

What Are Potential Landing Sites on the Lunar South Pole for In-Situ Resource Utilization (ISRU)?

Grayson Johnston

Roosevelt High School 1410 NE 66th St, Seattle, WA 98115, United States

ABSTRACT

Global interest in the Moon diminished with the conclusion of the United States Apollo Missions of the 1960s and 1970s. However, this decreasing interest is starting to turn around as NASA conducts its Artemis missions in order to promote increased interest in going back to the Moon. Interest on the Moon is back on the rise as many space agencies – including the United States, China, Japan, Canada, and the European Space Agency – are both competing and working together to create a permanent presence on the Moon. In order to accomplish this, we will not only have to choose a suitable landing site for a task of this magnitude, but also an exact purpose of what a permanent lunar base would do. From acting as a location for brand new research capabilities, such as realizing the effects of low gravity on human physiology and the utilization of new types of telescopes unusable here on Earth, to being a brand-new step forward for humankind's exploration of space, a lunar base could have many benefits. This review examines what exactly we can use a lunar base for and some of the most prominent and viable candidates for places to land on the Moon for a mission of this scale and complexity.

Keywords: In-Situ Resource Utilization; Lunar Base; South Pole Aitken Basin; Lunar regolith; Lunar ice; Permanent Structure

INTRODUCTION

With ever-increasing technological developments, many government space agencies have identified a return to the Moon as an important step in future space exploration. This is actively being showcased with the ongoing set of Artemis missions being conducted by NASA (1, 2). In order to accomplish this we will need to establish a permanent structure on the Moon (3, 4). Although there are many promising locations for this, the South Pole Aitken Basin (SPA) is considered to be

the most promising due to its potential use for In-Situ Resource Utilization (ISRU) (5-7).

ISRU is a highly active area of lunar research (8-10). The United States and other nations are currently considering sending both robotic and human-crewed missions to the surface of the Moon in order to assess the abundance and potential concentration of hydrogen-bearing compounds, including water, which have potential uses as fuel for rockets for supporting human activities at permanently crewed Moon bases (11-14).

There are several reasons as to why a lunar base would be beneficial. A lunar base's main utilization is as a refueling point for potential deep space missions using preexisting lunar surface ice as fuel, allowing rockets to be refueled and relaunched (11-13, 15). Along with serving as a refueling point, it would also be able to house telescopes that have the potential to look further into space than ever before, allowing us to achieve

Corresponding author: Grayson Johnston, E-mail: gwjohnston73@gmail.com.

Copyright: © 2026 Grayson Johnston. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Accepted July 15, 2026

<https://doi.org/10.70251/HYJR2348.44319326>

higher-quality images of other stars and planets (16-19). And finally, it can have potential industrial uses by refining minerals, such as iron, nickel, and quartz-from ancient meteor impacts all over the surface (12, 20).

However, a lunar base has many potential cons to its use. One of the most notable cons is the cost of putting permanent structures on the Moon. It is also difficult because something like this has never been done before due to the complexity of a mission of this scale, but also the safety concerns that would come with it (3, 4). With this base not only are there concerns of the safety of very sensitive equipment due to the vacuum of space and the lack of an atmosphere on the Moon to protect such equipment, but also human safety (3, 21, 22). A base like this would need a constant crew aboard, however: from intense temperatures, radiation, and varying light levels from the sun, along with other surface hazards, there are many things that make the Moon inhospitable for human life (21, 22). With a catastrophic failure of support systems, fatal injury would be extremely likely due to these conditions. Because of the importance of safety for a mission like this, the selected landing site for a mission like this is paramount for the safety of both the astronauts and equipment needed. This necessity for a suitable landing site is the primary factor that many space agencies are actively deciding on for their own missions (7).

