



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization
North American, Central American and Caribbean Office

WORKING PAPER

NACC/WG/10 — WP/43

29/08/25

Tenth North American, Central American and Caribbean Working Group Meeting (NACC/WG/10)

Tulum, Mexico, from 8 to 12 September 2025

Agenda Item 5: NACC/WG Collaborative Task Forces Working Session

FPL 2012 Best International Practices as a transition to FF-ICE

(Presented by IATA)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
This working paper presents a proposal to work on the application of best international practices on FPL 2012 to facilitate the transition to the FF-ICE 2034. This WP also presents some challenges and suggestions to address FF-ICE as part of regional initiatives.	
Action:	Actions suggested in item 4 of this study note.
<i>Strategic Objectives:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Safety• Air Navigation Capacity and Efficiency• Economic Development of Air Transport• Environmental Protection
<i>References:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ICAO AN-Conf/14 Report• ICAO Doc. 4444

1. Introduction

1.1 1.1 The 14th Air Navigation Conference highlighted the importance of ensuring a seamless transition towards flight and flow for a collaborative environment (FF-ICE). Several aspects need to be properly considered to ensure airspace users can receive all the information needed to create a trajectory as efficient as possible and consistently implement FF-ICE. If not properly addressed, airspace users' trajectories will be less than optimal and thus lead to more fuel uplift. In addition, if the FF-ICE services are not consistently implemented across the globe, airspace users flying globally will need to develop many different interfaces potentially leading to ambiguities and less than efficient handling of the trajectory.

1.2 The FF-ICE release 1 provisions that became applicable in November 2024, provided a new mechanism to exchange flight plan and flight plan related information while the existing flight plan 2012 format and distribution rules remained available.

1.3 The 14th Air Navigation Conference recognized that keeping two formats for the exchange of flight plan was not a long-term solution. The conference therefore agreed in recommendation 3.2/2 that the global cessation date of ICAO 2012 flight plan should be 2034. By that date, only FF-ICE should be used to exchange flight plan and flight plan related information.

1.4 Recommendation 3.2/2 also called for the development of national and regional implementation plans to transition to flight and flow for a collaborative environment supported by ICAO provisions and guidance.

2. FF-ICE at Regional Level

2.1 Regional planning is essential for a successful implementation of FF-ICE, but with the agreement for a flight plan 2012 cessation date in less than 10 years from now, it becomes crucial to provide education and training to all the States that did not participate to the ICAO provision development process so that they understand why they need to implement FF-ICE and why it is necessary to achieve the transition at the same time.

2.2 At the regional level, it is therefore important that the implementation of FF-ICE is planned so as to include not only the acceptance of FF-ICE services instead of FPL2012 messages, but also the necessary ANSPs automation systems adaptation to provide feedback during the pre-departure negotiation and the use of the addition trajectory information contained in the FF-ICE trajectory so that the planned flight efficiency can be granted.

3. Implementation of FPL 2012 best international practices

3.1 As an important initiative to pave the way to the implementation of FF-ICE, the implementation of FPL best international practices would facilitate the change management required to a more automated and collaborative environment required in the future.

3.2 At least since 2018, conclusions of several meetings were formulated to harmonize ways of solving the following presentation and processing problems of the FPL in the CAR/SAM Regions:

- Missing FPLs
- Wrong information in the FPL operational fields
- Duplicated/multiple FPLs
- Requirement of DEST ALTN as a mandatory field
- Lack of standardization when presenting FPLs due to different requirements across the CAR/SAM AIPs:
 - paper format (in some cases mandatory and in others optional).
 - WEB.
 - AFTN/AMHS to only the departing ARO/AIS unit.

- AFTN/AMHS to all involved ATS units.
- A combination of some of previous options.
- Need of Letter of Agreement between Airlines and ANSP to authorize FPL and associated messages presentation via AFTN/AMHS.
- Lack of standardization to process the FPL update messages (CHG, DLA, CNL) originated by the airlines AFTN addresses.
- Lack of training with feedback on errors founded in other ANSPs/Organizations.
- Requirement of the transmission of item 19 of the FPL by AFTN or its sending by another means available (e-mail, paper, etc.).
- Changes to FPLs without notification to users.
- No feedback to users of FPL acceptance or rejection.

3.3 In this sense, a map developed in 2018, and still valid, is attached as Appendix A to this working paper, containing a preliminary analysis, based on the information known and/or compiled from the aeronautical publications (AIP and AIC). The map indicates whether each CAR/SAM States complies with the following requirements, which could be considered as a basis for harmonization and modernization of the process of flight plans presentation and processing in the CAR/SAM Regions:

- P - Paper format only
- A - FPL, CHG, CNL, DLA accepted via AFTN/AMHS
- D - DEST ALTN not required if operator complies with annex 6 exception procedures
- I - Item 19 not mandatory for all flights via AFTN/AMHS
- F - Feedback provided by ANSP about message sent by operator

3.4 Investments are not always required to comply with the above, adequate regulations and standardized procedures, included in aeronautical publications, especially in items ENR 1.10 and 1.11 of the AIP would suffice

3.5 The objective is to adopt models already successfully applied in the USA, Canada, Eurocontrol, where the generation of FPLs and their updates are delegated to operators, according to Doc 4444.

3.6 It also seeks to harmonize the use of the DEST ALTN aerodrome according to Doc. 4444, applying the exception of Annex 6 for flights from Latin America and the Caribbean to the United States.

3.7 It is recommended not to require item 19 in the FPL shipment and to establish a procedure to obtain it from the Airline Operations Control Center if necessary, since they operate 24/7 and can be contacted quickly without generating unnecessary cargo.

4. Suggested action

4.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) Take note of the information contained in this working paper.
- b) Develop regional FF-ICE implementation plan, taking into consideration the ICAO Global Guidance Material and Road Map, considering among other aspects:
 - To provide education and training to the States, mainly those that did not participate to the ICAO provision development process.

- The necessary ANSPs automation systems adaptation to provide a full FF-ICE service.
- c) Request to the NACC States to update the information in Appendix A, if necessary.
- d) Establish a strategy to implement the best international practices to harmonize the FPL filing and processing procedures in NACC for, inter alia:
- Delegation to originate FPLs and their update messages.
 - Harmonization of procedures to recognize the box corresponding to the DEST ALTN aerodrome as an optional data for those flights that depart from Latin America and the Caribbean to the US and that will apply to the exception described in ICAO Annex 6.
 - Recommendation regarding the need of compliance with Doc 4444 regarding no transmission of the FPL's Item 19, as well as the establishment of a procedure in which the ATS contacts the Airline Operations Control Center, in case of need to obtain the information of the FPL's Item 19.
 - Feedback provided by ANSP about message sent by operator

APPENDIX/APÉNDICE A



Type of processes desired	
P	Paper format
A	FPL, CHG, CNL, DLA accepted via AFTN/AMHS (not forwarding FPL)
D	DEST ALTN not required if operator complies with annex 6 exception procedures
I	Item 19 not mandatory for all flights via AFTN/AMHS
F	Feedback provided by ANSP about message sent by operator

Number of processes implmented				
4	3	2	1	0