



LANDING.AERO / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

FAA Flight Plan ACK REJ Messages: OCC Reconciliation

LANDING.AERO is a Montreal software studio that builds custom, AI-assisted software for flight operations: operations tools, data integration, workflow automation and dashboards designed around how an airline, charter operator or flight department actually works.

Published by LANDING.AERO · 2026-10-15 · faa flight plan ack rej messages · flight plan acknowledgment · flight plan rejection · occ reconciliation · icao flight plan · flight operations software · flight plan integration · faa eras · operational control

Original article: <https://www.landing.aero/articles/en/faa-flight-plan-ack-rej-occ-checklist>



In this article

1. Executive Summary
 2. Introduction and Background
 3. Key Changes
 4. Message Identity and Field Mapping
 5. Implementation Considerations and Process Changes
 6. Delivery Controls and Audit Integrity
 7. Reconciliation Tests and Exception Ownership
 8. Data Analysis and Evidence
 9. Implications and Future Directions
 10. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
 11. Conclusion
-

Executive Summary

The **Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)** uses **acknowledgment (ACK)** and **rejection (REJ)** messages for flight-plan submissions and follow-ups. The currently linked **En Route Automation System (ERAS)** interface guide, **Version 3.2 dated August 20, 2025**, defines acknowledgments for successfully processed messages and rejections for unsuccessful processing. (www.faa.gov) An **operations-control center (OCC)** should preserve the transaction that produced each response. Provider labels require separate interpretation: ForeFlight's **February 2026** mobile filing guide says "Filed" means provider acceptance, without confirming transmission or **air traffic control (ATC)** acceptance. (cloudfront.foreflight.com)

The proposed design maintains a **versioned transaction ledger**, with local intent, provider receipt, FAA response and unresolved exceptions displayed separately. **Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP)** submission success is insufficient completion evidence: **Request for Comments (RFC) 9110** defines **202 Accepted** as processing not yet completed. (www.rfc-editor.org) Filing evidence also remains separate from clearance: **Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR), section 91.173**, requires both an **instrument flight rules (IFR)** flight plan and an appropriate ATC clearance for IFR operation in controlled airspace. (www.ecfr.gov) Domestic airline dispatch responsibilities and charter operational control remain governed by their respective rules. (www.ecfr.gov)

The report identifies a material documentation discrepancy over departure-time fields in change and cancellation messages. Resolve the implemented field profile with the provider and FAA before coding a matching rule. Do not assume that arrival order establishes precedence. Google's default Pub/Sub delivery contract, for example, permits repeated and unordered delivery; that illustrates a bridge design concern without establishing FAA behavior. (docs.cloud.google.com) Leidos's published flight-planning interface offers a concrete distinction between an unchanging flight identifier and a latest-version stamp required for modification. (lmfswebservices.atlassian.net)

The implementation package should include **message-specific field mapping**, a **synthetic transaction test table**, raw-message retention, a source-of-truth checklist and named exception ownership. A missing acknowledgment remains an unresolved observation, not evidence of rejection or clearance. Filing windows,

amendment cutoffs and callback deadlines measure different stages; none supplies a universal FAA response timeout. For example, ForeFlight's documented U.S. transmission window is **22 hours** before departure, (support.foreflight.com) while Azure Event Grid's endpoint-response deadline is **30 seconds**. (learn.microsoft.com) Neither quantity is an FAA acknowledgment service-level commitment. The actionable decision is whether the contracted filer exposes enough evidence to reconcile each intent and recover exceptions under the operator's established procedures.

Introduction and Background

An operations-control center (**OCC**) needs to answer a narrower question than "Was the flight plan filed?" It needs to establish which message was sent, what response was received, and which flight record that response supports. That distinction starts with the provider boundary: SkyVector describes its filing button as transmitting a plan to Flight Service, while ForeFlight Dispatch exposes sent messages and received air traffic control (**ATC**) messages in its Filing Messages section. These are different observations along a submission path. (skyvector.com) (support.foreflight.com)

This report covers the **United States domestic International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) flight-plan interface**. The FAA's current flight-planning page, updated **July 2, 2026**, specifies ICAO-format requirements and exceptions and directs service providers to its En Route Automation System (**ERAS**) interface guide. It does not establish that every commercial filing product exposes the same integration capabilities. Canadian, European and oceanic processing must be assessed separately. (www.faa.gov)

