



International Civil Aviation Organization

ICAO The Ninth Meeting of the APANPIRG ATM Sub-Group (ATM/SG/9)

Video Teleconference, 01 – 05 November 2021

Agenda Item 5: ATM Systems (Modernisation, Seamless ATM, CNS, ATFM)

MISSING DEPARTURE (DEP) MESSAGES

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper provides an update on the issue of missing departure messages, as discussed at multiple meetings of the Air Traffic Flow Management Steering Group (ATFM/SG) and ATM Sub-Group, since and including ATFM/SG/8 (2018) and ATM/SG/7 (2019)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 An analysis of missing DEP messages had been conducted in 2017, in response to the following APANPIRG Conclusion:

Conclusion APANPIRG/27/12: Origination and Distribution of Departure (DEP) Messages

That, recognizing the importance of AFTN departure (DEP) messages in the management and coordination of flight plans in both manual and automated ATM environments, ICAO be requested to:

- 1. Conduct an analysis of the incidence of non-receipt of DEP messages required by ICAO Doc 4444 Procedures for Air Navigation Services (PANS-ATM) Section 11.4.2.2;*
- 2. Request that States failing to ensure correct transmission of DEP messages promptly take corrective action and report the status of corrective actions to the ICAO APAC Regional Office by 30 April 2017; and*
- 3. Raise APANPIRG Air Navigation Deficiencies against failure by States to comply with Doc 4444 Section 11.4.2.2, at APANPIRG/28.*

1.2 ATM/SG/5 in August 2017 had requested that ongoing analysis be expanded to include missing FPL messages. The March 2018 analysis presented to ATFM/SG/8 resulted in APANPIRG Air Navigation Deficiencies being raised against several Asia/Pacific Region States. An APAC State Letter was also sent to non-APAC States that were demonstrated by the analysis to be systemically failing to send DEP messages.

2. DISCUSSION

Addressing of FPL and Other Related ATS Messages

2.1 There are a number of factors that contribute to the non-receipt of ATS messages at affected ATS units. While this paper is mainly focused on the matter of missing DEP messages, the following information is provided in relation to general aspects of ATS message handling.

2.2 ICAO Doc 4444 Procedures for Air Navigation Services – Air Traffic Management (PANS-ATM) specifies in section 11.2.1.1.1 that messages for ATS purposes (including FPL and associated ATS messages) shall be originated by the appropriate ATS units, except that, through special local arrangements, ATS units may delegate the responsibility for originating movement messages to the pilot, the operator, or its designated representative. Many airlines, accordingly, distribute FPL messages direct to concerned ATS units rather than submitting the flight plan to the air traffic services reporting office for onwards distribution (Doc 4444 section 4.4.2).

2.3 PANS-ATM 11.4.2.2.2 further specifies that a Filed Flight Plan (FPL) message shall be sent to, *inter alia*:

- The Area Control Centre (ACC) or flight information centre serving the control area or FIR within which the departure aerodrome is situated;
- All centres in charge of each FIR or upper FIR along the route; and
- The aerodrome control tower at the destination aerodrome.

2.4 PANS-ATM further specifies in section 11.2.1.2.3.3 that the following three letter designators (forming part of the AFTN address, together with the relevant ICAO four-letter location indicator and a supplementary letter, usually X) shall be used when addressing FPL and other ATS messages to ATS units:

If the message is relevant to an IFR flight ZQZ(X)

If the message is relevant to a VFR flight ZFZ(X)

Aerodrome control tower ZTZ(X)

Air traffic services reporting office ZPZ(X)

Other three-letter designators shall not be used for that purpose

2.5 There are multiple examples of States in the Asia/Pacific Region specifying in their Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP) Section ENR 1.11 that FPL be addressed other than in accordance with PANS-ATM.

2.6 The specification of non-compliant addressing requirements in State AIP (and, in some cases, in NOTAM) contributes to the non-receipt of FPL, DEP, and other related ATS messages.

2.7 There are also cases of States implementing the use of three-letter designators that are not assigned to them in ICAO Doc 8585 *Designators for Aircraft Operating Agencies, Aeronautical Authorities and Services*, but are in fact assigned to other States, authorities, or aircraft operating agencies.

