

Kisê-Manitow’s Hand in Space: Securing Communication and Connections in Space

Nesrine Benchoubane*[†], Gunes Karabulut Kurt*[†]

*Poly-Grames Research Center, Department of Electrical Engineering, Polytechnique Montréal, QC, Canada

[†]Astrolith, Transdisciplinary Research Unit of Space Resource and Infrastructure Engineering, Polytechnique Montréal, QC, Canada
{nesrine.benchoubane, gunes.kurt}@polymtl.ca

Abstract—The increasing complexity of space systems, coupled with their critical operational roles, demands a robust, scalable, and sustainable security framework. This paper presents a novel *system-of-systems* approach for the upcoming Lunar Gateway. We demonstrate the application of the *secure-by-component* approach to the two earliest deployed systems in the Gateway, emphasizing critical security controls both internally and for external communication and connections. Additionally, we present a phased approach for the integration of Canadarm3, addressing the unique security challenges that arise from both inter-system interactions and the arm’s autonomous capabilities.

Index Terms—space cybersecurity, system-of-systems, Canadarm3, cislunar operations, networking

I. INTRODUCTION

A Nehiyawak Elder once described the land as abundant with life, stressing that new civilizations, despite their technological advancements, must remain in harmony with nature. He recalled how industrial progress nearly led to the extinction of many species. From this wisdom, two key lessons emerge: (i) technological advancements must be (and remain) ethical and non-damaging, and (ii) life, whether on Earth or beyond, will thrive if we listen and adapt responsibly.

This abundance of life emerges from *Kisê-Manitow*, the Algonquian term for the Great Creator. While past wrongs cannot be undone, we, as authors and Canadians, acknowledge the origins of the land we live on and our responsibility to ensure that engineering remains ethical, sustainable, and fair. Our title honors First Nations’ wisdom, recognizing Canadarm as the “Great Creator’s Hand” in space, symbolizing Canada’s contributions to space exploration.

Canada has long played a critical role in space robotics, a legacy that continues with Canadarm3; an advanced AI-driven robotic system that will operate autonomously aboard the Lunar Gateway, building on the success of Canadarm2 on the International Space Station (ISS) [3]. This commitment to innovation in space exploration extends beyond robotics to human spaceflight. As part of NASA’s Artemis program, Canada is making history with Artemis II—the first crewed lunar mission since 1972—which will feature astronaut Jeremy Hansen. His participation marks Canada’s first human presence beyond low Earth orbit [4]. The mission will advance deep-




Figure 1: Operational context of Canadarm3 (2029) and Artemis II (2026) during its lunar fly-by phase, outbound transit in green, and return transit in blue per [1].




Figure 2: Overview of the Lunar Gateway and the interconnected system with each space agency highlighted. The background picture is of Orion approaching the Gateway in lunar orbit, courtesy of NASA [2].

space exploration and serve as a proving ground for critical technologies [4]. Fig. 1 illustrates these two contributions.

Both Artemis and Canadarm3 are integral to a broader deep-space exploration architecture aimed at establishing a sustainable human presence beyond Earth, centered on the Lunar Gateway. As shown in Fig. 2, the Gateway is a cornerstone of the next phase of space exploration—an international collaboration that integrates critical technologies. Orbiting the Moon in a near-rectilinear halo orbit (NRHO), it enables continuous access to the lunar surface and deep-space communication networks, operating as a highly dynamic system.

Table I: Systems in the *system-of-systems* of the Gateway.

System	No earlier than	Role
Habitation and Logistics Outpost (HALO)	2027	Serves as the Gateway’s primary crew living quarters and logistics hub.
Power and Propulsion Element (PPE)	2027	Delivers power and propulsion for the Gateway, enabling its orbit around the Moon.
Canadarm3	2029	Performs autonomous robotic tasks, including docking, assembly, and maintenance.
Orion Service & Multi Purpose Crew (OMCV)	2030	Serves as the vehicle for crewed lunar exploration missions and returns
Exploration Support and Power System (ESPRIT)	2030	Provides essential power, thermal, and propulsion support for Gateway operations.

