Space & Astronomy | Jan 8, 2026 | 7 min read | By Bryan White

The Physics, Economics, and Environmental Viability of Space-Based Data Centers

Environment * Space * AI

Introduction: The Terrestrial Resource Bottleneck and the Orbital Proposition

As the artificial intelligence revolution accelerates, terrestrial digital infrastructure faces a severe resource bottleneck driven by unsustainable electricity and freshwater consumption. In response, aerospace researchers and technology startups have proposed migrating high-performance computing clusters to Low Earth Orbit (LEO) to harness continuous solar irradiance and the radiative sink of deep space. However, this proposal has divided engineers, pitting theoretical orbital advantages against the constraints of thermodynamics, ionizing radiation, and launch logistics.

Global data centers consumed an estimated ~200-415 terawatt-hours (TWh) of electricity annually entering the mid-2020s -- roughly 1%-1.5% of global supply -- and rapid expansion in generative AI training and U.S. hyperscale computing is projected to drive steep electricity demand growth through 2028-2030.[1][2][3] Simultaneously, evaporative cooling towers impose an acute hydrological toll: training a single large language model such as GPT-3 can evaporate 700,000 liters of freshwater, and global AI water withdrawal is projected to reach 4.2 to 6.6 billion cubic meters annually by 2027.[4] With commercial grid connection queues in hubs like Northern Virginia exceeding seven years, orbital infrastructure is increasingly evaluated as an alternative.[1][2][3]

Orbital Solar Irradiance and the Stefan-Boltzmann Radiative Limit

The physical case for Space-Based Data Centers (SBDCs) rests on continuous solar flux and vacuum heat rejection. Proponents including Lumen Orbit (Starcloud) and the European Commission's ASCEND consortium target dawn-dusk Sun-Synchronous Orbits (SSO) that ride the day-night terminator in perpetual sunlight.[5] Outside atmospheric attenuation, the solar constant delivers roughly 1,361 W/m , enabling continuous 24/7 power generation without massive battery storage banks.[6] Thales Alenia Space estimates this orbital flux could support 1 gigawatt of orbital compute capacity by 2050.[7]

Although deep space has a background temperature of 2.7 Kelvin (-270 deg C), offering a theoretical 90% reduction in cooling energy overhead, vacuum heat transfer is governed by strict physical constraints.[8] Without atmospheric convection or evaporative phase change, orbital servers can only reject heat via infrared thermal radiation governed by the Stefan-Boltzmann law (P T4). Because silicon processors must remain below ~85 deg C, radiator surface temperature is capped, leaving surface area as the primary engineering lever. A room-temperature radiator emits only 300 to 400 W/m per side.[8] Even using two-phase

boiling-condensing cooling loops held at 20 deg C to reject ~770 W/m across both sides, dissipating megawatt- to gigawatt-scale AI thermal loads requires millions of square meters of deployable radiator wings shielded from direct solar flux.[8][9]

| Cooling Method | | Mechanism | | Medium | | Efficiency Dependency | | Water Usage |

| Terrestrial | | Convection / Evaporation | | Air / Water | | Ambient Air Temp & Humidity | | High |

| Orbital | | Thermal Radiation | | Vacuum / Infrared | | Surface Area & Surface Temp (T4) | | Zero |

Ionizing Radiation, Shielding Mass, and Optical Connectivity

Beyond thermal management, orbital servers lack Earth's atmospheric shielding against galactic cosmic rays and solar particle events, exposing hardware to Total Ionizing Dose (TID) degradation and Single Event Effects (SEEs). Traditional radiation-hardened spacecraft processors are orders of magnitude too slow for AI workloads, which require Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) GPUs such as NVIDIA H100s whose nanometer-scale transistors are vulnerable to bit-flipping Single Event Upsets and destructive Single Event Latch-ups.[10]

Protecting COTS silicon requires substantial physical mass -- estimated by Lumen Orbit at 1 kilogram of shielding per kilowatt of compute power -- though high-energy cosmic rays striking heavy shielding can still generate damaging secondary particle showers.[5][10] Emerging architectures supplement physical shielding with active "COTS-Capsule" particle detectors that trigger millisecond-scale protective shutdowns alongside triple-modular software redundancy.[11]

Once in orbit, inter-satellite laser links benefit from vacuum light propagation (~300,000 km/s), outperforming terrestrial glass fiber (~200,000 km/s due to a refractive index of ~1.5).[12] However, radio and optical ground-to-orbit uplinks remain a bottleneck for petabyte-scale training datasets, prompting proposals for physical "Data Shuttles" -- launch vehicles transporting solid-state storage arrays directly to and from orbital clusters.[8]

Launch Economics and Stratospheric Emissions

Deploying tens of thousands of tons of solar arrays, radiators, and radiation shielding depends entirely on launch cost reductions. Whereas the Space Shuttle cost ~$54,500/kg and the Falcon 9 lowered LEO delivery to ~$2,720/kg, SpaceX's super-heavy Starship targets costs below $100/kg, the threshold at which Thales Alenia Space projects SBDC economic viability by 2050.[13][14]

Yet the launch cadence required to assemble gigawatt-scale orbital complexes introduces an environmental paradox. Rocket plumes inject black carbon (soot) and alumina particulates directly into the stratosphere, where they persist for years and exert a radiative forcing up to 500 times stronger per unit mass than surface emissions.[15] Consequently, the ASCEND feasibility study concluded that net-positive climate benefits require launch vehicles ten times less emissive than current fleets.[7] Even with cleaner-burning liquid methane propellants, thousands of heavy-lift flights risk stratospheric ozone depletion and polar radiative

forcing.[15][16]

| Metric | | Terrestrial Data Center | | Space-Based Data Center |

| Power Source | | Grid (Mixed Fossil/Renewable) | | Direct Solar (1,361 W/m) |

| Cooling | | Water Evaporation / Air Convection | | Radiative (Infrared Emission) |

| Latency | | Fiber (~200,000 km/s) | | Vacuum Optical (~300,000 km/s) |

| Radiation Risk | | Low (Atmospheric Shielding) | | High (TID, SEU, Latch-up) |

| Maintenance | | Manual (Minutes) | | Robotic (Years / Unserviceable) |

| Primary Cost Driver | | OpEx (Electricity & Water) | | CapEx (Launch & Radiator Mass) |