2.8 The specification of non-compliant addresses in AIP is a key factor in missing FPL and associated ATS messages. For example, ANSP responsible for aerodrome reporting offices and other ATS units in distant FIRs that transmit FPL, DEP and other ATS messages are entitled to depend on compliance with the provisions of PANS-ATM by all downstream FIRs, and address ATS messages accordingly. They do not have any obligation to hold or read the AIP or NOTAMs promulgated by a far-distant State.

2.9 It should be noted that there are several States in the Asia/Pacific Region that are fully compliant with the abovementioned provisions of PANS-ATM. These States have, where locally required, implemented simple technology solutions to identify and re-direct FPL and other relevant ATS messages to other internal agencies such as Air Traffic Flow Management Units (ATFMUs) network management centres, centralized flight plan processing facilities, military units, regulators, etc.

2.10 A summary of non-compliant addressing requirements from published by Asia/Pacific Administrations in *online* AIP (Section ENR 1.11) is provided in **Attachment A**. Information from AIPs that are not available online will be further researched by ICAO. The meeting is invited to note that ICAO APAC Office will continue to encourage improved compliance with the provisions of PANS-ATM through direct contact with States, and if necessary through APANPIRG Air Navigation Deficiencies.

Note: The date in Attachment A was compiled in March 2021. ATM/SG-participating Administrations are invited to inform ICAO where any update has occurred since that time.

2.11 In that regard, the meeting is reminded of the following Conclusion agreed by ATM/SG/7 (2019):

Conclusion ATM/SG/7-5: ATS Message Reception and Handling

Noting that incorrect flight plan addressing requirements published by States in AIP ENR 1.11 contribute to the non-reception of flight plans and associated ATS messages, and that simple technology solutions are readily available to permit redistribution of messages to all necessary internal units and organizations, States are urged to:

- 1. ensure that, in accordance with PANS-ATM 11.4.2.2.2 all FPL and associated ATS messages that are addressed in accordance with PANS-ATM to the centre in charge of each FIR along the route and the destination aerodrome control tower, are correctly received and redistributed to all necessary ATS units by the receiving State;*
- 2. note that, as specified in PANS-ATM 11.2.1.2.3.3, the correct address for the centre in charge of the FIR is [FIR location indicator]ZQZX, and other indicators shall not be used;*
- 3. remove flight plan addressing requirements that do not comply with the above PANS-ATM provisions from AIP ENR 1.11; and*
- 4. ensure that all three letter designators used in addresses are correctly registered in ICAO Doc 8585.*

2.12 The Secretariat was also previously made aware of cases of coercive actions being taken in the APAC Region, involving threats by a State to airspace users and other States that clearances would be refused if the FPL was not addressed to non-compliant addresses published in either NOTAM or AIP. This practice of coercing other ICAO contracting States into non-compliance with the provisions of PANS-ATM is entirely unacceptable. Any continuation or further instances of this behavior will be formally referred to the Council of ICAO for action.

2.13 APAC Administrations receiving communication from any other Administration requesting that ATS messages, including FPL, be forwarded to any AFTN address that does not comply with PANS-ATM procedures are urged to inform the ICAO Regional Office, in order that corrective action may be initiated.

DEP Messages Not Received - Data Considerations

2.14 The data on missing FPL and DEP messages does not necessarily, in all cases, reflect failures at the aircraft operator or departure aerodrome ANSP. There may be a number of reasons these messages failed to reach one or more relevant ATS units, including such issues as, for example:

- non-compliant addressing requirements/handling at the reception end, as mentioned above;
- communication network failures;
- rejected message queues (format, syntax, semantic errors) not correctly actioned by the receiving ANSP;
- failure of the Centre in charge of the FIR to correctly re-distribute received messages to all relevant ATS units within the FIR; and/or
- Non-inclusion in FPL of Estimated Elapsed Times (EET) for all FIR boundaries crossed by the flight.

2.15 However, in many cases there are clear systemic issues that must be addressed by the Administration responsible for the aerodrome of departure.

DEP Messages Not Received – Follow-Up Actions

2.16 Following the analysis of missing DEP messages conducted in 2018, ATFM/SG/8 discussed steps to be taken to address the issue. State Letters were consequently sent by the ICAO Asia/Pacific Regional Office as follows:

- State Letters to APAC Administrations for which APANPIRG Air Navigation Deficiencies were proposed for non-compliance with the provisions of PANS-ATM (subsequently agreed by APANPIRG);
- A State Letter to all other APAC Administrations, and to non-APAC Administrations through their accredited ICAO Regional Offices, where the analysis indicated systemic failure to send DEP messages.