Table I provides an overview of the current planned systems that will form the Gateway which acts as a *system-of-systems*. Each of these systems plays a crucial role in ensuring the Gateway’s functionality, from crew habitation to power delivery, and robotic operations. From a design perspective, [5] asserts that architecting for sustainable space exploration requires a holistic approach, where systems are integrated not only for functionality but also from an economic and scalability standpoint. Additionally, [6] emphasizes a capability-based approach to systems engineering, ensuring that each system supports the overall mission while meeting individual requirements.

As a highly complex *system-of-systems*, the Gateway must function reliably while ensuring crew safety, managing the phased deployment of independently developed systems, and operating within the constraints of the cislunar environment—such as long communication delays and deep-space radiation. Safeguarding these interconnected systems is essential, as any weakness could compromise astronaut safety and robotic operations. With minimal crew intervention, the Gateway depends on autonomous, resilient systems, making security fundamental to its long-term success.

The Artemis missions, including Artemis II, provide critical opportunities to test and refine these systems, but gaps in security remain, especially in addressing known and emerging threats [7]. Likewise, lessons learned from Canadarm2’s opera-

tion on the ISS underscore the need to address potential failures in interconnected space systems [8], [9]. Existing efforts to secure cislunar systems [10], [11] highlight the need for first-line defenses, though they currently remain high level, leaving room for further refinement.

However, despite these advancements, significant gaps remain. One of the primary issues is that existing security strategies fail to view space systems as a complex *system-of-systems*. Instead, the focus tends to be on individual systems, even though each is developed and deployed at different times, locations, and conditions—some on Earth, some in space. This fragmented approach ignores the interdependencies and operational realities when these systems are integrated. Moreover, current security approaches typically follow a top-down strategy based on mission-specific goals, which fails to address the broader system-wide interactions. As missions become more ambitious and systems are interconnected at the bottom of the chain, this approach is no longer effective. The time and spatial differences in the deployment of these systems, combined with their varying operational environments, demand a scalable, unified security framework.

Current fragmented approaches fail to account for the complexities of interconnected systems across different deployment times, locations, and environments. To address these gaps, we propose shifting focus to a *system-of-systems* security approach, integrated with the *secure-by-component* approach [12].

II. CYBERSECURITY GAPS IN GATEWAY: INSIGHTS FROM AUDIT FINDINGS

A recent audit by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) assessed NASA’s cybersecurity posture, particularly for the OMCV and PPE [13]. As the primary crewed spacecraft for Artemis, OMCV demands stringent security measures to prevent unauthorized access and interference with positioning and timing systems and uses a segmentation strategy to isolate its systems. In parallel, the PPE focuses on securing command and communication channels, incorporating the Space Data Link Security Protocol [14].

However, the audit highlighted inconsistencies in cybersecurity enforcement, standards, and implementation timelines across these systems. While individual security measures are in place, a lack of overarching integration standards creates gaps in how security is enforced across interconnected systems. Notably, we also find that existing evaluations focus on NASA-led components but do not fully account for integration with externally developed systems, a crucial consideration given Gateway’s modular and multi-agency architecture.

III. APPLICATION OF *secure-by-component*

From a *system-of-systems* perspective, the Lunar Gateway represents an intricate web of interconnected systems which introduces several security challenges including:

- **Interdependencies and Cross-System Vulnerabilities:** The interconnected nature of the Gateway means that

security risks are not confined to individual systems—vulnerabilities in one system can cascade, affecting the integrity of the entire infrastructure.

- **Long-Term Security in a Dynamic Ecosystem:** The Gateway is designed to evolve over decades, with new systems integrated at different stages. Security measures must account for future additions, ensuring that today’s designs remain adaptable and resilient.
- **Standardization Across Modules:** With contributions from multiple sources, maintaining a consistent security architecture is critical. Standardized protocols must be established to ensure interoperability, resilience, and a uniform security baseline across all components.
- **Sustainability Beyond Deployment:** Security is not a one-time implementation—it must be adaptable to future threats. Systems planned for launch years from now must integrate evolving security standards, necessitating an architecture that supports continuous updates.

These complexities are not unmanageable; rather, they underscore the need for the *secure-by-component* approach (also examined in [15], [16]), developed for all space systems. Driven by the need for a foundational security strategy within a *system-of-systems*, this approach ensures that protections remain effective, even as components evolve or decompose into further subsystems.

