LANDING.AERO

LANDING.AERO / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Australian Flight Review Logbook Entries: PICUS or Dual?

> 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 · 2026-11-03 · australian flight review logbook entries · casa flight review · picus · icus · dual training · pilot logbook · electronic pilot logbook · flight time records · pilot logbook exports

Original article: https://www.landing.aero/articles/en/australian-flight-review-logbook-picus-dual-training



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Key Changes to Make in the Record
4. Evidence Before a PICUS Entry
5. Implementation Considerations and Process Changes
6. Electronic Records and Export Checks
7. Reconcile Records and Check Exports
8. Data Analysis and Evidence
9. Implications and Future Directions
10. Conclusion

Executive Summary

Australian flight review logbook entries should reflect the capacity supported by the particular flight. CASA directs pilots to record an assessment-only review as **pilot in command under supervision (PICUS)** where the relevant conditions are met, and a review requiring flight training as **dual**. The instructor's presence alone does not decide the entry, and passing the assessment does not itself establish ordinary **pilot in command (PIC)**. (www.casa.gov.au) The legal baseline checked for this report is the **Civil Aviation Safety Regulations 1998 (CASR)**, compilation **C103**, effective **29 September 2026**, identified as latest when accessed on **3 November 2026**. (www.legislation.gov.au)

For the instructor or examiner supervision route, substantiate the licence held, all-PIC-duties requirement, instructor or examiner supervision and absence of flight training. Keep that capacity decision separate from subsequent licence-credit calculations. (www.legislation.gov.au) Preserve an unresolved event's duration and evidence while obtaining a precise answer from the instructor or examiner. Existing specialist guidance already recommends this evidence check; the worksheet here concentrates on the review event, including training-containing and incomplete-evidence cases. (www.pilotaudit.com) Do not invent a universal formula for dividing a mixed training/assessment flight. A brief note saying “review completed” cannot explain every underlying activity or establish the meaning of each time column.

A paper worksheet should record the event, aircraft or device, licence held, supervisor, evidence reference, duties, training status, duration, claimed capacity, outstanding confirmation and intended export column. Electronic field names require inspection: Skylog documents **ICUS**, while Logbook.aero documents **PICUS**; MyFlightbook distinguishes supervised-PIC time from a PICUS-name property. (www.skylog.com.au) (www.logbook.aero) (myflightbook.com) The label mapping must preserve the supported category rather than manufacture additional experience.

Finally, **check the actual output and accompanying evidence**. CrewLounge documents layouts where PIC includes PICus unless separately displayed. (support.crewlounge.aero) ForeFlight excludes signatures and other media from comma-separated values (CSV) auto-export; spreadsheet portability therefore deserves a separate evidence check. (support.foreflight.com) FLYLOG.io documents Excel/CSV downloads, while SafelogWeb describes user-controlled import-field matching. These capabilities assist reconciliation, without

deciding Australian capacity. (www.flylog.io) (www.safelogweb.com) The report's duration examples are explicitly synthetic arithmetic demonstrations. Its decision table and blank worksheet support personal records, not review procedures, operational authorisation or an air transport pilot licence (ATPL) minima calculation.

Introduction and Background

An Australian professional pilot may leave a flight review with a satisfactory assessment, a completed review record and an aircraft flight to enter in a personal logbook. Those records answer different questions. The review outcome concerns completion of the event. The time entry describes the capacity actually performed. A later experience summary asks what that recorded experience can support. CASA describes instructor notification and updating the pilot licence record separately from its instructions for logging review time. (www.casa.gov.au)

This report examines **Australian flight review logbook entries**, including endorsement check flights and assessments, from the pilot's personal-record perspective. Its regulatory baseline is the **Civil Aviation Safety Regulations 1998 (CASR)**, compilation **C103**, effective **29 September 2026**, identified as latest on the Federal Register when checked on **3 November 2026**. This is a current-text analysis, with no claim that the record practices below represent a newly introduced legislative amendment. (www.legislation.gov.au)

The central vocabulary is **pilot in command (PIC)**, **pilot in command under supervision (PICUS)** and **dual**, meaning time receiving flight training. **In command under supervision (ICUS)**, encountered in Australian logbooks and software, is a label requiring a documented mapping to the intended supervised-command category. For example, Skylog lists ICUS and second-in-command (SIC) fields, while Logbook.aero lists PICUS among its totals. Their labels describe fields, without deciding whether a particular Australian flight qualifies. (www.skylog.com.au) (www.logbook.aero)

