SPACEDEV INC Form 10KSB March 28, 2003

U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-KSB

r ORPI I	0-030
[X] ANNUAL REPORT UNDER SECTION 13 O OF 1934	R 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT
For the Fiscal Year End	ed December 31, 2001
[] TRANSITION REPORT UNDER SECTION ACT OF 1934	13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE
For the transition period from	to
Commission file n	umber 000-28947
SPACEDEV (Name of small business	•
Colorado (State or other jurisdiction of incorporation or organization)	84-1374613 (I.R.S. Employer Identification number)
13855 Stowe Drive, Poway, California (Address of principal executive offices)	92064 (Zip Code)
Issuer's telephone number, including area	code: (858) 375-2000
Securities registered under Section 12(b)	of the Act:
Title of each class	Name of each exchange on which each class is registered
None.	None.
Securities to be registered under Section	12(g) of the Act:
Common Stock, \$.	0001 par value

Check whether the Issuer (1) filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the Registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90

(Title of Class)

days.

Yes [X] No []

Check if there is no disclosure of delinquent filers in response to Item 405 of Regulation S-B contained in this form, and no disclosure will be contained, to the best of registrant's knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-KSB or any amendment to this Form 10-KSB. []

State issuer's revenues for its most recent fiscal year: \$3,370,118

The aggregate market value of the voting stock held by non affiliates computed by reference to the price at which the stock was sold, or the average bid and asked prices of such stock as of March 21, 2003 was \$0.465, based on the last sale price of \$0.45 as reported by the NASD Over the Counter Bulletin Board.

As of March 21, 2003, Registrant had outstanding 15,338,907 shares of common stock, its only class of common equity outstanding.

Transitional Small Business Disclosure Format (Check one): Yes [] No [X]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I			1
ITEM		ESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS	
Fc	rward Look	ing Statements	1
Ge	neral		1
Bu	siness Str	ategy	4
Pr	oducts and	Services; Market	4
	Our Produ	cts	5
	Our Subsy	stem Products	6
	Our Servi	ces	7
Co	mponents a	nd Raw Materials	7
Сс	mpetition.		8
Re	gulation		8
Em	ployees		9
In	tellectual	Property	9
ITEM		ESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY	
ITEM	3. L	EGAL PROCEEDINGS	10
ITEM	4. S	UBMISSION OF MATTERS TO A VOTE OF SECURITY HOLDERS	11
PART II.			
ITEM	5.	MARKET FOR COMMON EQUITY AND RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS	12
Ма	rket Infor	mation	12
НС	lders		12
Di	vidends		12
ITEM		ANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION	
		ND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS	
		perations	
		d Capital Resources	
		ounting Standards	
		nting Pronouncements	
		ing Statements and Risk Analysis	
		INANCIAL STATEMENTS	
ITEM		HANGES IN AND DISAGREEMENTS WITH ACCOUNTANTS	
			22
ITEM		IRECTORS AND EXECUTIVE OFFICERS, PROMOTERS AND CONTROL	
		ERSONS; COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 16(A) OF THE EXCHANGE ACT	
		Employees	
) Beneficial Ownership Reporting Compliance	
ITEM		EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION	
		Paid to Executives	
		Paid to Directors	
		greements	
		efits	29
ITEM	11.	SECURITY OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN BENEFICIAL OWNERS AND	
_		MANAGEMENT	
ITEM		CERTAIN RELATIONSHIPS AND RELATED TRANSACTIONS	
TTEM	1.3.	EXHIBITS AND REPORTS ON FORM 8-K	34

ITEM 14. CONTROLS	AND PROCEDURES	35
SIGNATURES		36
CERTIFICATION OF CHIEF	EXECUTIVE OFFICER	37
CERTIFICATION OF CHIEF	FINANCIAL OFFICER	39
CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL	STATEMENTS	Δ1

ii

PART I

ITEM 1. DESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS

FORWARD LOOKING STATEMENTS

The following discussion should be read in conjunction with the Company's consolidated financial statements and the notes thereto and the other financial information appearing elsewhere in this document. Readers are also urged to carefully review and consider the various disclosures made by us which attempt to advise interested parties of the factors which affect our business, including without limitation the disclosures made under the caption "Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations" and in our General Registration Statement on Form 10SB12G/A filed January 28, 2000.

In addition to historical information, the following discussion and other parts of this document may contain forward-looking statements. These statements relate to future events or our future financial performance. In some cases, you can identify forward-looking statements by terminology such as "may," "will," "should," "expect," "plan," "anticipate," "believe," "estimate," "predict," "potential," or "continue," the negative of such terms or other comparable terminology. These statements are only predictions.

Although we believe that the expectations reflected in the forward-looking statements are reasonable, we cannot guarantee future results, levels of activity, performance or achievements. Moreover, neither we nor any other person assumes responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of the forward-looking statements. We undertake no obligation to publicly update any of the forward-looking statements after the date of this report to conform such statements to actual results or to changes in our expectations.

Actual results could differ materially from those anticipated by such forward-looking statements. Factors that could cause or contribute to such differences include, but are not limited to, the level of sales to key customers; the economic conditions affecting our industry; actions by competitors; fluctuations in the price of raw materials; the availability of outside contractors at prices favorable to the Company; our dependence on single-source or a limited number of suppliers; our ability to protect our proprietary technology; market conditions influencing prices or pricing; an adverse outcome in potential litigation, claims and other actions by or against us, technological changes and introductions of new competing products; the current recession; terrorist attacks or acts of war, particularly given the acts of terrorism against the United States on September 11, 2001 and subsequent military responses by the United States; mission disasters such as the loss of the space shuttle Columbia on February 1, 2003 during its re-entry into earth's atmosphere; ability to retain key personnel; changes in market demand; exchange rates; productivity; weather; and market and economic conditions in the areas of the world in which we operate and market our products. These are factors that we think could cause our actual results to differ materially from expected and historical events.

GENERAL

SpaceDev, Inc. (the "Company," "SpaceDev," "we," "us" or "our") is engaged in the conception, design, development, manufacture, integration and operations of space technology systems, products and services. We are currently focused on the commercial development of low-cost micro-satellites, nano-satellites and related subsystems, hybrid rocket propulsion as well as the associated engineering technical services to government, aerospace and other commercial enterprises. Our products and solutions are sold directly to these customers and include sophisticated micro- and nano-satellites, hybrid rocket-based orbital Maneuvering and orbital Transfer Vehicles ("MTVs") as well as safe sub-orbital and orbital hybrid rocket-based propulsion systems. We are also developing commercial hybrid rocket motors and small high performance space vehicles and subsystems.

1

Our approach is to provide smaller spacecraft - generally 250 kg mass and less - and compatible small hybrid propulsion space systems to commercial, international and government customers. We are developing smaller spacecraft and miniaturized subsystems using proven, lower cost, high-quality off-the-shelf components. Our space products are modular and reproducible, which allows us to create affordable space solutions for our customers. By utilizing our innovative technology and experience, and space-qualifying commercial industry-standard hardware, software and interfaces, we provide increased reliability at reduced costs.

We have been awarded, have successfully concluded or are successfully concluding contracts from such esteemed government, university and commercial customers as the Air Force Research Laboratory ("AFRL"), Boeing, the California Space Authority ("CSA"), the Jet Propulsion Laboratory ("JPL"), Lockheed Martin, the National Reconnaissance Office ("NRO"), and the University of California at Berkeley ("UCB") via NASA.

We were incorporated under the laws of the State of Colorado on December 23, 1996 as Pegasus Development Group, Inc. ("PDGI"). SpaceDev, LLC of Colorado was originally formed in 1997 for commercial space exploration and was the sole owner of shares of common stock of SpaceDev (a Nevada corporation) ("SpaceDev"), formed on August 22, 1997. On October 22, 1997, PDGI issued 8,245,000 of its \$.0001 par value common stock for 100 percent (1,000,000 shares) of SpaceDev's common stock owned by SpaceDev, LLC. Upon the acquisition of the SpaceDev stock, SpaceDev was merged into PDGI and, on December 17, 1997, PDGI changed its name to SPACEDEV, INC. After the merger, SpaceDev, LLC, changed its name to SD Holdings, LLC on December 17, 1997. We became a publicly traded company in October 1997 and are trading on the Nasdaq Over-the-Counter Bulletin Board ("OTCBB") under the symbol of "SPDV."

In February 1998, we acquired Integrated Space Systems ("ISS"), in San Diego. ISS was fully integrated into SpaceDev. Most of the ISS employees were former launch vehicle engineers and managers who worked for General Dynamics in San Diego. As SpaceDev employees, they primarily develop products based on hybrid rocket motor technology.

In August 1998, we acquired the patents and intellectual property produced by American Rocket Company ("AMROC"). The acquisition provided us access to a large cache of hybrid rocket documents, designs and test results. AMROC specialized in hybrid rocket technology (solid fuel plus liquid oxidizer) for small sounding rockets and launch vehicles.

In late 1998, we bid and won a government-sponsored research and development contract, which was directly related to our strategic commercial space interests. We competed with seven other industry teams and we were one of five

firms selected by Jet Propulsion Laboratory ("JPL") to perform a mission and spacecraft feasibility assessment study for the proposed 200-kg Mars MicroMissions. The final report was delivered to JPL in March 1999 and, as a result, we are now able to offer lunar and Mars commercial deep-space missions based on this innovative space system design.

In mid-1999, we won an R&D contract from the National Reconnaissance Office ("NRO") to study small hybrid-based "micro" kick-motors for small-satellite orbital transfer applications. During the contract, we successfully developed the Secondary Payload Orbital Transfer Vehicle ("SPOTV") design concept. We subsequently created a prototype, which lead to the development of our capability to apply the SPOTV concept to subsequent MTV programs.

2

In November 1999, we won a US \$4.9 million mission contract by the Space Sciences Laboratory ("SSL") at University of California, Berkeley ("UCB"). We were competitively selected to design, build, integrate, test and operate, for one year, a small NASA-sponsored scientific, Earth-orbiting spacecraft called CHIPSat. CHIPSat is the first mission of NASA's low-cost University-Class Explorer ("UNEX") series. Due to additional NASA and customer reviews, additional work and schedule extensions, the CHIPSat contract award was increased by \$600,000 on June 15, 2001 and again by \$1.2 million on November 28, 2001, bringing the total contract value for design and build to approximately \$6.8 million. An extension of the original contract based on our successful launch and orbit status in the amount of approximately \$400,000 was awarded to us for one year of satellite operations. CHIPSat launched as a secondary payload on a Delta-II rocket on January 12, 2003. The satellite achieved 3-axis stabilization, meaning it was pointing and tracking properly, with all individual components and systems successfully operating and is continuing to work well in orbit. The CHIPSat program generated approximately \$2.1 million, \$3.2 million and \$1.7 million of revenue in 2000, 2001 and 2002, respectively.