To achieve this, the approach follows a structured series of steps designed to break down the system and systematically address security at the component level. The key steps in this methodology are as follows: **(Step 1)** Define engineering scope **(Step 2)** Decompose systems into low-level components, **(Step 3)** Identify attack surfaces **(Step 4)** Identify attack vectors **(Step 5)** Identify *secure-by-design* principles **(Step 6)** Redesign vulnerable components **(Step 7)** Enunciate security requirements.

While many frameworks can be utilized to identify attack vectors **(Step 4)** and *secure-by-design* principles **(Step 5)**, we opt for the Aerospace Corporation’s SPARTA framework [17].

In the following, we will analyze the PPE and OMCV systems and set the perimeter of this paper:

(Focus 1) A single engineering scope that avoids one hazard that can arise from both intentional and unintentional sources.

(Focus 2) Two key segments—space and link—which are integral to data exchange, command transmission, and operational coordination between mission elements *in space*. This aligns with the objectives of the audit, such as maintaining command authority and detecting interference [13].

(Focus 3) One subsystem per segment which is shared in both systems to allow for a comparative analysis while contextualizing the findings for each system.

(Focus 4) The two shared subsystems perform critical functions of data distribution and error management, supporting reliable and resilient system communication, even in the event of a hazard.

(Focus 5) Set of the most critical security controls that apply to each system to address the threats studied.

A. Common Blocks for Analysis

We begin by defining one critical hazard associated with these systems: the loss of control of the space vehicle **(Focus 1 - Step 1)** which can lead to mission failure, loss of spacecraft, or, in the worst cases, the loss of crew members. We select two subsystems present in both systems: the Communication and Data Handling (C&DH) subsystem in the space segment, which ensures the accurate and secure distribution of mission-critical data, and the Error Correction Code (ECC) in the link segment, which plays a key role in managing errors and ensuring data integrity during transmission **(Focus 2→4)**.

Fig. 3 illustrates the data flows between these two subsystems. With this, we provide their breakdown into their components, attack surfaces, attack techniques, and associated countermeasures, as shown in Table II **(Steps 2→5)**.

The most critical countermeasures for OMCV are marked with (★), and for PPE with (♣) in the table. They will be used in the redesign process and in defining corresponding security requirements **(Steps 6→7)**, which will be discussed for each system **(Focus 4→5)**. They ensure secure connection and communication in (i) *internal*, within each system and (ii) *external*, with other systems in the Gateway.




Figure 3: Parallel data flows between C&DH subsystem and ECC.

Table II: C&DH subsystem with associated ECC component: security analysis.

C&DH Subsystem Low-Level Component	Associated ECC Low-Level Component	Attack Surface Perimeter	SPARTA Techniques	SPARTA Countermeasures
Onboard Computer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FEC for commands/telemetry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Input: Command interfaces Output: Processed telemetry Dependency: Firmware & software libraries 	EX-0005 Exploit Hardware/Firmware Corruption EX-0009 Exploit Code Flaws EX-0012 Modify On-Board Values	★CM0038 Segmentation ★CM0014 Secure boot CM0043 Backdoor Commands ★CM0045 Error Detection and Correcting Memory
Data Processing/Storage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Error detection algorithms ARQ for corrupted data retrieval 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Input: Data streams Output: Stored/retrieved data Dependency: Storage media, I/O processes 	EX-0012 Modify On-Board Values EX-0013 Flooding EXF-0001 Replay	CM0036 Session Termination ★♣CM0034 Monitor Critical Telemetry Points CM0033 Relay Protection ★♣CM0039 Least Privilege CM0056 Data Backup
Antennas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FEC in signal modulation/demodulation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Input: Incoming RF signals Output: Transmitted signals Dependency: Signal modulation systems 	EX-0016 Jamming EXF-0003 Eavesdropping EXF-0006 Modify Communications Configuration	♣CM0029 TRANSEC CM0083 Antenna Nulling and Adaptive Filtering CM0085 Electromagnetic Shielding
Signal Processing Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Error detection and correction in signal decoding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Input: Amplified RF signals Output: Decoded data Dependency: Amplifiers, decoders 	EX-0015 Side-Channel Attack EEX-0014 Spoofing EXF-0006 Modify Communications Configuration	CM0064 Dual Layer Protection ♣CM0028 Tamper Protection CM0061 Power Masking

B. Orion Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle

Due to the critical nature of the Orion, which includes the presence of a crew aboard the spacecraft, one of the most important countermeasures is Segmentation (CM0038), which isolates critical subsystems from one another to limit the potential impact of an attack on one component affecting others. A second one would be the Error Detection and Correcting Memory (CM0045) for safeguarding against potential data corruption resulting from factors like cosmic radiation or system malfunctions. An example of a security requirement for Orion is:

The onboard computer SHALL implement Error Detection and Correcting Memory (CM0045) to ensure the integrity of telemetry and command data, safeguarding against potential data corruption caused by space environment interference.