The regulatory boundary is equally important. **14 CFR 91.173** separately requires an instrument flight rules (**IFR**) flight plan and an appropriate ATC clearance before IFR operation in controlled airspace. (www.ecfr.gov) For domestic operations under **Part 121**, section 121.533 assigns operational-control responsibility to the certificate holder and joint planning, delay and dispatch-release responsibilities to the pilot in command and dispatcher. (www.ecfr.gov) Under **Part 135**, section 135.77 assigns operational control to the certificate holder and requires identification of authorized personnel in its manual. (www.ecfr.gov)

Accordingly, the proposed OCC design maintains distinct evidence for filing reconciliation, ATC clearance, and the operator's authorization or release process. The analysis supports integration requirements and procurement questions. The operator's approved procedures, manuals and operations specifications remain the framework for operational decisions.

The central design proposal is a **versioned transaction ledger**: preserve each outbound intent and its evidence, then derive a display through explicitly agreed rules. Microsoft's event-sourcing guidance describes append-only events, event versions and reconstruction of state. That supplies an engineering pattern for the ledger, rather than an FAA requirement to adopt a particular architecture. (learn.microsoft.com)

Key Changes

Replace the single “filed” flag with defined evidence states

A status label can describe a provider action rather than an FAA outcome. An HTTP interface adds another boundary: **HTTP 202** means processing has not completed. A successful asynchronous submission response therefore needs an independently defined completion check. (www.rfc-editor.org)

For an OCC bridge, proposed local labels are **Prepared**, **Submitted to provider**, **Awaiting reconciliation**, **Matched ACK**, **Matched REJ**, and **Exception open**. A revision creates another transaction linked to the previous intent. A cancellation request also creates a transaction; the interface must distinguish its submission from its matched response.

The proposed lifecycle below tracks a message transaction. Local projections use agreed rules; a revision or cancellation creates another intent.

```

flowchart TD
    A["Local intent and version"] --> B["Submitted to provider"]
    B --> C["Awaiting response reconciliation"]
    C --> D["Matched ACK for this transaction"]
    C --> E["Matched REJ for this transaction"]
    C --> F["Exception: missing or ambiguous response"]
    D --> G["Local projection under agreed rules"]
    E --> G
    F --> G
    G --> H["Revision creates a new transaction"]
    G --> CancelNode["Local cancelled status requires agreed CNL mapping"]
  
```

These names are application proposals. The provider and operator must agree how each maps to their actual service, including whether a provider status incorporates a raw FAA response. ForeFlight Dispatch’s published message definitions distinguish acknowledgments and rejections of **filed flight-plan (FPL)**, **change (CHG)**, **delay (DLA)** and **cancellation (CNL)** messages, providing a concrete place to investigate that mapping. (support.foreflight.com)

Do not compress the result into a universal precedence ladder. The proposed display presents “last matched response” beside “latest outbound intent,” with the unresolved relationship visible. Microsoft’s event-sourcing documentation supports preserving separate event versions; it does not decide aviation-specific precedence. (learn.microsoft.com)

Reconcile conflicting document versions before encoding fields

The FAA’s web instructions, updated **November 25, 2024**, exclude departure time from change messages and describe cancellation identification without time fields. (www.faa.gov) The linked ERAS guide includes departure time in change identification and gives a cancellation example containing it. (www.faa.gov) These differences affect payload construction and matching.

The integration specification should record which interface and tested message examples the provider implements. Obtain written clarification of the time-field discrepancy before releasing the parser or formatter. A document's later publication date alone does not establish which implementation a provider operates.

A parser also needs **message-type-specific layouts**. The FAA's published change acknowledgment example is ACK CHG KZDC N96747 KFDK KDAN. Its field presence differs from the flight-plan acknowledgment example. A generic parser that assumes every acknowledgment repeats a departure time needs explicit testing against the actual response set. (www.faa.gov)

Verify access before designing the bridge

Leidos Flight Service publicly documents web services using Simple Object Access Protocol (**SOAP**) or Representational State Transfer (**REST**). Public documentation establishes an integration surface, not an operator's entitlement to every operation. (Imfswebservices.atlassian.net)

ForeFlight documents administrator-generated Dispatch **application programming interface (API)** keys associated with an account. Its release history also records a restriction against updating filed flights through the API. Because release history is historical evidence, the current contract and supported operations must be confirmed before committing to an automated amendment workflow. (support.foreflight.com) (foreflight.com)

The procurement deliverable should therefore be an **operation-by-operation access matrix**: read status, retrieve raw messages, submit, amend, delay, cancel, receive notifications, and retrieve history. An account connection or data export should not stand in for that assessment.