This narrative review examines published literature on potential lunar landing sites that could support In-Situ Resource Utilization and a long-term human presence on the lunar surface. This review focuses on studies addressing the viability of lunar ice deposits, illumination conditions on the lunar surface, engineering considerations, scientific opportunities, and mission planning, and landing site considerations. Sources were identified through searches of peer-reviewed journals, government space agency reports, and technical publications relating to ISRU and lunar exploration.

LUNAR BASE UTILIZATION

A permanent structure on the Moon would provide many benefits to Earth both economically and technologically (3, 4). These benefits would not only be beneficial to just the space agencies involved in missions like this, but to everyone on Earth.

One of the possible ways that a lunar base could benefit Earth economically is by harvesting lunar ice from the surface and refining it down to hydrogen and liquid oxygen (11, 13, 15). This is a very common combination of elements that is used as fuel for many of today's

launch vehicles. Some notable examples of rockets that have used this combination include the Saturn V, the Space Shuttle, and NASA's current SLS launch system (1, 2). This would make the rest of our Solar System much more accessible for space travel because, by being able to refuel on the Moon, the cost of such spaceflights could potentially be reduced by available ISRU on the lunar Surface (15). This is mainly because of the lack of an atmosphere and low surface gravity on the Moon, making launches use less fuel to lift the same amount of weight. Being able to manufacture and store our own fuel on the Moon could also prove to be extremely beneficial as it would allow us to utilize the Moon as more than just another planetary body in our Solar System to visit, but rather as an extension of Earth's own industrial and technological capabilities (15, 23).

Furthermore, we could utilize a lunar base through the implementation of deep space telescopes within the base (16-19). This would allow an enhanced observation of space both within our own Solar System and potentially even beyond into other star systems. With the telescopes being on the Moon, with no atmosphere to combat with, they could provide a clearer image than what is currently available on Earth (16-19). This is also beneficial as there are many other types of light (such as x-rays and gamma rays) that are unable to reach the surface of Earth due to our atmosphere. The benefit for x-rays and gamma-rays is they otherwise get absorbed and blocked by our ozone layer, preventing them from reaching the surface. Another type of telescope that has been unusable on our surface due to the atmosphere is thermal infrared (IR) light. Our planet gives off too much of a thermal signature for IR to function on the surface. However, due to the absence of an atmosphere on the Moon's surface, the Moon would be perfectly capable of supporting an IR telescope. Another less common type of telescope on Earth that could prove to be very useful on the Moon is that of ultraviolet (UV) telescopes (19). On Earth, there are many limiting factors to the effectiveness of UV telescopes; these cons range from the atmosphere absorbing almost all UV radiation to human-caused light pollution causing images to become much more distorted. Many of these issues can be resolved if these telescopes were placed on the lunar surface where these issues are non-existent (19).

One possible caveat that needs to be discussed about the use of telescopes on the lunar surface is the existence of lunar dust on the Moon. Although there is no atmosphere to carry it, it is still able to move due to electrostatic levitation on the lunar surface (24, 25). This

movement of lunar dust is able to become increasingly detrimental over time to any surface telescope as it would cover the lens, causing the telescope to become unusable (24, 25). This however, could possibly be mitigated, as a permanent human presence on the Moon would allow for the telescope's lenses to be routinely cleaned, giving us high-quality images of the space beyond our own planet. The use of these telescopes would have a profound impact on our scientific capabilities. With the ability of clear deep space imagery, we could make new scientific discoveries. Along with telescopes, a permanent human presence on the Moon would also allow for the study of decimeter radio wavelengths. These wavelengths range from 10 meters to 100 meters and have never been able to be studied before on Earth due to our atmosphere (16).

A lunar base also allows for an increased amount of study on the impacts of low gravity on the human body (21, 22). This is because a mission of this scale would have to be permanently staffed and inhabited by astronauts. If given the proper equipment and ideal circumstances, these astronauts would be able to greatly improve the level of research into exactly how low gravity affects human anatomy (21). This area of study has been given some focus by NASA through the use of zero gravity on the International Space Station (ISS), however the amount of research available on the ISS is very limited. These limitations would be rectifiable with a lunar base as it would allow a more in-depth analysis on how the Moon's low gravity would impact the human body (21, 22).