C. Gateway Power and Propulsion Element

Similar principles must be applied, but with PPE, communication is central to coordinating operations between the spacecraft, ground stations, and future lunar outposts. One of the most important countermeasures in this context is TRANSEC (CM0029), which ensures that the communication

is encrypted, making it difficult for unauthorized parties to intercept or manipulate the data. A second one would be the Monitoring Critical Telemetry Points (CM0034) provides real-time surveillance of key data points to detect anomalies or deviations, as well as Least Privilege (CM0039) to limit access to mission-critical systems. An example of a security requirement for PPE is:

The data processing/storage unit SHALL implement encryption protocols that ensure confidentiality and integrity of communication signals by utilizing TRANSEC (CM0029) to prevent unauthorized interception or modification of data.

Notably, the analysis of both systems aligns with key security controls outlined in the [13]. While the audit may not disclose all controls, our methodology demonstrates how these controls can be extracted and examined.

IV. CANADARM3 INTEGRATION: ADDRESSING COMPLEXITY AND SECURITY CHALLENGES

Integrating Canadarm3 into the Lunar Gateway presents complex security challenges that must be addressed from the outset. The arm will interact with the evaluated systems in this paper and others. A full perimeter analysis would highlight

all interdependencies and integration points that impact each system. The critical countermeasures will highlight the critical points to secure internally and externally. For the arm, we propose the following *system-of-systems* approach, consisting of three key stages:

- (i) Conduct a *secure-by-component* study of the Canadarm3 and identify the critical internal and external points.
- (ii) Assess the *secure-by-component* results of each system by evaluating the internal and critical points flagged in each study, identifying any security gaps and misalignments.
- (iii) Implement necessary updates to the arm’s design and security protocols, while coordinating with relevant stakeholders to update other systems and ensure alignment across the interconnected architecture.

The different stages approach in the *system-of-systems* ensures that as new systems are introduced or existing ones undergo redesigns, security is continuously maintained throughout the lifecycle—independent of time, space, and external factors such as different actors or environments. Each phase will have concrete, time-bound, and measurable results, ensuring a clear progression from stage to stage and that security requirements are rigorously met at every step.

Additionally, we find that the arm faces challenges not only from cross-system connections and communication but also from its own autonomous capabilities. The arm’s autonomy adds complexity to its security requirements. Internal malfunctions, such as faults in the arm or erroneous command sequences, can jeopardize mission success. These failures can stem from both internal and external sources, and the arm’s autonomy has the potential to either mitigate or exacerbate these risks. This dual nature underscores the importance of rigorous error detection, fail-safes, and continuous monitoring into the arm’s to balance autonomy with reliability.

These challenges reinforce the broader theme that, in space—as in legend—the greatness of even the most advanced “hand” is sustained by a strong foundation. The integration of the arm into the Gateway must account for these challenges, ensuring that weaknesses in any component do not compromise its functionality.

Our future work will focus on evaluating the security and resilience of Canadarm3 under diverse failure scenarios, considering both internal and external sources. The study will investigate how errors lead to malfunctions and whether the arm’s autonomy helps mitigate or worsen these failures in the space environment. Simulations will be conducted using the Space ROS framework, developed by NASA for robotic applications in space [18].

