LANDING.AERO

LANDING.AERO / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Part 121 Dispatch Release Changes: Signature to Departure

> 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 · 2026-10-13 · part 121 dispatch release changes · dispatch release amendments · dispatch release signatures · operational control · electronic dispatch release · release version control · flight dispatch software · pilot dispatcher coordination · dispatch release data handoff

Original article: https://www.landing.aero/articles/en/part-121-dispatch-release-changes

In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Key Changes
4. Implementation Considerations and Process Changes
5. Source-to-Consumer Event Map
6. Acceptance Tests for Post-Signature Changes
7. Audit and Export Questions for Existing Suites and Adapters
8. Data Analysis and Evidence
9. Implications and Future Directions
10. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
11. Conclusion

Executive Summary

Part 121 dispatch release changes require an information and human-handoff analysis, not a blanket instruction to reissue every signed release. For United States domestic and flag operations, the **pilot in command (PIC)** and aircraft dispatcher share preflight-planning, delay and release responsibilities. The FAA interpretation supplied for this report explains that signature alone does not begin the flight and that information duties continue before departure. Supplemental operations are outside this report's scope. (www.ecfr.gov) (www.ecfr.gov) (www.faa.gov)

The regulatory timeline has distinct reference points. Section **121.687** requires specified weather material to be the latest available at signing. Section **121.601** requires available safety-relevant weather before beginning a flight and additional relevant information during flight. Section **121.663** preserves the signers' safety judgment and prohibits delegation of dispatch authority. A later source event should therefore remain connected to the release edition, communication and responsible human disposition. This does not imply that every update automatically requires an amendment or new signatures. (www.govinfo.gov) (www.ecfr.gov) (www.ecfr.gov) (www.ecfr.gov)

Quantitative evidence must retain its context. Section **121.695** requires specified flight records to be retained for **at least three months**. The Aviation Weather Center describes access to **up to 30 days** of weather data, a separate source-service window. Bytron advertises flight-history archives for **up to five years**, a vendor capability claim rather than a universal contract. The report's illustrative information-age calculation demonstrates arithmetic only; it establishes no FAA latency threshold. Current eCFR text was fetched in **October 2026**, with the inspected title-level display current through **October 8, 2026**. (www.govinfo.gov) (aviationweather.gov) (www.bytron.aero) (www.ecfr.gov)

The decision framework is to test the installed suite before commissioning a narrow adapter. Public vendor documentation shows capabilities such as API integration, paperless release delivery and briefing progress states. Those features need an operator-specific demonstration of source timestamps, immutable release/version identity, recipient delivery, defined acknowledgment, discrepancy ownership and exportable decisions. The proposed event map and acceptance matrix cover stale data, late revisions, duplicate events,

tail swaps, unsuccessful delivery and multi-party responses. An adapter may preserve and present that evidence; the PIC and dispatcher retain operational authority. (ba.foreflight.com) (ww2.jeppesen.com) (www.bytron.aero)

Introduction and Background

This report examines **Part 121 dispatch release changes** for United States domestic and flag operations. The **pilot in command (PIC)** and authorized aircraft dispatcher share preflight-planning, delay and dispatch-release responsibilities under the respective operational-control provisions. Supplemental operations use a different flight-release framework and are outside this analysis. (www.ecfr.gov) (www.ecfr.gov)

The practical question is whether an existing dispatch system can reconstruct what happened after signature: which source changed, which release was affected, who received the information and what the responsible people decided. A dispatch release is a regulated record prepared for a particular flight. A weather display, airport-status dashboard or notification feed has a different purpose, even when its information contributes to that record. (www.ecfr.gov) (aviationweather.gov)

Application programming interfaces (APIs) can connect scheduling, planning and briefing systems. ForeFlight documents both scheduling-data ingestion and the return of performance calculations and flight documents. Those interfaces establish possible handoff paths; they do not establish an individual operator's amendment procedure. The distinction matters when a source changes after a pilot has downloaded the briefing. (ba.foreflight.com) (ba.foreflight.com)

An adjacent integration perspective is relevant here. **LANDING.AERO** describes its work as custom software designed around each operation's needs. This report evaluates the handoff problem rather than any studio's services or an alternative dispatch authority. (www.landing.aero)

The analysis is anchored to **October 2026**. The fetched current Electronic Code of Federal Regulations (eCFR) page displayed Title 14 as current through **October 8, 2026**, with its title-level last amendment dated **September 29, 2026**. Those dates do not imply that the release provisions changed on that amendment date. The eCFR describes itself as authoritative but unofficial; the annual government publication supplies corroborating record-retention text. (www.ecfr.gov) (www.govinfo.gov)

Key Changes

Here, “changes” means information and record changes during a flight's preparation and operation. It does not mean that a new regulation requires every release to be reissued.

