total energy of 470.70

Table 6
Orbital manoeuvre performance budgets for Argonaut mission scenario.

Manoeuvre	ΔV [km/s]	M_{prop} [kg]	E_{cost} [GJ]
Lunar capture	0.910	2288.0	14.8
Descent injection	0.025	54.6	0.4
Landing termination	1.885	3045.4	19.7
Total	2.820	5388.0	34.9




Fig. 10. Specific global mission energy cost comparison.

GJ is required to manufacture the Argonaut's maximum 2100 kg payload.

For the orbital transfer, the Argonaut is put directly onto a Lunar Transfer Orbit (LTO) by Ariane 64. As the Argonaut uses a chemical bipropellant (MMH & MON3) system [29], a quasi-impulsive maneuver method was used again to analyze the orbital transfer. Adopting the input conditions of the LTO and accounting for a soft landing, the transfer performance is shown in Table 6.

5. Results

Compiling the outputs obtained throughout the analyses, a combined, global mission energy analysis was performed. This analysis formed the basis for the comparative analysis between the defined mission scenarios and the alternative mission scenario utilizing the Argonaut lander.

5.1. Specific global mission energy cost

Rather than comparing a total embodied energy cost, a specific energy cost, i.e. the energy cost per kg of raw material delivered was defined. This represents the energy investment corrected for an analogous raw material to create an equivalent comparative analysis across the various mission scenarios. Fig. 10 presents the results of the specific global mission energy analysis. The distinction between total energy use and energy cost is important again here, as solar energy by definition does not represent an actual energy investment and therefore does not contribute to energy cost. This is in contrast to other energy expenditures such as the combustion of propellants, which constitute a strict energy loss.

Both recycling mission concepts result in a 31 % lower specific energy cost than a conventional material delivery mission. This is primarily due to their substantially larger returned material mass. Capturing payload mass in orbit circumvents the strict launch mass constraints which limit the payload mass for traditional landers. It was found that launch dominates the energy analysis, with energy costs one or even two orders of magnitude larger than the other processes. For a space debris recycling mission, this excessive launch energy associated with the payload material has already been provided by the original mission that left this material in orbit in the first place.




Fig. 11. Launch mass distribution of GEO satellites.




Fig. 12. Specific global mission energy cost comparison adapted for launch vehicle payload capacity utilization.

5.2. Launch optimization through rideshare

Capturing payload mass in orbit significantly reduces the required vehicle launch mass. Whereas the Argonaut requires a dedicated launch of Ariane 64 to put it directly on its LTO, this is not the case for the space debris recycling missions. The transfer vehicle wet masses of 8834 kg and 6970 kg for the quasi-impulsive and low-thrust hybrid transfer mission scenarios, leave substantial margin within the 11500 kg payload mass capacity of Ariane 64 to GTO. This margin could be utilized by introducing a secondary client in a rideshare configuration through Ariane's dual payload integration.

This reduces the global mission energy cost by reducing the launch energy proportionally to the launch vehicle payload mass capacity utilization. The targeting of ESC-A upper stage debris objects in GTO makes GEO missions the primary candidates for inclusion as rideshare clients. The historical launch mass for GEO satellites, obtained from the Union of Concerned Scientists [30], in Fig. 11 indicates that numerous clients exist that fit in the leftover payload mass margin.

The only true constraint for a rideshare configuration is that a target must be chosen that naturally approaches an AoP value of 0° or 180° to facilitate client insertion into GEO. The wide spread of AoP values within the ESC-A population combined with the natural J2 motion makes choosing a target based on this constraint a viable option. Additionally, the fact that targeted apogee values of debris orbits have decreased over time may require the rideshare mission to perform a small apogee raising burn in perigee to reach geostationary altitude. Utilizing the Oberth effect combined with the fact that most GEO missions have a powerful rocket engine for GEO circularization, this additional apogee raising manoeuvre is considered a non-critical burden for rideshare missions. This proportional launch vehicle utilization was also applied by Wilson and Vasile [31] when studying the environmental impacts of space missions.