Additionally, a lunar base can be utilized as a way of experimenting and testing certain complex ideas and procedures that would be crucial for permanent structures on other planetary bodies within our Solar System. More specifically, a planet such as Mars. The Moon is the perfect testing ground for something like this, as if things were to go wrong and a rescue were necessary, it would only take a matter of days instead of months like it would if something were to go wrong on Mars (21). The development of a lunar base would allow us to test how many mission critical components required in a mission to Mars and beyond would actually function and survive within the harsh environments of both space and planets with a lower gravitational strength than that of Earth (3, 4, 21).

INCREASING GLOBAL FOCUS ON THE MOON

The Moon has slowly become an ever increasing topic of interest for many governments and space agencies

around the world (1, 2, 26). With many space agencies looking outward to the Moon for resources, research, and as a stepping stone for eventually landing humans on Mars and beyond (1-4). The establishment of the Artemis Accords in 2020 created a framework to promote transparency and cooperation between participating countries, in contrast to the secrecy that defined the Cold War and Space Race between the United States and Soviet Union. This includes missions and even any possible permanent bases established anywhere in the Solar System (26).

NASA has become a pioneer in modern space exploration after seeing a decline in its activity around the exploration of the Moon since the Apollo missions of the 1960s and 1970s (1, 2). With the ongoing Artemis missions aiming to put humanity back on the surface of the Moon (1, 2). The proposed 10-mission long program aims to gradually ramp up in complexity, from the next Artemis II mission planning to just do a flyby of the Moon, all the way to landing humans on the Moon and putting a permanent space station in orbit of the Moon -- the Lunar Gateway Station -- in missions III and onward (1, 2, 27). This is no small endeavor, with NASA not undertaking the program independently. They have outsourced many different aspects of it to other space agencies and companies around the world.

One of the most notable national agencies collaborating with NASA for this is the Canadian Space Agency (CSA). For decades CSA has mainly focused on robotics and space infrastructure, and they will now be able to put it on full display as they are designing many of the robotic and infrastructure systems planned to be in place on the Lunar Gateway Station (27). One of the more significant private companies selected to be a part of the missions is Elon Musk's SpaceX. For the missions, SpaceX has been given the role of designing and developing the Starship Human Landing System to actually land the astronauts onto the surface after they reach orbit of the Moon (1, 2). This level of international collaboration shows how the future of space exploration can potentially be more cooperative than it has been in the past.

Along with NASA, many other national space agencies have also shown their own increasing interest in the exploration of the lunar surface. The most notable and successful example of this is the China National Space Administration (CNSA). Although they are one of a few nations who are yet to agree and sign the Artemis Accords, they have made significant progress in their own exploration of the Moon. They have achieved this

through their Chang'e Program which has achieved many historic milestones in its own right. Not only have they become the first space agency to successfully softly land a spacecraft on the far side of the Moon, but have also become the first agency to return surface samples from the far side of the Moon. Something that has never been done before as all other samples from the Moon have come from the near side before this. The CNSA has also become one of the first ever space agencies to have deployed ultraviolet (UV) telescopes on the Moon's surface (19). These telescopes are able to capture images that have never before been seen and are a very large step for humanity's increasing focus on utilizing the Moon as a staging ground for new forms of telescopes. These accomplishments showcase how the U.S is expressing an increased interest in the Moon, but other countries as well. A lot of these independent organizations are also working in conjunction with one another in order to further advance this field of research, as it has become a global point of focus for the scientific community.