Signature fixes a record, not the information environment

Section **121.687** prescribes release content and requires specified weather reports or forecasts to be the latest available when the PIC and dispatcher sign. This establishes a signing-time reference point. A later report cannot retroactively become the report available at the earlier signature. The archive should therefore preserve the signed material separately from later information. (www.govinfo.gov) (www.law.cornell.edu)

The FAA interpretation supplied for this topic explains that signing alone does not begin the flight and that the dispatcher has continuing information duties between signing and departure. For purposes of section 121.601, the memorandum states that a flight begins when the aircraft departs by pushback or taxi from the departing gate or ramp area. That event precedes takeoff and is the departure boundary used in the proposed workflow below. The signature timestamp should not be used as an automatic boundary that disables updates. (www.faa.gov)

The interpretation's readable text did not establish its issue date or current supersession status. This report uses its explanation alongside current regulatory text, without labeling it a newly issued or independently verified controlling interpretation.

New information creates an assessment and handoff

Section **121.601(a)** addresses available current airport-condition information and navigation-facility irregularities that may affect flight safety. Subsection (b) addresses available safety-relevant weather reports and forecasts before beginning a flight, for the routes and airports used. The important relationship is between available information, relevance and delivery to the PIC. (www.ecfr.gov) (www.ecfr.gov)

An engineering workflow should record the new event and route it for the applicable human assessment. It should preserve whether the dispatcher considered it relevant, what was communicated and which approved procedure governed the resulting action. A background refresh, a changed forecast and a changed destination are not interchangeable events. W3C's provenance model supplies a useful general distinction between a revised entity, the activity producing it and the people associated with that activity. (www.w3.org) (www.w3.org)

Notification does not automatically mean reissue

The cited provisions establish release content, shared responsibility and continuing information duties. They do not establish a universal rule that every incoming change automatically requires a newly signed release. Section **121.631** addresses specific redispatch and amendment circumstances, including conditions for changing destinations or alternates while en route and recording en-route amendments. Those provisions should not be flattened into a generic predeparture software rule. (www.ecfr.gov) (www.ecfr.gov) (www.law.cornell.edu)

The system should preserve the human disposition under the operator's procedure: information communicated, further assessment needed, release amended, or another authorized action. An acknowledgment should state what was acknowledged. It should not silently stand for a new signature, dispatch authorization or agreement with an amended release. Dispatch authority cannot be delegated merely because a person or system can perform a signing-related action. (www.govinfo.gov) (www.law.cornell.edu)

Duties continue after the departure boundary

Section **121.601(c)** requires additional available safety-relevant meteorological and facility/service information during flight. Consequently, a departure event changes the applicable workflow stage; it does not terminate the information relationship. A queued predeparture update needs a visible disposition if departure occurs before its handoff is complete. (www.ecfr.gov)

Implementation Considerations and Process Changes

Preserve the release and its lineage

Version control should distinguish the signed release, its attachments and subsequent source observations. W3C PROV treats the result of each document revision as a new entity. That is a useful engineering model for preserving lineage without implying that the regulation mandates a particular database architecture. (www.w3.org)

The following fields are recommended for a release record and its event history:

- **Release identity:** operator, flight identity, operating date and immutable version identifier.
- **Signed content:** the release and the attachments actually associated with that version.
- **Signers:** authenticated identities and the signing events preserved with the correct version.
- **Source references:** producer, source identifier and the source edition used in preparation.
- **Change relationship:** the preceding version and the event that prompted review or revision.
- **Procedure reference:** the applicable operator procedure and its effective revision.
- **Decision record:** responsible person, disposition, reason and completion state.