Existing specialist coverage already addresses this distinction. **PilotAudit** recommends a separately identifiable PICUS or ICUS field and checking uncertain entries against the instructor, examiner or operator record. The useful addition here is a narrow event worksheet, including training-containing and unresolved cases, followed by an export check. It should help a pilot explain an entry later without relying on memory of what “review” meant that day. (www.pilotaudit.com)

Key Changes to Make in the Record

Separate the outcome from the capacity

For an assessment-only review, CASA directs the pilot to log PICUS subject to the relevant conditions. For a review requiring flight training, its direction is dual. The instructor's physical presence therefore does not, by itself, answer the capacity question. Nor does a satisfactory result convert supervised time into ordinary PIC. (www.casa.gov.au)

The practical change is to give the event and the capacity different places in the record. “Flight review completed” belongs in an event or remarks field. The duration belongs in the supported capacity field. A review result can be retained with its supporting document reference while the time remains subject to confirmation.

This preserves a useful distinction when a later reviewer asks what happened rather than whether the review was completed.

Software illustrates why field purpose matters. **LogTen** distinguishes the PIC/P1 crew-name field from the PIC/P1 duty field and the PIC duration field. Entering a person's name in the crew field does not describe a quantity of time. Likewise, **MyFlightbook** documents both a supervised-PIC time property and a separate “Name of PICUS” property. Read the definition before mapping either one. (support.logten.com) (myflightbook.com)

Identify training explicitly

CASA's logbook page expressly includes training received within a flight review in dual time and extends the assessment-versus-training distinction to endorsement check flights and flight tests. A generic remarks entry saying “assessment” should therefore be checked against what the instructor or examiner actually recorded. (www.casa.gov.au)

Recommended event notes should answer these questions:

- **Purpose:** Which review, endorsement check or assessment was being recorded?
- **Activity:** Was the flight assessment-only, training-containing or still unconfirmed?
- **Intervention:** Which activities did the instructor identify as training?
- **Reference:** Where is the instructor or examiner's corresponding record?
- **Status:** Which classification question remains open?

These are worksheet recommendations. They do not create a regulatory definition of an instructor intervention or a rule for dividing a mixed flight. If the records cannot establish the relevant facts, obtain a specific answer from the instructor or examiner before assigning an uncertain supervised-command amount. PilotAudit similarly recommends flagging uncertain entries and checking the underlying record. (www.pilotaudit.com)

Keep licence-credit calculations downstream

CASR **61.095** supplies conditions for PICUS. **61.705** separately addresses aeroplane **air transport pilot licence (ATPL)** experience requirements. Changing a software label from ICUS to PICUS does not itself establish ordinary PIC or show that the entry satisfies a particular licence application. Those are separate questions against separate provisions. (www.legislation.gov.au)

A useful personal-record rule is to finish the evidence work first. Then prepare the experience summary from confirmed categories, documenting the application-specific interpretation separately. A total that looks attractive on an export is an output to reconcile, rather than evidence of what duties occurred.

Evidence Before a PICUS Entry

For the instructor or examiner supervision route, substantiate the licence held, all PIC duties, supervision and absence of flight training. An instructor's signature or review result cannot replace these facts. (www.casa.gov.au)

The alternative operator route requires an operator with training and checking responsibilities. The flight's PIC must be authorised by that operator or its Part 142 operator to supervise the person. Keep the relied-upon authorisation reference with the entry. (www.legislation.gov.au)

The pilot should assemble the evidence before selecting the column:

- **Licence held:** Identify the licence held on the date, using a retained reference.
- **Duties performed:** Describe the basis for saying all PIC duties were performed.
- **Supervisor:** Identify the supervising instructor, examiner or authorised operator PIC.
- **Supervision route:** State which route is being relied upon.
- **Training status:** Obtain confirmation of assessment-only or training-containing activity.
- **Duration:** Reconcile the aircraft or simulator record with the event paperwork.

Table 1 below is a decision aid for **separate hypothetical events**, not a method for automatically splitting a mixed flight. It applies the sourced distinction while leaving uncertain facts open.