LANDING SITES

While we could technically set a base up anywhere on the lunar surface, the most useful locations for both ISRU and construction of telescopes would be on either the North or South Pole (11, 12). This is because the Poles have more potential for having surface ice deposits compared to the rest of the surface and can offer some of the clearest images of space (11, 12). The poles have more suspected ice deposits due to lower levels of direct sunlight allowing ice from water-rich asteroids to stay frozen on the surface, due to much lower surface temperatures (11). The Poles also offer a much better place to set up telescopes as they experienced a longer period of darkness than anywhere else on the lunar surface. This extended amount of darkness will prove to be especially beneficial to UV telescopes as they function best when there is an absence of light (19).

The South Pole has received greater attention by many space agencies planning on going back to the Moon. This is due to the South Pole Aitken Basin (SPA) and how it is located almost directly on the South Pole (5, 6, 7). The SPA is one of the largest impact basins (over 2500 km wide and 8 km deep) (5). Located on the far side of the Moon, this basin has gradually become one of the most promising and viable landing sites for a mission back to the Moon for many different reasons (7).

The SPA is suspected to be one of the oldest impact basins in the entire Solar System (5). Due to its depth, it is suspected that most of the surface is some of the deepest surface rock exposed on the surface (5, 12). It is especially important as the Southern edge of it is located almost directly over the South Pole causing some regions to be in permanent shadow while others are in permanent sunlight. In this southern edge, there are many smaller craters within the SPA. These smaller craters are the primary targets of future lunar exploration (7). There are three main ones that are focused on more in depth by professional space agencies. These are de Gerlache crater, Shoemaker crater, and the Shackleton crater. These are not the only three though, as there are other craters in this area, however they are not as primarily focused on as these three due to their size and potential of containing deposits of ice and other sought after materials (7, 11).

Out of the three major craters listed, the Shackleton Crater is by far the most discussed, this is because it is located directly on the South Pole of the Moon (29). The Crater is a rough circular shape with a diameter of roughly 21 kilometers and a depth of 4.2 kilometers (29). Some of the standout features of the crater are that the inside is in a permanent shadow while the very outer rim of the crater is in direct sunlight over 90% of the lunar year (29). This is one of the most notable reasons as to why it is the most discussed landing site for a mission to the Moon, as it would provide an almost permanent supply of solar power on the edge while protecting sensitive equipment from direct sunlight down inside the crater (29).

Another primarily discussed crater within the SPA is the Shoemaker Crater. Located almost directly due North of Shackleton by about 20-30 kilometers. It is also roughly circular in shape and about 50 kilometers in diameter and roughly 2.5 kilometers deep (30). Like Shackleton, it is permanently shadowed within the crater with only the outer rim being exposed to near constant sunlight. Although it is seemingly just as promising as the aforementioned Shackleton Crater, one main issue with it is that it is almost half as deep as Shackleton, which would be less beneficial for any potential material research of the lunar regolith. This is important as the craters are able to bring subsurface rocks all the way up to the surface, with the deeper the crater, the deeper the material being pushed up is. This alone is invaluable to lunar research as it would provide scientists with a much deeper and complex understanding of what the Moon is made up of (5, 12, 30).




Figure 1. Topographic Map of Lunar South Pole with major craters labeled. Color represents height above and below the lunar baseline radius of 1737 km from the Moon's center of mass (31).

Another less discussed area that is suitable for a mission like this is on the lunar North Pole. The North Pole offers the same types of resources as the South Pole, however, the suitable landing sites within the Pole are more restricted. One of the only noteworthy possible landing sites is within the Peary Crater. This crater is roughly 73 kilometers in diameter and 2-3 kilometers deep, offering similar levels of shaded areas as the craters on the South Pole. Although it is almost identical in opportunities for research of lunar resources, the craters within the South Pole are receiving a much more increased level of focus from every interested space

agency. This is mainly because terrain within the Peary Crater is much more rugged and unsuitable for a possible landing mission on the surface (12).