These are proposed design fields, not additional statutory minimums. Section 121.687 allows a release to be in any form while prescribing its content. A database representation should support that content and the approved workflow rather than treat an attractive dashboard as the release itself. (www.govinfo.gov)

For events, capture the source's relevant timestamp, the operator's receipt timestamp, the effective interval and processing time separately. RFC 3339 supplies a standard representation for unambiguous instants; W3C provenance supports the timing of generation, use and activities. Neither reference determines when an aviation source is acceptable for dispatch. (www.rfc-editor.org) (www.w3.org)

Separate delivery, acknowledgment and decision

Use explicit states such as queued, transmitted, delivery confirmed, opened, acknowledged and disposition completed. The operator should define which state has operational meaning under its procedure. The distinction is visible even at the transport layer: MQTT's acknowledgment mechanism concerns acceptance of a message by a receiver, not confirmation that a pilot has read and assessed its contents. This is a protocol example, not an assumption that an operator uses MQTT. (docs.oasis-open.org)

Multi-party handoff deserves the same precision. A dispatcher acknowledgment, a PIC acknowledgment and a maintenance or airport-operations response may concern different questions. The record should identify each person's role and the referenced event. W3C's model permits multiple agents to be associated with an activity, providing a general way to describe that relationship. (www.w3.org)

NIST defines an audit record as an entry related to an audited event. Its audit-content control addresses the event, time, location, source, outcome and associated identities. These are useful engineering references for an exportable handoff record; they are not FAA dispatch-release approval criteria. (csrc.nist.gov) (nvlpubs.nist.gov)

Show the handoff as a swimlane

The following **proposed swimlane** is a workflow design aid. It requires mapping to the operator's actual roles and approved procedures. Provenance models can represent an activity's relationship to a predefined plan or workflow. (www.w3.org)

```
Source producer   | Issue or revise information; identify validity and source edition
Integration       | Receive; preserve source; correlate flight and release; queue review
Dispatcher        | Assess relevance; communicate; choose action under procedure
PIC               | Receive identified information; acknowledge as defined; coordinate
Record service    | Preserve each event, delivery result, human action and version link
Departure event   | Record the departure boundary defined above; carry unresolved work into review
```

The swimlane helps expose a common ambiguity: a notification can be generated before its recipient is known to have received it. It also makes the discrepancy owner visible. The proposed record service should retain evidence of unsuccessful delivery and subsequent resolution, rather than replacing the history with a final green status. The engineering principle is to preserve event outcomes, which is consistent with audit-record content. (csrc.nist.gov)

Source-to-Consumer Event Map

The integration must understand the source's meaning before it calculates freshness or associates a change with a release. An aviation routine weather report (**METAR**) contains an observation time. A terminal aerodrome forecast (**TAF**) describes a forecast validity interval. FAA uses **Notice to Airmen (NOTAM)** for these notices. (www.faa.gov) A NOTAM can describe a condition scheduled within its validity period. Receipt and applicability therefore require separate fields. (www.weather.gov) (www.weather.gov) (www.faa.gov)

Table 1 maps the principal event classes to recommended handoff evidence. The last column names the relevant rule or engineering source; the evidence fields are analyst recommendations.

Source event	Relationship to release	Recommended evidence and consumer	Grounding
New METAR, corrected report or amended TAF	May change information relevant to an existing signed release	Preserve source edition, issue/observation time, receipt, validity, affected route or airport; route to dispatcher and PIC as applicable	Continuing preflight information duties. (www.ecfr.gov)
Airport or navigation-facility status change	May affect an airport or route associated with the flight	Preserve notice identity, effective period, supersession/cancellation link and affected flight; identify dispatcher review	Airport-condition and facility information. (www.ecfr.gov)
Aircraft assignment or tail swap	Changes the aircraft relationship and may affect required release identification	Link previous and replacement assignment to the release; preserve human assessment and applicable amendment procedure	Release-content requirements. (www.govinfo.gov)
Release or attachment revision	Produces a different record or briefing edition	Preserve original signed package, replacement version, reason, distribution and any required human action	Revision lineage as a general model. (www.w3.org)

The table should be implemented as a correlation map rather than a rule that blindly reissues documents. A source update can affect several flights, and a flight can be affected by several source events. The system should retain that relationship without making the dispatcher reconstruct it from unrelated screens.

