LANDING.AERO

LANDING.AERO / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

EASA Pilot Logbook UTC Dates: Audit Midnight and DST Entries

> 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 · 2026-11-20 · easa pilot logbook utc date · pilot logbook utc or local time · fcl.050 recording of flight time · amc1 fcl.050 · logbook date past midnight · daylight saving time pilot logbook · iana tz database 2026f · pilot logbook time zone conversion · electronic pilot logbook · pilot logbook

Original article: https://www.landing.aero/articles/en/easa-pilot-logbook-utc-dates-midnight-dst-audit



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. The EASA Text: Rule, AMC and What Is Not Said
4. Turning a Local Entry into a UTC Instant
5. Worked Cases: Midnight, Repeated Hour, Missing Hour, Opposite Dates and Changed Offsets
6. The Source-to-Logbook Worksheet
7. Reconciling the Same Flight and Editing the Record
8. Inspecting the Record in Paper, Established Electronic and Pilot Logbook Tools
9. Data Analysis and Evidence
10. Implications and Future Directions
11. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
12. Conclusion

Executive Summary

A personal logbook entry for an EASA pilot has two parts that source documents often blur: the **date shown on the record** and the **instants (date, clock and offset) that the times came from**. EASA's Part-FCL point FCL.050 requires a reliable record of all flights flown, in the form and manner the competent authority sets (www.easa.europa.eu). The related acceptable means of compliance (AMC1 FCL.050) says to enter the date on which the flight commences (www.easa.europa.eu) and that times should be in UTC (www.easa.europa.eu). Neither sentence tells a reviewer which time scale defines "the date on which the flight commences", so the AMC should be read as saying no more than it says, and the worksheet below is a proposal, not an EASA instruction.

The practical consequence is narrow and testable. A local OUT or IN time with no date and no numeric offset does not identify an instant. Twice a year, clock changes make that gap visible: the US fall-back on 1 November 2026 happens at 2 a.m. local time and repeats an hour (www.nist.gov); EU summer time ends at 1.00 a.m. Greenwich Mean Time on the last Sunday in October (eur-lex.europa.eu), which was 25 October in 2026. A synthetic New York example, 01:30 at -04 to 01:45 at -05 on 1 November 2026, is 75 minutes by UTC arithmetic, but 15 minutes if the two bare clocks are subtracted. If the offsets are missing, the entry is unresolved and should stay that way.

A memorised seasonal table can also be stale. IANA's tz database release 2026f, dated 27 October 2026, says Cuba will not fall back on 1 November 2026 and plans to keep -04 through 7 November 2027 (www.iana.org). Cuban state media reported on 24 October 2026 a joint ministry note keeping summer time until that date (www.cubadebate.cu). With the 2026f data, a Havana OUT at 19:30 on 1 November 2026 is 23:30Z; with a pre-2026f database it is 00:30Z on the next day, a one-hour and one-date difference.

The proposed method is therefore: (1) keep the roster or duty date, the event timestamps and the logbook date as three separate fields; (2) convert each local time using the airport, full local date, offset evidence and the time-zone data version; (3) reconcile the flight by direction, flight number, aircraft and source timestamps before any edit; (4) preserve the original and the review decision; and (5) leave an "unknown offset or

ambiguous hour" outcome open when the evidence does not close it. Competing guides already explain date disagreement and conversion (bluedecklogbook.com); this article adds the EASA source and purpose boundary, worked 2026 transition cases and explicit unresolved outcomes. It describes records only, not flight planning, scheduling or operational direction, and it does not extend EASA text to FAA, Transport Canada or UK CAA records.

Introduction and Background

An EASA airline or charter pilot typically holds three different "dates" for one flight. The roster shows a duty date in the operator's reference time. The operational flight plan (OFP, the pre-departure flight document) and the operator's flight-data feed show event times, sometimes in UTC and sometimes in airport-local clocks. The personal logbook then needs one date for the line. When a pilot imports an old roster, scans an older paper logbook or copies from an operator extract, the question is not "which time zone is right", but "does this source contain enough information to enter or correct the record?"