Accounting for this launch optimization through rideshare, the updated specific global mission energy analysis results are presented in Fig. 12.




Fig. 13. Specific energy cost as function of assumed raw material mass fraction.

A total specific energy cost reduction of 50 % and 61 % is observed for the quasi-impulsive and low-thrust hybrid transfer mission scenarios, respectively compared to the conventional lander mission. This substantial reduction reaffirms the importance of the launch as the dominant energy sink and the benefit of reducing launch mass by capturing debris in orbit rather as payload. Wilson and Vasile [31] concluded that the launch also dominates the environmental impacts and carbon footprint of space missions. As such, the more efficient use of the launch vehicle also significantly reduces the environmental impacts and carbon footprint of debris recycling missions.

When comparing the two debris recycling mission concepts directly however, practical aspects of a mission can justify an increased energy expenditure. The implementation of electric propulsion, despite resulting in lower specific energy cost, increases mission complexity. The long low-thrust spiral trajectory is more susceptible to Luni-Solar interactions, which complicates mission planning. Additionally, high power requirements and long flight times drive up vehicle complexity and cost. Additionally, the long flight times of the low-thrust trajectory brings with it practical downsides, such as excessive time spent within the high-radiation environments of the Van Allen belts. A conventional, direct Lunar transfer using chemical propulsion is significantly simpler and faster. For novel, complex missions, simplifying the process chain can be ideal whenever possible and practical. As such, sacrificing the additional 11 % energy cost reduction could potentially be justified.

5.3. Sensitivity analysis

The work presented in this paper relies on several mission-critical assumptions. A sensitivity analysis was conducted to study the impact of variations in these assumptions on the results. The raw material mass fraction of upper stages is the principal assumption, as it directly influences the mass that can be recovered. Fig. 13 presents the impact of raw material mass fractions lowered from the baseline of 60 %.

The intersections with the dotted line represent the break-even points, which are 30 % and 24 % for the quasi-impulsive and low-thrust hybrid transfer mission scenarios, respectively. As such, significant margin exists for lower raw material mass fractions while maintaining a lower specific energy cost. The crash velocity of the transfer vehicle and the debris object is the second main assumption. Fig. 14 presents the impact of lowering the crash velocity on the specific energy cost.

Here too, significant margin exists to lower the crash velocity while maintaining a lower specific energy cost. The reduction in impact velocity is limited by launch vehicle payload capacity, as more propellant is required for all manoeuvres. This limit was reached at 710 m/s and 310 m/s for the quasi-impulsive and low-thrust hybrid transfer mission scenarios, respectively.




Fig. 14. Specific energy cost as function of assumed debris crash velocity onto the Lunar surface.

6. Conclusions & next steps

This study has established technical baseline of the space debris recycling focusing on the transfer design and energy requirements. Using Ariane 5 upper stages in GTO as baseline, we demonstrated that efficient transfer architectures using chemical or electric propulsion can reduce mission energy cost by up to 30 % per kilogram compared to direct delivery from Earth. With rideshare configuration are included, the potential efficiency gains exceed 60 %, showing the importance of transfer optimization as enabler of debris recycling missions.

This work showed that debris recycling can create value beyond the debris mitigation. Recycling contributes to reducing collision risks in congested orbit and also a supplement to Lunar ISRU, particularly for material scarce in the Moon soil. The concept of resources and reserves to characterize quantity of debris provides a useful base for future studies.

The results form a preliminary work toward the practical application of debris recycling. Early steps could include precursor CubeSat missions to missions to characterize the tumbling behavior of Ariane 5 upper stages in GTO, or demonstration capture attempts similar to Astroscale’s planned missions [32]. Complementary investigations of hypervelocity debris impacts on the Moon, using assets such as the Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter or Chandrayaan-2, could also provide critical data for future Lunar processing concepts.

