LANDING.AERO

LANDING.AERO / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

FAA NMS API for Flight Operations: Source and Change Checklist

> 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 · 2026-10-01 · faa nms api · notam api · flight operations · notam management service · digital notam · aixm · geojson · dispatch integration · notam data lineage

Original article: https://www.landing.aero/articles/en/faa-nms-api-flight-operations-checklist

In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Key Changes
4. Implementation Considerations and Process Changes
5. Source-to-Consumer Matrix
6. Change-State Checklist
7. Build, Buy, or Integrate a Feed
8. Data Analysis and Evidence
9. Implications and Future Directions
10. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
11. Conclusion

Executive Summary

The **Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) NOTAM Management Service application programming interface (NMS-API)** is a documented access path for flight-operations software that consumes U.S. notices. The FAA's public FAQ directs prospective users to request API access, while its briefing describes search by time and location, retrieval of recently created or canceled notices, incremental delta queries, and responses in **Aeronautical Information Exchange Model (AIXM) 5.1** or **GeoJSON**. Those are published capabilities, not a public contract for particular fields, cursor behavior, latency, or entitlement. Teams should obtain the account-level documentation and current release notes before coding to an assumed schema. The FAQ says release notes require NMS sign-in. (www.faa.gov) (www.faa.gov) (www.faa.gov) (aixm.aero)

This distinction matters to a U.S. operations control center (OCC). Under **14 CFR 121.601**, a Part 121 dispatcher has duties concerning current airport and navigation-facility information, including information that develops during flight. An operations dashboard can support a documented information flow, but it cannot itself establish the operator's approved method of compliance or replace the pilot and dispatcher roles. The FAA also says NMS query results are **not prioritized**. A dashboard's relevance and alert rules therefore require operator review, explicit provenance, and a way to distinguish a fresh source response from a stale local display. (www.ecfr.gov) (www.ecfr.gov) (www.w3.org) (www.w3.org)

The transition status must be read by dated source rather than extrapolated from an old schedule. On **May 12, 2026**, the FAA reported shutdown of the legacy U.S. NOTAM System in the first NMS phase, and described the Federal NOTAM System retirement as a subsequent phase. Its more general NMS page still contains an earlier planned date. Neither statement alone verifies the exact state of every feed or an individual operator's access on **October 1, 2026**. The prudent acceptance path is to confirm the current FAA access terms, run an initial-load reconciliation, prove delta and cancellation handling, and assign an owner for stale-feed fallback. (www.faa.gov) (www.faa.gov)

A direct NMS-API integration, a contracted NOTAM feed, and a tailored integration around an operator's existing systems have different obligations. **Cirium** documents a contract requirement and a **60-second** cache for its NOTAM APIs; **SkyLink** documents an active-notice endpoint and cautions that parsed metadata can be

null; **NOTAC** documents a delta endpoint with withdrawals. These are vendor descriptions, not evidence that any feed meets a particular operator's approved procedure. The decision should turn on source lineage, permitted use, lifecycle coverage, testable recovery behavior, and staff ownership. LANDING.AERO describes custom data integration and dashboards rather than an off-the-shelf NOTAM distribution service. (developer.cirium.com) (skylinkapi.com) (notac.aero) (www.landing.aero)

Introduction and Background

A **Notice to Airmen (NOTAM)** carries information essential to flight-operations personnel about a change that was not available early enough for other publication. The FAA identifies facilities, services, procedures, and hazards among the subject matter. A NOTAM consumer is therefore handling time-sensitive aeronautical information, but the integration problem is broader than displaying a message: it must preserve where a record came from, what changed, whether the local copy is current, and which person or process resolves uncertainty. (www.faa.gov) (www.w3.org)

The FAA's **NOTAM Management Service (NMS)** is the successor program for the U.S. NOTAM System and Federal NOTAM System. Its May 2026 announcement confirms the first phase's U.S. NOTAM System shutdown and places Federal NOTAM System retirement in a later phase. That dated update is more useful than treating the older NMS page's proposed late-spring date as proof of completed cutover. It remains necessary to confirm the actual distribution path for an operator's account and contract. (www.faa.gov)