Event (Hypothetical Examples)	Evidence available	Personal-record treatment	Question before claiming experience
Assessment-only aircraft review (Hypothetical Example)	Licence, all PIC duties, instructor/examiner supervision and absence of training are supported.	Record the event; PICUS is supported by the stated facts. (www.casa.gov.au)	Does the retained record substantiate every condition being relied upon?
Aircraft review containing training (Hypothetical Example)	The instructor confirms training occurred.	CASA directs dual where the review requires training. Retain the training explanation. (www.casa.gov.au)	What exact treatment does the instructor or examiner confirm for this flight's facts?
Assessment described only as “review” (Hypothetical Example)	Training status or duties remain unclear.	Preserve duration and documents in the worksheet; keep the proposed classification unresolved.	What evidence is missing, and who can confirm it?
Simulator review session (Hypothetical Example)	The device, represented aircraft and session activity are identifiable.	Keep the simulated-flight record separately identified under the applicable recording requirements. (www.legislation.gov.au)	Has simulator time remained distinct from aircraft flight time in every output?

The table's unresolved row is deliberate. It is an evidence-control recommendation, not a new statutory capacity called “unresolved.” A pilot should still make the required timely personal record; the worksheet should accompany that record while the proper entry is clarified. CASR **61.345** contains the personal-logbook recording requirements, including separate provisions for aircraft and simulated flights. (www.legislation.gov.au)

Do not turn the training row into a home-made proportional formula. The sources support the distinction between assessment and training, but the retrieved guidance does not establish a universal arithmetic rule for a particular mixed event. Ask a precise question that includes the activities, duties, supervision and duration. Avoid a question framed only as “Can this review be PICUS?” because it omits the facts that decide the answer.

Implementation Considerations and Process Changes

Start with a paper worksheet

A worksheet can preserve the explanation even when the pilot's usual logbook has limited columns. It should travel with the event evidence and any later clarification. **Skylog**, for example, describes storing review paperwork, while **Logbook.aero** documents flight-linked notes and documents. These are storage capabilities; the quality of the explanation still depends on what the pilot retains. (www.skylog.com.au) (www.logbook.aero)

Table 2 provides a **blank record template**. “Export target” is the pilot's intended output field, to be checked against the actual file. The additional evidence and confirmation fields are recommended working controls, rather than a claim that each is a compulsory statutory logbook column.

Worksheet field	Entry to complete	Export target or accompanying record
Date	Flight or session date; link related events separately.	Date column.
Aircraft and registration	Aircraft type and registration; identify a device separately.	Aircraft fields or separate simulator record.
Event	Review, endorsement check or named assessment.	Event or remarks field.
Licence held	Licence held at the time; evidence reference.	Evidence index; notes where appropriate.
Supervisor	Name, role and applicable supervision route.	Supervisor or instructor field; supporting index.
Evidence reference	Review report, instructor record or confirmation identifier.	Stable document reference retained with the export.
Duties performed	Basis for the all-PIC-duties assertion, where relevant.	Supporting note, separate from duration.
Activity status	Assessment-only, training-containing or unknown.	Explicit note or separately maintained worksheet field.
Duration	Measured duration and the record used to reconcile it.	Confirmed category amount; simulator kept distinct.
Claimed capacity	Supported capacity, or proposed capacity awaiting confirmation.	Actual mapped time field, with its meaning recorded.
Confirmation outstanding	Precise question, responsible person and response reference.	Outstanding-items register accompanying the worksheet.
Export column	Exact header, unit and treatment in the intended output.	Mapping record linking the worksheet to the file.

The export-target column prevents a common reasoning error: assuming a meaningful note becomes a usable category total. **CrewLounge** documents distinct PICUS and dual time columns in its import specification, and alternatively a total-time-plus-capacity approach. That is evidence about the importer, not a promise that a particular export uses those same headers. (support.crewlounge.aero)

A paper user can keep the completed worksheet behind the corresponding logbook page. An electronic user can retain its reference with the flight. In either case, the event record should remain intelligible without access to a particular screen. A short filename or identifier is more useful if the matching document is included in the retained evidence set.

Electronic Records and Export Checks

Electronic Australian pilot logbooks should be evaluated at the level of **fields, evidence and output**. A label is an interface choice. A stored attachment is evidence access. A printed column is presentation. Each deserves a separate check against the completed worksheet.

Table 3 compares documented record-handling capabilities, rather than regulatory approval or the merits of an entire product. PDF means portable document format. Features were checked against vendor pages during this research. “Not established” means the retrieved page did not establish the point. It does not establish absence from the product.