This report is aimed at professional aeroplane pilots working under EASA Part-FCL, and the scope is deliberately limited. It explains what the EASA text says, where it is silent, and how to build an evidence trail for a UTC-based personal record. It does not tell anyone when to fly, how to plan a flight or which date an authority, examiner or operator must accept. Where a receiving authority publishes its own format rules, those control the pilot's submission; this report only shows where to look.

Three limits shape everything that follows. First, the EASA text is read as of the Easy Access Rules for Aircrew revision published on 16 October 2026, and the page itself tells readers to check whether any rule was adopted after that date (www.easa.europa.eu). The PDF states that its published date is when the consolidated version was generated (www.easa.europa.eu) and that it is not an official publication (www.easa.europa.eu). Second, the clock-change facts come from official or standards sources: NIST, GOV.UK, EUR-Lex, IANA and the Python and RFC documentation that define how ambiguous local times are handled. Third, every time calculation here is synthetic and is labelled as such; none is a reported flight or a measured error rate.

Two adjacent topics are outside this article: classifying a flight as night, and migrating a whole paper logbook into electronic form. The subject here is how one flight's full timestamps and displayed date are resolved from the evidence in hand.

The EASA Text: Rule, AMC and What Is Not Said

The binding rule: FCL.050

Point FCL.050 of Annex I (Part-FCL) is the rule. It requires the pilot to keep a reliable record of the details of all flights flown (www.easa.europa.eu). The form and manner of that record are established by the competent authority, which is why the national authority receiving the logbook matters. The Irish Aviation Authority's advisory memorandum restates the same rule text (www.iaa.ie), and the Swiss Federal Office of Civil Aviation's guidance says its purpose is to regulate the correct recording and logging of flight times in accordance with Part-FCL (ffac.ch).

The AMC: date of flight commencement and UTC times

The AMC1 to FCL.050 (issued under ED Decision 2025/002/R in the October 2026 consolidation) is guidance on one acceptable way to comply, not the rule itself. It lists, among the items to be recorded for each flight, the place and time of departure and arrival. The notes to the logbook columns then give two instructions that matter here. Column 1 is "the date (dd/mm/yy) on which the flight commences" (www.easa.europa.eu), and the notes say that times should be in UTC (www.easa.europa.eu).

The notes also include a sample line: a flight from London Gatwick (LGW) to Los Angeles (LAX) dated 11/04/12 with times 1645 and 0225 (www.easa.europa.eu). The arrival clock reads earlier than the departure clock while the line carries a single date. A reasonable reading is that the arrival falls on the following UTC day and the line carries only the commencement date, but that reading is this report's inference, not an EASA statement.

What the text does not say

The AMC does not state, in the passages reviewed, which time scale defines the date on which a flight commences. The UTC instruction is attached to times. A flight that commences at 23:50 local on one day and 21:50 UTC on the same day gives no difficulty; a flight that commences at 07:30 local on 2 November in Tokyo, which is 22:30 UTC on 1 November, does. Two points follow:

- **UTC clocks are explicit.** The notes say the times should be in UTC.
- **The commencement date's reference is not spelled out in the reviewed text.** A pilot who logs the UTC date is consistent with the UTC times in the same row; a pilot who logs the local departure date is following a different reading. The receiving authority's published format, or a written answer from it, settles which it expects.

That is why this report does not call any adjacent local date universally unlawful, and does not declare that a UTC date is mandated either. The honest status is: binding rule (FCL.050, reliable record in the authority's form and manner), AMC (date on which the flight commences; UTC times), and this article's proposed worksheet, which asks the reviewer to record which convention was applied and on what evidence.

Other AMC provisions that touch the date

Several other AMC sentences matter when a pilot corrects entries. Flight crew logbook entries should be made as soon as practicable after any flight undertaken (www.easa.europa.eu), which makes late corrections an exception that benefits from a written reason. Flights flown under commercial air transport may be recorded in an electronic format kept by the operator (www.easa.europa.eu). Where electronic records are kept, the AMC conditions them on being available at the request of a competent authority and containing the required items (www.easa.europa.eu).