This report concerns **data lineage and change handling** for a ground-based OCC display serving U.S. Part 121 and Part 135 teams. It is not flight-planning advice or a substitute for approved procedures, operations specifications, or manuals. The U.S. pilot in command must become familiar with available information before a flight under **14 CFR 91.103**; the specific dispatcher duty cited here is the Part 121 rule. Any local workflow for another operating rule needs its own regulatory and manual review. (www.ecfr.gov) (www.ecfr.gov)

The decision point is practical. A team can request the FAA interface, buy a provider feed, or commission software that joins a feed to existing dispatch and dashboard systems. NASA's separately documented REST service illustrates why labels matter: NASA describes a public NOTAM redistribution service drawing from an FAA System Wide Information Management feed, which does not establish NASA as an NMS-API mirror. Similar-looking data endpoints may have different source chains and event semantics. (ntrs.nasa.gov) (ntrs.nasa.gov) (ntrs.nasa.gov)

The source-to-consumer matrix below treats **FAA NMS API data sources** as a lineage question: who issues, redistributes, transforms, and displays each record. Its change-state checklist turns **data change management** into testable events, recovery checks, and named owners.

Key Changes

From a portal view to an accountable data path

The FAA briefing identifies **NMS-API** as an interface with time, location, accountability, radius, and free-text search options. It also describes latitude, longitude, and radius filtering. These statements establish query families, not the response fields or whether each format and filter is enabled for every account. The public FAQ

sends access requests to the FAA and puts release notes behind sign-in. An implementation plan should begin with the actual account documentation, a sample response set, and a change-notification contact. (www.faa.gov)

A **source-of-truth** label should name the authority that issued the notice, the immediate distribution service, and any intermediary that transformed it. The distinction is visible in vendor material: NOTAC says its notice data comes from the FAA NMS, while NASA says its own service uses a public FAA SWIM feed. Neither claim, by itself, verifies equal completeness or equal cancellation behavior. The local system should keep these three layers separate in its record, audit trail, and screen text. (notac.aero) (ntrs.nasa.gov) (www.w3.org) (www.w3.org)

From periodic copies to explicit change state

The FAA briefing says the API supports **delta queries** and retrieval of recently created or canceled NOTAMs. A delta is a change set, not automatically a complete picture. The briefing also mentions an initial load in the context of NMS-NPS, but public material does not publish the general consumer's cursor, pagination, or replay contract. A team should ask how an authorized consumer establishes its first complete snapshot and then proves that subsequent changes were neither missed nor applied twice. (www.faa.gov)

The FAA briefing says recently canceled notices can be retrieved, but the public briefing does not specify how each cancellation is represented in an account-level response. The consumer should test the API's actual state transition and reconcile against a new authoritative query, rather than assume that a particular message form always represents a withdrawn record. (www.faa.gov)

From text-only display to structured, reviewable relevance

AIXM describes conventional NOTAM as text with some structured qualifier fields; its digital model adds structured event coding. The FAA briefing says NMS-API responses are available in **AIXM 5.1** or **GeoJSON**. This is a format choice, not a guarantee that every notice has complete geometry or that a map can replace the original text. AIXM's own guidance says additional coding rules are needed to harmonize event categories. (aixm.aero) (www.faa.gov) (aixm.aero) (aixm.aero)

The GeoJSON standard defines a geospatial interchange format and specifies World Geodetic System 1984 decimal-degree coordinates. An operations screen should document coordinate order, units, inclusion tests, and what it does when a geometry or parsed field is absent. The Open Geospatial Consortium's feature standard also uses longitude/latitude order, but that standard does not establish that NMS-API implements its endpoints. Vendor documentation underscores the practical issue: SkyLink warns that most parsed metadata fields can be null. (www.rfc-editor.org) (www.rfc-editor.org) (www.ogc.org) (skylinkapi.com) (www.ogc.org)

Implementation Considerations and Process Changes

Confirm access, scope, and accountability

An account owner should request NMS-API access through the FAA path and obtain the signed-in release notes, permitted use terms, and supported formats. The public FAQ gives the access route and confirms that release notes are account-restricted. It also says service updates are emailed to affected users. The project

therefore needs a named mailbox or duty owner who converts FAA notices into software change tickets and an operations-facing status decision. (www.faa.gov)

