Space & Astronomy | Oct 28, 2026 | 5 min read | By Bryan White

Orbital Rendezvous and Cryogenic Staging: Inside NASA's Dual-Lander Artemis III Low-Earth-Orbit Test Campaign

Space & Astronomy * Orbital Mechanics * Artemis Program

1. Executive Summary: An Apollo 9 Paradigm for Modern Cislunar Return

In March 1969, four months before Apollo 11 touched down on Mare Tranquillitatis, NASA launched Apollo 9 -- a ten-day mission in Low Earth Orbit (LEO) in which astronauts James McDivitt, David Scott, and Rusty Schweickart performed the first crewed flight test, autonomous separation, and orbital rendezvous of the Grumman Lunar Module. Facing the steepest launch and hardware integration campaign since the Apollo era, NASA has restructured the Artemis III mission (slated for 2027) around the same risk-reduction philosophy [5] . Rather than attempting a direct crewed lunar south polar landing on the very first crewed flight of a commercial lander, Artemis III will execute a 14-to-17-day integrated LEO test flight crewed by NASA astronauts Randy Bresnik, Frank Rubio, and Andre Douglas alongside European Space Agency (ESA) astronaut Luca Parmitano [5] .

What makes the upcoming campaign unprecedented in human spaceflight history is its dual-lander sequential rendezvous architecture [5] . During a single multi-week mission, the crewed Orion spacecraft -- launched aboard the Space Launch System (SLS) -- will sequentially rendezvous and dock in Earth orbit with test configurations of both competing commercial Human Landing System (HLS) vehicles: Blue Origin's Blue Moon lander (launched via New Glenn) and SpaceX's Starship HLS [5] . By validating docking interfaces, relative navigation sensors, environmental control and life support systems (ECLSS), and flight-control software handover in LEO, NASA aims to buy down the highest-consequence operational risks before committing a crew to a lunar surface descent on Artemis IV in 2028 [1, 5] .

2. The Tsiolkovsky Rocket Equation and the Cislunar Delta-v Budget

To understand why both SpaceX and Blue Origin require multi-launch orbital staging and why their test campaigns are so intricate, one must examine the astrodynamic velocity budget (Delta v) separating Low Earth Orbit from the lunar South Pole [1, 2] . Under the Tsiolkovsky rocket equation , the maximum velocity change a chemical stage can achieve is a logarithmic function of its initial-to-final mass ratio (m 0 / m f) and its engine specific impulse (I sp):

Delta v = I sp g 0 ln(m 0 / m f)

Whereas the Apollo Saturn V launched both the Command/Service Module and a lightweight 15-metric-ton two-stage Lunar Module on a single direct injection to a low 100 km equatorial lunar orbit, the Artemis architecture targets sustained surface operations at the rugged lunar South Pole (85 deg S-90 deg S) staged from a 9:2 resonant Near-Rectilinear Halo Orbit (NRHO) around the Earth-Moon L 2 Lagrange point [1, 2] . Passing within 1,500 km of the lunar north pole at perilune and

swinging 70,000 km above the south pole at apolune over a 6.56-day period, the NRHO provides continuous direct-to-Earth communications and near-zero eclipse durations, but requires the lunar lander to execute a round-trip Delta v of approximately 5.0 km s −1 (~2.45-2.55 km s −1 for powered descent from NRHO to the surface, and another ~2.50 km s −1 to ascend and re-inject into NRHO) on top of the ~3.6 km s −1 needed to transfer from LEO into NRHO [1, 2] .

Delivering a 40-to-100-metric-ton reusable single-stage lander across a cumulative ~8.6 km s −1 trajectory is physically impossible from a single rocket launch without violating the mass-ratio limits of chemical propellants. Both commercial HLS providers therefore reset the rocket equation in space through in-space cryogenic propellant transfer [3, 5] .

| System / Architecture Parameter | | SpaceX Starship HLS | | Blue Origin Blue Moon MK1 / MK2 | | Apollo Lunar Module (Historical Baseline) |

| Primary Launch Vehicle | | Super Heavy / Starship (fully reusable two-stage) | | New Glenn (reusable first stage, 7 m fairing) | | Saturn V (three-stage expendable) |

| Propellant Combination & Boiling Point | | Subcooled LCH 4 (111 K) / LOX (90 K) | | Cryogenic LH 2 (20.3 K) / LOX (90 K) | | Hypergolic Aerozine 50 / N 2 O 4 (storable at 298 K) |

| Landing Engine & Vacuum I sp | | Raptor (full-flow staged combustion, I sp ~ 380 s) | | BE-7 (dual-expander cycle, I sp ~ 450 s) | | LMDE (pressure-fed ablative, I sp ~ 311 s) |

| In-Space Refueling Strategy | | LEO orbital depot fueled by ~6-8 Block 3 tanker flights [5] | | Cislunar Transporter & 20 K Zero-Boil-Off cryocoolers [4, 5] | | None (single-launch direct staging) |

| 2027 Artemis III LEO Test Role | | Orion RPOD, docking interface, and avionics checkout [5] | | Orion docking, crew ingress, and ECLSS habitat checkout [5] | | Apollo 9 (March 1969 LEO crewed LM flight test) |

3. Divergent Engineering Paths: Methalox Tanker Cadence vs. Zero-Boil-Off Hydrolox

The two lunar lander architectures converging on the 2027 LEO test campaign represent fundamentally different solutions to cryogenic fluid physics and orbital staging [3, 4] :