Message Identity and Field Mapping

Keep the flight, intent, attempt and response distinct

The proposed internal model separates the OCC flight identifier, outbound transaction version, transport attempt, provider identifier, FAA reference, and inbound event identifier. These identifiers answer different questions. Leidos, for example, documents an unchanging **flightIdentifier** alongside a **versionStamp** that must reference the latest stored version for modifications. (Imfswebservices.atlassian.net)

A trace identifier supplies another correlation dimension. OpenTelemetry specifies trace identifiers for distributed tracing; its HTTP conventions distinguish individual send attempts. Trace data can help find a failed bridge call, while the filing's business identifiers remain necessary to reconcile its meaning. (opentelemetry.io)

Preserve the exact outbound payload alongside its interpreted fields. The recommendation follows from the need to reproduce what was submitted, rather than reconstruct it from a flight record that may have changed.

Table 1 maps the message families to evidence the OCC should preserve. The right-hand column proposes local handling; it does not add fields to the FAA wire format.

Message	Documented meaning or identifying content	Proposed OCC evidence
FPL , filed flight plan	The FAA's FPL acknowledgment includes Fields 7 , 13a/b and 16a , identifying aircraft, departure airport/time and destination, plus center and any supplied optional message number. (www.faa.gov)	Original payload, provider flight ID, local intent version and corresponding acknowledgment.
CHG , change	Item 22 contains amendment content. FAA web and guide instructions differ over departure-time identification. (www.faa.gov)	Base-plan link, requested changes, exact reference and confirmed interface profile.
DLA , delay	FAA's DLA layout includes Fields 3 , 7 , 13a/b and 16a . (www.faa.gov)	Earlier and requested departure values, response evidence and unresolved matching issues.
CNL , cancellation	Leidos documents cancellation as removal of a proposed plan; confirm the provider's CNL mapping. (lmswebservices.atlassian.net)	Cancellation intent and matched outcome, with the earlier filing history retained.
ACK , acknowledgment	ForeFlight Dispatch identifies ACK as acknowledgment of the listed message families. (support.foreflight.com)	Raw response, parsed type, matching explanation and source channel.
REJ , rejection	The FAA web page documents a layout containing the complete rejected input. (www.faa.gov) The Version 3.2 guide (§2.1.3) also allows shorter REJs that reference the optional message number instead of repeating the submitted message. (FAA interface guide)	Support the implemented response profile; recover original content from the retained outbound payload. Preserve the rejected transaction, error classification and assigned exception.

The mapping deliberately avoids treating aircraft identification alone as a database key. It also avoids requiring every response family to carry identical fields. A matching explanation should state which fields were present, which reference was used, and whether another candidate remained.

Preserve reference scope and ambiguity

The FAA's optional **Field 3b message number** combines a response-address component, center identifier and three-digit sequence. For CHG, DLA and CNL, supplied **Field 3c reference data** should match the original number. Mismatches can cause rejection; an omitted reference can leave multiple matching plans. (www.faa.gov) That supports preserving the reference exactly as transmitted, rather than substituting the OCC's own identifier.

An internally generated event identifier does not retroactively become an FAA reference. **CloudEvents**, if selected for the bridge's internal event envelope, requires uniqueness of the source and id pair and permits identical pairs to be treated as duplicates. That convention applies to an adopted internal envelope, not automatically to FAA or provider messages. (github.com)

For troubleshooting, retain both raw error text and its parsed field. The FAA abbreviation table maps, for example, **AID** to aircraft identification, **TIM** to departure time, **RTE** to route and **AMD** to amendment. A normalized error category should remain linked to the original message so an analyst can check the interpretation. (www.faa.gov)

Implementation Considerations and Process Changes

Make the source of each observation explicit

A proposed reconciliation view should expose the origin of every status. Leidos's filing FAQ describes retrieval of **Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC)** rogered/rejected status and the last transmitted and received messages. That is stronger evidence for investigation than an unlabeled local badge, but its exact mapping still belongs in the integration specification. (Imfswebservices.atlassian.net)