The AMC also allows a series of flights on the same day to be combined in an entry in defined circumstances. It does not say which time scale defines "the same day", so a pilot combining sectors near midnight should confirm the receiving authority's expectation before merging.

National submission conventions

The competent authority sets form and manner, so national documents are the second place to look. The Irish Aviation Authority says its preferred logbook format is the one demonstrated in the AMC (www.iaa.ie), accepts electronic logbooks if flights requiring endorsement have been signed by the relevant holder (www.iaa.ie), and warns that failure to comply with its format after 29 February 2020 affects the administrative processes for which the logbook is submitted (www.iaa.ie). The Swiss guidance says flights in aeroplanes may be kept in electronic format according to the approval (ffac.ch). Neither document, as reviewed, adds a date or UTC rule beyond the AMC. A search of other member-state authority pages did not find a further statement on date or UTC conventions, so absence of a national rule should be recorded as "none found, as of 19 November 2026", not as "none exists".

Why a roster date is not automatically the logbook date

The EASA flight and duty time rules in ORO.FTL define terms on a local or reference clock. A 'local day' is a 24-hour period commencing at 00:00 local time (www.easa.europa.eu); 'local night' is a period of 8 hours between 22:00 and 08:00 local time; and 'reference time' is the local time at the reporting point within a 2-hour wide time zone band. A flight duty period commences when a crew member is required to report for duty. These definitions serve duty limits, not the personal logbook. No EASA statement reviewed ties them to the logbook date, so a roster date is evidence of when duty began, not proof of the logbook date.

Turning a Local Entry into a UTC Instant

The three-field separation

A source-to-logbook conversion works best when three things are kept apart.

- **Roster or duty date:** the operator's planning label, in whatever reference the roster uses.
- **Event instants:** OUT, OFF, ON and IN, each as a complete date, clock and numeric offset, or as UTC.
- **Logbook date:** the value printed in the date column, chosen by a documented convention and tied to the receiving authority.

One electronic logbook vendor describes the same separation for its own product: it keeps OUT, OFF, ON and IN as canonical UTC values (bluedecklogbook.com), a display preference changes how clocks appear without rewriting the stored flight (bluedecklogbook.com), and a separate flight date avoids silently moving the flight to another day (bluedecklogbook.com). That is a statement of one product's behaviour, not of any jurisdiction's rule, but it illustrates why the fields are separate.

UTC has no clock change; local time does

UTC is the international reference time scale (www.bipm.org) and is not adjusted during daylight saving time (www.nist.gov). The offset applied to a local clock therefore varies with the date. Time zone abbreviations do not carry enough information: CST means one thing in China and something else in North America (data.iana.org), so a numeric offset such as -05:00 is stronger evidence than an abbreviation. A numeric UTC

offset is the form defined in RFC 3339, where an offset of 00:00 is written Z (www.rfc-editor.org); the same document provides a way to say that a UTC time is known while the local offset is unknown (www.rfc-editor.org), which is the same distinction this report calls "unknown offset".

A published June 2026 guide gives the example that a 22:00 local departure at UTC-5 is 03:00 UTC the next day (www.wingmanlog.in), which agrees with the arithmetic used below. Because guides present the offset sign in different ways, this report avoids a prose formula and works from signed numeric offsets: an instant in UTC is the local clock minus the signed offset, so 23:20 at -05:00 is 04:20Z, and 07:30 at +09:00 is 22:30Z the previous day.

Clock-change dates in 2026

The rules for 2026 are documented by official sources. NIST says US daylight saving time in 2026 runs until 1 November at 2 a.m. local time (www.nist.gov), and when it ends that hour is repeated, so there is an extra hour in that day (www.nist.gov). The page was last updated 9 February 2026 (www.nist.gov). For the European Union, Directive 2000/84/EC sets the start of summer time at 1.00 a.m. Greenwich Mean Time on the last Sunday in March (eur-lex.europa.eu) and the end at 1.00 a.m. on the last Sunday in October (eur-lex.europa.eu), with summer time defined as the period when clocks are put forward by 60 minutes (eur-lex.europa.eu). That gives 29 March and 25 October 2026 for the EU; the 2026 dates were computed from the Directive's rule for this report and checked against the computed offsets for Paris, since the Commission's published schedule reviewed gives 1.00 a.m. UTC transitions for 2027 to 2031 only (eur-lex.europa.eu).