Record option	Capacity or simulator evidence in retrieved documentation	Output or supporting-record evidence	Check for this review event
Paper logbook with worksheet	Pilot supplies clearly labelled categories and separate simulator identification.	Keep the worksheet and review evidence together.	Can another reader trace each category amount to its explanation?
Skylog	Lists ICUS, Dual, PIC and SIC columns. (www.skylog.com.au)	Documents PDF and editable Excel exports. (www.skylog.com.au)	Inspect the chosen ICUS column and output key.
Logbook.aero	Lists PICUS and dual totals and separately recorded simulator sessions. (www.logbook.aero)	Documents CSV export; exact CSV capacity headers not established here. (www.logbook.aero)	Confirm the export retains the intended category separately.
MyFlightbook	Lists supervised-PIC time and a separate PICUS-name property. (myflightbook.com)	Documents CSV download. (myflightbook.com)	Distinguish a name property from a duration property.
ForeFlight	Import template names PICUS, DualReceived and SimulatedFlight. (support.foreflight.com)	CSV auto-export excludes signatures and other supporting media. (support.foreflight.com)	Inspect the actual export and retain evidence separately.
LogTen	Documents distinct simulator type/category handling; exact current PICUS export field not established here. (support.logten.com)	Tab-separated flight export omits signatures and images. (support.logten.com)	Match actual headers to the worksheet before totalling.
FLYLOG.io	Retrieved export page does not establish exact capacity headers.	Documents Excel/CSV downloads and signatures on PDF pages. (www.flylog.io)	Check capacity mapping separately from PDF signing.
CrewLounge PILOTLOG	Importer maps PIC/us, P/us and PICUS to PICUS time. (support.crewlounge.aero)	Printing documentation describes combining PICus into PIC unless the layout separates it. (support.crewlounge.aero)	Inspect the selected layout and its column definitions.

Record option	Capacity or simulator evidence in retrieved documentation	Output or supporting-record evidence	Check for this review event
SafelogWeb	Transition documentation describes user-controlled field matching. (www.safelogweb.com)	Retrieved transition page establishes import handling, not an exact export schema.	Verify the destination field and retained evidence independently.
capzlog.aero	Documents separate simulator sessions. (capzlog.aero)	Documents PDF/CSV exports over a selected period or the full logbook. (capzlog.aero)	Check exported categories and the accompanying signature evidence.
Pilot Logbook, the publisher's product	Confirm actual capacity labels against the worksheet before use.	Assess a sample output and evidence-retention workflow.	Invitation-only: request an invite.

The comparison includes Pilot Logbook because the publisher is a direct provider in this category. Its row is a practical evaluation step, with no assertion that it automatically classifies Australian reviews or establishes Australian licence credit. The same event-and-output check applies to every option.

Reconcile Records and Check Exports

Reconcile the event and review records

CASA's instructor guidance describes entering review details on the pilot's licence and submitting a report. That administrative record should be reconciled with the personal entry, while recognising that completion and capacity answer different questions. (www.casa.gov.au)

A recommended reconciliation sequence is:

- **Match the event:** Confirm that the dates, aircraft or device and event description agree.
- **Read the activity:** Identify what the instructor or examiner recorded as assessment or training.
- **Check the duties:** Resolve whether the PICUS duties condition is supported.
- **Check the quantity:** Reconcile the duration without adding the same event twice.
- **Record the answer:** Retain the confirmation and the resulting entry reference.
- **Review the output:** Check the exported category and supporting-document reference together.

Preserve the response, rather than merely ticking “confirmed.” If a correction affects a signed entry, consult the product's documented workflow before editing. MyFlightbook explains that editing a signed flight invalidates its signature. **capzlog.aero** documents uploading images of paper signatures and stamps against corresponding flight or simulator records, which provides another way to retain supporting material. Neither feature itself proves Australian capacity. (myflightbook.com) (capzlog.aero)

Inspect the selected output

The most consequential documented output detail is CrewLounge's printing explanation: PIC includes PICus and other categories unless the chosen layout provides a separate column. The support article is dated **30 September 2021**; it should prompt inspection of the current selected layout, rather than be treated as

independent testing of every present report. (support.crewlounge.aero)

Several evidence-handling differences also matter. ForeFlight's documentation distinguishes its comprehensive PDF from CSV auto-export, which excludes signatures, endorsements, photos and track logs. LogTen likewise says its spreadsheet export omits signatures and images. A pilot who keeps only the spreadsheet should therefore check what additional evidence must be retained to explain the review entry. (support.foreflight.com) (support.logten.com)

A disciplined sample-output check should cover:

- **Capacity header:** Identify the exact supervised-command field and distinguish it from ordinary PIC.
- **Training header:** Confirm where received instruction is represented.
- **Simulator header:** Keep simulated activity identifiable in rows and totals.
- **Units:** State whether durations are decimal hours or hours and minutes.
- **Evidence:** Retain referenced documents and any signatures outside a time-only export.
- **Presentation:** Read the printed column definitions before reusing a total.