The response-delivery path also needs verification. The ERAS guide describes coordination to make an originating Aeronautical Fixed Telecommunications Network (**AFTN**) address answerable, optional mapped response addresses, and response-origin addresses distinct from submission addresses. An OCC using a commercial filer must establish where that filer receives and exposes these responses. (www.faa.gov)

A practical evidence checklist is:

- **Outbound intent:** retain the payload and the local version against which it was generated.
- **Provider receipt:** save the response body, provider identifier and documented meaning.
- **FAA response:** preserve the original ACK or REJ where the provider exposes it.
- **Matching basis:** record the reference and identifying fields used to attach the response.
- **Observation time:** separate provider event time from bridge receipt and processing times.
- **Current projection:** show the derived state and the rule version used to calculate it.
- **Open exception:** identify an owner, next action and review deadline.
- **Manual decision:** retain the evidence and authorized user behind any disposition.

These are proposed acceptance criteria for the bridge. They are not a claim that every provider supplies every item. An absent raw-message export or historical query capability should become an explicit procurement gap.

Treat notifications as evidence to reconcile

Leidos's push-notification documentation directs recipients of flight-change notifications to retrieve the latest flight plan. This is a useful concrete distinction between being notified of a change and obtaining the current stored record. (Imfswebservices.atlassian.net)

Its documented webhook response is **JavaScript Object Notation (JSON)** with a success value represented as the string `true`. That is a provider-specific receipt contract. It does not establish that the OCC has completed business reconciliation, or that every flight-plan interface follows the same callback convention. (Imfswebservices.atlassian.net)

Azure Event Grid uses HTTP responses to acknowledge event receipt, illustrating a delivery-level boundary for that infrastructure service. (learn.microsoft.com)

The proposed bridge acknowledges receipt according to its actual contract, durably stores the event, then completes matching through a separately observable process. Recovery should make incomplete work visible after a restart. Attempt-level instrumentation can expose separate sends without asserting whether a filing was accepted. (opentelemetry.io) Leidos also warns that cancelled or closed records may become unavailable after purging, strengthening the case for an agreed evidence-retention mechanism. (Imfswebservices.atlassian.net)

Avoid treating local retention as a substitute for current provider state. The ledger preserves observations; a provider retrieval can supply a newer observation. Any disagreement needs a defined comparison and exception workflow.

Delivery Controls and Audit Integrity

Separate retry safety from response ordering

Google Pub/Sub documents default at-least-once delivery without ordering guarantees. Amazon Simple Queue Service (**SQS**) likewise recommends consumers that tolerate repeated delivery. These are examples of messaging contracts a bridge might use, not evidence that FAA responses or a particular filer behave identically. (docs.cloud.google.com) (docs.aws.amazon.com)

For an interface that supports idempotency, **Amazon Web Services (AWS)**'s Builders' Library describes caller-provided request identifiers for recognizing duplicates and validation errors for changed parameters under an existing token. The OCC should ask whether its filing endpoint offers comparable semantics before implementing automatic retries. (aws.amazon.com)

The proposed controls are:

- **Stable intent:** identify the requested business operation independently of its transport attempts.
- **Attempt history:** retain each send outcome and its uncertainty.
- **Changed payload:** create a new intent version and apply the endpoint's documented key rules.
- **Duplicate event:** preserve receipt evidence while preventing repeated local side effects.
- **Ambiguous timeout:** investigate the earlier attempt before deciding whether resubmission is permitted.
- **Stale write:** reject or review a projection update based on an obsolete local version.

These recommendations require an agreed provider contract. Microsoft's optimistic-concurrency pattern illustrates rejection of an append when the underlying stream has changed; it does not resolve which flight-plan response takes operational priority. (learn.microsoft.com)

Preserve timestamps without inventing causal order

Normalize ledger display times to **Coordinated Universal Time (UTC)**, retain original timestamps and offsets, and record whether a time came from the source or the bridge. **National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)** log-management guidance supports time-zone normalization and synchronized clocks. These practices aid correlation; they cannot prove that network arrival order equals processing order. (nvlpubs.nist.gov)

OpenTelemetry's HTTP conventions include an ordinal resend count. A comparable attempt field can make repeated calls visible under the same internal intent, provided it remains distinct from the provider's flight version and the FAA reference. (opentelemetry.io)

Reconciliation Tests and Exception Ownership

Table 2 is a **Hypothetical Example**, using synthetic events and relative timestamps. Versions A, B and C are local labels, not FAA message numbers. The example intentionally leaves precedence unresolved.