* SpaceX Starship HLS (High-Mass Methalox Staging in LEO): Starship HLS uses subcooled liquid methane (LCH 4 , boiling point 111.6 K) and liquid oxygen (LOX, boiling point 90.2 K) burned in full-flow staged-combustion Raptor engines (I sp ~ 380 s). Because Starship's dry mass is roughly 80 to 100 metric tons, propelling the vehicle from LEO to NRHO, down to the lunar surface, and back to NRHO requires transferring over 1,000 metric tons of cryogenic propellant into an orbiting depot in LEO [3, 5] . While earlier Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel (ASAP) models projected up to 15-22 tanker launches under initial vehicle performance, upgraded Block 3 (V3) Starship payload capacity aims to complete refueling in roughly 6 to 8 tanker flights [5] .

* Blue Origin Blue Moon (High- I sp Hydrolox with Active Cryocooling): Blue Origin's Blue Moon architecture fits inside the 7-meter payload fairing of the heavy-lift New Glenn rocket and utilizes liquid hydrogen (LH 2 , boiling point 20.3 K) and LOX powering three dual-expander-cycle BE-7 engines [5] . Because hydrogen-oxygen combustion achieves a much higher specific impulse (I sp ~ 450 s), Blue Moon requires substantially lower total propellant mass per landing cycle. However, liquid hydrogen has a low density (70.8 kg m −3) and an extremely low boiling point (20.3 K), making passive radiative boil-off a severe challenge during multi-week loiter phases [4] . Blue Moon therefore integrates active two-stage Zero-Boil-Off (ZBO) cryocoolers (combining a 90 K reverse-Brayton or pulse-tube cooler for LOX and radiation shields with a 20 K stage for LH 2) alongside an uncrewed pathfinder landing mission (Blue Moon MK1) prior to crewed tests [4, 5] .

4. Fluid Mechanics of Microgravity Cryogenic Propellant Transfer

A central technical bottleneck preceding full lunar missions is transferring cryogenic liquids between two docked spacecraft in microgravity (~10 −6 g) [3] . On Earth's surface, hydrostatic pressure naturally stratifies liquid propellant at the bottom of a tank and vapor (ullage) at the top. In orbital free fall, surface tension and capillary forces dominate over gravity -- a regime governed by a Bond number Bo = ρ aL [2] /sigma ≪ 1, where ρ is fluid density, a is residual acceleration, L is tank radius, and sigma is surface tension [3] .

Without gravitational settling, liquid oxygen or methane clings to tank walls and baffles while vapor bubbles float in the tank core. Attempting to pump cryogenic liquid across a docking coupler under unsettled conditions risks vapor ingestion (cavitation in pumps or transfer lines) and premature shutoff [3] . Furthermore, when cryogenic liquid enters a warm transfer line or receiver tank, flash boiling generates rapid pressure spikes, requiring thermodynamic vent systems (TVS) and continuous micro-acceleration ullage settling burns (typically 10 −4 to 10 −3 g) to keep the liquid pool positioned over the sump outlet while venting or re-condensing boil-off vapor [3, 4] .

5. Inside the 2027 Artemis III Dual-Docking Sequence

By staging the 2027 Artemis III mission in Low Earth Orbit, NASA transforms a single point of failure into a high-observability engineering laboratory [5] . Under the baseline mission profile, Blue Origin will launch its Blue Moon test article via New Glenn into LEO, followed by the launch of the four-person Artemis III crew aboard SLS and Orion. After orbital insertion and checkout of Orion's service module, Bresnik, Rubio, Douglas, and Parmitano will execute automated and manual rendezvous and proximity operations (RPOD), docking with the Blue Moon vehicle so the crew can pressurize the vestibule, enter the lander cabin, and stress-test its environmental control, power-sharing, and avionics buses [5] .

Following undocking and separation from Blue Moon, SpaceX will launch a Starship test configuration into a co-planar LEO orbit, enabling the Orion crew to perform a second independent RPOD and docking evaluation against Starship's International Docking System Standard (IDSS) port [5] . Operating inside Earth's magnetosphere with sub-hour abort return windows, this head-to-head orbital campaign will directly

determine hardware readiness and lander selection for the Artemis IV lunar surface landing targeted for 2028 [1, 5] .

References & Primary Sources

* [1] Whitley, R., & Martinez, R. (2016). Options for staging orbits in cislunar space. 2016 IEEE Aerospace Conference, 1-9. -- https://doi.org/10.1109/AERO.2016.7500635

* [2] Zimovan-Spreen, E. M., Howell, K. C., & Davis, D. C. (2020). Near rectilinear halo orbits and nearby higher-period dynamical structures: orbital stability and resonance properties. Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy, 132(5), 28. -- https://doi.org/10.1007/s10569-020-09968-2

* [3] Chato, D. J. (2008). Low gravity issues of deep space refueling. 46th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit. -- https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2008-1256

* [4] Plachta, D. W., Johnson, W. L., & Feller, J. R. (2016). Zero boil-off system testing. Cryogenics, 74, 88-94. -- https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cryogenics.2015.10.009

* [5] NASA Exploration Systems Development Mission Directorate (2026). Artemis Campaign Development & Human Landing System (HLS) Architecture Overview. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. -- https://www.nasa.gov/humans-in-space/artemis/