For UK civil clocks only, GOV.UK says the clocks go forward 1 hour at 1am on the last Sunday in March (www.gov.uk) and back 1 hour at 2am on the last Sunday in October (www.gov.uk). That is a statement about UK civil time, not about EASA logbook scope; UK pilot records fall under a different authority and are not covered here.

Time-zone data versions matter

Calculators rely on the tz database, whose versions are named with a four-digit year and a lower-case letter (data.iana.org). Its maintainers state that clock rules sometimes change with little notice, and that the shorter the notice, the more likely clock problems arise (data.iana.org). Their theory document adds that current predictions will be incorrect after future governments change the rules (data.iana.org).

The Cuba case shows why that matters for a logbook. IANA release 2026f, released 27 October 2026, says Cuba will not fall back to -05 on 2026-11-01 (www.iana.org) and instead plans to maintain -04 through 2027-11-07 (www.iana.org). The underlying national announcement was reported by Cuban state media: the Ministry of Energy and Mines and the Ministry of Labour and Social Security issued a joint information note (www.cubadebate.cu) deciding to maintain summer time until 7 November 2027 (www.cubadebate.cu), with a 30 minute delay to school and workplace start times from 1 November 2026 (www.cubadebate.cu). A second outlet gives the same end date (www.riotimesonline.com). The original ministry text was not located in this review, so the national legal status rests on state-media reports, one non-Cuban outlet and the IANA release, and any calculation should say which tz data version it used.

Worked Cases: Midnight, Repeated Hour, Missing Hour, Opposite Dates and Changed Offsets

All cases below are **(Hypothetical Example)** records constructed for this report. Each was computed with timezone-aware UTC arithmetic using tz database release 2026f (the Python tzdata package 2026.6, whose data header reads version 2026f), and the Cuba case was also run on a pre-2026f database to show the difference. The container's default database was not assumed to be 2026f.

Ordinary midnight

A New York departure at 23:20 on 2 November 2026 is at -05:00, so it is 04:20Z on 3 November. If the IN is 00:50 on 3 November (also -05:00), the IN instant is 05:50Z and the elapsed time is 90 minutes. The local dates differ (2 and 3 November) and the UTC dates are both 3 November. A source that gives only "23:20" and "00:50" with one date is ambiguous about whether the IN is on the next local day; a source that carries the full date on both sides closes the question.

A Paris example shows the same effect across the European change. OUT at 23:50 on 24 October 2026 at +02:00 is 21:50Z and IN at 00:35 on 25 October at +02:00 is 22:35Z, which is 45 minutes. Both UTC instants fall on 24 October, while the local IN date is 25 October.

Repeated autumn hour

On 1 November 2026 in New York, local times from 01:00 to 01:59 occur twice. OUT 01:30 at -04:00 is 05:30Z and IN 01:45 at -05:00 is 06:45Z, so the elapsed time is **75 minutes**. Subtracting the bare clocks gives 15 minutes. If both offsets were -04:00 the answer would be 15 minutes. The offsets are the evidence; the clock faces are not. A source that shows "01:30" and "01:45" with no offsets supports 15 minutes, 75 minutes or other combinations, and must stay "unresolved".

The Python documentation describes the mechanism: the fold attribute is used to disambiguate wall times during a repeated interval (docs.python.org), with 0 and 1 representing the earlier and later of the two moments (docs.python.org), and PEP 495 defines fold as selecting the later of the two possible readings of an ambiguous local time (peps.python.org). A software tool therefore may silently pick one reading. A MyFlightbook developer post lists the same hazard for imports: 1:30am on the date that DST ends is ambiguous because it occurs twice (myflightbookblog.blogspot.com).