Input event	Outbound version/reference	FAA response	Matched OCC flight	Displayed evidence state	Exception owner	Times tamp
Initial submission	FPL A, reference R	None observed	Flight Alpha	Submitted; reconciliation pending	Filer liaison	T-start
Response received	FPL A, reference R	Matched FPL ACK	Flight Alpha	FPL A acknowledgment recorded	None	T-next
Amendment sent	CHG B, reference R	None observed	Flight Alpha	CHG B pending; FPL A evidence retained	Dispatcher or designated filer	T-later
Amendment rejected	CHG B, reference R	Matched CHG REJ	Flight Alpha	CHG B rejected; prior evidence visible	Filer liaison	T-after
Earlier response replayed	FPL A, reference R	Duplicate FPL ACK	Flight Alpha	Duplicate recorded; no new local outcome	Bridge support if unexplained	T-replay
Cancellation submitted	CNL C, reference R	None observed	Flight Alpha	Cancellation requested; response pending	Designated operational owner	T-cancel
Unmatched response	Reference absent or conflicting	REJ with uncertain match	Unassigned	Unmatched response requiring review	Filer liaison with IT support	T-review
Cancellation response received	CNL C, reference R	Matched CNL ACK	Flight Alpha	Cancellation acknowledgment recorded	Owner confirms agreed disposition	T-close

The table records what the OCC knows at each event. It does not assert that a rejected amendment proves the entire remaining flight state, or that a later-arriving acknowledgment outranks another transaction. Closure requires the operator's and provider's approved mapping.

Test the difficult cases before ordinary throughput

Microsoft's event-sourcing guidance describes testing from prior events through a command to expected new events. Apply that approach to the flight-specific reconciliation rules, while separately exercising the real provider interface in its authorized test environment. (learn.microsoft.com) For a bridge using SQS, repeated-delivery handling belongs in consumer acceptance criteria. (docs.aws.amazon.com)

The proposed acceptance suite should include:

- **Missing response:** retain pending or exception status when a send has no matched outcome.
- **Duplicate callback:** replay identical inbound evidence and check local side effects.
- **Out-of-order delivery:** deliver an earlier response after a later intent.

- **Multiple candidates:** present flights sharing visible aircraft and airport fields.
- **Incorrect reference:** attach a response with a conflicting stored reference.
- **Changed departure:** verify the provider's treatment of identity and time changes.
- **Stale provider version:** attempt a mutation using an older stored version.
- **Cancellation gap:** distinguish request receipt, FAA response and local disposition.
- **Replacement safeguard:** test that automated cancel-and-refile remains blocked while cancellation is pending or rejected. Require a CNL ACK or Flight Data verification of removal before replacement; route lockout cases through established Flight Data coordination procedures. (FAA interface guide)
- **Restart recovery:** resume stored events whose matching was incomplete.
- **Restricted access:** verify behavior when a required retrieval or mutation is unavailable.

These cases are design tests, not claims about defect rates. Azure Event Grid expressly does not guarantee event order, illustrating why ordering assumptions must be tested when that service is part of the bridge. Its behavior cannot be generalized to the filer. (learn.microsoft.com)

Route rejection troubleshooting by evidence

For malformed plans, the FAA FAQ describes correcting the error and reentering the message. The FAA rejection chart also includes conditions requiring Flight Data coordination, including reference and duplicate-plan problems. A single "retry" button therefore needs more precise eligibility rules than "the last result was REJ." (www.faa.gov)

Garmin's support documentation identifies incomplete information and aircraft-profile ICAO-code discrepancies among filing-error causes. This is provider troubleshooting evidence; it does not establish that every provider error is an FAA rejection. The OCC should preserve that distinction in its exception category. (support.garmin.com)

The owner of an unmatched response should be a named operational role, with information technology (IT) staff supporting transport and parser investigation. FAA's current filing page directs tactical flight problems to the appropriate center's Flight Data unit. Automated escalation should use the operator's established contact procedure rather than inventing an independent dispatch workflow. (www.faa.gov)

Data Analysis and Evidence

The public evidence supports **documented formats, filing windows and interface constraints**. It does not supply a cross-provider benchmark for acknowledgment latency, rejection frequency or reconciliation accuracy. No operational performance improvement is quantified here.