On March 22, 2000, the California Spaceport Authority and the California Space and Technology Alliance ("CSTA") notified us that we had been awarded a grant of approximately \$100,000 to be used for test firing our hybrid rocket motors. California's Western Commercial Space Center also awarded us approximately \$200,000 to help build and equip its satellite and space vehicle manufacturing facilities. These facilities were completed in January 2001.

In July 2000, the NRO granted us two separate follow-on competitive awards of approximately \$400,000 each for further hybrid rocket engine design, test, evaluation, and development. Our work for the NRO has helped fund two innovative hybrid rocket motor products:

- o a family of small versatile orbital Maneuver and Transfer Vehicles ("MTVs") using clean, safe hybrid rocket propulsion technology; and,
- o a protoflight hybrid propulsion module for a 50-kg class micro-satellite.

Both of those contracts were successfully completed.

In September 2001, we were awarded a contract for a proprietary hybrid propulsion research program valued in excess of \$1 million. As a part of that program, we are competing with another party to design a space propulsion system. The entire contract, which will be awarded based upon the submitted designs, is valued at approximately \$2.2 million. We believe that the award could lead to a long-term market for our hybrid propulsion technology. Due to the highly competitive, confidential and market-sensitive nature of the contract, we are unable to release more detailed information on the project

until the contract has been awarded in full. However, we do believe this new contract is indicative of an increased demand for our hybrid motor technology and expertise in the space industry. Work on this project generated approximately \$300,000 and \$1.2 million of revenue in 2001 and 2002, respectively.

On April 4, 2002, SpaceDev, Inc., an Oklahoma corporation, was formed for the purpose of investigating and developing commercial space products in the state of Oklahoma. Plans for development of this business in Oklahoma are currently on-hold.

On April 30, 2002, the Company was awarded Phase I of a contract to develop a Shuttle-compatible propulsion module for AFRL. We anticipate receiving an award for Phase II of the contract by the second quarter of 2003 and will use the project to further expand our product line and to satisfy commercial and government space transportation requirements. The first two phases of the contract are estimated to be valued at approximately \$2.5 million, of which \$100,000 was awarded for Phase I. Phase II is expected to be awarded by spring 2003. Congress has already appropriated money for this project.

3

BUSINESS STRATEGY

Our strategy is based on the belief that advancements in technology and the application of standard processes will make access to space much more practical and affordable. We believe these factors will cause growth in certain areas of space commerce and will create new space markets and increased demand for our products.

Our business strategy is to:

- o Introduce commercial business practices into the space arena, use off-the-shelf technology in innovative ways and standardize hardware and software to reduce costs and to increase reliability and profits;
- o Start with small, practical and profitable projects, and leverage credibility and profits into larger and ever more bold initiatives - utilizing partnerships where appropriate;
- o Bid, win and leverage government programs to fund our Research and Development ("R&D") and product development efforts;
- o Integrate our smaller, low cost commercial spacecraft and hybrid space transportation systems to provide one-stop turnkey payload and/or data delivery services to target customers;
- o Apply our low cost space products to new applications and to create new users, new markets and new revenue streams;
- o Produce and fly commercial missions, in conjunction with partners and investors, throughout the inner solar system and be "first to market" in the commercial beyond earth orbit "space"; and
- o Join or establish a team to build a safe, affordable sub-orbital, passenger space plane to help initiate the space tourism business.

We believe that our business model, emphasizing smaller satellites, commercial approaches, technological simplicity, architectural and interface standardization and horizontal integration (i.e., "whole product"), provides the following advantages:

- o Enables small-space customers to contract for end-to-end mission solutions, reducing the need for and complexity of finding other contractors for different project tasks;
- o Lowers total project costs and therefore provides greater value and increases return on investment for us and our customers; and
- o Creates barriers to entry and competition from competitors.

PRODUCTS AND SERVICES; MARKET

We currently have three primary lines of space products and services on which we believe a sound foundation and profitable, cash generating business can be built:

Our Products - Microsatellites & Nanosatellites, BD-II Spacecraft Bus, MTV (orbital maneuvering and transfer vehicle) and Hybrid Propulsion Systems;

4

- Our Subsystem Products MFC (miniature flight computer), MS-VOS (micro space vehicle operating system), PC-DS (power conditioning and distribution system) and MTS (miniature S-band transponder); and,
- Our Services Mission Analysis and Design, Spacecraft Subsystem Design, Microsatellite and Nanosatellite Launches and Mission Control and Operations.

These products and services are being marketed and sold directly into domestic and international government, university and commercial markets. Our business is not seasonal to any significant extent; however, our business follows normal industry trends such as increased demand during bullish economic periods, or slow-downs in demand during periods of recession.

In addition, we are working with partners to create new markets that can generate new space-related service, media, tourism and commercial revenue streams. While we believe that certain space market opportunities are still several years away, we are currently working with industry-leading partners to develop unique enabling technology for the potentially very large sub-orbital manned space plane tourism market; and, creating a new unmanned Beyond Earth Orbit commercial market with spacecraft derived from our NASA JPL Mars MicroMission mission design contract.

Our Products

Microsatellites & Nanosatellites - We design and build small, light, high-performance, reliable and affordable micro- and nanosatellites. The primary benefit of micro- and nanosatellites is lower cost. Since we can dramatically reduce manufacturing costs and the costs to launch the satellites to earth-orbit and deep space, we can pass those cost savings on to our customers. Small, inexpensive satellites were once the exclusive domain of scientific and amateur groups; however, smaller satellites are now a viable alternative to larger, more

expensive ones, as they provide cost-effective solutions to traditional problems. We design and build low cost space-mission solutions involving micro-satellites (generally less than 100 kg) and even smaller satellites (less than 50 kg). Our approach is to provide smaller spacecraft and compatible low cost, safe hybrid propulsion space systems to a growing market of commercial, government and potentially international customers.

BD-II (Boeing Delta-II compatible) spacecraft bus - We have a qualified microsatellite bus available to sell as a standard, fixed-price product to government and commercial customers needing an affordable satellite for small payloads. We developed this product in 1999, when we were selected as the mission designer, spacecraft bus provider, integrator and mission operator of the University of California, Berkeley ("UCB") Space Sciences Laboratory's ("SSL") Cosmic Hot Interstellar Plasma Spectrometer ("CHIPS") mission. CHIPSat was launched at 4:45 PM PST on January 12, 2003 from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California. The satellite achieved 3-axis stabilization with all individual components and systems successfully operating and continues to work well in orbit.

Orbital Maneuvering and Transfer Vehicle ("MTV") - Our MTV system is a family of small, affordable, elegantly simple, throttleable, and restartable propulsion and integrated satellite products. Our MTV can be used as a standard propulsion module to transport a customer's payload. The MTV provides the change in velocity and maneuvering capabilities to support a wide variety of applications for on-orbit maneuvering, proximity operations, rendezvous, inspection, docking, surveillance, protection, inclination changes and orbital transfer.

5

Hybrid Rocket Propulsion System - We provide a wide variety of safe, clean, simple, reliable, inexpensive hybrid propulsion systems to safely and inexpensively enable satellites and on-orbit delivery systems to rendezvous and maneuver on-orbit and deliver payloads to sub-orbital altitudes. Hybrid rocket propulsion is a safe and low-cost technology that has tremendous benefits for current and future space missions. Our hybrid rocket propulsion technology features a simple design, is restartable, is throttleable and is easy to transport, handle and store. We acquired some of our expertise in hybrid propulsion technology from AMROC.

Our Subsystem Products

Miniature Flight Computer ("MFC") - Our MFC is a high performance 300 million instructions per second ("MIPS") general-purpose flight computer for a wide variety of space vehicles. It is cost-effective, has about ten times the performance-to-power ratio of current flight computers and only uses 2 to 6 watts of power, depending on its tasks. Our MFC has successfully passed manufacturing and environmental testing for low earth orbit ("LEO") missions and is ready for civil, military and commercial spacecraft and launch vehicle applications.

Micro Space Vehicle Operating System ("MS-VOS") - Our MS-VOS is a small, fast, modular and layered operating system, similar to the operating systems of microcomputers. The modular nature of our MS-VOS and our other space products allow us to design and build affordable space solutions for our customers. We use industry-standard interfaces to increase reliability while reducing cost. Our MS-VOS combines standard protocols like TCP/IP, software components like VxWorks(R) and application software to effect real time command and control, scriptable autonomous vehicle control, scriptable data acquisition and telemetry.

Mission Control and Operations Software ("MC-OS") - Our MC-OS performs satellite command and control and data acquisition. The MC-OS satellite command and control is managed via user commands, batched command scripts and timed command scripts. Data acquisition is accomplished by mapping the input data stream (bytes, words or floats) to MC-OS variables. The mapping is accomplished by selecting a frame offset and data type for each MC-OS variable. Other MC-OS components include file transfer protocol ("FTP") for file transfer between the ground station and satellite, a system security module which assigns users a password, command level and logs all user commands to disk, and a status window for monitoring MC-OS status.

Power Conditioning and Distribution System ("PC-DS") - Our PC-DS controls critical failsafe spacecraft functions, including battery charge control, bus voltage regulation, load power switching, current monitoring & limiting for the spacecraft and individual loads, and hardware load-shedding protection for spacecraft contingency management, and allows direct ground control of power switches. Our PC-DS is capable of keeping the spacecraft alive independent of any other spacecraft computers.

Our Miniature S-Band Transmitter ("MST") and Miniature S-Band Receiver ("MSR") are a cost-effective solution for low cost and low mass spacecraft. The MST and MSR feature lightweight state-of-the-art electronic circuitry designed to meet today's requirements for power efficient space-based communications hardware. The weight of the transmitter and receiver are 2.5-oz and 32-oz, respectively. These units leverage years of communications design heritage and have been in orbit since the January 12, 2003 launch of CHIPSat, the first mission to be funded through NASA's University-Class Explorer ("UNEX") Program. The MST and MSR designs provide flexibility to meet customer requirements and options. Both units are designed to operate in most present day thermal, launch, and on-station low-Earth-orbit ("LEO") spacecraft environments.

6

Our Services

Mission Analysis and Design - We provide end-to-end mission design and analysis, including the design of the mission and its science, commerce or technology demonstration goals, the design of an appropriate space vehicle (satellite or spacecraft), prototype development, construction and testing of the spacecraft, integration of one or more payloads (instruments, experiments or technologies) into the spacecraft, integration of the spacecraft onto the launch vehicle (rocket), the launch and the mission control and operations during the life of the mission. Many of our products and services are now qualified and capable to assist with missions that orbit the earth, travel to another planetary body, or cruise through space taking measurements and transmitting valuable data back to Earth.

