

Space Tourism: Governance, Economics, and Sustainability

**R. Durai¹, S. Gnanasaranya², V. Kaveri³, M. S. Fathima Begam⁴, Sruthi Mohan⁵,
S. Ramaswamy⁶**

¹Director, GTN Group of Institutions, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.

²Assistant Professor (Contract), Department of Lifelong Learning and Extension, The Gandhigram Rural Institute (DU), Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.

³Head, Department of Management Studies, GTN Arts College (Autonomous), Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.

⁴Associate Professor (Dean R and D), Department of History, GTN Arts College (Autonomous), Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.

⁵Chief Administrative Officer, GTN Group of Institutions, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.

⁶Advisor -cum-Adjunct Professor (Economics), Corresponding Author, GTN Group of Institutions, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India.

Abstract

The structural transition of human spaceflight from an exclusive instrument of state-directed geopolitical rivalry to an expanding commercial marketplace marks a profound institutional evolution within the governance of the global commons. This paper provides a rigorous, multidisciplinary examination of the commercial space tourism industry, integrating theoretical and empirical perspectives across political economy, international jurisprudence, atmospheric chemistry, and multilateral policy coordination. The maturation of reusable launch systems, additive manufacturing, and private venture funding has substantially lowered marginal orbital payload costs, shifting access to outer space from career state astronauts to private flight participants. Nevertheless, this rapid market growth generates substantial systemic hazards and external diseconomies. From an ecological perspective, suborbital and orbital launch vehicles emit black carbon particulates, reactive chlorine radicals, nitrogen oxides, and water vapour directly into the stratosphere and mesosphere. These emissions initiate catalytic ozone degradation and persistent radiative forcing with multi-year atmospheric residence times. Operationally, accelerating launch cadences compound orbital congestion across Low Earth Orbit corridors, exacerbating hypervelocity impact risks governed by the Kessler syndrome and disrupting civil aviation systems through extensive airspace closures. Jurisprudentially, the sector strains existing international legal regimes. An acute normative dissonance persists between the collective principles of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty—which designates the celestial domain as the non-appropriable province of all humanity—and the private extraction of commercial value by ultra-high-net-worth consumers. Furthermore, domestic regulatory frameworks that rely on experimental informed-consent regimes transfer physical and financial liabilities onto participants, creating direct friction with sovereign liability obligations under the 1972 Liability Convention and air sovereignty principles under the 1944 Chicago Convention. Compounding these governance challenges are national export control regimes, such as the United States International Traffic in Arms Regulations, which restrict multinational technical co-operation while marginalising non-spacefaring nations across the Global South. To ensure the long-term sustainability of the orbital environment, this paper delineates a polycentric regulatory architecture comprising dynamic upper airspace management, standardised passenger protection covenants, mandatory active debris remediation mechanisms, and multilateral stratospheric carbon accounting frameworks administered through enhanced collaboration between the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and the International Civil Aviation Organisation. Together, these integrated interventions offer an actionable pathway to reconcile private entrepreneurial dynamism with public-interest safeguards, planetary ecological protection, and equitable governance of outer space.

Keywords: Space Tourism, Commercial Spaceflight, Outer Space Treaty, Orbital Congestion, Stratospheric Forcing, Space Jurisprudence, Upper Airspace Management, Export Control, Global South Equity, Sustainable Astronautics.

1.0 Introduction

For the first half-century after Sputnik 1's launch in 1957, human space exploration functioned almost exclusively as an instrument of state-directed geopolitical rivalry, managed by public aerospace institutions and underwritten by national treasuries to secure ideological supremacy, technological deterrence, and sovereign prestige. The conclusion of the Apollo programme, alongside the operational routine of the Space Transportation System (STS) and the International Space Station (ISS), consolidated access to Low Earth Orbit (LEO) while entrenching an expensive, bureaucratic model. Over the past two decades, however, this public monopoly has yielded to an industrial reorganisation termed "NewSpace," characterised by private equity, commercial procurement, and agile engineering, transforming space access into an active marketplace. Space tourism emerged as an operational commercial sector in 2001, when Dennis Tito flew aboard a Soyuz craft to the ISS, proving that human spaceflight could be decoupled from state scientific mandates. Subsequent legislative frameworks fostered technical experimentation by establishing statutory "learning periods" that intentionally restricted early regulatory oversight of passenger safety, allowing the sector to expand across an operational spectrum encompassing stratospheric balloons, suborbital spaceplanes, orbital capsules, and commercial habitats. Theoretically, space tourism sits at the intersection of institutional economics, high-hazard operations, and commons governance, using an outer space environment that is a global commons legally immune from sovereign appropriation yet vulnerable to resource depletion and spatial congestion. The microeconomic engine of this commercial transition relies on launcher reusability, where modern multi-cycle boosters and capsules substantially lower marginal launch costs, expanding the supply curve and unlocking consumer demand

among affluent demographics. Concurrently, commercial operators employ hybrid manifests, pairing private tourists with microgravity research payloads, pharmaceutical crystallisation rigs, and sovereign space missions to diversify institutional revenue. However, this accelerating growth generates severe systemic, ecological, and jurisprudential friction. Operating in extreme physical regimes—cryogenic propellants, hypervelocity speeds, severe acceleration forces, and intense thermal re-entry heating—poses substantial physiological risks to non-professional passengers with diverse medical profiles. At the same time, rising launch cadences deposit black carbon soot directly into the stratosphere, threatening middle-atmosphere ozone recovery, while increased orbital traffic strains congested LEO corridors, heightening hypervelocity collision risks governed by the Kessler syndrome. Coupled with outdated international treaties negotiated during the era of state monopoly, these operational and environmental hazards require comprehensive international policy co-ordination to safeguard the sustainable utilisation of outer space.