2.17 A further 24-hour data gathering activity was conducted on 14 June 2019. The planned data gathering and analysis in 2020 was not conducted due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on traffic volumes. While traffic volumes continue to be significantly reduced in most parts of the Asia/Pacific region a regional analysis was tentatively planned for Q3 2021. However, due to unexpected demand on constrained resources the 2021 analysis has not yet been conducted.

Asia/Pacific State Analysis and Deficiencies

2.18 APANPIRG/31 (December 2020) endorsed the current list of States having ANS Deficiencies recorded for non-compliance with the requirements of PANS-ATM Section 11.4:

Bangladesh, India, Malaysia, Maldives, Nepal, USA

2.19 The original criterion used for the ANS Deficiency was the failure to send DEP messages for 10 flights or more. This criterion did not adequately capture poor performance from States with low numbers of international departures. It was therefore agreed by ATFM/SG and ATM/SG that the criteria will be five percent of flights. However, States with very low numbers of international departures, i.e. less than 20 per month, should be excluded from the Deficiency List due to the small sample size, but will be formally contacted by ICAO, and monitored closely.

2.20 The meeting is invited to note that few Administrations achieved 100% of DEP messages transmitted to all relevant participating FIRs. All Administrations should examine their processes and system configuration in order to improve overall performance.

Thailand Update

2.21 Thailand continuously monitors the non-receipt of DEP messages for flights entering the Bangkok FIR, and kindly agreed to provide data for the information of the meeting.

2.22 For the month of February 2021 the following ‘top ten’ States were the most prominent originating States (more than ten flights per month) from which no DEP message was received by Thailand:

United Kingdom, France, Ethiopia, Bahrain (100% DEP missing), Turkey (97%), Bangladesh (35%), Germany (27%), Russia (25%) India (22%)

2.23 **Table 2** summarizes non-receipt of DEP messages for flights originating in the FIRs of APAC Administrations and entering the Bangkok FIR for the six months ending in June 2021 (missing DEP/Number of Flights).

Originating State	JAN 2021	FEB 2021	MAR 2021	APR 2021	MAY 2021	JUN 2021	TOT %
Afghanistan				2/2			100%
Bangladesh	34/100	40/112	29/106	8/99	6/89	11/62	23%
Bhutan	0/8	1/8	0/13	0/12	1/10	0/14	3%
Brunei Darussalam	0/6	0/4	0/6	0/8	0/10	0/10	0%
Cambodia	2/147	0/124	2/127	3/121	0/171	1/179	1%
China	2/473	4/356	1/498	0/474	2/495	4/478	< 1%
India	43/224	52/233	23/276	34/248	41/323	35/256	15%
Indonesia	6/101	6/96	8/107	6/79	5/69	4/69	7%
Lao PDR	0/21	0/15	0/23	0/21	0/19	0/29	0%
Malaysia	39/240	29/200	38/229	32/229	32/206	22/142	11%
Maldives	0/7	3/10	4/13	3/13	3/14	0/6	23%
Myanmar	4/146	1/86	7/103	3/126	1/142	8/140	3%
Nepal	0/45	1/43	0/57	2/63	2/18	0/11	2%
Pakistan	3/9	0/6	0/9	0/6	1/5	0/6	10%

Originating State	JAN 2021	FEB 2021	MAR 2021	APR 2021	MAY 2021	JUN 2021	TOT %
Philippines	8/477	2/385	4/470	2/409	11/426	1/417	1%
Republic of Korea	0/128	0/138	2/180	2/189	2/221	0/176	< 1%
Singapore	2/405	1/328	1/452	1/489	2/501	1/518	< 1%
Sri Lanka	1/77	0/57	0/74	0/60	2/71	1/71	< 1%
USA	0/22	1/11	4/24	3/23	1/26	5/33	10%
Viet Nam	0/295	1/230	4/325	1/311	9/313	2/293	1%

Table 2: Non-receipt of DEP Messages for Flights Entering the Bangkok FIR per Originating State – September 2020 to February 2021

Ongoing Activities

2.24 The work on missing DEP messages was initially carried out as a result of ATFM/SG discussion, noting that DEP messages currently provide the first real-time information used to update demand calculations in most ATFM processes. However, DEP messages have a broader impact, also serving an important role in both manual and automated ATM systems. This work will therefore continue, with data examined by ATFM/SG under the oversight of ATM/SG.