Nonexistent spring hour

Clocks that jump forward create a gap, and a local time that falls in the gap is called missing (peps.python.org). In Paris on 29 March 2026, local times from 02:00 to 02:59 do not exist. OUT 01:50 at +01:00 is 00:50Z and IN 03:40 at +02:00 is 01:40Z, which is 50 minutes, whereas subtracting the bare clocks gives 110 minutes. A source that shows an OUT time of 02:30 on that date describes a clock reading that did not occur in Paris, so it is a data-quality flag: the entry cannot be accepted as shown, and the evidence needs checking before conversion.

Opposite local and UTC dates

A Tokyo departure at 07:30 on 2 November 2026 (+09:00) is 22:30Z on 1 November, so the local date is one day after the UTC date. A Los Angeles departure at 18:40 on 1 November 2026 (-08:00, after the US change) is 02:40Z on 2 November, so the local date is one day before the UTC date. In both rows, the logbook date depends on which convention the receiving authority expects, and the worksheet must say which was applied.

Changed country offset: the Cuba 2026f case

Take a flight from Havana with OUT at 19:30 local on 1 November 2026 and IN at 19:35 Miami local time the same evening (Miami is on -05:00 after the US change). With the 2026f data, Havana stays at -04:00: OUT is 23:30Z on 1 November, IN is 00:35Z on 2 November, and the elapsed time is **65 minutes**. With a pre-2026f database in which Cuba falls back that morning, Havana is at -05:00, OUT becomes 00:30Z on 2 November and the same clocks give **5 minutes**. In a domestic version of the same case (OUT 19:30, IN 20:40 in Havana), the elapsed time is 70 minutes under both databases, but the UTC date of the OUT instant changes from 1 November to 2 November.

This example does not describe any carrier's actual schedule; it shows that airport, flight date, offset evidence and tz data version are all required inputs.

The Source-to-Logbook Worksheet

The worksheet below is this report's proposal for recording the evidence behind a date or time correction. It is not an EASA form, and no authority has been shown to require it. *Table 1* applies it to the synthetic cases above. Each row keeps the source document, original flight or duty date, airport and zone, local OUT and IN including dates, explicit numeric offsets, complete UTC instants, elapsed minutes, the destination logbook date convention and where it came from, the proposed correction, the reviewer and evidence, and any unresolved field.

Case	Source document, original date, airport/zone	Local OUT / IN with dates and offsets	UTC instants and elapsed minutes	Destination date convention and source	Proposed correction	Reviewer and evidence	Unresolved field
1. Ordinary midnight (Hypothetical Example)	Roster extract, duty date 2 Nov 2026, New York	OUT 2 Nov 2026 23:20 (-05:00) IN 3 Nov 2026 00:50 (-05:00)	3 Nov 04:20Z to 3 Nov 05:50Z **90 min**	Date on which flight commences, UTC times (AMC1 FCL.050); recipient format to confirm	Enter IN as the next local day; log date by the stated convention	Reviewer initials, date; OFP and operator extract show both dates	Receiving authority's date reading