1.1 Theoretical Foundations and Conceptual Evolution

The conceptual evolution of commercial spaceflight reflects an institutional shift from sovereign state monopolies to private corporate enterprise. During the formative decades of the space era, the formidable capital intensity and immense technological hazards intrinsic to human space missions confined operational activity to national governments. The legal, structural, and economic architecture of exo-atmospheric access directly reflected these geopolitical priorities, subordinating commercial considerations to national security mandates, military deterrence, and international prestige. However, escalating fiscal burdens of sustaining public orbital programmes, coupled with the rapid expansion of commercial telecommunications, earth observation, and satellite constellations, created strong structural incentives to privatise and commercialise space launch capabilities (Denis et al. 2020). Progressive deregulation of launch service procurement catalysed an operational shift from traditional cost-plus state contracts to performance-driven, fixed-price commercial arrangements. Under this reorganised paradigm, private aerospace corporations assumed direct responsibility for vehicle engineering, capital financing, and technological validation. Civil space agencies became anchor institutional clients, enabling private enterprises to market surplus payload and passenger volume to non-governmental entities and foreign states. This procedural reorganisation substantially altered the operational identity of human space voyagers, replacing civil-servant career astronauts with paying commercial participants and private researchers (Pelton, 2020). Consequently, human spaceflight evolved into an accessible consumer service, laying the operational and economic foundations of modern space tourism. From a political economy perspective, the emergence of commercial human spaceflight exposes deep institutional tensions between private profit maximisation and the governance of global public goods. As codified in foundational international jurisprudence, outer space is a global common resource belonging to all humankind. Private corporations' commercial exploitation of this planetary commons for luxury leisure introduces fundamental structural conflicts over resource prioritisation, equitable physical access, and the distribution of environmental and societal externalities. The industry's rapid growth poses critical challenges to legacy legal regimes, requiring modern governance frameworks that reconcile private commercial innovation with collective public welfare, systemic safety, and long-term orbital sustainability (Steer, 2017).

Structural Taxonomy and Flight Profiles: The commercial space tourism market is organised into distinct operational tiers delineated by apogee, velocity requirements, and mission duration. These profiles encompass suborbital trajectories, LEO expeditions, and cislunar voyages. Suborbital flights carry commercial participants beyond internationally recognised space boundaries—either the 80-kilometre altitude boundary recognised by United States civil aviation authorities or the 100-kilometre Kármán line delineated by the Fédération Aéronautique Internationale—along a parabolic arc. These vehicles do not attain orbital velocity, maintaining maximum velocities between Mach 3 and Mach 4 while delivering three to five minutes of microgravity before conducting an unpowered atmospheric glide or parachute-assisted recovery. In contrast, orbital spaceflight mandates accelerating the spacecraft to approximately 7.8 kilometres per second at altitudes between 300 and 500 kilometres. Achieving orbital velocity requires staged liquid-propellant rocketry, sophisticated thermal protection shields that can withstand re-entry thermal loads exceeding 1,600°C, and fully integrated environmental control and life support systems. Orbital operations span multiple days or weeks, functioning as autonomous free-flying capsules or docking with crewed orbital research platforms. Beyond LEO, cislunar expeditions target circumlunar trajectories, requiring escape velocities of approximately 11.2 kilometres per second along with comprehensive life-support architectures designed to mitigate deep-space cosmic radiation hazards (Wouters et al. 2017).

Microeconomic Drivers and Market Dynamics: The microeconomic framework of commercial space tourism is characterised by steep initial fixed capital investments paired with low marginal operating costs achieved through vehicle reusability. Historically, expendable rocketry required a single mission to absorb the launch vehicle's full manufacturing cost, generating prohibitive per-seat ticket prices that limited market participation. The introduction of rapidly reusable rocket boosters, automated recovery systems, and refurbishable crew capsules has sharply reduced marginal flight costs, enabling commercial operators to achieve higher flight frequencies and capture broader consumer demand. This expanding supply curve interacts with demand from ultra-high-net-worth individuals, who constitute the sector's initial consumer base. Because high-net-worth passenger demand alone cannot support the industry's recurring capital expenditure requirements, operators employ multi-tiered monetisation models. Flight manifests routinely combine high-paying space tourists with automated microgravity experiments, institutional biotechnology payloads, and sovereign agency researchers. This diversified revenue structure insulates launch providers from consumer volatility and enables sustained reinvestment in vehicle manufacturing and flight operations (Marvell, 2022; McCue, 2023).