2.25 The issue was also raised with ICAO Headquarters by the ICAO APAC Regional Office, and by Thailand with the ATM Operations Panel. The Secretariat and Thailand have also made separate direct approaches to relevant States and International Organizations.

2.26 Other States having the capability are requested to participate in data gathering activities to support ongoing monitoring.

COVID-19 Pandemic Impact

2.27 The ATFM/SG Chair and ICAO Secretariat had planned to conduct further data gathering and analysis of missing DEP messages in the March-April 2020 timeframe. The onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and the resultant reduction in international aviation activity, generally considered to have reduced by about 85%, at its lowest point, was thought to render any such data analysis unrepresentative. While traffic levels have only partly recovered, the importance of this issue is such that it should continue to be monitored. Therefore, another regional analysis is being tentatively planned.

2.28 The analysis of incorrect FPL addressing requirements mentioned in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.13 of this paper will continue. Participants are urged to ensure their Administration responds to any requests for further information by the ICAO Regional Office.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the information contained in this paper;
- b) note:
 - i) the ICAO Doc 4444 PANS-ATM procedures for the addressing of FPL and associated ATS messages;
 - ii) the contribution of incorrect addressing requirements published in AIP ENR 1.11, and as highlighted in **Attachment A**, to missing FPL and associated ATS messages including DEP;

- iii) the potential for APANPIRG Air Navigation Deficiencies, where appropriate, in cases where AIP ENR 1.11 does not comply with PANS-ATM
- c) comply with conclusion ***ATM/SG/7-5: ATS Message Reception and Handling***;
- d) inform the ICAO APAC Regional Office in the event that any Administration requests the forwarding of FPL and other ATS messages to addresses that are not compliant with the provisions of PANS-ATM;
- e) note the list of current ANS Deficiencies relating to non-compliance with PANS-ATM Section 11.4, as agreed by APANPIRG/31;
- f) take all steps to examine processes and system configuration, to improve performance in DEP message transmission;
- g) participate in future data gathering and analysis activities; and
- h) discuss any relevant matters as appropriate.

.....

ANALYSIS OF AIP ENR 1.11 FPL ADDRESSING REQUIREMENTS – APAC ADMINISTRATIONS¹

States	Compliance	Addresses (PRIMARY FOCUS ON INBOUND OR OVERFLIGHTS)
Afghanistan	No	<p>Kabul (OAKB) - OAKBZTZX OAKBYWYX, OAKBZPZX Kabul Area Control Center (KACC) - OAKXZQZX OAKBZQZX OAKKZQZX</p> <p><i>YFMS YAYX YWYX not compliant with PANS-ATM 11.2.1.2.3.3. ZPZX is only required for departing flights OAKB = Kabul International Airport (OAKX – Kabul ACC/FIC) OAKK is not a valid Location Indicator</i></p>
Australia	Yes	<p>Brisbane FIR - YBBBZQZX Melbourne FIR - YMMMZQZX Departure or destination aerodrome ICAO Location indicator ZTZX</p>
Bangladesh	No	<p>Into or via FIR and/or TMA: VGFRZQZX, VGHSZAZX VGFRZQZX, VGHSZQZX, VGHSZAZX VGFRZQZX, VEGGZTZX, VGHSZAZX VGFRZQZX, VGSYZTZX, VGHSZAZX</p> <p>Outbound VGFRZQZX, VGHSZQZX, VGHSZAZX VGFRZQZX, VEGGZTZX, VGHSZAZX VGFRZQZX, VGSYZTZX, VGHSZAZX</p> <p><i>ZAZX is not compliant with PANS-ATM 11.2.1.2.3.3. VGHSZQZX is not a valid address (ZQZX = CENTRE IN CHARGE OF FIR, i.e. VGFRZQZX)</i></p>
Bhutan	Yes	<p>Paro - VQPRZTZX VQPRZPZX Bumthnag - VQBTZTZX VQPRZPZX Gelephu - VQGPZTZX VQPRZPZX Yonphula - VQTYZTZX VQPRZPZX</p>
Brunei Darussalam		

¹ Includes data from AIP available online. Further analysis of the AIPs of the remaining States will be undertaken.