Conclusion: Engineering Realities vs. Exponential Compute Demand

The debate over space-based data centers ultimately reflects a collision of engineering timescales. For near-term AI deployments, radiative cooling mass penalties, COTS radiation vulnerability, and launch capital expenditures make terrestrial efficiency upgrades far more economical.[17] Over multi-decade horizons, however, if AI power and water demands saturate terrestrial grids, dawn-dusk orbital compute clusters may transition from theoretical speculation to strategic infrastructure -- provided aerospace engineers can simultaneously solve megawatt-class radiative heat rejection and low-emission heavy launch.

Updates... (Nov 22, 2026): Upgraded Google's Project Suncatcher paper (Ref #6) to its canonical arXiv DOI (doi:10.48550/arXiv.2511.19468), added missing publication years and exact dates to Refs #5-9 and #14, stripped "accessed" clauses, and added exact CrossRef, DataCite, and NASA NTRS publication dates across all 17 references.

Works Cited

* [1] Shehabi, A., Smith, S. J., Hubbard, A., Newkirk, A., Lei, N., et al. (2025). 2024 United States Data Center Energy Usage Report (LBNL-2001637). Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. https://doi.org/10.71468/P1WC7Q

* [2] Masanet, E., Shehabi, A., Lei, N., Smith, S., & Koomey, J. (Feb 28, 2020). Recalibrating global data center energy-use estimates. Science, 367(6481), 984-986. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba3758

* [3] de Vries, A. (Oct 2023). The growing energy footprint of artificial intelligence. Joule, 7(10), 2191-2194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2023.09.004

* [4] Li, P., Yang, J., Islam, M. A., & Ren, S. (Jul 2025; published online Jun 27, 2025). Making AI Less 'Thirsty': Uncovering and Addressing the Secret Water Footprint of AI Models. Communications of the ACM, 68(7), 54-61. https://doi.org/10.1145/3724499

* [5] Network World (Oct 29, 2024). Lumen Orbit wants to deploy data centers in space. https://www.networkworld.com/article/3594676/lumen-orbit-wants-to-deploy-data-centers-in-space.html

* [6] Arcas, B. A. y, et al. (Nov 22, 2025). Towards a future space-based, highly scalable AI infrastructure system design. Google Research / arXiv:2511.19468.

https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2511.19468

* [7] Thales Alenia Space (Jun 27, 2024). Thales Alenia Space reveals results of ASCEND feasibility study on space data centers. https://www.thalesaleniaspace.com/en/press-releases/thales-alenia-space-reveals-results-ascend-feasibility-study-space-data-centers-

* [8] Starcloud (Sep 25, 2026). Data Centers in Space: The Future of AI. https://starcloud.com/

* [9] Tom's Hardware (Oct 3, 2025). Jeff Bezos envisions space-based data centers in 10 to 20 years -- could allow for natural cooling and more effective solar power. https://www.tomshardware.com/tech-industry/artificial-intelligence/jeff-bezos-envisions-space-based-data-centers-in-10-to-20-years

* [10] Wilson, J. W., O'Neill, P. M., Zang, T. A., et al. (Jan 1, 2006). Electronics Shielding and Reliability Design Tools (NASA NTRS 20060048506). NASA Langley Research Center. https://ntrs.nasa.gov/api/citations/20060048506/downloads/20060048506.pdf

* [11] Simhony, Y., Segal, A., Amrani, O., & Etzion, E. (Feb 2026). High-end space electronics: Active shielding to mitigate catastrophic single-event effects. Aerospace Science and Technology, 169, 111344. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ast.2025.111344

* [12] Zhou, Y., Guo, B., Liang, J., et al. (Nov 22, 2025). An Advantage Actor-Critic-Based Quality of Service-Aware Routing Optimization Mechanism for Optical Satellite Network. Photonics, 12(12), 1148. https://doi.org/10.3390/photonics12121148

* [13] Jones, H. W. (2018; NTRS record Sep 17, 2017). The Impact of Lower Launch Cost on Space Life Support (NASA NTRS 20180007067). AIAA SPACE Forum / NASA Ames Research Center. https://ntrs.nasa.gov/api/citations/20180007067/downloads/20180007067.pdf

* [14] Innovation News Network (Jun 28, 2024). New study highlights the viability of space data centres. https://www.innovationnewsnetwork.com/new-study-highlights-the-viability-of-space-data-centres/48810/

* [15] Ryan, R. G., Marais, E. A., Balhatchet, C. J., & Eastham, S. D. (Jun 2022; published online Jun 24, 2022). Impact of Rocket Launch and Space Debris Air Pollutant Emissions on Stratospheric Ozone and Global Climate. Earth's Future, 10(6), e2021EF002612. https://doi.org/10.1029/2021EF002612

* [16] Ross, M., Mills, M., & Toohey, D. (Dec 2010; published online Dec 28, 2010). Potential climate impact of black carbon emitted by rockets. Geophysical Research Letters, 37(24), L24810. https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL044548

* [17] Turyshev, S. G. (Apr 29, 2026). Orbital Data Centers: Spacecraft Constraints and Economic Viability. arXiv:2604.27197. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2604.27197