Weather: distinguish product time from pipeline time

The Aviation Weather Center (AWC) API schema distinguishes METAR `receiptTime`, `obsTime` and `reportTime`, and TAF `issueTime`, `validTimeFrom` and `validTimeTo`. Its receipt field describes receipt in the source system; it is not automatically the operator's own ingestion timestamp. The adapter should preserve the distinction rather than rename every field “updated.” (aviationweather.gov)

AWC describes most METARs as updating hourly, while the National Weather Service's Birmingham explainer describes routine TAF issuance at six-hour intervals. Those product schedules do not prescribe an operator's permissible information age. A new edition and an old edition with a recent download time must remain distinguishable. (aviationweather.gov) (www.weather.gov)

Airport status: preserve effective periods

FAA NOTAM time instructions specify Coordinated Universal Time (**UTC**), unless otherwise stated, and a date-time representation of year, month, day, hour and minute. The adapter should decode that representation explicitly, retaining the original notice as well as normalized times. A timestamp parser should not silently infer the computer's local timezone. (www.faa.gov) (www.rfc-editor.org)

A notice received now may concern a future scheduled condition. Conversely, the arrival of a replacement or cancellation can alter the context of an already delivered briefing. FAA instructions distinguish the scheduled condition within the validity period and state that an estimated-end notice still expires at end of validity if not canceled or replaced. Preserve the lifecycle relationship as well as the latest text. (www.faa.gov) (www.faa.gov)

Aircraft and attachment handoffs

For a tail swap, verify the aircraft identity against the release-content requirements and send the discrepancy to the responsible people. This report does not prescribe a universal amendment or re-signature sequence for that event. The required action must come from the operator's procedure and the applicable planning context. (www.govinfo.gov)

For attachments, use a stable version link or content fingerprint to distinguish the signed package from a later download. The proposed fingerprint is an engineering control, not a regulatory form requirement. The system should make both the historical attachment and the currently distributed attachment identifiable. W3C's revision relationship offers a conceptual basis for this separation. (www.w3.org)

Acceptance Tests for Post-Signature Changes

Acceptance should test an end-to-end handoff with the operator's authorized personnel involved. A successfully received API payload demonstrates only one part of the path. Transport protocols can allow repeated messages, and transport duplication indicators can describe a packet rather than the underlying

business event. These are reasons to test event correlation explicitly. (docs.oasis-open.org) (docs.oasis-open.org)

Table 2 is a **copyable test matrix (Hypothetical Example)**. All times, identifiers and procedure placeholders are synthetic. “PROC” must be replaced with the operator's actual applicable procedure, including its revision. No timing value below is an FAA latency threshold.

Test	Source time UTC	Received UTC	Effective time UTC	Release/version ID	Recipient	Delivery	Acknowledgment	Discrepancy owner	Applicable procedure	Pass evidence
Stale data	12:00:00	12:12:00	Product validity	R-A/vA	Dispatcher	Delivered	Pending	Dispatch supervisor	PROC freshness review	Source age visible; freshness review disposition recorded
Late revision	12:05:00	12:05:20	12:15:00	R-A/vB proposed	Dispatcher, PIC	Delivered	Each tracked	Assigned dispatcher	PROC release amendment	Signed vA preserved; decision and vB relationship exportable
Duplicate event	12:05:00	12:05:25	Same as original	R-A/vA	Same recipients	Retry logged	Original state retained	Integration support	PROC duplicate handling	No duplicate operational task; repeat receipt remains traceable
Tail swap	Assignment event	Operator receipt	Swap effective	R-A/vA linked	Dispatcher, PIC	Delivered	Each tracked	Operations control	PROC aircraft change	Old/new assignment and human disposition identifiable
Failed message delivery	12:06:00	12:06:10	Source-defined	R-A/vA	PIC	Failed	Absent	Dispatch supervisor	PROC communication recovery	Escalation and alternative handoff recorded; no false acknowledgment
Multi-party acknowledgment	12:07:00	12:07:10	Source-defined	R-A/vA	Named participants	Per recipient	Per person/version	Assigned dispatcher	PROC coordinated review	Roles, referenced event and outstanding responses visible

The matrix tests evidence completeness and procedure execution. It does not prescribe a flight decision. Some events may require communication without a new release; others may require a changed release or additional action. The test passes when the authorized disposition is reconstructable and consistent with the applicable procedure, not when every row ends in reissue.