Before building, record the intended use for each consumer: briefing preparation, a situational-awareness dashboard, dispatch change review, or analytics. The FAA says NMS query results are not prioritized and leaves priority decisions to users. Any local rule that escalates a runway, navigation aid, route, or airspace message should be documented and reviewed under the operator's own process. It should remain possible to inspect the original notice and the source timestamp, rather than seeing only a derived severity label. (www.w3.org)

For a Part 121 workflow, the system design should identify how current information reaches the dispatcher and, where applicable, the pilot in command during flight. The cited rule addresses both preflight and inflight information. For Part 135 or other operations, map the relevant rules and approved manuals independently. The software can route and record information; it does not transfer the underlying decision duty to an API or supplier. (www.ecfr.gov) (www.ecfr.gov)

Treat the schema as an acceptance artifact

The FAA's public briefing names capabilities but does not expose a complete field dictionary, stable identifier/version rule, cursor lifetime, rate limit, or service-level agreement. Those are **design questions** for the account holder, not documented promises. AIXM's general guidance discusses time-invariant feature identifiers and temporal modeling, while GeoJSON permits a feature identifier. Neither general standard proves which identifier an NMS-API response uses. Ask for real schema examples before choosing a deduplication key. (aixm.aero) (aixm.aero) (www.rfc-editor.org)

A minimum acceptance pack should contain: a full-load sample; a creation sample; a changed effective period; a cancellation or withdrawal; a notice without parsed geometry; an empty query response; and a recovery after a missed poll. GeoJSON explicitly allows an empty feature collection, so an empty response must be distinguished from transport failure in a GeoJSON consumer. AIXM also notes that business rules can sit outside its XML schema; schema validation alone is therefore an incomplete business check. (www.rfc-editor.org) (aixm.aero)

An FAA NMS API **implementation checklist** should turn each unknown into a testable question:

- **Access:** Which account and environment will supply the feed?
- **Entitlement:** Which notice types and geographies are included?
- **Format:** Which response formats can this account request?
- **Baseline:** How is a complete first load demonstrated?
- **Pagination:** How are partial pages detected and resumed?
- **Identity:** Which fields bind revisions to one notice?
- **Ordering:** What makes one event later than another?
- **Replay:** How long can an old checkpoint be reused?
- **Duplicates:** Is applying the same event twice harmless?
- **Cancellation:** What exact payload ends active status?
- **Exceptions:** How are missing fields shown to staff?
- **Recovery:** Who approves a rebuilt snapshot after a gap?

Separate source time from processing time

A dashboard should store the source's issue and effective times separately from receipt and display times. This is a design recommendation, supported by the provenance distinction between an entity and the activity that produced a copy. A vendor example makes it concrete: NOTAC documents source issue/update timestamps separately from timestamps for when its own API stored or changed a record. Those fields should not be silently merged into a single “updated” value. (www.w3.org) (notac.aero)

Clock differences can also make simple timestamp sorting unreliable. The W3C provenance constraints note that systems may use clocks that are not precisely synchronized. The acceptance test should specify whether ordering comes from a source sequence or cursor, a source timestamp, or a provider's receipt time, and what happens when the chosen value repeats. Any rule for replay and idempotency must be verified against the actual NMS account contract or the vendor's written feed contract. (www.w3.org)

Source-to-Consumer Matrix

Table 1 maps each source decision to a consumer check and an accountable owner. “Verify” means a design question requiring the current account documentation or supplier contract; it is not a claim that NMS-API exposes the proposed field.