Why craters? There are many different reasons as to why craters have been seen as the more favorable option for any sort of permanent structure on the Moon. One important reason is that craters offer the most potentially suitable location for ISRU to even be possible. This is due to not only rare metals being trapped within the asteroids that caused these craters but also the fact that craters offer an abundant amount of shade. This shade not only protects sensitive equipment and materials from coming in direct contact with sunlight, but also allows the formation of ice (11, 12). With ice being one of the most sought after resources for ISRU, the availability of accessible ice is an important criterion when selecting a landing site (11, 12, 13). As previously discussed the need for ice is largely based on the idea of being able to use the Moon as a place to refuel for any potential future missions that would go deeper into the Solar System. With the main point of it being a place to refuel before heading to Mars (15).

However, these craters are fairly difficult to access and are much more complex than other potential landing sites. One of these potential sites is in the Oceanus Procellarum located on the Moon's equator. This area of the Moon is much easier to land in as it is situated nearly directly on top of the equator. However; the resulting ease of mission planning is hampered by the fact that this region of the Moon has very little to no directly available resources that would benefit a mission of this kind (20,23). With this region being located on the equator, it receives much more direct sunlight than either of the Poles, therefore almost completely ruling out the chances of ice deposits on the lunar surface, due to the extreme temperatures the surface can endure (11).

Table 1. Comparison of key characteristics, resource potential, advantages, and limitations of candidate lunar landing sites for in-situ resource utilization.

Site	Region	Ice Potential	Sunlight Availability	ISRU Potential	Advantages	Limitations
Shackleton Crater	South Pole	High	Very High (rim)	High	Near-continuous sunlight on rim; potential ice deposits; strong scientific value	Challenging terrain; permanently shadowed interior
Shoemaker Crater	South Pole	High	High	High	Potential ice deposits; access to deep lunar materials	Less favorable illumination than Shackleton

Continued Table 1. Comparison of key characteristics, resource potential, advantages, and limitations of candidate lunar landing sites for in-situ resource utilization.

Site	Region	Ice Potential	Sunlight Availability	ISRU Potential	Advantages	Limitations
de Gerlache Crater	South Pole	High	Moderate–High	High	Strong evidence of volatiles; favorable location near South Pole	Difficult access and landing conditions
Peary Crater	North Pole	Moderate–High	High	Moderate–High	Polar resources and extended illumination periods	Rugged terrain and less emphasis in current mission planning
Oceanus Procellarum	Equatorial Region	Low	Very High	Low–Moderate	Easier landing conditions; extensive basaltic plains; potential construction materials	Limited evidence of water ice; less suitable for propellant production and polar ISRU objectives

CONCLUSION

The reviewed literature indicates that the lunar poles are among the most promising regions for future ISRU activities because of their potential access to water ice, favorable illumination conditions, and scientific value. The reviewed literature suggests that the Moon could serve as an extension of humanity's scientific and industrial capabilities. Current international space programs have suggested that long-term lunar exploration is an important objective for many government space agencies. Given the many benefits of a permanent habitation on the Moon, careful selection of a landing site will be important for a permanent structure with the South Pole Aitken Basin being one of the top contenders for that location. Among the sites discussed, Shackleton, Shoemaker, and nearby South Pole–Aitken Basin locations appear particularly promising due to their combination of permanently shadowed regions, potential raw material value, and near-continuous solar illumination on their crater edges. The lunar surface could provide an advantageous environment for many different scientific experiments than that of Earth's surface. From studying the effects of low gravity on human biology to potentially utilizing our current forms of deep space imaging to their full potential, the Moon could play a critical role in advancing our current technological capabilities. With the resources that the SPA offers, future space exploration could potentially be more feasible with the implementation of ISRU on the lunar surface. The utilization of pre-existing ice deposits

as fuel for future space missions is widely considered to be a primary application of ISRU on the lunar surface. Current exploration strategies identify sustained lunar exploration as one possible intermediate step toward future missions to Mars and potentially beyond.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author acknowledges mentors Ryan and Chris from the Polygence Research Program.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares that there are no conflicts of interest related to this work.