It should be noted that the assumption of pre-existing Lunar recycling infrastructure introduces an optimistic bias in the energy balance. The deployment of large-scale smelting or processing facilities on the Moon would likely require substantial upfront energy and logistical investment. Moreover, long operational durations, rover mobility for debris collection, and site safety protocols would further increase the total energy cost. Considering that the available number of recoverable Ariane 5 upper stages is limited, the long-term return on investment should be re-evaluated once infrastructure deployment energy is included. Future studies should extend this analysis to include infrastructure establishment and operational cycles.

In summary, although the details of recycling methods remain to be developed, this paper demonstrates that mission transfer design is a decisive factor in determining whether debris recycling can become a viable contributor to sustainable Lunar infrastructure. By clarifying the energy and architectural conditions under which such missions are feasible, this work lays the groundwork for advancing the broader field of space debris recycling.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Y. Heumassej: Writing – original draft, Software, Formal analysis, Data curation. **A. Cervone:** Writing – review & editing, Validation, Supervision, Project administration, Conceptualization. **S. Vincent-Bonnieu:** Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Resources, Methodology, Conceptualization.

Acknowledgements

Y. Heumassej would like to thank ESA and TU Delft for their continued support and the opportunity to conduct the study detailed in this paper. The authors would like to express their gratitude to the reviewers for their valuable feedback, which has significantly enhanced the quality of this article.