Control	Authoritative source and access path	Consumer validation question	Dashboard behavior and owner
Source and lineage	FAA NMS access is requested through the FAA; an intermediary may redistribute notices. (ntrs.nasa.gov)	Which agency issued the notice, which service delivered this copy, and was any text or geometry transformed?	Show source and receipt chain; data lead owns mapping. (www.w3.org)
Initial load	FAA briefing mentions NMS-API initial load for NMS-NPS. (www.faa.gov)	What endpoint, filters, pagination, and completeness check establish this account's first state?	Mark load provisional until reconciled; integration lead owns it.
Delta and replay	FAA briefing identifies delta queries; NOTAC separately documents a vendor delta feed. (www.faa.gov) (notac.aero)	What cursor, order, retention, and replay window are contracted?	Display last successful checkpoint; integration lead owns recovery.
Create and cancel	FAA briefing identifies retrieval of recently created or canceled notices.	How does the account represent a replacement, cancellation, or removed result?	Change visible state only after identity match; data lead owns rules.
Identifier and version	AIXM discusses feature identifiers; GeoJSON has an optional feature `id`. (aixm.aero) (www.rfc-editor.org)	Which actual NMS or vendor fields identify a notice and its revision?	Retain raw identifier and version evidence; data lead owns schema. (www.w3.org)
Effective period	AIXM models aeronautical data over time. (aixm.aero)	Which start, end, estimated end, and schedule fields are populated?	Show source period and uncertainty; OCC owner reviews. (ext.eurocontrol.int)

Control	Authoritative source and access path	Consumer validation question	Dashboard behavior and owner
Geospatial relevance	FAA briefing identifies latitude, longitude, and radius filtering.	How are location, radius, missing geometry, and route relevance tested?	Never hide an unlocated notice solely because a map filter fails; OCC owner reviews.
Stale-feed indicator	FAA describes service-interruption emails; W3C notes clock differences. (www.w3.org)	What age threshold and reconciliation result define local staleness?	Show stale status and last success; duty owner invokes fallback.
Human review and fallback	FAA says its query results are not prioritized.	Which notices require human triage, and which approved source is used when feed confidence is low?	Keep original text and review status; OCC manager owns procedure.

The matrix is deliberately more demanding than a field map. A provider can return a valid JSON object while the operations display remains incomplete because a delta window was missed, a cancellation was misinterpreted, or the local copy is stale. The FAA's advisory material on aeronautical information data links asks users to consider information quality, latency, and integrity and addresses alternative means when service is unavailable. Those principles motivate a recorded fallback owner, while the operator's own approved procedures decide the actual response. (www.faa.gov) (www.w3.org)

Change-State Checklist

Table 2 is an acceptance-test ledger for a hypothetical notice lifecycle. The event names, keys, times, and dashboard actions below are **hypothetical examples**. They do not reproduce a live NOTAM or a verified NMS-API payload.

Hypothetical state	Example event ledger	Acceptance check	Dashboard response and owner
First snapshot	`T0: snapshot S1 contains notice X, revision A`	Record source, filter set, response count, pagination, and completion marker.	Show X only after full-load reconciliation; integration lead.
Created	`T1: delta D1 adds X, revision B`	Confirm whether B supersedes A and whether duplicate D1 is harmless. FAA describes created-notice retrieval.	Keep prior record and new event in audit history; data lead.
Effective period changed	`T2: delta D2 revises start/end window`	Compare raw time fields, schedule, and local display conversion. AIXM models data over time. (aixm.aero)	Flag changed period for OCC review; OCC manager.
Canceled or withdrawn	`T3: delta D3 marks X inactive`	Verify whether the account represents cancellation as an event, field, or replacement record.	Remove from active view while retaining history; data lead.
Missed interval	`T4: poll fails, then D4 arrives late`	Replay from last confirmed checkpoint and compare against an authoritative fresh query. FAA describes delta queries.	Show stale-feed banner until reconciled; duty owner.

Hypothetical state	Example event ledger	Acceptance check	Dashboard response and owner
Filter change	`T5: airport set changes from A to A+B`	Rebuild baseline for changed scope; a vendor documents that a record can leave a filtered window without an event. (notac.aero)	Mark new scope provisional; integration lead.

This ledger separates **event time** from **observation time**. It also treats a current active view as a derived product: the underlying events remain reviewable. W3C provenance guidance models changing information with separately identified entities, and its clock note warns against assuming perfect synchronization. Those principles support an append-only local audit trail, but they do not specify the FAA's event identifiers. The real acceptance test must use account-level NMS examples or the contracted provider's documented payloads. (www.w3.org) (www.w3.org) (aixm.aero)

A useful test report should record the raw payload hash, source and receipt times, query parameters, cursor or checkpoint, parser version, expected state, observed state, reviewer, and disposition. These are proposed local controls. The criteria for declaring the dashboard stale, the cadence of reconciliation, and the fallback source belong in an operator-approved procedure. Do not represent a test pass on a sample ledger as proof of operational suitability across all notice types.