1.2 Economic Scope and Market Opportunities

The economic expansion of commercial space tourism is an accelerating component of the global space economy, widely projected to surpass \$1 trillion over the next two decades. Within this evolving industrial architecture, human spaceflight functions as a high-margin sector that drives research, capital allocation, and technological innovation across adjacent aerospace domains. While initial commercial access remains largely restricted to ultra-high-net-worth individuals, projected reductions in launch costs are expected to broaden consumer access over time, creating multi-tiered commercial travel markets (Denis et al. 2020; Toivonen, 2020). The economic significance of space tourism extends beyond direct passenger ticket sales into extensive secondary and tertiary supply chains. Engineering human-rated spaceflight systems demands advanced metallurgy, precision additive manufacturing, high-density energy storage, complex life-support infrastructure, and resilient ground telemetry networks. These technical requirements stimulate capital investment across regional industrial clusters, fostering specialised high-technology employment hubs around commercial spaceports. Furthermore, investments in human-rated space transportation accelerate the commercial realisation of point-to-point suborbital flight corridors, which could compress transcontinental travel times between major international economic centres to under two hours (Pelton, 2020; Sarkar and Chaudhury, 2023).

Table 1: Operational and Financial Taxonomy of Commercial Space Tourism Architecture

Operational and Financial Taxonomy of Commercial Space Tourism Architecture	Primary Industrial Actors	Approximate Ticket Tariff	Flight Envelope Profile	Mission Duration
Stratospheric Balloon Capsule	Space Perspective, World View Enterprises	USD 50,000 to USD 125,000	30 km to 35 km altitude	6.0 hours
Suborbital Rocket / Spaceplane	Virgin Galactic, Blue Origin	USD 450,000 to USD 600,000	80 km to 105 km altitude	1.5 to 2.5 hours
Orbital Free-Flyer Vehicle	Space Exploration Technologies, Axiom Space	USD 50,000,000 to USD 65,000,000	300 km to 500 km LEO	3.0 to 10.0 days
Modular Commercial Orbital Station	Axiom Space, Vast Space, Orbital Reef	USD 60,000,000 and above	400 km ISS orbital shell	8.0 to 14.0 days

Source: Pelton (2020), Toivonen (2020), and Sarkar and Chaudhury (2023).

Table 1 illustrates the structured industrial stratification of the commercial human spaceflight sector, demonstrating that kinetic energy requirements and operational altitude strictly govern access, mission profiles, and capital intensity. The data reveal an extreme, non-linear pricing continuum spanning three orders of magnitude, from entry-level near-space balloon capsules priced between US\$ 50,000 and US\$ 125,000 to orbital and space station expeditions priced between US\$ 50,000,000 and US\$ 60,000,000 per seat. This sharp economic disparity directly reflects the underlying physics of flight: while stratospheric balloons rely on buoyant lift without attaining microgravity, ascending past the 80 to 100-kilometre boundary requires chemical propulsion, and achieving LEO at approximately 7.8 kilometres per second demands multi-stage rocketry, advanced thermal protection systems capable of withstanding re-entry temperatures above 1,600°C, and closed-loop life-support infrastructure. Consequently, the commercial passenger market is divided into distinct socioeconomic tiers; stratospheric balloons and suborbital spaceplanes cater to high-net-worth adventure travellers seeking panoramic views or brief parabolic weightlessness with minimal physiological training, whereas multi-day orbital missions remain restricted to ultra-high-net-worth individuals and sovereign astronauts. Ultimately, the table demonstrates that orbital destinations cannot survive on leisure tourism alone, compelling operators to adopt hybrid business models that pair elite private participants with corporate biotechnology research and government-funded science to offset high capital expenditures.

Commercial Orbital Real Estate and Habitats: The impending decommissioning of the ISS by the conclusion of this decade has catalysed the commercial development of privately funded, modular orbital habitats. Aerospace enterprises—including Axiom Space, Vast Space, and the Orbital Reef industrial consortium—are developing habitable orbital platforms to succeed the legacy state station. These commercial habitats are engineered as multipurpose facilities that can accommodate commercial tourists, corporate researchers, and sovereign astronauts simultaneously. By leasing pressurised volume, life-support utilities, and external payload platforms, station developers secure recurring revenue streams that offset the substantial capital expenditures required for on-orbit assembly, resupply, and stationkeeping (Salin, 2001). These commercial habitats rely on modular expansion, allowing additional pressurised units to integrate as demand matures. These orbital outposts provide research infrastructure for advanced biomedical manufacturing, protein crystallisation experiments, and material science investigations that capitalise on sustained microgravity conditions. Furthermore, commercial habitats drive demand across dedicated logistics sectors, including orbital cargo transit, automated resupply spacecraft, and orbital servicing vehicles. This multi-sector commercial model establishes orbital stations as sustainable economic hubs within the expanding LEO economy (Denis et al. 2020).

Ancillary Tourism Services and Spillovers: Beyond launch services, the space tourism ecosystem encompasses a diverse range of ancillary services and consumer products. Specialised pre-flight astronaut training programmes—incorporating high-G centrifuge runs, parabolic microgravity flights, hypobaric chamber habituation, and mission simulation exercises—have emerged as profitable commercial offerings for specialised aerospace training providers. At the same time, terrestrial spaceports are becoming regional tourism destinations with public viewing galleries, science education centres, and hospitality infrastructure, generating local

economic activity and regional employment in host communities (Mehran et al. 2023; Sarkar and Chaudhury, 2023). Additionally, technologies developed for commercial spaceflight generate valuable spillovers that benefit broader aerospace sectors. Aerothermal protection systems, lightweight composite structures, clean-burning methane propulsion systems, and automated flight safety software have direct applications in commercial aviation, satellite launch systems, and national defence logistics. Similarly, closed-loop environmental control systems designed for space tourism cabins can improve efficiency in terrestrial building air filtration, wastewater recycling, and compact medical life-support systems, demonstrating the cross-sector benefits of space-related capital investments (Pelton, 2020).