Spacecraft and Subsystem Design - We also provide reliable, affordable access to space through innovative solutions currently lacking in the marketplace. Our approach is to provide smaller spacecraft - generally 250 kg mass and less - and compatible hybrid propulsion space systems to commercial, university and government customers. The small spacecraft market is supported by the evolution and enabling of microelectronics, common hardware & software interface standards, and smaller launch vehicles. Reduction of the size and mass of traditional spacecraft electronics has reduced the overall spacecraft size, mass, and volume over the past 10 to 15 years. For example, our Miniature Flight Computer ("MFC") is only 24 cubic inches and provides 300 million instructions per second ("MIPS") of processing power versus a competitor's more "traditional" solution that requires about 63 cubic inches and only provides 10 MIPS.

Microsatellite & Nanosatellite Launches - To support the growth in customer demand within the small satellite market, we are working with several launch providers to identify and market affordable launch opportunities and to provide customers with a complete on-orbit data delivery service that combines our spacecraft and hybrid propulsion products. These innovative, low-cost, turn-key launch solutions will allow us to provide one-stop shopping for launch services, spacecraft, payload accommodation, total flight system integration and test and mission operations. The customer only needs to provide the payload, and we perform all the tasks required for the customer to get to orbit and to get their data.

Mission Control and Operations - Our mission control and operations package is uniquely Internet-based and allows for the operation and control of missions from anywhere in the world that has access to the Internet. The Cosmic Hot Interstellar Plasma Spectrometer Satellite ("CHIPSat") is the first U.S. mission to use end-to-end satellite operations with TCP/IP and FTP. While this concept has been analyzed and demonstrated by the NASA OMNI team, CHIPSat is the first to implement the concept as the only means of satellite communication. A formation flying cluster or constellation of TCP/IP-based microsatellites can be designed to communicate directly with each other. Providing any one satellite/node in this network is in line-of-sight with any ground station at any given time, the entire constellation would always maintain ground station connectivity, thus creating a network on orbit and on the web, a direct extension of CHIPSat's elegantly simple TCP/IP mission operations architecture.

COMPONENTS AND RAW MATERIALS

Although we may experience a shortage of certain parts and components related to our products, we have many alternative suppliers and distributors and are not dependent on any individual supplier or distributor. Furthermore, we have not experienced difficulty in our ability to obtain our parts or component materials, nor do we expect this to be an issue in the future.

- 7

COMPETITION

We compete for sales of our products and services based on price, performance, technical features, contracting approach, reliability, availability, customization and, in some situations, geography. Our primary competition for low-cost propulsion systems using clean, safe, commercially available hybrid rocket motor technology comes from Cesaroni Technology Incorporated in Canada and their affiliates. While Lockheed Martin has demonstrated large-scale hybrid rocket capability, and there are a number of smaller enterprises, especially academic-based organizations, in the domestic market currently investigating various aspects of hybrid rocket technology, to date we have seen limited competitive pressures arising from these organizations.

The primary domestic competition for unmanned earth-orbiting micro-satellites, unmanned deep space micro-spacecraft and micro-satellite subsystems as well as software systems comes from other small companies such as AeroAstro or MicroSat Systems. The most established international competitor is Surrey Satellite Technology Limited ("SSTL") in the United Kingdom. Swedish Space Corporation is also able to compete in the small-satellite arena, particularly in the European market. In addition to private companies, there are a limited number of universities in the United States that have the capability to produce reasonably simple micro-satellites. These include Weber State in Utah and Arizona State University ("ASU") in Phoenix.

While we believe that our product and service offerings provide a wide breadth of solutions for our customers and prospective customers, some of our

competitors compete across many of our product lines. Several of our current and potential competitors have greater resources, including technical and engineering resources. We are not aware of any established large companies (e.g., Northrop Grumman, Lockheed Martin, Boeing), which have expressed corporate goals to design and build inexpensive micro-spacecraft for a mission, which would be our direct competition.

REGULATION

Our business activities are regulated by various agencies and departments of the U.S. government and, in certain circumstances, the governments of other countries. Several government agencies, including NASA and the U.S. Air Force, maintain Export Control Offices to ensure that any disclosure of scientific and technical information ("STI") complies with the Export Administration Regulations and the International Traffic in Arms Regulations ("ITAR"). Exports of the Company's products, services and technical information require either Technical Assistance Agreements ("TAAs") or licenses from the U.S. Department of State, depending on the level of technology being transferred. This includes recently published regulations restricting the ability of U.S.-based companies to complete offshore launches, or to export certain satellite components and technical data to any country outside the United States. The export of information with respect to ground-based sensors, detectors, high-speed computers, and national security and missile technology items are controlled by the Department of Commerce. The government is very strict with respect to compliance and has served notice that failure to comply with the ITAR and/or the Commerce Department regulations may subject guilty parties to fines of up to \$1 million and/or up to 10 years imprisonment per violation. The failure of the Company to comply with any of the foregoing regulations could have serious adverse effects as dictated by the rules associated with compliance to the ITAR regulations. Also, our ability to successfully market and sell into international markets may be severely hampered due to ITAR regulation requirements. Our conservative position is to consider any material beyond standard marketing material to be regulated by ITAR regulations.

In addition to the standard local, state and national government regulations that all businesses must adhere to, the space industry has specific regulations. In the U.S., command and telemetry frequency assignments for space missions are primarily regulated by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") for our domestic commercial products. Our products geared toward domestic government

8

customers are regulated by the National Telecommunications Information Agency ("NTIA") and any of our products sold internationally, if any, are regulated by the International Telecommunications Union ("ITU"). All launch vehicles that are launched from a launch site in the United States must pass certain launch range safety regulations that are administered by the U.S. Air Force. In addition, all commercial space launches that we might perform require a license from DOT. Satellites that are launched must obtain approvals for command and frequency assignments. For international approvals, the FCC and NTIA obtain these approvals from the ITU. These regulations have been in place for a number of years to cover the large number of non-government commercial space missions that have been launched and put into orbit in the last 15 to 20 years. Any commercial deep space mission that we might perform would be subject to these regulations. Presently, we are not aware of any additional or unique government regulations related to commercial deep space missions.

We are also required to obtain permits, licenses, and other authorizations under federal, state, local and foreign statutes, laws or regulations or other governmental restrictions relating to the environment or to emissions,

discharges or releases of pollutants, contaminants, petroleum or petroleum products, chemicals or industrial, toxic or hazardous substances or wastes into the environment including, without limitation, ambient air, surface water, ground water, or land, or otherwise relating to the manufacture, processing, distribution, use, treatment, storage, disposal, transport or handling of pollutants, contaminants, petroleum or petroleum products, chemicals or industrial, toxic or hazardous substances or wastes or the clean-up or other remediation thereof. Presently, we do not have a requirement to obtain any special environmental licenses or permits.

We may need to utilize the Deep Space Network ("DSN") on some of our missions. The DSN is an international network of antennas that supports interplanetary spacecraft missions and radio and radar astronomy observations for the exploration of the solar system and the universe. The network also supports selected Earth-orbiting missions. The network is a facility of NASA, and is managed and operated for NASA by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory ("JPL"). The Telecommunications and Mission Operations Directorate ("TMOD") manages the program within JPL. Coordination for the use of this facility is arranged with the Telecommunications and Mission Operations Command ("TMOC").

EMPLOYEES

At December 31, 2002, we employed approximately twenty-four (24) persons full and part-time, most of whom are aerospace, mechanical and electrical engineers. We expect to hire other personnel as necessary for product development, quality assurance, sales and marketing, finance and administration. In addition, due to the nature of our business, we anticipate that it may become necessary to lay off employees whose work is no longer required to maintain operations in order to prevent cost overruns. We do not have any collective bargaining agreements with our employees and we believe our employee-relations are good.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

We rely in part on patents, trade secrets and know-how to develop and maintain our competitive position and technological advantage. We intend to protect our intellectual property through a combination of license agreements, trademarks, service marks, copyrights, trade secrets and other methods of restricting disclosure and transferring title. There can be no assurance that such applications will be granted. We have and intend to continue entering into confidentiality agreements with our employees, consultants and vendors; enter into license agreements with third parties; and, generally, seek to control access to and distribution of our intellectual property.

9

In August 1998, we acquired a license to intellectual property (including patents and trade secrets) from an individual who had acquired them from the former AMROC, which specialized in hybrid rocket technology. We are obligated to issue warrants to this individual to purchase a minimum of 100,000 and a maximum of 3,000,000 shares of our common stock over ten years beginning at the inception of the agreement, depending on our annual revenues related to sales of hybrid technology-based products. To date, we have issued warrants to purchase a total of 100,000 shares of our common stock under the agreement.

ITEM 2. DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Subsequent to year-end, we entered into a 25,000 square foot lease for our facility in Poway, California that includes a small Spacecraft Assembly and Test facility ("SAT") with an 1,800 square foot Class 100,000 clean room, avionics development lab, machine shop, mechanical assembly lab, and mission operations

center. Key uses of the Poway facility are program and project conferences and meetings, engineering design, engineering analysis, spacecraft assembly, avionics labs and software labs and media outreach. We also have a Mission Control Center in the Poway building, which is currently being used to monitor the CHIPSat mission. Our facility allows for efficient design, assembly and test of our products, thereby providing us a cost effective means to produce quality, low cost products.

We purchased our headquarter facility, which houses our engineering, manufacturing and administration, in the Poway Industrial Park complex in December 1998. We subsequently sold our facility on January 31, 2003, wherein we entered into a long-term leaseback of the facility. [See Notes 2 and 9(c) to our consolidated financial statements for additional information.] The selling price of the facility was \$3.2 million. The total debt repayment from the transaction was approximately \$2,407,000. The approximate net proceeds to us for working capital purposes was \$636,000. Mr. Benson provided a guarantee for the leaseback. [See Subsequent Events note in our consolidated financial statements.]

ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

On June 18, 2001, we entered into a relationship with two individuals (doing business as EMC Holdings Corporation ("EMC")), whereby EMC was to provide certain consulting and advisory services to us in exchange for our common stock. EMC received the first installment of 500,000 shares of our common stock on June 26, 2001. Total expense for the initial stock issuance through September 30, 2001 was valued at approximately \$455,000. Pursuant to a demand for arbitration filed by us on November 7, 2001, we sought the return of all or a portion of the shares issued to EMC. EMC filed a its own claim with the American Arbitration Association on November 13, 2001, alleging that we owed EMC \$118,000 in fees, plus damages.