REFERENCES

1. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Artemis: NASA's Return to the Moon [Internet]. Washington (DC): National Aeronautics and Space Administration; 2025. Available from: <https://www.nasa.gov/artemis/> (accessed on 2026-04-05)
2. Creech S, Guidi J, Elburn D. Artemis: An Overview of NASA's Activities to Return Humans to the Moon. *2022 IEEE Aerospace Conference (AERO)*. 2022 Mar 5; 1–7. doi:10.1109/AERO53065.2022.9843277
3. Benaroya H, Bernold L, Chua KM. Engineering, Design and Construction of Lunar Bases. *J Aerosp Eng*. 2002 Apr; 15 (2): 33–45. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)0893-1321(2002)15:2(33)

4. European Space Agency. Lunar base concepts. Paris: European Space Agency; 2025]. Available from: https://www.esa.int/Science_Exploration/Human_and_Robotic_Exploration/Exploration/Moon (accessed on 2026-04-12)
5. Pieters CM, Head III JW, Gaddis L, Jolliff B, Duke M. Rock types of South Pole-Aitken basin and extent of basaltic volcanism. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets*. 2001; 106 (E11): 28001–22. doi:10.1029/2000JE001414
6. James PB, Smith DE, Byrne PK, Kendall JD, Melosh HJ, Zuber MT. Deep Structure of the Lunar South Pole-Aitken Basin. *Geophysical Research Letters*. 2019; 46 (10): 5100–6. doi:10.1029/2019GL082252
7. Peña-Asensio E, Neira-Acosta ÁS, Sánchez-Lozano JM. Evaluating potential landing sites for the Artemis III mission using a multi-criteria decision making approach. *Acta Astronaut*. 2025; 226 (1): 469–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2024.10.049>
8. Schlüter L, Cowley A. Review of Techniques for In-Situ Oxygen Extraction on the Moon. *Planetary and Space Science*. 2019 Sep 26; 181. doi:10.1016/j.pss.2019.104753
9. Cao G, Cincotti A, Concas A, Depau A, Fais G, Lai N, *et al.* ISRU and ISFR science and technology—A review of the last 15 years. *Technologies*. 2026; 14 (4): 220. doi:10.3390/technologies14040220.
10. Just GH, Smith K, Joy KH, Roy MJ. Parametric review of existing regolith excavation techniques for lunar in situ resource utilisation (ISRU) and recommendations for future excavation experiments. *Planet Space Sci*. 2020; 180: 104746. doi:10.1016/j.pss.2019.104746.
11. Cannon KM, Britt DT. A geologic model for lunar ice deposits at mining scales. *Icarus*. 2020 Sep; 347: 113778. doi:10.1016/j.icarus.2020.113778
12. Anand M, Crawford IA, Balat-Pichelin M, *et al.* A brief review of chemical and mineralogical resources on the Moon. *Earth-Sci Rev*. 2012; 116: 1–20.
13. Ikeya K, Guerrero-Gonzalez FJ, Kiewiet L, Cardin MA, Cilliers J, Starr S, *et al.* Hybrid lunar ISRU plant: A comparative analysis with carbothermal reduction and water extraction. *Acta Astronautica*. 2025 May 1; 230: 148–68. doi:10.1016/j.actaastro.2025.02.004
14. Physicochemical properties of lunar regolith simulant for oxygen production. 2026. Available from: <https://arxiv.org/html/2601.14719v1> (accessed on 2026-03-16)
15. Cost breakeven analysis of cis-lunar ISRU for propellant. 2019. Available from: <https://ttu-ir.tdl.org/> (accessed on 2026-05-05)
16. Burns JO, Duric N, Taylor GJ. A lunar far-side radio observatory for cosmology. *Adv Space Res*. 2003; 31 (11): 2421.