China	No	<p>ZBPEZQZX ZGZUZQZX ZPKMZQZX ZLHWZQZX ZJSAZQZX ZSHAQZX ZYSHZQZX ZWUQZQZX ZHWHZQZX</p> <p>For traffic flow management service: ZBBBFPM ZSSSFPM</p> <p>Specific flights East China Sea ADIZ (Refer ENR5.2.1) - ZBBBZGZX ZSACZQZX R200 (BTN BEBEM and OLDID) - VHHKZQZX (FPL/CHG/DLA/CNL/DEP)</p> <p><i>ZSAC is not a valid Location Indicator (Doc 7910) ZSACZQZX is not the centre in charge of any FIR ADIZ addressing requirement is not compliant with PANS-ATM ZFPM and ZGZX are not compliant with PANS-ATM 11.2.1.2.3.3. ZFPM does not designate an air traffic flow control unit</i></p>
Hong Kong, China	Yes	<p>Inbound to Hong Kong or transiting Hong Kong FIR - VHHKZQZX Outbound from Hong Kong – VHHHPZA</p>
Macao, China	No	<p>Inbound to Macao – VMMCZTX, VHHKZQZX, ZBBBFPM, ZSSSFPM, ZGZUZQZX, ZGJDZAX</p> <p>Outbound from Macao – VMMCZPZX</p> <p><i>ZFPM ZAX are not compliant with PANS-ATM 11.2.1.2.3.3. ZGJDZQZX is not the centre in charge of any FIR.</i></p>
Cook Islands		
Fiji	Yes	<p>NFFFZQX ICAO Location indicator ZTX</p>
India	No	<p>All flights landing in India or transiting through Indian FIRs may use ZQZX, ZRZX and ZTX for addressing to the respective Flight Information Centre, Area Control Centre & Aerodrome Control Tower.</p> <p><i>ZRZX is not compliant with PANS-ATM 11.2.1.2.3.3.</i></p>
Indonesia	No	<p>Jakarta FIR - WIIIZQX Ujung Pandang FIR - WAAAZQX Destination and Alternate Aerodrome Aerodrome's Location Indicator +ZPZ+X Into or Via Jakarta FIR and Ujung Pandang FIR WRRRZEZX <i>PANS-ATM does not require FPL addressing to alternate aerodromes ZEZX is not compliant with PANS-ATM 11.2.1.2.3.3. WRRR is not the location indicator of any FIR WIIZ is not a valid location indicator. Should be WIIF. WAAA is the location indicator for Makassar/Sultan Hassanudin airport. Should be WAAF.</i></p>

Japan	No	<p>IFR flights – RJJZQZX VFR flights – RJJYFYQ, RJCCYSYA/RJSSYSYA (six more examples YSYA) RJTZYWYX (flights through ADIZ) ICAO Location indicator + ZPZX</p> <p>YSYA YWYX not compliant with PANS-ATM 11.2.1.2.3.3.</p>
Kiribati		
Lao PDR		
Malaysia	Maybe	<p>WMFCZQZX [various]ZTZ WBFCZQZX</p> <p><i>The following text is no longer present in AIP Malaysia, but there may be some data missing from AIP ENR 1.11</i></p> <p>Butterworth – WMKBYWYX, WMKBZAZX Kuantan Airport – WMKDYWYX Kuching International – WBGZTZ, WBGZTZ</p> <p>YWYX ZAZX YWYX ZRZX not compliant with PANS-ATM</p>
Maldives	No	<p>VRMFZQZX, VRMMZTZ, VRMMZPZX</p> <p>In addition, for flights into Male' TMA, VRMFZQZX, VRMMZTZ, VRMMZPZX</p> <p>ZPZX is for departure flights, for distribution of the FPL Unable to update March 2021</p>
Marshal Island		
Micronesia		
Mongolia	No	<p>IFR flights - ZMUBZRZX, ZMUBZRZA, ZMUBZRZB, ZMUBZQZX, ZMUBZRZQ, ZMUBYAYX, ZMUBZTZ, ZMUBZGZX VFR flights - ZMUBZRZX, ZMUBZRZA, ZMUBZRZB, ZMUBZQZX, ZMUBZRZQ, ZMUBYAYX, ZMUBZFZX, ZMUBZLZX, ZMUBZTZ, ZMUBZGZX</p> <p>All flights - ZMUBZPZX, ZMUBZTZ</p> <p>ZRZX ZRZA ZRZB YAYX ZGZX ZLZX not compliant with PANS-ATM 11.2.1.2.3.3. ZLZ is not a valid three-letter designator (Doc 8585)</p>
Myanmar	Yes	VYYFZQZX VYYYZTZ
Nauru		
Nepal	No	<p>VNSMZQZX VNKTZRZX VNKTZAZX * + ZTZ</p> <p>ZRZ ZAZ not compliant with PANS-ATM 11.2.1.2.3.3.</p>
New Zealand	Yes	NZZOZQZX NZZCZQZX NZZCFZX * + ZTZ