A three-day arbitration hearing was held in May and June 2002 with respect to claims arising out of consulting and advisory service agreements between EMC and us. On July 17, 2002, an interim award was issued in favor of us against EMC, ordering the return of the initial installment of 500,000 shares and denying EMC's claim for \$118,000. On October 22, 2002, a status conference was held and a tentative final award was issued again in the favor of us. Included in this tentative final ruling was an award of approximately \$83,000 in attorney and arbitration fees to us. The tentative final ruling became effective on October 29, 2002, and was submitted to the Superior Court of California, Orange County, for entry of judgment.

Because collection of the attorney and arbitration fees award is not assured, we expensed all of our fees related to this matter. Any recovery of fees will be recorded as income in the period they are received. The return of the 500,000 shares, as provided in the interim award issued on July 17, 2002, was recorded in the third quarter of 2002 as a reversal of the original expense recorded. See "Results of Operations" below.

10

ITEM 4. SUBMISSION OF MATTERS TO A VOTE OF SECURITY HOLDERS

No matters were submitted to a vote of our shareholders during the fourth quarter of our fiscal year ended December 31, 2002.

11

PART II

ITEM 5. MARKET FOR COMMON EQUITY AND RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS

MARKET INFORMATION

Our common stock has been traded on the Over-the-Counter Bulletin Board ("OTCBB") since August 1998 under the symbol "SPDV." The following table sets forth the trading history of our common stock on the OTCBB for each quarter as reported by Dow Jones Interactive. The quotations reflect inter-dealer prices, without retail mark-up, markdown or commission and may not represent actual transactions.

QUARTER ENDING	QUARTERLY HIGH	QUARTERLY LOW
3/31/2001	\$1.03	\$0.63
6/30/2001	\$0.97	\$0.45
9/30/2001	\$1.01	\$0.69
12/31/2001	\$0.86	\$0.35
3/31/2002	\$0.65	\$0.48
6/30/2002	\$0.64	\$0.43
9/30/2002	\$0.52	\$0.30
12/31/2002	\$0.50	\$0.29
3/7/2003*	\$0. 55	\$0.36

^{*}Reflects partial period.

HOLDERS

As of March 7, 2003, there were approximately 200 holders of record of our common stock. We estimate the total number of beneficial owners of our common stock to be in excess of 2,500 holders. We believe that the number of beneficial owners is substantially greater than the number of record holders because a significant portion of our outstanding common stock is held in broker "street names" for the benefit of individual investors.

DIVIDENDS

We have never paid a cash dividend on our Common Stock. Payment of dividends is at the discretion of the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors plans to retain earnings, if any, for operations and does not intend to pay dividends in the foreseeable future.

12

ITEM 6. MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

The following discussion should be read in conjunction with our consolidated

financial statements and the notes thereto and the other financial information appearing elsewhere in this document. In addition to historical information, the following discussion and other parts of this document contain forward-looking information that involves risks and uncertainties. Actual results could differ materially from those anticipated by such forward-looking information due to a number of factors beyond our control. (See Item 1. Forward Looking Statements.)

OVERVIEW

We are engaged in the conception, design, development, manufacture, integration and operations of space technology systems, products and services. We are currently focused on the commercial development of low-cost micro-satellites, nanosatellites and related subsystems, hybrid rocket propulsion as well as the associated engineering technical services to government, aerospace and other commercial enterprises. Our products and solutions are sold directly to these customers and include sophisticated micro- and nanosatellites, hybrid rocket-based orbital Maneuvering and orbital Transfer Vehicles ("MTVs") as well as safe sub-orbital and orbital hybrid rocket-based propulsion systems. We are also developing commercial hybrid rocket motors and small high performance space vehicles and subsystems.

We were incorporated under the laws of the State of Colorado on December 23, 1996 as Pegasus Development Group, Inc. ("PDGI") and subsequently changed our name to "SpaceDev." We became a publicly traded company in October 1997 and are trading on the Nasdaq Over-the-Counter Bulletin Board ("OTCBB") under the symbol of "SPDV."

In February 1998, our operations were expanded with the acquisition of Integrated Space Systems, Inc. ("ISS"), a California corporation founded for the purpose of providing engineering and technical services related to space-based systems. The ISS employee base, acquired upon acquisition, largely consisted of former General Dynamics personnel and enlarged our then current employee base to 20 employees. ISS was purchased for approximately \$3.6 million, paid in Rule 144 restricted common shares of SpaceDev. Goodwill of approximately \$3.5 million was capitalized and was to be amortized over a period of 60 months, based on the purchase price exceeding the net asset value of approximately \$164,000. As a result of a change in corporate focus, on November 15, 2001, we determined that the unamortized balance of goodwill from ISS, which was approximately \$923,000, had become impaired and it was written off. While the ISS segment did provide small hybrid propulsion space systems and engineering services on separate contracts (mainly with the government), the engineering service contracts had expired and, therefore, would not be producing revenue or cash flow to support future operations. We determined that all future business, contracts, and proposals would be sought after only in the SpaceDev name, making it a more efficient way for us to manage and track multiple contracts and work on many different business ventures at the same time within the same operating segment.

In November 1999, we were awarded a \$4.9 million turnkey mission contract by the Space Sciences Laboratory ("SSL") at University of California, Berkeley ("UCB"). We were competitively selected by UCB/SSL to design, build, integrate, test and operate for one year a small scientific, Earth-orbiting spacecraft called CHIPSat. In 2000, we reviewed the contract status at year-end and determined that the total estimated costs at the end of the program would exceed the likely revenue. As a result, we accrued a loss of approximately \$860,000 based on the expected contract modification of \$600,000, which was approved on June 15, 2001. On November 28, 2001, a second contract modification was signed with UCB, which

contract scope. This increased the total contract revenue to approximately \$6.8 million and reduced the total expected loss on the contract to approximately \$460,000. During 2002, an additional contract modification for approximately \$400,000 was signed, which also increased the contract value and scope to the current value of the CHIPSat project of approximately \$7.2 million, further reducing the total expected loss on the contract to approximately \$430,000. As of December 31, 2002, approximately 97% of the total contract costs were expended and the remaining loss on the balance sheet at year-end totaled approximately \$11,000. The CHIPSat contract is expected to conclude in January 2004. Revenues for 2002 were approximately \$1.7 million and are expected to be approximately \$200,000 in 2003. We are currently receiving monthly payments on the contract according to a preset payment schedule detailed in the contract.

In April 2001, we were awarded one of four \$1.0 million contracts from NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California. As part of a Boeing-led team, we participated in a study of the options for a potential Mars sample return mission in 2011. The contract ran from April through October 2001. Our revenue from this contract in 2002 and 2001 was approximately \$7,000 and \$216,000, respectively.

In September 2001, we were awarded a contract for a proprietary propulsion research program valued in excess of \$1.0 million. As a part of that program, we are competing with another party to design a space propulsion system. The entire contract, which will be awarded based upon the submitted designs, is valued at approximately \$2.2 million. We expect this contract to generate revenue in 2003 of approximately \$240,000. Work on this project generated approximately \$1.2 million in revenues during 2002. To date, we have recognized approximately \$19,000 of gross margin on this contract. We reviewed the contract status in the fourth quarter of 2002, to evaluate changes to the total estimated costs to complete the contract due to schedule delays. Further discussion of the impacts of the contract delay is included under "Liquidity and Capital Resources - Forward Looking Statements and Risk Analysis" below.

On April 30, 2002, we were awarded Phase I of a contract to develop a Shuttle-compatible propulsion module for the Air Force Research Lab ("AFRL"). We anticipate receiving an award for Phase II of the contract in early 2003, and will use the project to further expand our product line to satisfy commercial and government space transportation requirements. The first two phases of the contract (including an additional add-on option) are worth up to approximately \$2.5 million, of which \$100,000 was awarded for Phase I. Although we expect Phase II to be awarded to us shortly, there can be no assurance that Phase II will actually be awarded to us. Congress has appropriated money to this project and, as of the date of this report, we have submitted a proposal for Phase II. Our success in winning this next phase of the program will depend on our ability to meet the AFRL's objectives and their approval of our submitted Phase II proposal. AFRL Phase II is anticipated to be a cost-plus contract.

On June 18, 2001, we entered into a relationship with two individuals (doing business as EMC Holdings Corporation ("EMC")) whereby EMC was to provide certain consulting and advisory services to us. EMC received the first installment of 500,000 shares of our common stock on June 26, 2001. Total expense for the initial stock issuance through September 30, 2001 was approximately \$455,000. Pursuant to a demand for arbitration filed by us on November 7, 2001, we sought the return of all or a portion of the shares issued to EMC. Following a three-day arbitration in May and June 2002, on July 17, 2002, an interim award was issued in favor of us against EMC, ordering the return of the initial installment of our 500,000 shares and denying EMC's own claim for \$118,000. On October 22, 2002, a tentative final award was issued in our favor including an award of approximately \$83,000 in attorney and arbitration fees to us. The tentative final ruling became effective on October 29, 2002, and has been submitted to the Superior Court of California, Orange County, for entry of judgment.

14

Because collection of the attorney and arbitration fees award is not assured, we expensed all of our fees related to this matter. Any recovery of the fees will be recorded as income in the period they are received. The return of our 500,000 shares, as provided in the interim award issued on July 17, 2002, was recorded in the third quarter of 2002 as a reversal of the original expense recorded. Because the original expense was not recorded as an extraordinary item, the reversal of the expense did not qualify as an extraordinary item. See "Results of Operations" below.

RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

Please refer to the consolidated financial statements, which are a part of this report for further information regarding the results of operations.

YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2002 -VS.- YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2001

During the year ended December 31, 2002, we had net sales of \$3.4 million as compared to net sales of \$4.1 million in 2001. Sales in 2002 were comprised of approximately \$1.7 million from the CHIPSat program, approximately \$1.2 million from a contract for a proprietary propulsion development program, approximately \$300,000 from the completion of our outstanding State Grants, approximately \$70,000 from Phase I of the AFRL project and approximately \$130,000 from all other programs. In 2001, sales were comprised of approximately \$3.2 million from the CHIPSat program, approximately \$328,000 from a contract for a proprietary propulsion development program, approximately \$228,000 from research and development performed for the Office of Space Launch ("OSL"), approximately \$216,000 from the Boeing Mars Sample Return and Mars Assent Vehicle projects, and approximately \$164,000 from all other programs.

For the year 2002, we had costs of sales (direct and allocated costs associated with individual contracts) of approximately \$3.3 million as compared to approximately \$2.4 million in 2001. This increase was primarily due to additional project costs as a result of project delays and scope changes. The gross margin percentage for the year ended December 31, 2002 was 2% as compared to 41% for the same period in 2001. The decrease was due to additional project costs due to contract delays and an allocation of certain G&A expenses to cost of goods sold.