ForeFlight's template separately documents PICUS, received instruction and simulator duration. This makes it a useful example of explicit field meanings, but the template is an **import specification**. Its existence does not prove that a reader's chosen export contains an identical set of fields. (support.foreflight.com)

Data Analysis and Evidence

Synthetic duration reconciliation

The following **Hypothetical Example uses synthetic durations solely to demonstrate arithmetic**. It is not an ATPL calculation, an observed pilot record or a proposed way to divide a mixed flight.

Suppose the worksheet contains an assessment-only aircraft event already confirmed as **1.2 hours PICUS**, a separate training flight confirmed as **0.8 hours dual**, an aircraft event of **0.5 hours awaiting classification**, and a separately identified simulator session of **1.0 hour**. The classifications are assumptions of the example. In an actual record, the legal conditions and simulator recording requirements still need to be met. (www.legislation.gov.au)

The reconciliation is:

- **Aircraft time recorded:** 1.2 + 0.8 + 0.5 = **2.5 hours**.
- **Confirmed example categories:** 1.2 PICUS + 0.8 dual = **2.0 hours**.
- **Classification outstanding: 0.5 hours**, retained separately in the worksheet.
- **Simulator activity: 1.0 hour**, identified separately from the aircraft figure.
- **Unresolved amount:** The worksheet supplies no assumed PIC, PICUS or dual credit for it.

The outstanding amount has not vanished. Its source duration and event evidence remain available while the category is resolved. Conversely, adding the simulator session to an undifferentiated “aircraft total” would erase a distinction the example was designed to preserve. CrewLounge's CSV importer expressly requires

simulator sessions to occupy separate records, illustrating why a migration must preserve row type as well as time values. (support.crewlounge.aero)

A different **Hypothetical Example, also synthetic**, concerns display rather than arithmetic. If a selected layout combines the example's 1.2 PICUS with a PIC heading, the displayed number has not established 1.2 hours of ordinary PIC. The pilot must read the layout definition and inspect the underlying category. CrewLounge's documented printing behavior provides a concrete reason to perform that check. (support.crewlounge.aero)

What the evidence can quantify

The report offers field-level comparisons and transparent synthetic sums. It offers no measured error rate, pass rate, software time-saving estimate or Australian search-demand estimate. Such figures would not resolve the capacity of an individual review, and the retrieved material does not establish them.

The documented migration evidence supports a more modest conclusion: source and destination fields require inspection. **SafelogWeb** explains that fields may not match directly and that the pilot controls the matching process. LogTen warns that automatically matched headers may be misidentified. Those are reasons to reconcile a small representative sample before relying on a migrated experience summary. (www.safelogweb.com) (support.logten.com)

Recommended sample records include:

- **Confirmed PICUS:** A record with explicit duties and supervision evidence.
- **Confirmed dual:** A separate event with documented received instruction.
- **Unresolved event:** A record whose confirmation note survives the transfer.
- **Simulator session:** A record remaining distinguishable from aircraft time.
- **Signed event:** A record checked together with its retained signature evidence.

FLYLOG.io documents filtering exports to selected flights, useful when constructing such a sample. capzlog.aero describes exports for a period or the complete logbook. These options facilitate inspection; neither constitutes a measurement that the export preserves every category or supporting document needed by a particular pilot. (www.flylog.io) (capzlog.aero)

Implications and Future Directions

The durable record is the combination of a supported capacity, the matching event evidence and an intelligible output. Choosing a different app cannot repair an uncertain account of what happened. A careful worksheet can make that uncertainty explicit and give the instructor or examiner a focused question to answer.