The **change-state checklist** can be used during acceptance and update monitoring:

- **Capture:** Retain the unmodified source response.
- **Classify:** Label the event using documented source semantics.
- **Match:** Resolve identity before changing active state.
- **Compare:** Preserve prior and new effective periods.
- **Apply:** Write a deterministic state transition.
- **Repeat:** Reprocess the event to test idempotency.
- **Reconcile:** Compare derived state with a fresh query.
- **Alert:** Surface material changes for human review.
- **Age:** Calculate last successful source contact.
- **Escalate:** Invoke the named fallback owner when stale.

Build, Buy, or Integrate a Feed

Table 3 compares ways to supply an existing OCC screen. It is a procurement and implementation matrix, not a ranking of aeronautical information authority. Vendor statements are attributed to their own documentation and require contract verification.

Option	Documented access or model	What to validate before use	Owner and fit
Direct FAA NMS-API integration	FAA requests access through its NOTAM contact; its briefing lists delta queries and AIXM 5.1 or GeoJSON responses. (www.faa.gov)	Account entitlements, schema, initial load, replay window, changes, and service notices.	In-house IT and OCC own connector and procedure.

Option	Documented access or model	What to validate before use	Owner and fit
Cirium NOTAM APIs	Cirium documents global coverage, contract access, and a 60-second response cache. (developer.cirium.com) (developer.cirium.com)	Source chain, geographic and notice coverage, cancellation semantics, latency under the contract, and rights.	Supplier manages feed; operator owns acceptance.
SkyLink NOTAM endpoint	SkyLink documents active notices by airport and optional parsed metadata that may be null. (skylinkapi.com) (skylinkapi.com)	Source chain, missing fields, history, deltas, support terms, and use permissions.	Supplier manages endpoint; operator owns display rules.
NOTAC API	NOTAC documents an initial sync and a delta feed with withdrawals. (notac.aero) (notac.aero)	Filter-window behavior, contract access, completeness, and recovery tests.	Supplier manages endpoint; operator owns reconciliation.
LANDING.AERO custom integration	LANDING.AERO describes tailored flight-operations software, data integration, and dashboards, with no off-the-shelf model. (www.landing.aero) (www.landing.aero) (www.landing.aero)	Which FAA or licensed feed will be used, who holds access rights, and who maintains the connector and fallback process.	Custom software builder; it is not itself an authoritative NOTAM feed or dispatch service.

The first choice should be the **required operational workflow**, not a preferred API style. A provider's active-notice endpoint may answer a dashboard lookup, yet an audit or change-alert workflow may need explicit created, modified, canceled, and replay records. Cirium also documents both pull and push offerings across its broader developer portfolio, but that statement alone does not confirm a push channel for a particular NOTAM contract. Compare the contracted product, not a portfolio label. (www.cirium.com)

Use the same **source validation checklist** for an internal connector and a vendor proposal:

- **Origin:** Identify the issuing authority and distribution path.
- **Scope:** List included notice classes and locations.
- **Rights:** Confirm contractual and account-level use permissions.
- **Latency:** Define which timestamps the commitment measures.
- **History:** Ask for prior revisions and withdrawal behavior.
- **Filters:** Test notices entering and leaving a chosen scope.
- **Continuity:** Test gaps, duplicates, and replay.
- **Change notice:** Name the recipient of release information.
- **Display:** Preserve original text and missing-field indicators.
- **Ownership:** Assign reconciliation, review, and fallback roles.

The legacy Laminar documentation says new account creation on that platform is no longer supported, while current Cirium pages describe Laminar Data Hub through Cirium Developer Studio. A team evaluating that route should use current commercial and developer documentation rather than an old endpoint example. LANDING.AERO's role in this matrix is as a builder of an integration around a selected source, not as a seller of a generally available NOTAM service. Its projects page labels NOTAM Notifier **“Coming Soon”**, which does not establish current operational availability. (developer.laminardata.aero) (developer.cirium.com) (www.landing.aero)

Data Analysis and Evidence

The quantitative evidence is useful only if its measurement dates and units are preserved. The FAA stated in a **May 2026** transition announcement that more than **4 million NOTAMs** are issued annually. (www.faa.gov) That is a system-wide annual statement, not an NMS-API request-volume benchmark. It shows why a connector should be tested with realistic volume and filter breadth, but it does not determine an individual operator's traffic or polling interval.