We experienced a decrease in operating expenses from approximately \$3.2 million in 2001 to approximately \$66,000 for 2002. Operating expenses include general and administrative expenses and research and development expenses. General and administrative expenses consisted primarily of salaries for administrative personnel, fees for outside consultants, insurance, legal and accounting fees and other overhead expenses. The reduction of approximately \$3.1 million in the operating expenses was due in part to the arbitration ruling reversal of the EMC stock issuance of 500,000 shares and a resulting credit of \$455,000 in 2002 that was expensed in 2001. See "ITEM 3. Legal Proceeding" above. Other issues involving the reduction in operating expenses can be attributed to a reduction of research and development costs from \$198,400 in 2001 to none for the same period in 2002, a write-off of \$923,000 in 2001 related to the impairment of the unamortized balance of goodwill from the ISS acquisition, the amortization expense related to goodwill for ISS of \$520,000 incurred in 2001 compared to none in 2002, the expense of \$150,000 for a contingent liability due to Technical & General Guarantee Company Limited expensed in 2001 compared to none in 2002, an issuance of 80,000 stock options that had a value of \$67,000 for the acquisition of Explorespace.com that was expensed as advertising in 2001 compared to no equivalent expense in 2002, as well as, a reduction in salaries of approximately \$190,000 from 2001 to 2002 due to changes in personnel. In

addition, we began a system of more fully absorbing costs into projects, effectively shifting approximately \$600,000 of expenses that were recorded as operating expenses in 2001 to cost of goods sold in 2002.

1.5

Interest expense for the periods ending December 31, 2002 and 2001 was approximately \$263,000 and \$303,000, respectively. We paid interest expense on certain capital leases and mortgages. In addition, we accrued interest expense related to our related party notes and convertible debentures. In 2002, we accrued a convertible debt discount related to warrants that accompanied the convertible debt issue of approximately \$475,000, of which \$125,000 was expensed in 2002 and the remainder will be amortized over the remaining life of the notes.

During the year ended December 31, 2002, we incurred a net loss of approximately \$400,000, compared to a net loss of approximately \$1.9 million for the same period in 2001. The decrease in the net loss was due to our reduction in operating expenses by approximately \$3.2 million. As discussed above, the decrease was primarily attributable to non-cash expenses, including impairment of the un-amortized balance of goodwill from ISS, goodwill expense in 2001, stock issued to EMC in 2001 and then recovered by us in 2002, the note payable to T&G, the stock options issued for the acquisition of ExploreSpace.com, and research and development costs.

LIQUIDITY AND CAPITAL RESOURCES

Our auditors have expressed a formal auditors' opinion that our December 31, 2002 financial position raises substantial doubt about our ability to continue as a going concern. The opinion is based on net losses incurred by us for the years ended December 31, 2002 and 2001 of approximately \$400,000 and \$1.9 million, respectively, and working capital deficits of approximately \$200,000 and \$1.0 million, respectively, for those years. Although there was a significant reduction in the working capital deficit, items remain that raise substantial doubt about our ability to continue as a going concern.

On January 31, 2003, we closed escrow on the sale of our facility in Poway, California and entered into a ten-year lease for the same facility. The selling price of the facility was \$3.2 million. The total debt repayment from the transaction was approximately \$2.4 million. The approximate net proceeds to us for working capital purposes was approximately \$636,000. However due to continuing delays and schedule slips with our commercial propulsion project and further delays in obtaining new contract business, we remain in a cash crisis.

From October 14, 2002 through November 14, 2002, we raised \$475,000 from certain of our directors and officers by issuing 2.03% convertible debentures. The convertible debentures entitle the holder to convert the principal and unpaid accrued interest into our common stock when the note matures. The original maturity on the notes was six (6) months from issue date and were subsequently extended to twelve (12) months from issue date on March 19, 2003. The convertible debentures are exercisable into a number of our common shares at a conversion price that equals the 20-day average asking price less 10%, which was established when the note was issued, or the initial conversion price. Concurrent with the issuance of the convertible debentures, we issued to the subscribers, warrants to purchase 1,229,705 shares of our common stock. These warrants are exercisable for three (3) years from the date of issuance at the initial exercise price which equals to the 20-day average asking price less 10% which was established when the note was issued, or the initial conversion price. There can be no assurance that additional funds will be raised and if raised, will be under the same or more favorable terms than the convertible debentures.

We have sustained ourselves over the last few years with a mixture of government and commercial contracts. In particular, we anticipate receiving an award for AFRL Phase II in early 2003. AFRL Phase II is a cost-plus contract, which will require us to incur certain costs in advance of regular contract reimbursements from AFRL. Although we will need a certain amount of cash to fund advance payments on the contract, we will be entitled, as a small business concern, to recover our costs on a weekly basis.

16

We can continue to grow and execute certain parts of our strategy without additional equity funding by identifying, bidding and winning new commercial and government funded programs. We expect to obtain new commercial and government contracts; however, depending on the timing of those contracts, we may need to seek additional and possibly immediate financing through a combination of public and private debt or equity placements, commercial project financing and government programs to fund future operations and commitments. There is no assurance that new contracts or additional debt or equity financing needed to fund operations will be available or obtained in sufficient amounts necessary to meet our needs. The likelihood of our success must be considered in light of the expenses, difficulties and delays frequently encountered in connection with the developing businesses, those historically encountered by us, and the competitive environment in which we operate.

CASH POSITION FOR YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2002 -VS.- YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2001

Net decrease in cash during the year ending December 31, 2002 was approximately \$184,000, compared to a net decrease of \$48,000 for the same period in 2001. Net cash used in operating activities totaled approximately \$707,000 for the year ending December 31, 2002, a decrease of approximately \$775,000 as compared to approximately \$68,000 provided by operating activities during the same period in 2001. This is attributable primarily to the increased costs on the CHIPSat project as well as the contract for a proprietary propulsion research program, both of which, at December 31, 2002, had costs that exceeded their billings for the ongoing work toward completion of these programs.

Net cash provided by investing activities totaled approximately \$48,000 for the year ended December 31, 2002, compared to approximately \$43,000 of net cash used in investing activities during the same period in 2001. The increase in cash used of \$91,000 is attributable to a reduction in the purchase of fixed assets and an advance payment made toward the purchase of our facility in January 2003. Net cash provided by financing activities totaled approximately \$475,000 for the year ended December 31, 2002, which showed an increase of \$549,000 from the approximately \$74,000 used in financing activities during the same period in 2001. This improvement is primarily attributable to generating more cash from sales of common stock and issuance of convertible debt in 2002 of \$550,000 versus \$120,000 in 2001.

At December 31, 2002, our cash, which includes cash reserves and cash available for investment, was approximately \$27,000 as compared to approximately \$212,000 at December 31, 2001, a decrease of approximately \$184,000. At December 31, 2002, our working capital ratio improved to 0.94 compared to 0.34 at December 31, 2001.

As of December 31, 2002, our backlog of funded and non-funded business was approximately \$4.0 million, as opposed to approximately \$3.4 million as of fiscal year end 2001. During 2002, we won AFRL Phase I, negotiated increases of approximately \$500,000 to the CHIPSat program and began a private commercial propulsion project.

Deferred income taxes are provided for temporary differences in recognizing certain income and expense items for financial and tax reporting purposes. The deferred tax asset of approximately \$1.4 million consisted primarily of the income tax benefits from net operating loss carryforwards, amortization of goodwill and research and development credit carryforwards. A valuation allowance has been recorded to fully offset the deferred tax asset as it is more likely than not that the assets will not be utilized. The valuation allowance decreased approximately \$600,000 during 2001, from \$2.0 million at December 31, 2001 to \$1.4 million at December 31, 2002. Please refer to our consolidated financial statements, which are a part of this report for further information regarding our liquidity and capital resources.

17

CRITICAL ACCOUNTING STANDARDS

Our revenues are derived primarily from fixed price contracts and are recognized using the percentage-of-completion method of contract accounting based on the ratio of total costs incurred to total estimated costs. Losses on contracts are recognized when they become known and reasonably estimable (see Note 10(c) of the Consolidated Financial Statements). Actual results of contracts may differ from management's estimates and such differences could be material to the consolidated financial statements. Professional fees are billed to customers on a time and materials basis, a fixed price basis or a per-transaction basis. Time and materials revenues are recognized as services are performed. Billings in excess of costs incurred and estimated earnings represent the excess of amounts billed in accordance with the contractual billing terms. Deferred revenue represents amounts collected from customers for services to be provided at a future date.

In October 1995, the FASB issued SFAS No. 123, "Accounting for Stock-Based Compensation." We adopted SFAS 123 in 1997. We have elected to measure compensation expense for our stock-based employee compensation plans using the intrinsic value method prescribed by APB Opinion 25, "Accounting for Stock Issued to Employees" and have provided pro forma disclosures as if the fair value based method prescribed SFAS 123 has been utilized. See Note 8(d) of the Consolidated Financial Statements. We have valued our stock, stock options and warrants issued to non-employees at fair value in accordance with the accounting prescribed in SFAS No. 123, which states that all transactions in which goods or services are received for the issuance of equity instruments shall be accounted for based on the fair value of the consideration received or the fair value of the equity instruments issued, whichever is more reliably measurable.

Fixed assets are depreciated over their estimated useful lives of three-to-five years using the straight-line method of accounting in accordance with Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 144. Goodwill and other intangible assets were created upon the acquisition of our subsidiaries. Intangible assets are amortized over their assets' estimated future useful lives on a straight-line basis over three to five years. Goodwill and other intangibles are periodically reviewed for impairment based on an assessment of future operations to ensure they are appropriately valued in accordance with Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 142. Effective November 2001, there will be no more amortization of goodwill (see Note 3 of the Consolidated Financial Statements).

RECENT ACCOUNTING PRONOUNCEMENTS

In April 2002, the Financial Accounting Standards Board ("FASB") issued Statement of Financial Accounting Standards ("SFAS") No. 145, "Rescission of FASB Statements No. 4, 44, and 64, Amendment of FASB Statement No. 13, and Technical Corrections." SFAS No. 145 rescinds SFAS No. 4, "Reporting Gains and

Losses from Extinguishment of Debt," and an amendment of that SFAS, SFAS No. 64, "Extinguishment of Debt Made to Satisfy Sinking-Fund Requirements." SFAS No. 145 also rescinds SFAS No. 44, "Accounting for Intangible Assets of Motor Carriers." Further, SFAS No. 145 amends SFAS No. 13, "Accounting for Leases," to eliminate an inconsistency between the required accounting for sale-leaseback transactions and the required accounting for certain lease modifications that have economic effects that are similar to sale-leaseback transactions. SFAS No. 145 also amends other existing authoritative pronouncements to make various technical corrections, clarify meanings, or described their applicability under changed conditions. This pronouncement requires gains and losses from extinguishment of debt to be classified as an extraordinary item only if the criteria in Accounting Principles Board Opinion No. 30, "Reporting the Results of Operations--Reporting the Effects of Disposal of a Segment of a Business, and Extraordinary, Unusual and Infrequently Occurring Events and Transactions," have been met. Further, lease modifications with economic effects similar to sale-leaseback transactions must be accounted for in the same manner as sale-leaseback transactions. The provisions of SFAS No. 145 related to the

18

rescission of SFAS No. 4 shall be applied in fiscal years beginning after May 15, 2002. The provisions of SFAS No. 145 related to Statement 13 shall be effective for transactions occurring after May 15, 2002, with early application encouraged. The adoption of SFAS No. 145 did not have a material impact on our consolidated financial position or results of operations for the year ended December 31, 2002.