Extend the matrix with these sequential checks:

- **Capture:** preserve the source identity and original content before transformation.
- **Correlate:** identify the affected flight, release edition and current aircraft assignment.
- **Order:** receive a newer event before an older event and inspect both dispositions.
- **Retry:** repeat delivery without creating another independent operational decision.

- **Disconnect:** interrupt recipient connectivity and preserve the undelivered state.
- **Reconnect:** verify that queued information still references the intended release version.
- **Acknowledge:** confirm that each response identifies its person, event and meaning.
- **Escalate:** assign unresolved discrepancies according to the operator's procedure.
- **Transition:** record the departure boundary defined above while an item remains pending and inspect the handoff.
- **Export:** reconstruct the signed version, source event and completed human action.

The ordering and retry recommendations are application-level controls. MQTT's at-least-once delivery example illustrates why arrival assurance and duplicate-free business handling are separate questions. It does not justify assuming any particular airline's communications architecture. (docs.oasis-open.org)

Offline access also needs a specific test. Lufthansa Systems describes offline briefing access in Lido mBriefing, while Bytron describes progress states for briefing download and flight acceptance. Downloaded, currently synchronized and operationally acknowledged should therefore be tested as separate meanings in the selected product and operator workflow. (www.lhsystems.com) (www.bytron.aero)

Audit and Export Questions for Existing Suites and Adapters

Begin with what the installed suite can demonstrate

Several established products document relevant capabilities. The evidence below comes from vendor pages fetched for this report; it is a capabilities screen, not an independent performance ranking. A product description does not demonstrate the configuration, contractual permissions or approved process of a particular operator.

Table 3 links public product evidence to the acceptance question it leaves for the buyer or system owner.

Product or provider	Documented capability	Specific verification request
ForeFlight Dispatch	API integration and flight-status synchronization. (ba.foreflight.com) (ba.foreflight.com)	Demonstrate signed-version preservation, identifiers returned through the current API, and export of subsequent source and human events
Jeppesen dispatch solutions / FliteBrief	Paperless release delivery and customer-specific portals for flight-status visibility. (ww2.jeppesen.com) (ww2.jeppesen.com)	Show which release edition reached each recipient, how a later change is handled, and which events can be exported
Bytron skybook	Direct dispatch-to-aircrew messages and flight-acceptance progress; multiple NOTAM-update email recipients are documented. (www.bytron.aero) (www.bytron.aero)	Distinguish message delivery, download, flight acceptance and the operator-defined acknowledgment of a particular change
Lufthansa Systems Lido	Lido mBriefing integration with Flight 4D and push notifications for plan changes. (www.lhsystems.com) (www.lhsystems.com)	Demonstrate offline-to-online version reconciliation and the record of recipient and dispatcher dispositions

Product or provider	Documented capability	Specific verification request
IBS Software iFlight Core	A unified crew-planning, flight-operations and crew-operations platform. (www2.ibsplc.com)	Establish which installed modules and interfaces expose release versions, changes and retained records before assuming coverage

The table favors demonstrations over feature-name matching. An operator may already own the necessary functionality. A configuration change or supported export can address the gap more economically than a new data service, although no cost comparison was verified in this research. Procurement should request evidence against the same scenarios for every option.

Questions to put to a packaged vendor

ForeFlight's integrations page describes outbound flight documents, and Bytron's Record Vault describes downloadable operational flight plans and signature reports. These are useful starting points for export discussions; they do not establish that every proposed event field is included in the exported objects. (ba.foreflight.com) (www.bytron.aero)

Ask the vendor to demonstrate:

- **Identity:** whether the signed release has a stable identifier separate from a mutable flight record.
- **History:** whether the original package remains available after an edit or replacement.
- **Source timing:** whether original issue, observation, receipt and validity fields survive normalization.
- **Notification:** whether recipient-specific delivery results and retries are retained.
- **Acknowledgment:** whether responses refer to a particular event and release edition.
- **Roles:** whether dispatcher, PIC and other participants have distinct attributable actions.
- **Export:** whether records are machine-readable and interpretable without the live interface.
- **Retention:** which record classes, contract terms and deletion controls apply.
- **Recovery:** how outages, replay, reconnection and partial delivery appear in the history.
- **Procedure fit:** which behavior is configurable and which requires an approved process change.