The FAA NMS portal has a metrics display explicitly stamped **April 18, 2026, 10:25:35 UTC**. In that snapshot it showed **261 onboarded API users**, **338,048 API calls per day**, and **74,241 active NOTAMs**. (nms.aim.faa.gov) (nms.aim.faa.gov) These dashboard values are cited as a dated snapshot, not as October measurements or a service-level promise. A current account-specific capacity or latency commitment was not established from the public pages reviewed for this report.

A vendor figure needs the same discipline. Cirium's NOTAM API documentation says responses are cached for **60 seconds** (developer.cirium.com); that is a stated cache setting, not an independent measurement of end-to-end notice publication delay. Likewise, ICAO's **28-day** Aeronautical Information Regulation and Control cycle is a publication schedule for certain aeronautical information changes, not an NMS-API polling recommendation. (www.icao.int) A design review should separate source publication time, intermediary cache time, transport delay, local processing time, and time until a human sees the change. (notac.aero)

For a source validation test, calculate measurable local values from raw events: snapshot completeness by scope, oldest unprocessed change age, duplicate replay rate, cancellation reconciliation count, and time from source issue to dashboard display. These are proposed test metrics, not published FAA performance benchmarks. The source's own issue time and a provider's storage time can differ, as NOTAC's field documentation illustrates. A test that measures only API response time would miss that distinction. W3C's provenance model supports retaining the record of each processing activity for later audit. (notac.aero) (www.w3.org)

For each measure, record the population, observation window, source clock, exclusions, and number of events inspected. An average update time without the slowest observations can obscure the very gap an OCC needs to notice. A useful report pairs the measured distribution with a list of unresolved exceptions and the date of the last full reconciliation. These are local test outputs, not values supplied by FAA or a vendor.

Implications and Future Directions

A flight-operations team should treat NMS-API as an **access and change-management project**, not a one-time endpoint connection. The FAA publishes broad capabilities and a route to access, yet the decisive integration facts, such as exact schema, revision identity, event replay, access terms, and current release changes, require the authorized documentation. The FAA FAQ's signed-in release notes make a maintenance owner necessary. A change-control calendar should review those notes, test parser changes in a nonproduction environment, and record the operating procedure impacted by each change. (www.w3.org) (www.w3.org)

The format roadmap also needs careful wording. AIXM 5.2 is the latest general AIXM model version according to AIXM's version page, while the FAA briefing specifically names **AIXM 5.1** for NMS-API responses. The version of a standard and the version exposed by a particular service are different facts. The FAA FAQ says it will determine the schedule for broader International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) NOTAM format support after the NMS transition. No team should silently upgrade assumptions from a standards release to an FAA endpoint. (aixm.aero) (www.faa.gov) (www.icao.int)

More structured data can make filtering and visualization easier, but it also creates a risk of hiding unparsed or out-of-scope text. AIXM's digital NOTAM page says coding guidance is needed beyond the model, and a vendor example states that parsed fields may be null. The display should retain original text, identify missing structure, and surface a review route. The FAA says the NMS interface itself does not prioritize results, so local prioritization requires explicit operational ownership and periodic review. (aixm.aero)

Finally, the operator should make the fallback visible to staff. The FAA's service-update email path and its advisory discussion of alternative means support a named contact and a documented fallback process. The trigger threshold and approved alternate source must come from the operator's own procedure. An integration can make uncertainty conspicuous; it cannot authorize a flight decision.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Is there public FAA NMS API documentation?

The FAA's public NMS page and FAQ describe the access route and broad interface capability. The FAQ directs an access request to the FAA and says release notes require sign-in. Public material reviewed for this report did not establish a complete endpoint schema, field dictionary, cursor contract, or service limits. Request the account-level documentation and verify examples against the actual entitlement. (www.faa.gov)

Can a team use deltas alone to initialize its dashboard?