1.3 Technological Frontiers and Operational Paradigms

The engineering viability of human commercial spaceflight depends upon reconciling high-thrust propulsion, passenger survivability, structural reliability, and rapid operational reusability. Unlike historical expendable launch vehicles that relied on hypergolic propellants or non-throttleable solid rocket motors, commercial passenger spacecraft require propulsion systems that can be safely throttled, shut down, and inspected post-flight. Modern launch providers increasingly use cryogenic liquid propellants, specifically liquid methane paired with liquid oxygen (methalox), which burn cleanly, minimise turbomachinery coking, and enable rapid, non-destructive post-flight engine inspection (Pelton, 2020). In parallel, suborbital spaceplane operations use hybrid rocket propulsion systems that combine solid fuel grains with liquid oxidisers to provide throttleable thrust profiles while reducing handling risks. However, integrating commercial launch vehicles within civil airspace introduces substantial operational complexities. Rocket launches require reserving expansive airspace corridors to ensure safety during ascent and potential stage-recovery manoeuvres. Shifting from expansive, static Temporary Flight Restrictions to dynamic airspace corridors that integrate real-time, four-dimensional vehicle trajectory tracking into civil air traffic control networks is critical to minimising flight disruptions, delays, and fuel consumption for conventional airlines (McCue, 2023).

Human Factors and Biodynamic Stress: Commercial human spaceflight exposes non-professional passengers to significant physical stressors throughout launch, orbital flight, and atmospheric re-entry. During launch ascent and deceleration, passengers experience multiaxial acceleration vectors ($+G_x$ chest-to-back and $+G_z$ head-to-toe). While chest-to-back forces are generally well tolerated, head-to-toe acceleration causes blood to pool in the lower extremities, increasing the risk of G-induced loss of consciousness (G-LOC). To mitigate these circulatory risks, passenger seats articulate dynamically, directing acceleration vectors through the chest rather than down the spine (Mehran et al. 2023). Atmospheric re-entry introduces decelerative forces combined with thermal loads exceeding 1,600°C on vehicle heat shields. For non-professional passengers, the abrupt transition from microgravity to hyper-gravity can trigger orthostatic hypotension, balance disruption, and visual impairments. Spacecraft cabins must therefore feature automated re-entry profiles, passive restraint systems, and supportive seat geometries to stabilise passengers and ensure cognitive awareness and physical comfort during landing and recovery (Pelton, 2020).

Medical Screening and Spaceflight Adaptation: Unlike military test pilots and government astronauts who undergo rigorous physical selection, commercial spaceflight participants exhibit diverse medical histories, often including cardiovascular conditions, balance disorders, or age-related metabolic changes. The absence of gravity eliminates hydrostatic blood pressure gradients, causing approximately 1.5 to 2 litres of intravascular fluid to migrate from the lower limbs to the chest and head. This cephalad fluid shift elevates central venous and cranial pressures, contributing to facial puffiness, nasal congestion, and Spaceflight-Associated Neuro-ocular Syndrome (SANS) during longer orbital stays. Furthermore, sensory conflict between visual inputs and the vestibular balance organs triggers Space Motion Sickness (SMS) in 60.0 to 80.0 per cent of space travellers during their first 48 hours in microgravity. Symptoms range from dizziness and lethargy to severe nausea and vomiting. In a commercial cabin environment, sudden vomiting during critical mission phases introduces risks of airway obstruction and cabin contamination. Managing these physiological responses requires standardised medical evaluations, personalised medication regimens, and ergonomic cabin sanitisation systems to ensure passenger well-being (Mehran et al. 2023).

1.4 Structural Bottlenecks, Risks, and Systemic Vulnerabilities

Physical, environmental, and operational bottlenecks constrain the expansion of commercial spaceflight and threaten its long-term viability and growth. Because rocket launches traverse every atmospheric layer, their chemical emissions deposit reactive pollutants directly into the sensitive stratosphere and mesosphere, where natural cleansing and precipitation mechanisms are absent. As launch cadences rise to meet commercial demand, these cumulative upper-atmospheric emissions risk destabilising global climate dynamics and stratospheric ozone systems (Marais et al. 2022; Ryan et al. 2022). Exo-atmospherically, the rapid commercialisation of LEO exacerbates orbital congestion. The proliferation of commercial mega-constellations, operational scientific satellites, and discarded rocket upper stages has elevated spatial densities across popular orbital shells. Consequently, human-occupied commercial spacecraft must manoeuvre through dense orbital debris fields where hypervelocity impacts pose existential mission risks. Navigating these environmental and orbital hazards requires rigorous international coordination, operational discipline, and enforceable regulatory frameworks to ensure orbital sustainability and safety (Kessler et al. 2010; Liou, 2011).

Atmospheric Impacts and Chemical Perturbations: The environmental footprint of space tourism differs fundamentally from terrestrial commercial aviation because rocket engines discharge reactive pollutants directly into the stratosphere and mesosphere.