In July 2002, the FASB issued Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 146, "Accounting for Costs Associated with Exit or Disposal Activities" ("SFAS 146"). SFAS 146 requires that a liability for costs associated with an exit or disposal activity be recognized and measured initially at fair value only when the liability is incurred. SFAS 146 is effective for exit or disposal activities that are initiated after December 31, 2002. We do not expect the adoption of SFAS 146 to have a material impact on our operating results or financial position.

In December 2002, the FASB issued SFAS No. 148, "Accounting for Stock-Based Compensation-Transition and Disclosure-an amendment of SFAS No. 123." SFAS No. 148 provides alternative methods of transition for a voluntary change to the fair value based method of accounting for stock-based employee compensation. In addition, this Statement amends the disclosures in both annual and interim financial statements about the method of accounting for stock-based employee compensation and the effect of the method used on reported results. Management is evaluating the adoption of this statement.

FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS AND RISK ANALYSIS

During the first two months of 2003, we submitted five bids for government programs, worked with the US Congress to identify directed funding for our programs and are actively working to win several significant commercial programs. We believe that we will win some of these programs, which would enable us to continue to grow and broaden our business base, although there can be no assurance that these contracts will be awarded to us. At this time, we are awaiting approval of a government contract for one of these programs that would ultimately lead to over \$2 million of new business over the next 18 months. We have no firm information on any other of these current projects.

To date, we have maintained a mix of government and commercial business. In 2001, we had about 80% government or government related work. In 2002, we had about 60% government and government related work. In 2003, we expect the ratio

to be about 70% government or government-related work. We will continue to do both government and commercial business and anticipate the mix of government revenues to continue to be above 60% for the next several years as we increase our government and commercial marketing efforts for both of our product lines. Currently, we are focusing on the domestic U.S. government market, which we believe is only about one-half of the global government market for our products and services. Although we are interested in exploring international revenue and contract opportunities, we are restricted by export control regulations, e.g., International Traffic in Arms Regulations ("ITAR"), which may limit our ability to develop market opportunities outside the United States.

While we do not expect a reduction of government sales, a majority of our government work is contract related. We are beginning to develop commercial products and aggressively market our products to the commercial market, particularly for micro- and nano-satellites and applications of our propulsion technology and products. We anticipate winning contracts in both market segments, although there can be no assurance that the contracts will be awarded to us. If they are not awarded to us, based on current trends and proposals, we believe that we can offset fluctuations in one market segment with contracts from the other; however, our inability to win business in both markets would have a negative effect on our business operations and financial condition.

19

We are forecasting a modest growth in sales for 2003. At this time, about 50% of the forecasted sales are under contract or near to contract award, but there is no guarantee that we will win enough new business to achieve our targeted growth projection or to achieve a positive cash flow position. We do not believe that significant capital expenditures will be required to achieve this modest increase in sales.

As it relates to the CHIPSat program, we will receive total fixed compensation on the CHIPSat project in an amount of approximately \$7.2 million, of which about \$3.1 million was generated in 2001, and \$1.2 million was generated in 2002. The contract calls for payments of approximately \$450,000 in 2003. As outlined above, we reviewed the contract again in late 2002 and the total loss was reduced from \$463,000 to approximately \$432,000. As the project is completed, the loss is reduced as costs become realized. At this time, we do not expect any additional losses from or increases to the contract. The launch of CHIPSat occurred in January 2003.

We expect payments of about \$240,000 in 2003 from a private commercial propulsion contract. This effort could lead to follow-on contracts from the same customer later this year, but at this time we cannot assess the probability of winning the contract or the value of the contract.

Our broad, overall, higher growth business strategy, requires significant development and capital expenditures. We will incur a substantial portion of these expenditures before it generates significantly higher sales. Combined with operating expenses, these capital expenditures will result in a negative cash flow until we can establish an adequate revenue-generating customer base. We expect losses through the first part of 2003 and expect to begin generating net positive cash flow from operations sufficient to fund both operations and capital expenditures toward the end of 2003. There is no assurance, however, that we will achieve or sustain any positive cash flow or profitability thereafter.

During the years ended December 31, 2002 and 2001, we raised approximately \$145,000 through private sales of stock and approximately \$475,000 from our convertible debt offering. To execute our strategy of small, capable, low-cost micro- and nano-satellites, hybrid propulsion products and new commercial

revenue sources, we require significant funding and/or the win of both significant government and commercial programs. We believe investor or customer funding of \$1 to \$5 million will be required, which could come from a combination of private and/or public equity placements or government and commercial customers. At this time, we do not have any ongoing private or public equity offerings, although we have agreed to use our best efforts to register the common stock underlying the warrants issued in our recent private placement memorandum within four to six months of completing the offering.

We need to raise additional capital. The amount of capital we need to raise is dependent upon many factors. For example, the need for additional capital will be greater if (i) we do not enter into agreements with other customers on the terms we anticipate; (ii) our net operating deficit increases because we incur significant unanticipated expenses; or (iii) we incur additional costs from modifying our satellite products or our proposed hybrid-related systems to meet changed or unanticipated market, regulatory, or technical requirements. If these or other events occur, there is no assurance that we could raise additional capital on favorable terms, on a timely basis or at all. If additional capital is not raised, it could have a significant negative effect on our business operations and financial condition, possibly causing us to take immediate cost reduction or other actions.

Our ability to execute a public offering or otherwise obtain funds is subject to numerous factors beyond our control, including, without limitation, a receptive securities market and appropriate governmental clearances. No assurances can be given that we will be profitable, or that any additional public offering will occur, that we will be successful in obtaining additional funds from any source or be successful in implementing an acceptable exit strategy on behalf of our investors. Moreover, additional funds, if obtainable at all, may not be available on terms acceptable to us when such funds are needed or may be on terms which are significantly adverse to our current shareholders. The unavailability of funds when needed would have a material adverse effect on us.

20

Our business partially depends on activities regulated by various agencies and departments of the U.S. government and other companies that rely on the government. Recently, in response to terrorists' activities and threats aimed at the United States, transportation, mail, financial, and other services have been slowed or stopped altogether. Further delays or stoppages in transportation, mail, financial, or other services could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, and financial condition. Furthermore, we may experience a small increase in operating costs, such as costs for transportation, insurance, and security as a result of the activities and potential activities. The U.S. economy in general is being adversely affected by the terrorist activities and potential activities, and any economic downturn could adversely impact our results of operations, impair our ability to raise capital, or otherwise adversely affect our ability to grow our business. Conversely, because of the nature of our products, there may be opportunities for us to offer solutions to the government that may address some of the problems that the country faces at this time.

ITEM 7. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Please see our audited financial statements for the period ended December 31, 2002 as compared to the period ended December 31, 2001 attached hereto.

ITEM 8. CHANGES IN AND DISAGREEMENTS WITH ACCOUNTANTS

During its last fiscal year and as of the date of this report, we have had no changes in or disagreements with our principal independent accountants regarding any matter of accounting principles or practices, financial statement disclosure or auditing scope or procedure, nor has our principal accounting firm resigned or declined to stand for re-election.

2.1

PART III

ITEM 9. DIRECTORS AND EXECUTIVE OFFICERS, PROMOTERS AND CONTROL PERSONS; COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 16(a) OF THE EXCHANGE ACT

Our management and directors' business activities are under the control of our Board of Directors. Our Chief Executive Officer, James W. Benson, Vice President of Product Development & Marketing, Stuart Schaffer and Chief Financial Officer, Richard B. Slansky, manage the Company's daily operations. Our Board currently consists of seven directors. General Howell M. Estes, III (USAF Retired), and Retired Congressman Robert S. Walker were added to the Board of Directors in 2001. Stuart Schaffer and Scott McClendon were added to the Board of Directors in 2002. Below are our executive officers and directors.

NAME POSITION HELD ____ _____ James W. Benson

13855 Stowe Drive Poway, California 92064

Stuart Schaffer

13855 Stowe Drive Poway, California 92064

Richard B. Slansky 13855 Stowe Drive Poway, CA 92064

J. Mark Grosvenor* 13855 Stowe Drive Poway, CA 92064

Wesley T. Huntress* 13855 Stowe Drive Poway, California 92064

Curt Dean Blake* 13855 Stowe Drive

Poway, California 92064

13855 Stowe Drive Poway, California 92064

13855 Stowe Drive Poway, California 92064

Robert S. Walker*

Scott McClendon * 13855 Stowe Drive Poway, California 92064

Chief Executive Officer, Director, Chairman of the Board

Director Vice President, Product Development & Marketing

Corporate Secretary, Chief Financial Officer

Director

Director

Director

General Howell M. Estes, III (USAF Retired) * Director

Director

Director

* Denotes Independent Director

22

The following is a summary of the business experience of our officers and directors as well as other key employees.

JAMES W. BENSON, age 57, is our founder and has served as our Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board since inception. In 1984, Mr. Benson founded Compusearch Corporation (later renamed Compusearch Software Systems), in McLean, Virginia. The company was based on use of personal computers to create full text indexes of massive government procurement regulations and to provide fast full text searches for any word or phrase; the first instance of large scale, commercial implementation of PC-based full text searching, which later grew to encompass such systems as worldwide web search engines. Seeing related opportunities in document and image management, Mr. Benson started the award-winning ImageFast Software Systems in 1989, which later merged with Compusearch. In 1995, Mr. Benson sold Compusearch and ImageFast, and retired at age fifty. After months of research, Mr. Benson started SpaceDev LLC, which was acquired by us in October 1997. Mr. Benson holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Geology from the University of Missouri. He founded the non-profit Space Development Institute and introduced the \$5,000 Benson Prize for Amateur Discovery of Near Earth Objects. He is also Vice-Chairman and private sector representative on NASA's national Space Grant Review Panel and a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers subcommittee on Near Earth Object Impact Prevention and Mitigation.