Comments and edit histories are helpful but have specific scopes. ForeFlight documents a save-with-comment feature. Bytron documents timestamps, user details and required reasons for post-flight edits. Neither cited description, by itself, demonstrates a complete post-signature predeparture change workflow. Ask for the installed version's actual behavior. (ba.foreflight.com) (www.bytron.aero)

When a narrow adapter is reasonable

A narrow adapter is justified when the release system remains the system of record but the cross-system evidence is incomplete. Its proposed role is to preserve source events, correlate versions, expose unresolved handoffs and produce an audit view. It should have a documented ownership boundary and avoid writing a dispatch decision merely because an event matched a software rule.

Public integration evidence is encouraging but incomplete. Bytron lists API, secure file transfer, email and messaging as ingestion methods. The existence of a transport does not establish access to the needed objects, update permissions or retained history. Validate those details against current documentation and the

operator's account. (www.bytron.aero)

A custom audit view should preserve event records rather than scrape changing dashboard labels into a supposed authoritative release. NIST's audit definition concerns individual recorded events; W3C provenance distinguishes revisions and their relationships. Together they support a proposed evidence architecture without changing the regulatory allocation of responsibility. (csrc.nist.gov) (www.w3.org)

Protect the evidence store and define correction behavior. NIST's audit-protection control addresses unauthorized access, modification and deletion. That is an engineering reference, not a claim that adopting the control certifies the dispatch workflow. Authorized corrections should retain their attribution and relationship to earlier events. (nvlpubs.nist.gov)

Data Analysis and Evidence

Separate four kinds of numbers

The useful quantitative evidence here concerns **regulatory minima**, **source-service behavior**, **vendor-stated capabilities** and **illustrative engineering measurements**. They should not be combined into a universal dispatch-performance benchmark. No independent cross-vendor latency or acknowledgment-completeness benchmark was verified for this report.

Release content: section 121.687(a) has **six numbered categories**: aircraft identification, trip number, airports, type of operation, minimum fuel and a conditional Extended Operations (**ETOPS**) diversion-time item. The existence of six categories does not make the release a six-column record; airport fields and the conditional item have their own meaning. (www.ecfr.gov)

Record retention: section 121.695 requires the certificate holder to keep the specified records for **at least three months**. It also addresses the PIC carrying copies of the release, flight plan and load-manifest material to destination. The minimum applies to specified records; it should not be casually described as a rule prescribing the retention of every integration log. (www.govinfo.gov) (www.ecfr.gov) (www.law.cornell.edu)

Source access: AWC documents access to **up to 30 days** of weather data and limits requests to **100 per minute**. Its cache table lists METAR cache updates once a minute and TAF cache updates every ten minutes. Cache cadence, product issuance and operator receipt are separate measurements. AWC recommends cache files instead of excessively large or frequent custom queries. (aviationweather.gov) (aviationweather.gov) (aviationweather.gov)

Forecast cadence: the National Weather Service Birmingham page describes TAF validity of **24 to 30 hours** and routine issuance **four times daily**, at **six-hour intervals**. Those figures describe forecast products; they do not authorize an operator to ignore later available safety-relevant information. (www.weather.gov) (www.weather.gov)

Vendor archive: Bytron advertises flight-history archives for **up to five years**. That is a vendor statement, not a verified contractual commitment for every record, account or operator. Compare the included record classes and export rights with the operator's requirements before relying on that maximum. (www.bytron.aero)

Illustrative information-age calculation

Information age at operator receipt (Hypothetical Example) is receipt time minus source issuance time. Suppose a synthetic source was issued at **12:00:00 UTC** and the operator received it at **12:03:20 UTC**. The calculated interval is **200 seconds**, or **3 minutes 20 seconds**. These values are invented for arithmetic demonstration and are not observed performance, service commitments or FAA limits.