Pakistan	No	<p>Karachi FIR – OPKCZIZX, OPKCZRZX, OPKCZRZA, OPKCZPZX, OPKRZRZA, OPKRZRZB</p> <p>Lahore FIR - OPLAZIZX, OPLRZQZX, OPLAZRZA, OPLRATMA, OPLRATMB</p> <p>Cherat CTR - OPLAZIZX, OPLRZQZX, OPCTZTZX, OPRNZRZA</p> <p>Multan TMA - OPMTZTZX, OPMTYFYX.</p> <p><i>ZIZX, ZRZX, ZRZA, ZRZB, ATMA, ATMB not compliant with PANS-ATM 11.2.1.2.3.3.</i></p> <p><i>ATM is not allocated to Pakistan (Airlines of Tasmania, Doc 8585)</i></p>
Palau		
Papua New Guinea		
Philippines	Yes (inbound and overflights)	<p>International flights outbound RPLLYIYX</p> <p>International Flights inbound RPHIZQZX and airport of destination location indicator + ZTZX</p> <p>International flights overflying Manila FIR RPHIZQZX</p> <p>Domestic Flights RPLLYJYX</p> <p><i>YIY and YJY are not compliant with PANS-ATM 11.2.1.2.3.3. and are not allocated in Doc 8585</i></p>
Republic of Korea	Maybe	<p>Departure or Destination airport RKSIZPZX, RKSSZPZX, RKPCZPZX, RKPZPZX, RKNYPZX, RKTUZZPZX, RKTNPZX, RKJBZPZX, RKJJPZX, RKJKZPZX, RKJYPZX, RKNWZPZX, RKPSZPZX, RKPUPZX, RKSMZPZX, RKTHZPZX, RKTLPZX, RKDZZPZX</p> <p>Incheon FIR RKRRZQZX</p> <p><i>ZPZX should only be for departure FPL</i></p>
Samoa		
Singapore	Maybe	<p>Transiting Singapore FIR or inbound to Singapore Changi Airport WSJCZQZX</p> <p>Inbound to Singapore Changi Airport WSJCZQZX</p> <p>Outbound from Singapore Changi Airport WSSSZPZX</p> <p>Inbound to Seletar Airport WSJCZQZX, WSSLZPZX</p> <p>Outbound from Seletar Airport WSSLZPZX</p> <p>Inbound to/Outbound from Paya lebar Airport WSJCZQZX, WSAPZPZX</p> <p>Inbound to/Outbound from Tengah Airport WSJCZQZX, WSATZPZX</p> <p><i>ZPZX should only be for departure FPL</i></p>
Solomon Islands		

Sri Lanka	No	<p>VCCCZQZX</p> <p>Into Katunayake/Bandaranaike Intl. Airport Colombo VCCCZQZX VCBIZTZX VCBIZPZX</p> <p>Into Mattala/Mattala Rajapaksa Intl. Airport VCCCZQZX VCRIZTZX VCRIZPZX</p> <p>Into Ratmalana/Colombo Airport VCCCZQZX VCCCZTZX VCCCZPZX</p> <p><i>VCCCZQZX is not the centre in charge of any FIR (should be VCCFZQZX)</i> <i>ZPZX should only be for departure FPL</i></p>
Thailand	Yes	VTBBZQZX
Timor Leste		
Tonga		
Vanuatu		
Viet Nam	No	<p>VVHNZQZX VVHMZQZX VVVVZQZX +ZTZ +ZPZX</p> <p><i>VVVVZQZX is not the centre in charge of any FIR</i> <i>ZPZX should only be for departure FPL</i></p>
USA	Yes	[large number of FIRs, all ZQZX]
France (French Polynesia and New Caledonia)	Yes	ZQZ ZTZ