Conventional kerosene-fuelled engines (RP-1/Liquid Oxygen) and hybrid rocket motors emit substantial quantities of black carbon soot. These microscopic soot particles absorb solar radiation within the stratosphere, warming surrounding atmospheric layers while cooling the terrestrial surface below. Because the stratosphere lacks precipitation-driven cleansing, these carbon particles persist for three to five years, amplifying their radiative forcing impact relative to surface-level emissions (Ryan et al. 2022). Additionally, solid rocket propulsion systems and atmospheric re-entry processes produce inorganic chlorine compounds, nitrogen oxides, and aluminium oxide particulates that catalyse the chemical destruction of stratospheric ozone (O₃). Hydrogen- and methane-fueled engines also introduce water vapour into the dry mesosphere, generating hydroxyl radicals that deplete upper-atmospheric ozone layers. As commercial spaceflight frequencies scale toward hundreds of annual missions, the cumulative environmental impact of these emissions presents an escalating ecological policy challenge that requires targeted regulatory standards and cleaner propulsion chemistries.

Orbital Congestion and Collision Cascades: Operating in LEO exposes commercial human spacecraft to the escalating hazard of hypervelocity space debris. At orbital velocities of approximately 7.8 kilometres per second, collision with a metal fragment as small as one centimetre releases kinetic energy equivalent to an exploding artillery shell, easily breaching passive spacecraft shielding. The Kessler syndrome describes this operational hazard: a cascade in which orbital debris density surpasses a critical threshold, triggering chain-reaction collisions that outpace natural orbital decay (Kessler et al. 2010; Liou, 2011). Commercial space tourism missions operating in congested orbital regimes require continuous conjunction assessments and costly collision avoidance manoeuvres to protect human occupants. Any in-orbit fragmentation event involving a commercial spacecraft would release thousands of additional debris fragments across active orbital shells, further endangering civil and scientific satellites. To safeguard the orbital environment, regulatory bodies must mandate strict five-year post-mission disposal timelines, reliable de-orbit propulsion systems, and standardised grapple fixtures to facilitate automated Active Debris Removal operations (Pelton, 2020).

1.5 Jurisprudential and Regulatory Quandaries

Pronounced institutional tensions between legacy international space treaties and contemporary commercial market dynamics define commercial spaceflight governance. The foundational 1967 OST was drafted during the Cold War, when human space exploration was conducted exclusively by sovereign states. As a direct consequence, the treaty's structural provisions do not explicitly address private corporate space operations, for-profit commercial passenger transit, or civilian consumer rights. Under Article VI, signatory states bear direct international responsibility for national space activities conducted by non-governmental corporate entities, requiring continuous state authorisation and active supervision (Tronchetti, 2013). This legal structure creates complex international obligations when private commercial activities lead to orbital incidents, liability disputes, or operational catastrophes. Article VII of the OST, alongside the 1972 Liability Convention, establishes an absolute liability regime holding launching states liable for third-party damages caused by space objects on the surface of the Earth or to aircraft in flight. However, these international conventions completely omit regulations governing vehicle airworthiness standards or carrier liability toward paying passengers aboard the spacecraft. The absence of harmonised international passenger safety standards leaves the space tourism sector governed by a fragmented patchwork of domestic statutes, generating substantial regulatory discrepancies that hinder cross-border commercial operations (Freeland, 2010; von der Dunk, 2011).

Air Law versus Space Law Demarcation: A fundamental jurisprudential challenge in aerospace law is the lack of an internationally codified boundary separating sovereign airspace from outer space. Under the 1944 Chicago Convention, nations exercise complete and exclusive sovereignty over their territorial airspace and require foreign aircraft to obtain diplomatic clearance before entry. Conversely, the 1967 OST establishes that outer space is not subject to national appropriation and remains free for exploration and use by all nations without sovereign restrictions (Hobe, 2007). Suborbital spaceplanes and orbital ascent vehicles cross both legal domains within a single flight profile, creating jurisdictional ambiguity during transition phases. If a commercial suborbital spaceplane strays into foreign territorial airspace during an emergency diversion, it risks violating sovereign airspace under the Chicago Convention. While customary international practice often treats the 100-kilometre Kármán line as a practical boundary, formally codifying a unified Upper Airspace Traffic Management regime remains essential to harmonise air-law safety standards with the freedom of transit in outer space (Wouters et al. 2017).

Informed Consent and Liability Covenants: In response to operational uncertainties, leading spacefaring jurisdictions have implemented experimental "informed consent" regulatory models. Under the United States Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, regulatory agencies assess launch safety primarily to protect uninvolved third parties on the ground and in civil airspace, while intentionally withholding vehicle airworthiness certifications for passenger cabins. Consequently, operators must disclose only known flight risks, and passengers must sign broad liability waivers that release operators from civil liability in the event of injury or death (McCue, 2023; von der Dunk, 2011). This experimental deregulatory approach was designed to foster technological innovation by shielding early-stage operators from catastrophic litigation costs. However, it leaves commercial space passengers with significantly fewer legal protections than conventional commercial airline travellers under the Montreal Convention. As commercial spaceflight shifts from experimental testing to mainstream consumer service, this reliance on informed consent will face mounting legal challenges, necessitating baseline airworthiness standards and compulsory passenger insurance mechanisms (Sundahl, 2009).