Table 3 separates sourced quantities from the measurement an OCC still needs. Values retain their document scope and are not proposed operational settings.

Documented quantity	Source scope	What it establishes	What it does not establish
001 through 999 before sequence restart	FAA optional message numbering guidance. (www.faa.gov)	A finite, sequential wire-reference space.	A globally unique, permanent OCC transaction ID.
28 days advance submission; 22 hours before departure for U.S. transmission	ForeFlight support article updated January 13, 2025 . (support.foreflight.com)	Provider storage and transmission are separate stages.	FAA ACK delivery latency or a universal filer window.
30 minutes before estimated time of departure	SkyVector's undated amendment/cancellation guide. (skyvector.com)	What that guide states for its filing connection.	A current universal ARTCC cutoff.
Two hours before departure	FltPlan's undated tutorial, with an older copyright footer. (www.fltplan.com)	That tutorial's described transmission timing.	Confirmation of the operator's present contracted behavior.
30 seconds for an endpoint response	Azure Event Grid delivery documentation. (learn.microsoft.com)	A callback deadline for that infrastructure service.	A flight-filing or FAA acknowledgment timeout.

The quantities describe different clocks. An advance-storage window, transmission schedule, amendment cutoff and callback deadline should not be combined into an end-to-end acceptance deadline. The differences also show why a historical guide should remain date-scoped until the provider confirms the deployed behavior.

A useful OCC measurement plan follows the same separation:

- **Submission interval:** local send to documented provider receipt.
- **FAA observation interval:** outbound transmission evidence to matched FAA response observation.
- **Bridge interval:** inbound receipt to completed matching and display update.
- **Unresolved inventory:** transactions still awaiting evidence, grouped by age and owner.
- **Matching exceptions:** ambiguous, conflicting and unassigned responses.
- **Evidence completeness:** transactions missing a required payload, reference or response artifact.

These are proposed metrics. Before calculating them, define the population, exclusions, clock source, observation point and treatment of unresolved transactions. Report censored or missing observations separately from completed response intervals.

Transport timing is particularly easy to misread. RFC 9110's asynchronous semantics explain why an accepted HTTP request cannot, by itself, populate the completion timestamp. Google's documented delivery semantics explain why receipt counts can differ from distinct-event counts. Neither source supplies an FAA service-level commitment. (www.rfc-editor.org) (docs.cloud.google.com)

Similarly, the FltPlan tutorial says its menu does not automatically refresh. A display observation can therefore lag a described filing process without establishing a new FAA outcome. An OCC integrating any provider should ask whether it is reading a live state, cached projection, notification or historical snapshot. (www.fltplan.com)

Implications and Future Directions

Make integration acceptance a documented handover

The practical procurement decision is whether a bought filing service supplies enough evidence for a reliable custom bridge. Leidos's retrieved documentation provides identifiers, stored versions and retrieval behavior; ForeFlight's public material provides message visibility and account-level integration controls. These are starting points for a requirements review, not proof of unrestricted access to every filing operation. (imfswbsservices.atlassian.net) (support.foreflight.com)

For a software studio such as **LANDING.AERO**, the relevant perspective is integration: preserve the operator's definitions, evidence and exception ownership across systems. This report evaluates those controls rather than ranking filing services or substituting software for operational authority.

Resolve these questions before acceptance:

- **Authority:** which account, pilot authorization and contractual rights enable each required operation?
- **Response path:** where does each FAA response arrive, and can the OCC retrieve its raw content?
- **Matching:** which fields and references does the implemented interface use for each message family?
- **Delivery contract:** what are the documented timeout, retry, duplicate and ordering behaviors?
- **History:** what remains retrievable after cancellation, closure or account changes?
- **Service changes:** where are current notices published, and who approves corresponding configuration changes?

