

Comments on the RSVIPP – F. S. Alvi

General Comments

- Consider dividing the committee into **technical** and **business/economic impact** areas.
- If we do not have this already, consider adding someone with direct experience in space launch programs. Maybe both from the management and technical sides.
- If as noted in the State Statute the aim is “... that awarding a prize for achieving a specific goal *stimulates entrepreneurial investment in the state,*” then
 - Shouldn't we require launch from Florida?
 - Similar requirement for future launches if a commercial vehicle is finally designed?
 - Stipulate a reduced fare for x seats on the first y flights to be sold to Space Florida?
The above ensures long term returns to the state beyond the media rights, initial publicity, etc.
- Should consider launching a SpacePort Florida in conjunction with this program? (There is no reason we cannot/should not have one more successful than the NM Space Port?)

Technical Comments

- Is the vehicle target/purpose limited to space tourism alone? If so, how does this compare to SpaceShipTwo/White Knight from Virgin Galactic?
- Is it better to encourage payload delivery also? Maybe add \$\$ to the prize for each additional xxx kgs of payload?
- Rationale behind the 185km altitude & the 7 person capacity?
 - Should we offer incentives to exceed the minimum?
- What if more than one team meets the 185/7 criterion; need more specificity.
- In the draft of the Master Agreement, section 2.1, it is noted “*Therefore, TEAM may credit the mass of ejection seats or other crew escape systems against the required payload capacity.*” We Should NOT COUNT the safety equipment against the payload criterion, as this can greatly reduce the number of people being carried. The goal should be to design a safe vehicle that also carries a minimum number of people. At most, the safety hardware can count for a maximum of 1-2 persons.
- Launch attempt window (section 1.6, Master Agreement) are unclear to me.