17. Mimoun D, Wieczorek MA, Alkalai L, Banerdt WB, Baratoux D, Bougeret JL, *et al.* Farside explorer: unique science from a mission to the farside of the moon. *Exp Astron*. 2012 Apr 1; 33 (2): 529–85. doi:10.1007/s10686-011-9252-3
18. Polidan RS, Burns JO, Ignatiev A, Hegedus A, Pober J, Mahesh N, *et al.* FarView: An In-Situ Manufactured Lunar Far Side Radio Array Concept for 21-cm Dark Ages Cosmology. arXiv; 2024. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2404.03840
19. Cao L, Ruan P, Cai H, Deng J, Hu J, Jiang X, *et al.* LUT: A lunar-based ultraviolet telescope. *Sci China Phys Mech Astron*. 2011; 54: 558–562. doi:10.1007/s11433-011-4255-7.
20. United States Geological Survey. Lunar resources. Reston (VA): United States Geological Survey; 2025. Available from: <https://www.usgs.gov/centers/astrogeology-science-center/science/moon> (accessed on 2026-3-8)
21. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA's Human Research Program: Three steps to Mars. Washington (DC): National Aeronautics and Space Administration; 2025. Available from: <https://www.nasa.gov/hrp/three-paths-to-mars/> (accessed on 2026-04-19)
22. George SP, Gaza R, Matthia D, Laramore D, Lehti J, Campbell-Ricketts T, *et al.* Space radiation measurements during the Artemis I lunar mission. *Nature*. 2024 Oct; 634 (8032): 48–52. doi:10.1038/s41586-024-07927-7
23. Alex Ellery. Leveraging in situ resources for lunar base construction. doi:10.1139/cjce-2021-0098
24. Wang X, Barker D, Blewett DT, Chandrachud R, Deca J, Delzanno GL, *et al.* Electrostatic dust transport and its effect on human exploration on the surface of the Moon. Boulder (CO): University of Colorado Boulder; 2021 Oct 15. Available from: https://science.nasa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/194_e79c117e05c56e519829614fab6f4d88_WangXu.pdf? (accessed on 2026-04-21).
25. Abel PB, Anderson MD, Blom ET, Calle C, Dunlap PH, Greenberg PS, *et al.* *Lunar dust mitigation: a guide and reference*. 1st ed. Cleveland (OH): National Aeronautics and Space Administration; 2023 Sep. Report No.: NASA/TP-20220018746. Available from: <https://ntrs.nasa.gov/api/citations/20220018746/downloads/TP-20220018746.pdf>. (accessed on 2026-04-21).
26. U.S. Department of State. The Artemis Accords. Washington (DC): U.S. Department of State; 2025. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/artemis-accords/> (accessed on 2026-4-21)
27. Canadian Space Agency. Gateway contributions overview. Saint-Hubert (QC): Canadian Space Agency;

2025. Available from: <https://www.asc-csa.gc.ca/eng/astronomy/moon-exploration/lunar-gateway/default.asp> (accessed on 2026-4-15)
28. Stöffler D. Cratering History and Lunar Chronology. *Reviews in Mineralogy and Geochemistry*. 2006 Jan 1; 60: 519–96. doi:10.2138/rmg.2006.60.05
29. Spudis PD, Bussey B, Plescia J, Josset JL, Beauvivre S. Geology of Shackleton Crater and the south pole of the Moon. *Geophysical Research Letters*. 2008; 35 (14). doi:10.1029/2008GL034468
30. Pirrone SRM, Witchalls J, Dillenburger J, *et al.* Lunar regolith sampling technologies: a critical review. *Space Sci Rev*. 2025; 221 (8): 111. doi:10.1007/s11214-025-01239-6.
31. Zhao F, Lu P, Meng T, Dang Y, Gao Y, Xu Z, Wang R, Wu Y. Selection of landing sites for the Chang'E-7 mission using multi-source remote sensing data. *Remote Sens*. 2025; 17 (7): 1121. doi:10.3390/rs17071121.