Preserve the complete date and timezone with both instants. RFC 3339 provides an unambiguous timestamp representation, and NIST's audit-timestamp control refers to using internal system clocks for audit records. Clock alignment and the source timestamp's meaning must be checked before interpreting a computed interval. (www.rfc-editor.org) (nvlpubs.nist.gov)

Useful proposed measurements include:

- **Source-to-receipt age:** elapsed time from the relevant source timestamp to operator receipt.
- **Receipt-to-notification interval:** processing and queue time before a notification attempt.
- **Notification-to-acknowledgment interval:** elapsed time until the defined human response.
- **Open-discrepancy count:** unresolved events, grouped by responsible role and workflow stage.
- **Version-link completeness:** whether each event and response identifies its relevant release edition.
- **Export completeness:** whether sampled handoffs can be reconstructed from retained records.

Set targets through the operator's governance process and source contracts. AWC product schedules describe source behavior, while NIST's audit-record concept describes evidence structure. Neither establishes a universal maximum latency for Part 121 release changes. (aviationweather.gov) (csrc.nist.gov)

Implications and Future Directions

The decision between a packaged feature and a custom adapter should begin with a witnessed acceptance test. Use the operator's existing release workflow, actual authorized roles and representative source events. Request an export before accepting a dashboard demonstration as proof of traceability. Jeppesen documents release delivery, while Bytron documents downloadable flight and signature records; the next question is the actual relationship between those artifacts. (ww2.jeppesen.com) (www.bytron.aero)

An integration partner belongs at the data and workflow boundary. LANDING.AERO's first-party description concerns tailored flight-operations software and integrating disparate sources. That makes a custom adapter a relevant category of work, but it does not establish a particular integration, operational approval or replacement for a dispatch suite. (www.landing.aero)

Governance should assign a procedure owner, a source-interface owner and an evidence-store owner. The operator should control the definition of acknowledgment and the escalation path when delivery remains incomplete. W3C provenance supports relating activities to procedures and people; this is a useful documentation model rather than an additional regulatory mandate. (www.w3.org) (www.w3.org)

Future automation can improve correlation and presentation, but it should preserve the original source and attributable human actions. If an AI-assisted summary is used, the proposed acceptance criterion is that its underlying information remains accessible and its output is distinguishable from the source. No AI dispatch-decision capability or regulatory approval is asserted in this report.

Human authority remains explicit. Domestic and flag provisions allocate shared preflight and release responsibilities to the PIC and dispatcher, and section 121.663 distinguishes permitted signing delegation from dispatch authority. An alerting engine should not convert an unresolved discrepancy into authorization to depart. (www.ecfr.gov) (www.ecfr.gov) (www.govinfo.gov)

The appropriate improvement is a demonstrable evidence chain: original release, new source, relevant version, communication, response and authorized disposition. Product notifications, APIs and archives are candidate mechanisms. Their suitability must be shown in the installed configuration and the operator's procedure, rather than inferred from a feature label. Lido documents change notifications and ongoing monitoring, which are relevant capabilities to test against that chain. (www.lhsystems.com) (www.lhsystems.com)

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Does every post-signature change require an amended release?

No blanket requirement of that kind is established by the cited provisions. Continuing information duties and specific amendment rules have different scopes. The operator must determine the appropriate action under applicable regulations and its approved procedure; the integration should retain the determination and handoff. (www.ecfr.gov) (www.law.cornell.edu)

Must the PIC and dispatcher sign the release?

Section 121.663 requires both to sign only when both believe the flight can be made safely. It allows a particular signing-authority delegation by the dispatcher while prohibiting delegation of dispatch authority. An electronic workflow must preserve those distinct meanings. (www.govinfo.gov) (www.law.cornell.edu)

Is an electronic dispatch release permitted?

Section 121.687 says the release may be in any form, subject to its required content. That statement alone does not establish approval of a specific electronic signing, acknowledgment or amendment implementation. Vendor release-delivery features should be assessed within the operator's authorized process. (www.ecfr.gov) (ww2.jeppesen.com)

What should release version control preserve?