V. CONCLUSION

This paper conducted a *system-of-systems* analysis of the Lunar Gateway, applying the *secure-by-component* approach to PPE and OMCV, with a focus on the link and space segments and common subsystems. Additionally, we highlight security challenges relevant to the Canadarm3 integration, which include cross-system vulnerabilities and autonomy-related risks.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Canadian Space Agency, “Artemis II: First crewed flight to the Moon since Apollo – infographic,” Mar. 2023, image date: March 28, 2023. Credits: CSA, NASA. [Online]. Available: <https://www.asc-csa.gc.ca/eng/multimedia/search/image/17679#longdesc>
- [2] NASA, “NASA Secures First International Partnership for Moon to Mars Lunar Gateway,” <https://www.nasa.gov/news-release/nasa-secures-first-international-partnership-for-moon-to-mars-lunar-gateway>, 2025, accessed: Jan. 19, 2025.
- [3] L. Oshinowo, C. Lyn, A. Ogilvie, N. Panek, and G. Bilodeau. (2012) The next generation Canadarm project - Enabling future robotic servicing. [Online]. Available: <https://www.canada.ca/en/news/archive/2012/09/next-generation-cnadarm-project.html>. [Accessed: Jan. 13, 2025].
- [4] S. Creech, J. Guidi, and D. Elburn, “Artemis: An Overview of NASA’s Activities to Return Humans to the Moon,” in *IEEE Aerospace Conference (AERO)*, 2022, pp. 1–7.
- [5] L. F. Carrio, R. Palmer, A. Lillard, S. Hilliard, J. Morzel, A. Harvey, N. Ball, A. Gebhardt, H. Dietz, and T. Cichan, *System-of-Systems Analysis Approach to Establishing Lunar Infrastructure*. [Online]. Available: <https://arc.aiaa.org/doi/abs/10.2514/6.2023-4612>
- [6] K. K. Andersson, K. Andersson, C. Jouannet, K. Amadori, and P. Krus, *System of systems lessons to be learned in the development of air power for the future – a small state’s perspective*. [Online]. Available: <https://arc.aiaa.org/doi/abs/10.2514/6.2022-1471>
- [7] G. Falco and N. G. Gordon, “Cybersecurity and human spaceflight safety,” in *IEEE Aerospace Conference*, 2023, pp. 1–7.
- [8] R. Mamen, “Applying space technologies for human benefit; the Canadian experience and global trends,” in *International Conference on Recent Advances in Space Technologies (RAST '03)*, 2003, pp. 1–8.
- [9] T. Braithwaite, “Canadarm2: 20 years of canadian space robotics on the iss,” Apr 2021, accessed: 2025-02-03. [Online]. Available: <https://www.asc-csa.gc.ca/eng/blog/2021/04/28/cnadarm2-20-years-of-canadian-space-robotics-on-the-iss.asp>
- [10] N. Benchoubane, B. Donmez, O. Ben Yahia, and G. K. Kurt, “Securing cislunar missions: A location-based authentication approach,” in *2024 Security for Space Systems (3S)*, 2024, pp. 1–8.
- [11] N. G. Gordon, D. Marsili, I. Nikas, and N. Boschetti, “Lasers on the Moon: Recommendations for Pioneering Lunar Communication Infrastructure,” *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, 2023.
- [12] G. Falco *et al.*, “Minimum Requirements for Space System Cybersecurity - Ensuring Cyber Access to Space,” in *IEEE International Conference on Space Mission Challenges for Information Technology*, 2024.
- [13] U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), “NASA Cybersecurity: Plan Needed to Update Spacecraft Acquisition Policies and Standards,” NASA, Report to Congressional Requesters, May 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-24-106624.pdf>
- [14] I. A. Sanchez, G. Moury, and H. Weiss, “The CCSDS Space Data Link Security protocol,” in *Milcom Military Communications Conference*, 2010, pp. 219–224.
- [15] A. Viswanathan, B. Bailey, K. Tan, and G. Falco, “Secure-by-component: A system-of-systems design paradigm for securing space missions,” in *Security for Space Systems (3S)*, 2024.
- [16] O. Ben Yahia *et al.*, “Securing Satellite Link Segment: A Secure-by-Component Design,” in *IEEE International Conference on Wireless for Space and Extreme Environments (WiSEE)*, 2024, pp. 177–182.
- [17] The Aerospace Corporation, “SPARTA: Space Attack Research and Tactic Analysis,” <https://aerospace.org/sparta>, 2023, [Accessed: Jan. 1, 2025].
- [18] A. Probe *et al.*, “Space ROS: An Open-Source Framework for Space Robotics and Flight Software.” San Diego, CA, USA: American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA), 2023.