Keep data portability separate from evidence portability. MyFlightbook documents CSV download, while LogTen's export instructions describe producing a tab-separated flight report. Those files support data inspection, but their names alone do not establish what supporting material accompanies them. Examine the actual file and retain the relevant evidence set alongside it. (myflightbook.com) (support.logten.com)

Similarly, exporting the flights is not proof that supplementary records migrated. SafelogWeb expressly excludes medical-certificate records from its transition process. The lesson for review paperwork is a verification question, not an inference that review documents have the same treatment: check whether each referenced document is present and readable after the move. (www.safelogweb.com)

Digital signing also deserves a separate workflow check. LogTen documents signing entries and certificates and printing signatures in reports. capzlog.aero documents instructor and examiner signatures on flight or simulator records. These are vendor-described capabilities, whose operation and relevance to the particular record should be confirmed by the pilot. (support.logten.com) (capzlog.aero)

For long-term handling, the Australian requirements include **seven-year retention from the last entry**, with entries retained unaltered. Production of an electronic logbook under **61.365** involves a printed copy with each page certified by the holder as a true copy. This holder certification should not be confused with an instructor's confirmation of what occurred on a flight. (www.casa.gov.au)

A useful recurring practice is to retain the worksheet, obtain unresolved confirmations, inspect the selected print layout and preserve an export together with its supporting evidence. Revisit the mapping when the software, template or intended experience summary changes. The aim is a record that remains explainable beyond the interface in which it was first entered.

Conclusion

Australian review logging starts with the event evidence. Establish the licence, duties, supervision and training facts before choosing the supported capacity. Keep assessment outcome, personal-logbook entry and subsequent licence-credit assessment distinct. A completed review label cannot carry all of those meanings.

The worksheet's value is practical: it keeps the source duration, supervisor reference, activity status and outstanding question in one place. It gives an instructor or examiner enough information to address the precise uncertainty, and it helps the pilot carry the resulting explanation into an experience summary without quietly changing its meaning.

For electronic records, inspect the chosen output. CrewLounge's documented treatment of PICus within some PIC print columns shows why a displayed heading must be read with its definition. A correct underlying entry still needs an intelligible export. (support.crewlounge.aero)

The strongest final record is one a later reader can trace: what occurred, which capacity is supported, where the confirmation is retained and how that time appears in the supplied file. Where the facts are incomplete, preserve them and resolve the classification with the instructor or examiner before claiming the uncertain category. For an ATPL application, apply the separate requirements to confirmed experience rather than treating a renamed field as additional credit. (www.legislation.gov.au)

Source links

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

1. https://www.casa.gov.au/licences-and-certificates/pilots/ratings-reviews-and-endorsements/flight-reviews-and-proficiency-checks/flight-reviews

2. https://www.legislation.gov.au/F1998B00220/latest/details
3. https://www.legislation.gov.au/F1998B00220/2026-09-29/2026-09-29/text/original/epub/OEBPS/document_2/document_2.html
4. https://www.pilotaudit.com/australia-casa/casa-picus-icus-hours-atpl-australia
5. https://www.skylog.com.au
6. https://www.logbook.aero/features
7. https://myflightbook.com/logbook/mvc/pub/PropertyTable
8. https://support.crewlounge.aero/support/solutions/articles/24000051702-what-hours-are-printed-in-this-column-
9. https://support.foreflight.com/hc/en-us/articles/27890005247639-What-is-the-Auto-Export-option-for-the-Logbook
10. https://www.flylog.io/help/logbook-export
11. https://www.safelogweb.com/transition
12. https://support.logten.com/en/articles/11771755-importing-spreadsheet-files
13. https://www.casa.gov.au/licences-and-certificates/pilots/keeping-records-flight-crew-logbooks
14. https://support.crewlounge.aero/support/solutions/articles/24000034487
15. https://myflightbook.com/logbook/mvc/faq?q=57
16. https://support.foreflight.com/hc/en-us/articles/215647217-What-are-the-formatting-requirements-for-each-field-in-the-Logbook-template
17. https://support.logten.com/en/articles/11641587-logging-simulator-training-device-time
18. https://support.logten.com/en/articles/11632689-spreadsheet-export
19. https://capzlog.aero/about/features/subscriptionsinfo
20. https://pilots.landing.aero
21. https://www.casa.gov.au/licences-and-certificates/flight-instructors/flight-instructor-requirements-and-guidance
22. https://support.logten.com/en/articles/11625726-getting-my-logbook-and-endorsements-signed-in-logten

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 tools for aviation professionals: Pilot Logbook, an invitation-only electronic logbook made by a line pilot that logs flights from the pilot's roster and flight plan, works offline and prints in the logbook layouts of 14 authorities; 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.