The proposed minimum engineering package is the signed edition and attachments, source-event links, the changed edition if applicable, recipient-specific delivery and response, and the responsible person's disposition. Provenance revision concepts support that design; they do not prescribe an FAA database schema. (www.w3.org)

Can a weather archive replace the operator's release archive?

These are different records. AWC's documented historical-data window describes its weather service. Section 121.695 addresses the operator's specified flight records. Preserve the actual weather package associated with the release rather than assume later source retrieval will reconstruct it. (aviationweather.gov)

(www.law.cornell.edu)

Conclusion

For domestic and flag operators, the central requirement is to keep release responsibility and information handoff connected throughout the workflow. A signed release establishes an identifiable record; it does not stop weather, airport status or other relevant information from changing. The practical assessment should therefore begin with the signed package and follow each subsequent event to its authorized human disposition.

The proposed test matrix turns that assessment into observable evidence. It asks whether source timing remains meaningful, whether an event identifies the affected release edition, whether recipients and response meanings are distinct, and whether unresolved discrepancies have an owner. Its timestamps and identifiers are illustrative. Its pass criteria depend on the operator's actual procedures rather than an invented universal reissue rule.

Existing suites should be tested first. Documented release delivery, APIs, briefing notifications and archives can contribute to the chain, but feature descriptions leave implementation questions. A witnessed demonstration and an interpretable export provide a stronger basis for deciding whether configuration, a supported interface or a narrow adapter is needed.

The resulting architecture should preserve the original release, later source information, communications and attributable decisions. It should also keep regulatory record obligations separate from service-data windows and vendor archive claims. A useful system makes the history understandable to dispatch, operations control and IT while leaving the PIC and dispatcher with their established authority. That is the decision standard for assessing Part 121 dispatch release changes from signature to departure and beyond.

Source links

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

1. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/part-121/section-121.533
2. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/part-121/section-121.535
3. https://www.faa.gov/media/12196
4. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2025-title14-vol3/pdf/CFR-2025-title14-vol3-sec121-687.pdf
5. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/chapter-I/subchapter-G/part-121/subpart-T/section-121.601
6. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/part-121/section-121.663
7. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2025-title14-vol3/pdf/CFR-2025-title14-vol3-sec121-695.pdf
8. https://aviationweather.gov/data/api/
9. https://www.bytron.aero/skybook-software/flight-dispatch/record-vault
10. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/chapter-I/subchapter-G/part-121/subpart-V/section-121.695
11. https://ba.foreflight.com/all-integrations
12. https://ww2.jeppesen.com/flight-planning-and-dispatch/dispatch-services/

13. https://www.bytron.aero/skybook-software/flight-dispatch/digital-briefing
14. https://www.landing.aero/
15. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/14/121.687
16. https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-primer/
17. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/part-121/section-121.631
18. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/14/121.631
19. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2025-title14-vol3/pdf/CFR-2025-title14-vol3-sec121-663.pdf
20. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/14/121.663
21. https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3339.html
22. https://docs.oasis-open.org/mqtt/mqtt/v5.0/mqtt-v5.0.html
23. https://csrc.nist.gov/glossary/term/audit_record
24. https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.800-53r5.pdf
25. https://www.faa.gov/about/initiatives/notam/what_is_a_notam
26. https://www.weather.gov/asos/METAR.html
27. https://www.weather.gov/index.php/bmx/aviationwx
28. https://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/publications/atpubs/notam_html/chap4_section_2.html
29. https://aviationweather.gov/data/schema/openapi.yaml
30. https://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/publications/atpubs/notam_html/chap3_section_3.html
31. https://www.lhsystems.com/solutions/pilot-applications/lido-mbriefing
32. https://ba.foreflight.com/solutions/flight-planning
33. https://www.bytron.aero/skybook-software/resources/skybook-faq
34. https://www2.ibsplc.com/iflight-core--elevating-agility-in-airline-operations-to-new-heights.html
35. https://ba.foreflight.com/releases/flight-plan-save-with-comment
36. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/part-121/section-121.687
37. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/14/121.695
38. https://www.landing.aero/about/
39. https://www.lhsystems.com/solutions/operations-control-center/lido-flight-4d

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.