STUART SCHAFFER, AGE 43, is our vice president of product development and marketing. From 1998 to 2001, Mr. Schaffer acted as vice president of marketing for Infocus Corporation, a fully reporting company, where he managed all aspects of the marketing mix for market-share leading digital projection business throughout the Americas region. In that position, Mr. Schaffer revitalized the Proxima brand, managed a multi-million dollar annual advertising, communications and program budgets, directed multiple outside and in-house agencies, led product marketing teams in defining and delivering both mobile and conference room digital projector product lines, developed channel strategies and programs for both value-added and volume channels, served as primary press spokesperson for the company, established a market intelligence structure focused on developing customer and industry knowledge and spearheaded merger teams to ensure the smooth transition of the merger between the Infocus and Proxima marketing organizations. Prior to Infocus, Mr. Schaffer worked for the Hewlett-Packard Company from 1985 to 1998, where he held various positions in Business Development, Marketing and Business Planning. Mr. Schaffer has worked with the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, on a volunteer basis, as an Assistant Coach and Mentor. Mr. Schaffer has an MBA from Harvard University and a BS degree in physics from Harvey Mudd College.

RICHARD SLANSKY, AGE 45, Is our chief financial officer and corporate secretary and joined us on February 10, 2003. Mr. Slansky served as interim chief executive officer and chief financial officer of Quick Strike Resources, Inc., an IT training, services and consulting firm, from July 2002 to February 2003. Previously, Mr. Slansky served as chief financial officer, vice president of finance, administration and operations and corporate secretary for Path 1 Network Technologies, Inc., a company focused on merging broadcast and cable quality video transport with IP networks from May 2000 to July 2002. Before his tenure at Path 1, Mr. Slansky served as president, chief financial officer and member of the Board of Directors of Nautronix, Inc., a marine electronics/engineering services company, from January 1999 to May 2000. Prior to Nautronix, Mr. Slansky served as Chief Financial Officer of Alexis Corporation, an international pharmaceutical research products technology

23

company, from August 1995 to January 1999. He also served as President and Chief Financial Officer of C-N Biosciences, formerly Calbiochem, from July 1989 to July 1995. Mr. Slansky is currently serving on the Board of Directors of two privately held high technology companies and one closely held, private real estate company. Mr. Slansky earned a bachelor's degree in economics and science from the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Business and a master's degree in business administration in finance and accounting from the University of Arizona.

J. MARK GROSVENOR, age 55, was appointed to our Board of Directors as an independent director at our Board Meeting on March 19, 2003. Mr. Grosvenor is currently chief executive officer of Grosvenor Industries, originally established in San Diego in 1979. Grosvenor Industries was involved in the purchase and sale of the historic El Cortez Hotel in addition to owning three other city blocks of property in downtown San Diego. Grosvenor Industries also owns and operates Grosvenor Square Shopping Center. Since 1979, Mr. Grosvenor has built three hotels and has founded or become involved with many other national businesses. In 1984, he started Medallion Foods, Inc. in Newport, Arkansas, a snack food manufacturing company supplying Wal-Mart, Sam's Club and Costco as well as other companies. In 1989, Grosvenor formed GHG Hospitality, Inc., which owns and operates eleven hospitality projects including motels, hotels, resorts, and marinas across the United States. Prior to founding Grosvenor Industries and its combination of businesses, Grosvenor worked for more than three years as a stockbroker and financial planner. In 1973 he founded Jaymark Financial, a real estate company with offices in San Diego, Tokyo and Osaka, Japan. Mr. Grosvenor graduated from San Diego State University with a bachelor's degree in business and finance. Mr. Grosvenor has been very active in the community as a member of San Diego Sheriff's Association Honorary Deputy, Young Presidents Organization: California and Colorado Chapters, the President's Council at San Diego State University, the Lincoln Club, the San Diego Rotary, the University Club and the San Diego Yacht Club. He serves as a Director of the Grosvenor Foundation, a private family foundation which funds other charities.

WESLEY T. HUNTRESS, age 60, was elected to our Board of Directors as an independent director at our annual shareholder meeting held June 30, 1999. Dr. Huntress is currently Director of the Geophysical Laboratory at the Carnegie Institution of Washington in Washington, DC, where he leads an interdisciplinary group of scientists in the fields of high-pressure science, astrobiology, petrology and biogeochemistry. Prior to his appointment at Carnegie, Dr. Huntress served the Nation's space program as the Associate Administrator for Space Science at NASA from October 1993 through September 1998 where he was responsible for NASA's programs in astrophysics, planetary exploration, and space physics. During his tenure, NASA space science produced numerous major discoveries, and greatly increased the launch rate of missions. These discoveries include the discovery of possible ancient microbial life in a Mars meteorite; a possible subsurface ocean on Jupiter's moon Europa; the finding that gamma ray bursts originate at vast distances from the Milky Way and are extraordinarily powerful; discovery of massive rivers of plasma inside the Sun; and a wealth of announcements and images from the Hubble Space Telescope, which have revolutionized astronomy as well as increased public interest in the cosmos. Dr. Huntress also served as a Director of NASA's Solar System Exploration Division from 1990 to 1993, and as special assistant to NASA's Director of the Earth Science and Applications from 1988 to 1990. Dr. Huntress came to NASA Headquarters from Caltech's Jet Propulsion Laboratory ("JPL"). Dr. Huntress joined JPL as a National Research Council resident associate after receiving is B.S. in Chemistry from Brown University in 1964 and his Ph.D. in Chemical Physics from Stanford in 1968. He became a permanent research scientist

at JPL in 1969. He and his JPL team gained an international reputation for their pioneering studies of chemical evolution in interstellar clouds, comets and planetary atmospheres. At JPL Dr. Huntress served as co-investigator for the ion mass spectrometer experiment in the Giotto Halley's Comet mission, and as an interdisciplinary scientist for the Upper Atmosphere Research Satellite and Cassini missions. He also assumed a number of line and research program management assignments while at JPL, and spent a year as a visiting professor in the Department of Planetary Science and Geophysics at Caltech.

2.4

CURT DEAN BLAKE, age 45, was appointed to our Board of Directors as an independent director on September 5, 2000. Mr. Blake acted as the Chief Operating Officer of the Starwave Corporation from 1993 until 1999, where he managed business development, finance, legal and business affairs, and operations for the world's most successful collection of content sites on the Internet. During that time, he developed business strategies, financial models, and structured and negotiated venture agreements for Starwave's flagship site, ESPN Sportszone, at that time the highest traffic destination site on the Internet. He also developed and negotiated venture agreements with the NBA, NFL, Outside Magazine and NASCAR to create sites around these brands. Mr. Blake negotiated sale of controlling interest in Starwave Corporation to Disney/ABC. Prior to Starwave, Mr. Blake worked at Corbis from 1992 to 1993, where he led the acquisitions and licensing effort to fulfill Bill Gates' vision of creating the largest taxonomic database of digital images in the world. Mr. Blake acted as General Counsel to Aldus Corporation from 1989 to 1992, where he was responsible for all legal matters of the \$125 million public corporation and its subsidiaries. Prior to that, Mr. Blake was an attorney at Shidler, McBroom, Gates and Lucas, during which time he was assigned as onsite counsel to the Microsoft Corporation, where he was primarily responsible for the domestic OEM/Product Support and Systems Software divisions. Mr. Blake has an MBA and JD from the University of Washington.

GENERAL HOWELL M. ESTES, III (USAF RETIRED), age 61, was appointed to our Board of Directors as an independent director on April 2, 2001. General Estes retired from the United States Air Force in 1998 after serving for 33 years. At that time he was the Commander-in-Chief of the North American Aerospace Defense Command ("CINCNORAD") and the United States Space Command ("CINCSPACE"), and the Commander of the Air Force Space Command ("COMAFSPC") headquartered at Peterson AFB, Colorado. In addition to a Bachelor of Science Degree from the Air Force Academy, he holds a Master of Arts Degree in Public Administration from Auburn University and is a graduate of the Program for Senior Managers in Government at Harvard's JFK School of Government. Gen. Howell Estes is the President of Howell Estes & Associates, Inc., a wholly owned consulting firm to CEOs, Presidents and General Managers of aerospace and telecommunications companies worldwide. He serves as Vice Chairman of the Board of Trustees at The Aerospace Corporation. He served as a consultant to the Defense Science Board Task Force on SPACE SUPERIORITY and more recently as a commissioner on the U.S. Congressional Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization (the "Rumsfeld Commission").

ROBERT S. WALKER, age 60, was appointed to our Board of Directors as an independent director on April 2, 2001. Mr. Walker has acted as Chairman of Wexler & Walker Public Policy Associates in Washington, D.C. since January 1997. As a former Congressman (1977-1997), Chairman of the House Science Committee, Vice Chairman of the Budget Committee, and a long-time member of the House Republican leadership, Walker became a leader in advancing the nation's space program, especially the arena of commercial space, for which he was the first sitting House Member to be awarded NASA's highest honor, the Distinguished Service Medal. Bob Walker is a frequent speaker at conferences and forums. His main issues include the breadth and scope of space regulation today, and how

deregulation could unleash the telecommunications, space tourism, broadcast and Internet industries. Mr. Walker currently sits on the boards of directors of DCH Technology, Inc. and Aerospace Corporation, positions held since January 1999 and March 1997, respectively. DCH Technology, Inc. is subject to the reporting requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Wexler & Walker is a Washington-based, full-service government relations firm founded in 1981. Wexler & Walker principals have served in Congress, in the White House and federal agencies, as congressional staff, in state and local governments and in political campaigns. Wexler & Walker is a leader on the technology issues of the twenty-first century. During 2002 and 2001, we incurred consulting fees with Hill and Knowlton, Inc., an affiliate of Wexler & Walker, in an aggregate amount of approximately \$56,000 and \$36,000, respectively.

25

SCOTT MCCLENDON, AGE 63, was appointed to our Board of Directors as an independent director on July 19, 2002. McClendon currently sits on the Board of Directors for Overland Storage, Inc., where he acts as chairman of the Board. He became the chairman after serving as president and chief executive officer from October 1991 to March 2001. Prior to joining Overland Storage, Inc., Mr. McClendon was employed by Hewlett-Packard Company for over 32 years in various positions of engineering, manufacturing, sales and marketing. Mr. McClendon received a Bachelor of Science degree in electrical engineering in June 1960, and a Master of Science degree in electrical engineering in June 1962 from Stanford University School of Engineering.