Authorization deserves an explicit test. Leidos's route-change integration documentation requires pilot authorization and enrollment conditions. SkyVector's guide likewise describes account linkage and enabling the service provider. These examples demonstrate that a technically reachable endpoint is only part of the integration boundary. (imfswbsservices.atlassian.net) (skyvector.com)

Keep unresolved public-documentation questions visible

Public documentation should not be treated as confirmation of a universal FAA acknowledgment timeout, a comprehensive filing-service notice feed or a common provider retry guarantee. Before acceptance, obtain provider-specific confirmation of supported API operations, raw-message and history retrieval, authentication requirements, notification delivery, and retry behavior. Record the applicable documentation version and review date alongside the contract-specific answers.

Future improvements should prioritize reproducible reconciliation over a more confident badge. Retain the event schema version, matching-rule version and evidence behind each decision. Microsoft's event-version guidance supports deliberate handling of evolving records; AWS's idempotency guidance supports asking exactly what a repeated operation means at the endpoint. (learn.microsoft.com) (aws.amazon.com)

The resulting acceptance artifact should include representative message fixtures, provider-approved field mappings, exception ownership, and signed-off display meanings. It should also document how a later interface change is detected, reviewed and tested before it affects live filing reconciliation.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

What is the difference between ACK and REJ?

An acknowledgment and a rejection concern an identified message, not an entire OCC workflow. ForeFlight Dispatch documents both response types for FPL, CHG, DLA and CNL. Preserve the message family and its correlation evidence beside the result. (support.foreflight.com)

Does FAA acceptance confirm clearance?

Keep clearance as a separate status. The federal rule independently requires an IFR flight plan and an appropriate ATC clearance for IFR operation in controlled airspace. A reconciled filing acknowledgment does not satisfy the OCC's evidence requirement for clearance. (www.ecfr.gov)

What should the OCC show when acknowledgment is missing?

A proposed display is "submitted; acknowledgment not reconciled," accompanied by elapsed observation time and an owner. ForeFlight's mobile guide describes a missing-acknowledgment message and says acknowledgment emails are not sent for plans filed through Dispatch in the United States and Canada. Check the actual product channel before treating absent email as absent response. (cloudfront.foreflight.com)

Can a flight-plan change create another plan?

ForeFlight's support article says changes to specified identity, airport or departure-time fields can result in another plan being filed. Confirm the provider's actual behavior and preserve links between the original filing and replacement intent. Before filing a replacement, confirm cancellation/deletion of the original through a CNL ACK or verification with the relevant center's Flight Data unit. ([FAA interface guide](#)) (support.foreflight.com)

Should the latest received message determine filing status?

Only an agreed reconciliation rule should determine the projection. Event arrival order can be unsuitable as a causal rule in infrastructure that permits unordered delivery. Retain the event, identify its transaction, and escalate conflicts instead of silently assigning operational precedence. (learn.microsoft.com)

Conclusion

An OCC can make FAA flight-plan acknowledgment and rejection useful only when the response remains attached to the message it actually concerns. The proposed design preserves the outbound intent, provider observation, FAA evidence, matching explanation and unresolved work. Its display distinguishes an earlier confirmed observation from a later pending request.

The implementation decision is therefore concrete: determine which evidence the filing service exposes, agree its meanings, and test the bridge against the difficult cases. Missing responses, conflicting identifiers, repeated notifications, stale versions and cancellation gaps all need an owner and a visible disposition. A generic status badge cannot communicate those distinctions.

The report's transaction model is a design proposal, with operator and provider confirmation required for field profiles, precedence, retries and final disposition. Filing reconciliation remains separate from clearance and from the operator's authorization or release responsibilities. The document discrepancies and unavailable public interface details belong in the acceptance record.

A complete handover should let an OCC manager inspect a displayed state and answer: which intent, which response, which source, which matching rule, and which outstanding action? When those answers are available, the system offers traceable evidence for the operator's established process. When they are unavailable, the display should expose the uncertainty and route it to the responsible person.

Source links

Links cited in this article, in order of first appearance. Full addresses are provided for readers using extracted text.