1.6 International Policy Coordination and Cross-Border Alliances

Because spaceflight follows planetary trajectories that cross multiple sovereign territories, the commercial space tourism industry requires coordinated international policy frameworks. A commercial spacecraft ascending to orbit or re-entering the atmosphere crosses multiple national airspaces and international waters within minutes. Managing these operations requires multilateral agreements on tracking and telemetry, emergency landing protocols, and upper-airspace communication standards (Marchisio, 2021; Wouters et al. 2017). The United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (UN COPUOS) serves as the primary international body for establishing norms for orbital governance. However, because UN COPUOS operates on a consensus-based model, negotiating binding multilateral treaties is often slow and politically difficult. Consequently, international governance increasingly relies on voluntary "soft law" mechanisms, such as the Guidelines for the Long-term Sustainability of Outer Space Activities. In parallel, collaborative initiatives between the International Civil Aviation Organisation and the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs seek to harmonise air traffic control procedures with spaceport operations to manage congested upper airspace regimes (Marchisio, 2021).

Table 2: Strategic SWOT Matrix of the Global Commercial Space Tourism Industry

Strategic SWOT Matrix of the Global Commercial Space Tourism Industry	Analytical Factor and Operational Description
Strengths Factor S-1	Reusable Launch Systems: Reusing boosters and capsules across multiple cycles dramatically lowers marginal cost per passenger seat.
Strengths Factor S-2	Private Capital Accumulation: Substantial venture capital enables rapid design iteration and agile risk management.
Weaknesses Factor W-1	Restrictive Ticket Costs: Extremely high seat prices limit immediate market access to ultra-wealthy demographics.
Weaknesses Factor W-2	Physiological Stressors: High G-forces, space sickness, and fluid shifts create health barriers for passengers.
Opportunities Factor O-1	Commercial Orbital Stations: Impending ISS retirement drives private demand for commercial habitats.
Opportunities Factor O-2	Point-to-Point Hypersonic Logistics: Suborbital profiles enable transcontinental passenger travel in under two hours.
Threats Factor T-1	Stratospheric Chemical Loading: Direct soot and gas emissions cause long-term ozone depletion and climate warming.
Threats Factor T-2	Kessler Syndrome Cascades: Congested orbital corridors elevate catastrophic hypervelocity debris collision risks.

Source: Denis et al. (2020), Kessler et al. (2010), Mehran et al. (2023), Pelton (2020), Ryan et al. (2022), Salin (2001), and Toivonen (2020).

Table 2 provides a strategic synthesis of the commercial human spaceflight sector by balancing internal organisational capabilities against external macroeconomic, orbital, and ecological realities. On the internal axis, the industry's primary competitive strengths stem from rapid capital accumulation through private venture investment and the maturation of reusable launch architectures, which collectively lower the marginal operational costs per seat and accelerate engineering iteration cycles. However, these technical achievements are constrained by significant internal vulnerabilities, most notably prohibitive per-seat pricing that restricts the immediate consumer base to an ultra-wealthy elite, alongside acute physiological stressors—such as multiaxial acceleration loads, cephalad fluid redistribution, and space motion sickness—that limit the medical eligibility of ordinary civilian passengers. Looking outward, the sector faces lucrative expansion vectors, including the commercialisation of modular LEO habitats to succeed the decommissioning of the ISS, as well as dual-use technological spillovers into suborbital point-to-point hypersonic transportation capable of compressing transcontinental travel to under two hours. Nevertheless, these commercial opportunities are directly threatened by severe systemic externalities: high-altitude chemical exhausts that deposit persistent black carbon and nitrogen oxides directly into the stratosphere, causing long-term ozone depletion and localised radiative forcing, alongside escalating spatial congestion in LEO that increases the probability of hypervelocity collisions governed by the Kessler syndrome. Ultimately, the table demonstrates that while private initiative and technological reusability have successfully established commercial spaceflight as a viable economic frontier, its long-term industrial survival requires addressing physical, biological, and planetary limits through proactive international governance, sustainable propulsion chemistries, and coordinated orbital traffic management.

Dual-Use Export Controls and Technology Transfer: A major barrier to international commercial spaceflight collaboration is the prevalence of strict national export control regimes. Because advanced rocketry, guidance avionics, and thermal protection materials share technical heritage with military ballistic missiles, these technologies are classified as sensitive dual-use munitions. In the United States, the International Traffic in Arms Regulations and the Export Administration Regulations strictly control space launch technologies, restricting foreign access to technical data and hardware (Steer, 2017). These national export controls create operational hurdles for international spaceport operations and commercial partnerships. When aerospace firms launch from foreign facilities, host states must ratify formal Technology Safeguard Agreements to create secure enclaves that prevent foreign personnel

from accessing proprietary systems. Export control restrictions further complicate passenger screening, requiring operators to isolate technical flight hardware from foreign passengers. Modernising these regulatory frameworks through reciprocal multilateral agreements is necessary to enable cross-border commercial spaceflight while maintaining counter-proliferation safeguards (Hobe et al. 2020; Jakhu et al. 2021).

Global South Inclusivity and Commons Equity: The expansion of commercial space tourism highlights growing geopolitical inequities between advanced spacefaring states and non-spacefaring nations across the Global South. Article I of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty mandates that nations explore and use outer space for the benefit and in the interests of all nations, establishing outer space as the common province of all humanity. However, wealthy individuals' commercial use of scarce orbital corridors and radiofrequency spectrum raises concerns about the monopolisation of shared international resources (Freeland, 2017; Tronchetti, 2013). Non-spacefaring nations bear disproportionate environmental and operational risks from commercial space activities. Equatorial launch paths and re-entering debris trajectories often cross developing nations that do not benefit directly from commercial revenues or technological spillovers. To address these inequities, emerging policy proposals advocate establishing an international equity levy on commercial space tickets. Administered through the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs, these funds could support educational development, satellite telemetry access, and scientific research in developing nations, ensuring the space economy benefits the broader international community (Salin, 2001).