The FAA briefing says delta queries support incremental updates and mentions NMS-API for an NMS-NPS initial load. It does not publish a universal initialization recipe for every consumer. The team should ask how to load a complete scope, checkpoint it, and reconcile future deltas. NOTAC's separately documented API explicitly calls its first request an initial sync, which illustrates that a vendor can specify a different contract.

Does GeoJSON mean every notice can be mapped automatically?

No such guarantee follows from a response-format label. GeoJSON defines a geospatial interchange format; the FAA briefing names it as an available response. AIXM explains that coding guidelines are needed beyond a data model, while SkyLink cautions that parsed metadata can be null. A map should disclose missing geometry and preserve source text for review. (www.rfc-editor.org) (aixm.aero) (www.ogc.org)

When should a vendor feed be preferred?

A vendor feed may suit a team that needs contracted distribution, a documented initial-load and delta contract, or integration support. That is a procurement inference, not a claim of regulatory approval. Compare actual terms: Cirium states a contract requirement, NOTAC documents withdrawals in its delta feed, and SkyLink

documents an airport active-notice endpoint. Test the chosen product's source chain and recovery behavior against the operator's approved workflow. (developer.cirium.com) (skylinkapi.com)

Conclusion

FAA NMS-API offers a documented route to search and incrementally retrieve NOTAM information, but the public pages are a starting point for an integration decision. The FAA briefing supports the broad capability set; the FAQ provides the access path and restricts release notes to signed-in users. A production decision requires the account-level schema, event semantics, permitted use, and a tested recovery path.

The durable design is a traceable chain from issuing source to feed to local state to human review. Start with a reconciled initial load, prove create and cancel transitions, keep source and receipt times distinct, make stale status visible, and assign a fallback owner. Those are acceptance questions and proposed controls, not claims that the FAA supplies a particular field or that software changes an operator's legal duties. The cited Part 121 rule and FAA guidance keep the decision with the people and procedures charged with flight operations. (www.w3.org) (www.ecfr.gov) (www.w3.org)

A direct FAA connection and a vendor feed can both be evaluated against the same change-state ledger. Documented product details, such as Cirium's cache and contract terms or NOTAC's delta behavior, should be checked under the specific agreement. A tailored integration builder can connect a selected feed to an existing OCC workflow, while the operator retains control of source approval, review thresholds, and operational fallback. (www.landing.aero)

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/initiatives/notam/faqs
2. https://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/flight_info/aeronav/acf/media/Presentations/5-notam-mod-brief.pdf
3. https://aixm.aero/page/digital-notam
4. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/chapter-I/subchapter-G/part-121/subpart-U/section-121.601
5. https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-overview/
6. https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-constraints/
7. https://www.faa.gov/newsroom/trumps-transportation-secretary-sean-p-duffy-completes-phase-one-overhaul-critical-pilot
8. https://developer.cirium.com/apis/cirium-sky-api/notam
9. https://skylinkapi.com/docs/v3/notams/
10. https://notac.aero/api/notam-delta/
11. https://www.landing.aero/
12. https://www.faa.gov/about/initiatives/notam/what_is_a_notam
13. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/chapter-I/subchapter-F/part-91/subpart-B/subject-group-ECFRe4c59b5f5506932/section-91.103
14. https://ntrs.nasa.gov/citations/20250003355

15. https://notac.aero/api/search-notams/
16. https://aixm.aero/page/usage-and-implementation
17. https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7946/
18. https://www.ogc.org/standards/ogcapi-features/
19. https://aixm.aero/page/aixm-51-specification
20. https://notac.aero/api/notam-detail/
21. https://ext.eurocontrol.int/aixm_confluence/display/DNOTAM/Item%2BC%2B-%2Bend%2Bof%2Bvalidity
22. https://www.faa.gov/documentLibrary/media/Advisory_Circular/AC_00-63B.pdf
23. https://www.landing.aero/about/
24. https://www.cirium.com/data/aviation-api/
25. https://developer.laminardata.aero/documentation
26. https://developer.cirium.com/apis/laminar-data-hub/overview
27. https://www.landing.aero/projects/
28. https://nms.aim.faa.gov/
29. https://www.icao.int/airnavigation/aeronautical-information-management
30. https://aixm.aero/page/versions

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.