1. https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/ato/service_units/air_traffic_services/flight_plan_filing/ERAS-Interface-Reference-Guide.pdf
2. <https://cloudfront.foreflight.com/docs/ff/18.1.1/ForeFlight%20Filing%20Guide.pdf>
3. <https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9110.html>
4. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/chapter-I/subchapter-F/part-91/subpart-B/subject-group-ECFR4d527a6f79bbf6f/section-91.173>
5. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/chapter-I/subchapter-G/part-121/subpart-T/section-121.533>
6. <https://docs.cloud.google.com/pubsub/docs/subscription-overview>
7. <https://lmswebervices.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/WSS/pages/1605682/Flight%2BPlanning>
8. <https://support.foreflight.com/hc/en-us/articles/9353667642519-When-can-IFR-flight-plans-be-filed-canceled-or-amended>
9. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/event-grid/delivery-and-retry>
10. <https://skyvector.com/Flight-Planning-and-Filing-Pilots-Guide>
11. <https://support.foreflight.com/hc/en-us/articles/360037208834-What-do-the-flight-plan-messages-in-Filing-Message-section-mean-in-ForeFlight-Dispatch>
12. https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/ato/service_units/air_traffic_services/flight_plan_filing
13. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/chapter-I/subchapter-G/part-135/subpart-B/section-135.77>
14. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/architecture/patterns/event-sourcing>
15. https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/ato/service_units/air_traffic_services/flight_plan_filing/guidance/reference_guide/message_ack_rej
16. https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/ato/service_units/air_traffic_services/flight_plan_filing/guidance/reference_guide/message_ack_rej/message_examples
17. <https://lmswebervices.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/WSS/pages/1605652>
18. <https://support.foreflight.com/hc/en-us/articles/360037724333-How-can-API-Keys-be-generated-in-ForeFlight-Dispatch>
19. <https://foreflight.com/releases/dispatch-api>
20. <https://opentelemetry.io/docs/specs/otel/trace/api>
21. <https://github.com/cloudevents/spec/blob/main/cloudevents/spec.md?plain=1>

22. https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/ato/service_units/air_traffic_services/flight_plan_filing/guidance/reference_guide/message_ack_rej/abbreviations
23. <https://lmswebservices.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/WSS/pages/2691170306/General%2BFlight%2BPlan%2BFiling%2BQuestions>
24. <https://lmswebservices.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/WSS/pages/1605681/Push%2BNotifications>
25. <https://opentelemetry.io/docs/specs/semconv/http/http-spans>
26. https://docs.aws.amazon.com/AWSSimpleQueueService/latest/SQSDeveloperGuide/standard-queues-at-least-once-delivery.html?trk=article-ssr-frontend-pulse_little-text-block
27. https://aws.amazon.com/builders-library/making-retries-safe-with-idempotent-APIs?did=ba_card&trk=ba_card
28. <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/legacy/SP/nistspecialpublication800-92.Pdf>
29. https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/ato/service_units/air_traffic_services/flight_plan_filing/faq
30. <https://support.garmin.com/en-CA?faq=ngAa40sQnO1AkgJKZZ4O76>
31. <https://www.fltplan.com/tutorial.htm>
32. <https://lmswebservices.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/WSS/pages/2724823044/RetrieveFlightPlan%2B-%2BATC%2BRoute%2BChange>

THE PUBLISHER

About LANDING.AERO

LANDING.AERO builds custom software for aviation operations teams at airlines, charter operators and flight departments. It is based in Montreal.

What it builds

Operations tools that reduce manual steps in day-to-day flight operations; integration of existing systems and data sources into one operational picture; workflow automation; real-time operational dashboards; bridges between legacy systems and modern applications; and mobile apps for staff in the field. Each application is designed around the operator's own workflows rather than sold as an off-the-shelf platform.

How it works

Work starts with discovery of the operator's workflows, continues with iterative development alongside the operator's team, and includes integration with the tools already in use and ongoing support.

Its own tools

LANDING.AERO also publishes small tools for aviation professionals, including UTC Alarm, which sets alarms in Zulu time, and NOTAM Notifier, announced for NOTAM change alerts on chosen airports.

Visit

See LANDING.AERO and its projects.

Articles published here explain general practice and cite their primary sources, naming the jurisdiction of any rule they describe. They are not operational, regulatory or legal advice, do not replace an operator's approved procedures or manuals, and requirements change.

Website: <https://www.landing.aero>

This article is educational. Verify consequential medical, legal, financial, regulatory and technical decisions with appropriate professionals and the cited primary sources. Company services are described separately from the article's research findings.