References

- [1] J. Flahaut, CH van der Bogert, IA Crawford, S Vincent-Bonnieu, 2025 Scientific perspectives on lunar exploration in Europe npj Microgravity 9 (1), 50.
- [2] European Space Agency, Argonaut, 2023 https://www.esa.int/Science_Exploration/Human_and_Robotic_Exploration/Exploration/Argonaut (accessed 08/11/2023).
- [3] P. Davies, Ariane 6 launch: Why it matters for Europe's space ambitions, Euronews (7 July 2024) <https://www.euronews.com/next/2024/07/09/ariane-6-launch-how-to-watch-it-and-why-it-matters-for-europes-space-ambitions>. (accessed 23/08/2024).
- [4] ITU, Space Connect: The rise of LEO satellite constellations, News, 11 Feb 2025 <https://www.itu.int/hub/2025/02/space-connect-the-rise-of-leo-satellite-constellations/#:~:text=The%20world%20is%20witnessing%20an,the%20last%20five%20years%20alone.&text=the%20satellite%20value%20chain%20driven,efficient%20and%20cost%20effective%20deployments>. (accessed 28/8/2025).
- [5] European Space Agency, ESA's Annual Space Environment Report, issue 9.1, ref GEN-DB-LOG-00288-OPS-SD, 21 October 2025, https://www.sdo.esa.int/environment_report/Space_Environment_Report_latest.pdf (accessed 13/11/2025).
- [6] E. Hill, M.J. Mellin, B. Deane, Y. Liu, L.A. Taylor, Apollo sample 70051 and high- and low-Ti lunar soil simulants MLS-1A and JSC-1A: Implications for future lunar exploration, J. Geophys. Res. 112 (2 February 2007), doi:10.1029/2006JE002767.
- [7] W.T. Choate, J.S.U.S. Green, Energy Requirements for Aluminum Production Historical Perspective, Theoretical Limits and Current Practices, Business Consulting and Services, BCS) LLC, U.S. Department of Energy: Industrial Technologies Program, February 2007.
- [8] M.M. Gallbrecht, A. Cervone, S. Vincent-Bonnieu, The Moon as an effective propellant source: A comprehensive exergy analysis from extraction to depot, Acta Astronaut. 218 (24 February 2024), doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2024.02.035.
- [9] European Space Agency, DISCOSweb, 2023, <https://discosweb.esoc.esa.int/>(accessed 16/05/2023).
- [10] Kelso, T.S., CelesTrak, 2023, <https://celestrak.org/>(accessed on 28/05/2023).
- [11] United States Space Command, Space-Track, 2023, <https://www.space-track.org/>(accessed 31/05/2023).
- [12] P.V. Anderson, D.S. McKnight, F. Di Pentino, H. Schaub, Operational Considerations of GEO Debris Synchronization Dynamics, in: Proceedings of the 66th International Astronautical Congress, 2015.
- [13] Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC), IADC Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines: Revision 3, 23 June 2021.
- [14] United States Geological Survey, Principles of a Resource/Reserve classification for minerals, Geol. Surv. Circ. 831 (1980).
- [15] F. Koch, A Business Case for Space Debris: Analysis of space debris recycling potential to supply raw materials for construction on the Moon, Orbit Recycling, European Space Agency, July 2021.
- [16] A. Biryukov, G. Beskin, S. Karpov, S. Bondar, E. Ivanov, E. Katkova, A. Perkov, V. Sasyuk, The first light of Mini-MegaTORTORA wide-field monitoring system, Balt. Astron. 24 (6 January 2015), doi:10.1515/astro-2017-0208.
- [17] E. Katkova, Satellites identified in MMT data, Kazan Federal University, 5 August 2024 <http://mmt9.ru/satellites/> (accessed on 16/02/2024).
- [18] Ariane Space, Ariane 6 User's Manual, Version 2, Revision 0, February 2021.
- [19] B.T.C. Zandbergen, AE4-S01: Thermal Rocket Propulsion: Version 2.08, Delft University of Technology, August 2020.
- [20] G.P. Sutton, O. Biblarz, Rocket Propulsion Elements, 9th ed, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey, 2001.
- [21] P.J. Linstrom, W.G. Mallard, NIST Chemistry WebBook, NIST Standard Reference Database Number, 2023.
- [22] National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2023, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18434/T4D303>.
- [23] C. Uphoff, Practical Aspects of Transfer from GTO to Lunar Orbit, Flight Mechanics: Estimation Theory Symposium 1993, Ball Corporation, 1993 February.
- [24] Wertz, J.R., Orbit & Constellation Design & Management, Microcosm Press, Hawthorne, California, 2001.
- [25] Lunar Resources Registry, Space Debris Lunar Landing Zone –Space Debris Graveyard, July 2022, <https://lunarresourcesregistry.com/infrastructure/space-debris-graveyard/>(accessed on 06/06/2023).
- [26] A.I. Solutions, FreeFlyer Astrodynamics Software, 2024 <https://ai-solutions.com/freeflyer-astrodynamic-software/>(accessed 21/11/2023).
- [27] D.A. Herman, T. Gray, I. Johnson, T. Kerl, T. Lee, T. Silva, The Application of Advanced Electric Propulsion on the NASA Power and Propulsion Element (PPE), 36th International Electric Propulsion Conference, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria, September 2019.
- [28] Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO), Chandrayaan-3 Mission, August 2023, <https://twitter.com/isro/status/1695725102166671448?> (accessed 24/11/2023).
- [29] G. Liggieri, A. Boiron, B.E. Hansen, H. Josefsen, E. Worsley, A. Haynes, M. Shaw, RELIANCE Design, Manufacturing and Testing of the Breadboard Engine, Aerospace Europe Conference 2023 - 10th EUCASS - 9th CEAS, July 2023, doi:10.13009/EUCASS2023-470.
- [30] Grimwood, T., UCS Satellite Database, Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), May 2023, http://www.ucusa.org/satellite_database (accessed 18/12/2023).
- [31] A.R. Wilson, M. Vasile, Life cycle engineering of space systems: Preliminary findings, Adv. Space Res. 72 (18 January 2023), doi:10.1016/j.asr.2023.01.023.
- [32] Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA), CRD2: Commercial removal of Debris Demonstration, 2024 <https://www.kenkai.jaxa.jp/eng/crd2/>(accessed 26/08/2024).