1.7 Strategic Imperatives and Policy Roadmaps

To ensure the sustainable development of the commercial space tourism sector, national governments and international organisations must transition from experimental deregulation toward unified, polycentric governance models. Allowing the commercial sector to expand without standardised safety baselines, environmental limits, and orbital debris mandates risks severe operational accidents and ecological degradation. Proactive governance mechanisms will provide the legal certainty and environmental sustainability needed for the industry's long-term maturation (Marchisio, 2021; McCue, 2023). A modern policy framework requires harmonising environmental regulations, air traffic management procedures, and passenger protection standards across jurisdictions. Adapting international civil aviation models, such as the International Civil Aviation Organisation's Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme, offers a blueprint for tracking and offsetting stratospheric emissions from commercial rocket launches. In parallel, transitioning from broad, static airspace closures to flexible, dynamic flight corridors will preserve commercial airspace capacity while accommodating rising launch frequencies. By addressing these strategic priorities, the international community can foster commercial aerospace innovation while protecting the orbital and terrestrial commons (Pelton, 2020; Ryan et al. 2022).

Sustainable Propulsion and Active Remediation: Mitigating the environmental and orbital impacts of commercial spaceflight requires adopting sustainable technologies and binding operational standards. Regulatory agencies must incentivise launch operators to shift away from high-emission propellants, such as kerosene and solid rocket fuels, toward cleaner cryogenic fuels like liquid methane and liquid hydrogen. Additionally, commercial launch licensing should incorporate life-cycle environmental assessments to ensure greenhouse gas emissions, stratospheric aerosol production, and resource consumption are accurately tracked and minimised (Marais et al. 2022; Ryan et al. 2022). In orbit, space agencies must replace voluntary post-mission guidelines with enforceable regulations requiring spacecraft to de-orbit within five years of mission completion. Operators should also be mandated to equip commercial spacecraft and upper stages with standardised mechanical grapple fixtures to facilitate automated Active Debris Removal if a vehicle fails in orbit. Establishing national and multilateral funds to finance targeted debris-remediation missions in congested orbital shells will protect human spaceflight corridors and prevent runaway collision cascades under the Kessler syndrome (Kessler et al. 2010; Liou, 2011).

Harmonised Safety Certification and Passenger Rights: As the commercial space tourism market expands beyond early adopters, regulatory frameworks must evolve from experimental informed-consent waivers toward standardised airworthiness and occupant safety certifications. While the informed-consent model supported early technical experimentation, it leaves commercial passengers vulnerable to operator negligence or mechanical failure. Introducing objective safety standards for human-rated vehicles, emergency cabin egress systems, and automated flight abort capabilities is essential to building long-term public confidence (McCue, 2023; von der Dunk, 2011). This regulatory evolution should incorporate standardised medical screening protocols to evaluate passenger fitness for suborbital and orbital flight profiles. Unified medical guidelines across jurisdictions will help commercial operators screen for cardiovascular and neurological vulnerabilities while minimising flight-related health risks. Furthermore, establishing a multilateral passenger insurance regime modelled on the Warsaw and Montreal Conventions would ensure equitable passenger compensation without exposing early-stage operators to unpredictable legal liabilities, providing a balanced legal framework for commercial human spaceflight (Sundahl, 2009; von der Dunk, 2011).

1.8 Conclusion

The commercialisation of human spaceflight marks an unprecedented shift in the historical evolution of space access, transitioning the exo-atmospheric realm from an arena of state-funded geopolitical rivalry into an expanding commercial marketplace. Driven by reusable launch architectures, additive manufacturing, and private investment, commercial space tourism has reduced orbital delivery costs and demonstrated the technical feasibility of private travel across suborbital, orbital, and station-destination profiles. These private aerospace developments provide flexible human-rated transportation systems that complement and, in several

operational respects, surpass traditional state-managed launch architectures. However, the continued expansion of commercial human spaceflight introduces systemic environmental, orbital, and jurisprudential vulnerabilities that market mechanisms alone cannot resolve. The environmental footprint of commercial rocketry is uniquely hazardous; releasing black carbon particulates, reactive chlorine compounds, and water vapour directly into the stratosphere and mesosphere causes disproportionate, multi-year radiative warming and catalytic ozone depletion. In orbit, escalating commercial launch cadences exacerbate congestion in LEO, raising hypervelocity collision risks under the Kessler syndrome and straining terrestrial civil aviation networks through expansive launch-airspace closures. Misalignments in international space law compound these operational and environmental challenges. The Outer Space Treaty's foundational principle—that the celestial domain is the non-appropriable province of all humanity—stands in normative tension with private, profit-driven space tourism for high-net-worth individuals. Moreover, domestic regulatory exemptions that rely on informed-consent liability waivers deny passengers baseline consumer protections, creating a legal disconnect between domestic passenger risk assumption and the absolute sovereign liability that international liability conventions impose on launching states. The lack of a codified boundary between sovereign airspace and outer space further exposes hybrid suborbital spaceplanes to legal uncertainty under international air law. At the same time, dual-use export controls limit cross-border collaboration and entrench technological divides that exclude the Global South. To ensure a sustainable and equitable future for commercial spaceflight, the international community must establish a polycentric, multilateral governance framework. Supranational bodies, primarily the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and the International Civil Aviation Organisation, must collaborate to implement dynamic Upper Airspace Traffic Management architectures that integrate rocket trajectories into civil aviation routes. Furthermore, regulatory bodies must transition beyond experimental informed consent toward standardised airworthiness baselines, compulsory passenger insurance pools, enforceable orbital debris remediation rules, and stratospheric carbon accounting mechanisms. Finally, adopting international equity mechanisms that direct a portion of commercial revenues toward scientific capacity building across non-spacefaring nations will uphold the common heritage principles of outer space. Only through proactive international coordination and environmental stewardship can commercial space tourism expand safely and sustainably as an inclusive frontier for all humankind.