SIGNIFICANT EMPLOYEES

JEFF JANICIK, AGE 35, is our director of flight systems and was primarily responsible for managing the success of the CHIPSat project. He also oversees all flight system / component marketing and research activity. Mr. Janicik has over 13 years experience in program management, engineering and instruction in aerospace. Before coming to us in January 2000, Mr. Janicik spent ten years as a project manager, engineer and instructor in the field of aerospace working for the United States Air Force in designing low-cost, streamlined approaches for the X-40A and X-37 program at Air Force SMC/TE, and set the precedent for future space vehicle demos with extensive research of safety, technical and operational issues. Mr. Janicik has an Aerospace Engineering degree from the University of Notre Dame and a Master's Degree in Mechanical Engineering from the University of California, Davis, which he received while serving as an active duty officer in the United States Air Force.

SECTION 16(a) BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP REPORTING COMPLIANCE

Based upon a review on the Forms 3 and 4 furnished to us with respect to our most recent fiscal year, each of the Directors and/or Executive Officers each timely filed his initial Form 3 and Forms 4 under Section 16(a) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 during 2002 with the following exception: Messrs. Schaffer and McClendon filed their initial Form 3's a few days late.

26

ITEM 10. EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION

REMUNERATION PAID TO EXECUTIVES

The following table sets forth the remuneration to our executive officers for the past three fiscal years:

SUMMARY COMPENSATION TABLE

					Long	ion	
		Anı 	Annual Compensation		Aw	ards	Payout
Name and Principal Position	Year	Salary (\$)	Bonus (\$)	Other Annual Compensation (\$)	Restricted Stock Award(s) (\$)	Securities Under-lying Options/ SARs (#)	LTIP Payou (\$
James W. Benson, CEO (1)	2000 2001 2002	42,946 147,923 141,325	- - -	- - -	- - - -	2,500,000(1) 10,000(1) - 750,000(2)	
Charles H. Lloyd, COO & CFO	2000 2001 2002	77,770 200,000 118,565	- - -	- - -	- - -	10,000(1)	

- (1) Mr. Benson was awarded 2,500,000 options in 1997 and those options were modified in 2000. Messrs. Benson and Lloyd were awarded 10,000 options each as a part of an annual award of options to our employees. Mr. Lloyd resigned in June 2002.
- (2) 200,000 of these options were performance-based options, which terminated on December 31, 2000. Mr. Lloyd was awarded 10,000 options as a part of an annual award of options to our employees.

During the last fiscal year and as of December 31, 2002, we did not grant stock options to our executive officers Listed in the above compensation table.

The following table is intended to provide information as to the number of stock options exercised by each of the executive officers listed above, the value realized upon exercise of such options, and the number and value of any unexercised options still held by such individuals.

				Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Options/SARs at FY-End (#)	Value of U In-the-Mon Options/SA End (\$)
Name	Shares Acquired on Exercise (#)	Value Realized (\$)		Exercisable/ Unexercisable	Exercisabl Unexercisa
James W. Benson	C)	0	503,333/ 2,006,667	
Charles H. Lloyd(2)	C)	0	697 , 963/	

27

- (1) For purposes of determining whether options are "in-the-money," we defined fair market value as the five-day weighted average of the closing price of our common stock on the Over-The-Counter Bulletin Board as of March 7, 2003, or \$0.46 per share. None of the options listed on the table are "in-the-money."
- (2) Mr. Lloyd resigned in June 2002; however, his options will remain exercisable until the five-year anniversary of the grant date of each option, as specified in a separation agreement with him dated May 31, 2002.

REMUNERATION PAID TO DIRECTORS

At our annual meeting on July 16, 2000, our Board of Directors adopted a compensation plan for independent directors whereby they will receive options for attending meetings of the Board as follows: each such director shall receive an option to purchase 5,000 shares for each of two telephonic meetings attended per year, and an option to purchase 10,000 shares for each of two meetings attended in person per year. These directors will not receive additional compensation for attending meetings in excess of those described above. In addition to the above, independent directors will receive \$5,000 in options on the date of election or appointment. All such options will be issued pursuant to the Plan at fair market value as of the date of the meeting attended, will vest 50% on the first anniversary date of the date of grant and 50% on the second anniversary date of the date of grant and will expire on the five-year anniversary of the grant date. We do not compensate any of our directors for their services as members of the Board through non-standard arrangements.

The following table sets forth the remuneration paid to our directors during our fiscal year ended December 31, 2002.

	Cash Compensation			Security G	Security Gra	
	Annual Retainer Fees	Meeting Fees		Num Sec Number of Und Shares Opt	mbe cur der	
James W. Benson	-	-	- 	-		
Charles H. Lloyd	_	_		_		
Stuart Schaffer	_	_	- - -	_		
Weslev T. Huntress		_		_		
Curt Dean Blake	_	_		_		
General Howell M. Estes, III	-	-		-		
Robert S. Walker	-	-		-		
Scott McClendon(1)	-	-	 	-		

(1) Pursuant to our policy regarding compensation of independent directors, we issued Mr. McClendon options to purchase a total of \$5,000 in common shares, or 10,460 shares at a per share price of \$0.478, upon acceptance of his position as one of our directors. The exercise price of the shares represents the fair market value on July 19, 2002, the date of issuance. The options vest at a rate of 50% on July 19, 2003 and the remaining 50% on July 19, 2004. Mr. McClendon also received options to purchase 5,000 shares on October 31, 2002 for attendance at a telephonic meeting of the Board of Directors. These options vest as follows: 50% on the one-year anniversary of the grant date and 50% on the two-year anniversary of the grant date.

28

EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENTS

On November 21, 1997, we entered into a five-year employment agreement with our CEO, Mr. Benson. This agreement provides for compensation of salary and stock as well as stock options. This agreement also prohibits Mr. Benson from competing with us, disclosing any confidential information, or soliciting any of our employees or customers for one year after termination of employment. Our Board of Directors amended the employment contract for Mr. Benson at its meeting on July 16, 2000. The amended agreement provides for the grant of options to purchase up to 4,000,000 shares of our common stock upon the occurrence of certain events. Such options would be immediately exercisable upon grant.

On May 17, 2002, we entered into an "at-will" employment agreement with Mr. Schaffer. The agreement provided for Mr. Schaffer's compensation of salary, benefits and options to purchase up to 450,000 shares of our common stock. The agreement also provided for severance under certain termination provisions.

On May 31, 2002, we entered into a Confidential Separation Agreement and General Release of Claims with Mr. Lloyd, our former Chief Operating Officer and Chief Financial Officer. The agreement provided for the resignation of Mr. Lloyd as an officer and director of SpaceDev, Inc. and Integrated Space Systems, Inc., effective June 14, 2002. In exchange for a release of claims and other promises set forth in the agreement, Mr. Lloyd received \$36,000 and an extension of the exercise period of each of his non-statutory stock options for a five-year period from the original date of grant. Until May 31, 2003, the agreement also prohibits Mr. Lloyd from soliciting our employees, inducing any customer away from us or representing himself on our behalf.

On February 14, 2003, we entered into an "at-will" employment agreement with Mr. Slansky. The agreement provided for Mr. Slansky's compensation of salary, benefits and options to purchase up to 375,000 shares of our common stock. The agreement also provided for severance under certain termination provisions.

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

At our 1999 Annual Stockholder Meeting, the shareholders adopted an Incentive Employee Stock Option Plan under which its Board of Directors may grant our employees, directors and affiliates Incentive Stock Options, Supplemental Stock Options and other forms of stock-based compensation, including bonuses or stock purchase rights. Incentive Stock Options, which provide for preferential tax treatment, are only available to employees, including officers, and affiliates, and may not be issued to non-employee directors. The exercise price of the Incentive Stock Options must be 100% of the fair market value of the stock on the date the option is granted. Pursuant to our plan, the exercise price for the Supplemental Stock Options will not be less than 85% of the fair market value of the stock on the date the option is granted. We are required to reserve an amount of common shares equal to the number of shares, which may be purchased as a result of awards made under the Plan.

2.9

At the 2000 Annual Stockholder Meeting, the shareholders approved an amendment to the Stock Option Plan of 1999, increasing the number of shares eligible for issuance under the Plan to 30% of the then outstanding common stock and allowing the Board of Directors to make annual adjustments to the Plan to maintain a 30% ratio to outstanding common stock at each annual meeting of the Board of Directors. The Board, at its annual meetings in 2001 and 2002, made no adjustment, as a determination was made that the number of shares then available under the Plan was sufficient to meet the Company's needs. As of December 31, 2002, 4,184,698 shares were authorized for issuance under the Plan, 3,398,772 of which are currently subject to outstanding options and awards. The Stock Option Plan of 1999 was registered with the U.S. Securities & Exchange Commission on Form S-8.

During the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2002, we issued non-statutory options to purchase 30,000 shares to our independent directors for attendance at our October 18, 2002 Board of Directors meeting. In addition to the Stock Option Plan of 1999, our shareholders adopted the 1999 Employee Stock Purchase Plan, which authorized our Board of Directors to make twelve consecutive offerings of our common stock to our employees. The 1999 Employee Stock Purchase Plan has been instituted. To date, no employees have purchased any shares of common stock under the Plan. We also offer a variety of health, dental, vision, 401(k) and life insurance benefits to our employees in conjunction with our co-employment partner, Administaff.

30

ITEM 11. SECURITY OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN BENEFICIAL OWNERS AND MANAGEMENT

The following table provides information as March 21, 2003 concerning the beneficial ownership of our common stock by (i) each director, (ii) each named executive officer, (iii) each shareholder known by us to be the beneficial owner of more than 10% of our outstanding Common Stock, and (iv) our directors and officers as a group. Except as otherwise indicated, the persons named in the table have sole voting and investing power with respect to all shares of Common Stock owned by them.

Title of Class	Name and Address of Beneficial Owner	Amount and Nature of Beneficial Ownership(1)	Perce Clas
\$.0001 par value common stock	James W. Benson, CEO and Chairman 13855 Stowe Drive Poway, California 92064	12,078,336(2)	56
\$.0001 par value common stock	J. Mark Grosvenor, Director 13855 Stowe Drive Poway, California 92064	1,330,376(3)	6
\$.0001 par value common stock	Curt Dean Blake, Director 13855 Stowe Drive Poway, California 92064	100,930(4)	0

\$.0001 par value common stock	Wesley T. Huntress Jr., Director 13855 Stowe Drive Poway, California 92064	60,515(5)	(
\$.0001 par value common stock	General Howell M. Estes, III, Director 13855 Stowe Drive Poway, California 92064	26,667(6)	(
\$.0001 par value common stock	Robert S. Walker, Director 13855 Stowe Drive Poway, California 92064	26,667(7)	(
\$.0001 par value common stock	Stuart Schaffer, Director & Vice President, Product Development & Marketing 13855 Stowe Drive Poway, California 92064	301,410(8)	-
\$.0001 par value	Scott McClendon, Director		