References

- [1] Denis, G., Alary, D., Pasco, X., Patureau-Mirand, A., and Sassaro, A. (2020). From New Space to Space 4.0: An Overview of the New Dynamic in Space Activity. *Acta Astronautica*, 174, 144–157.
- [2] Freeland, S. (2010). Up, Up and... Back: The Emergence of Space Tourism and Its Impact on the International Law of Outer Space. *Chicago Journal of International Law*, 10(2), 1–22.
- [3] Freeland, S. (2017). The Commercialisation of Space and the Development of Space Law: What Does the Future Hold? *Australian Resources and Energy Law Journal*, 36(1), 1–11.
- [4] Hobe, S. (2007). Legal Aspects of Space Tourism. *Zeitschrift für Luft- und Weltraumrecht (German Journal of Air and Space Law)*, 56(3), 354–373.
- [5] Hobe, S., Schmidt-Tedd, B., and Schrogl, K.-U. (Eds.). (2020). *Cologne Commentary on Space Law: In Three Volumes*. Carl Heymanns Verlag.
- [6] Jakhu, N. P., Freeland, S., and Dempsey, P. S. (2021). The Artemis Accords and the Future of International Space Law. *Air and Space Law*, 46(4/5), 461–488.
- [7] Kessler, D. J., Johnson, N. L., Liou, J.-C., and Stansbery, E. G. (2010). The Kessler Syndrome: Implications for Future Space Operations. *Advances in the Astronautical Sciences*, 137(8), 1–15.
- [8] Liou, J.-C. (2011). An Active Debris Removal Parametric Study for LEO Environment Remediation. *Advances in Space Research*, 47(11), 1865–1876.
- [9] Marais, E. A., Ryan, R. G., Eastham, S. D., and Ball, W. T. (2022). Radiative Forcing of Climate from Emissions by Current and Projected Rocket Launches. *Earth's Future*, 10(6), Article e2021EF002612.
- [10] Marchisio, S. (2021). The UN COPUOS Guidelines for the Long-term Sustainability of Outer Space Activities. In P. Stubbe and I. Marboe (Eds.), *Space Law: Legal Aspects of Peace and Security* (pp. 89–112). Eleven International Publishing.
- [11] Marvell, A. (2022). Space Tourism. In D. Buhalis (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Tourism Management and Marketing* (pp. 193–196). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [12] McCue, M. M. (2023). A Regulatory Scheme for the Dawn of Space Tourism. *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, 56(1), 225–258.
- [13] Mehran, J., Olya, H., and Han, H. (2023). Psychology of Space Tourism Marketing, Technology, and Sustainable Development. *Psychology and Marketing*, 40(6), 1146–1165.
- [14] Peeters, P. (2018). Why Space Tourism Will Not Be Part of Sustainable Tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 43(4), 540–543.
- [15] Pelton, J. N. (2020). *Space Debris and Human Spaceflight: Risk and Liability*. Springer.
- [16] Ryan, R. G., Marais, E. A., Balhatchet, C. J., and Eastham, S. D. (2022). Impact of Rocket Launch and Space Debris Air Pollutant Emissions on Stratospheric Ozone and Global Climate: Earth's Future, 10(6), Article e2021EF002612.
- [17] Salin, P. A. (2001). New Developments in Commercial Space Law: Space Tourism and Private Space Stations. *Annals of Air and Space Law*, 26, 223–242.
- [18] Sarkar, S., and Chaudhury, S. K. (2023). Economic Exploration of Space Tourism: A Descriptive Approach. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 4(8), 1774–1781.
- [19] Sesliokuyucu, O. S., Koc, R., and Ozturk, A. (2023). Space Tourism as a New Experience: A Research on Gen-Z. *Journal of Mediterranean Tourism Research*, 3(1), 1–17.
- [20] Steer, C. (2017). Global Commons, Cosmic Commons: Implications of Military and Commercial Activities in Outer Space. *Air and Space Law*, 42(1), 9–28.
- [21] Sundahl, M. J. (2009). The Duty to Rescue Space Tourists and Return Private Spacecraft. *Journal of Space Law*, 35(2), 741–760.
- [22] Toivonen, A. (2020). Sustainability Dimensions in Space Tourism: The Case of Finland. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 30(9), 2223–2239.
- [23] Tronchetti, F. (2013). *Fundamentals of Space Law and Policy*. Springer.
- [24] von der Dunk, F. G. (2011). Space Tourism, Private Spaceflight and the Safety of Each and All. *Nebraska Law Review*, 90(2), 376–418.

[25] Wouters, J., De Man, P., and Hansen, R. (Eds.). (2017). Commercial Uses of Space and Space Tourism: Legal and Policy Aspects. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Copyright & License:

© Authors retain the copyright of this article. This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), permitting unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.