Case	Source document, original date, airport/zone	Local OUT / IN with dates and offsets	UTC instants and elapsed minutes	Destination date convention and source	Proposed correction	Reviewer and evidence	Unresolved field
2a. Repeated hour with offsets (Hypothetical Example)	Operator extract, 1 Nov 2026, New York	OUT 1 Nov 01:30 (-04:00) IN 1 Nov 01:45 (-05:00)	1 Nov 05:30Z to 1 Nov 06:45Z **75 min**	As row 1	Block time 75 min, not 15	Offsets printed on extract; recalculated in a tz-aware tool	None
2b. Repeated hour without offsets (Hypothetical Example)	Handwritten note, 1 Nov 2026, New York	OUT 01:30 (offset unknown) IN 01:45 (offset unknown)	Not computable: 15 min if both -04:00 or both -05:00, 75 min in the case above	As row 1	**No change.** Keep original; mark ambiguous	Reviewer notes missing offsets and that other sources were sought	Offsets for OUT and IN; duration
3. Nonexistent spring hour (Hypothetical Example)	Operator extract, 29 Mar 2026, Paris	OUT 29 Mar 01:50 (+01:00) IN 29 Mar 03:40 (+02:00)	29 Mar 00:50Z to 29 Mar 01:40Z **50 min**	As row 1	50 min, not 110	Offsets on extract; EU 29 Mar change at 01:00Z	None
4. Opposite dates (Hypothetical Example)	Roster, duty date 2 Nov 2026, Tokyo	OUT 2 Nov 07:30 (+09:00)	1 Nov 22:30Z	Local roster date 2 Nov; UTC date 1 Nov	Log by the receiving authority's convention; record both	Written authority answer or published format	Which date the recipient expects
5. Cuba, 2026f (Hypothetical Example)	Roster, 1 Nov 2026, Havana to Miami	OUT 1 Nov 19:30 (-04:00 per 2026f) IN 1 Nov 19:35 (-05:00)	1 Nov 23:30Z to 2 Nov 00:35Z **65 min** (5 min on a pre-2026f database)	As row 1	Use offsets from source; record tz data version	Offsets on source plus tz release note; national notice via state media	Original national legal text; version used by source system

Table 1 is intended to be read row by row. The first four rows show how a full date and numeric offset convert into a complete instant and a defensible duration, while row 2b shows the recommended handling when evidence is missing: the entry is left as it was and marked unresolved, rather than being normalised to a

plausible figure. Rows 4 and 5 show that a date convention and a data version are separate inputs from the clock face. The reviewer column is for the pilot's own record; no authority has been shown to require reviewer sign-off.

Reconciling the Same Flight and Editing the Record

Match before changing

Before editing any time, confirm that the roster line, the OFP and the log entry describe the same flight: direction (A to B, not B to A), flight number, aircraft registration, and scheduled and actual event timestamps. Same-day round trips, positioning sectors and aircraft changes are ways for two similar lines to be confused. If two candidate flights fit the evidence equally, record that and leave both unchanged.

Weighting the evidence

A rough order of evidential weight, strongest first, is below. It is this report's working proposal, not an EASA ranking.

- **Complete timestamps with numeric offsets or UTC:** a source that states date, clock and offset, or UTC, resolves the instant directly.
- **Local timestamps with full dates and airport:** the instant is resolved if the offset for that airport and date is unambiguous in a dated tz release.
- **Local clocks with the date only on one side:** a midnight crossing may be inferred from direction and elapsed time, but the inference should be recorded.
- **Bare HH:MM clocks:** these identify nothing if either clock can occur twice, and should not be used to compute elapsed time.

Decide, then preserve

Every edit should leave three things: the original source value, the corrected value, and the reason with a date. If the source is a PDF or export, keep the file. This follows from the AMC's expectation that entries are made as soon as practicable after any flight: a later correction is legitimate but deserves a visible trail.

MyFlightbook offers an optional local-to-UTC conversion on import, which its own FAQ calls a fragile process to be used with care (myflightbook.com). Its developer suggests converting local time to UTC before entering historical flights (myflightbookblog.blogspot.com), because the conversion depends on rules by date. A pilot using any such feature should treat its output as a candidate value, then check it against the worksheet.

Inspect the PDF or export

After a correction, inspect the output the recipient will see. Check the date column against the convention chosen, check that every clock in the row is in the same time scale, and check any total that depends on elapsed minutes. For a printed or exported record, note the export date and software version, since a later re-export may apply a newer time-zone database.

Inspecting the Record in Paper, Established Electronic and Pilot Logbook Tools

The tools differ in what they say about the date and the clock. *Table 2* summarises the vendors' own documentation as reviewed; product behaviour can change, so re-check each vendor page before relying on it. The last row covers Pilot Logbook, the invitation-only logbook from the publisher of this article; it is a publisher disclosure, not independent evidence. The table does not rank products or imply that any of them is accepted by an authority.

Tool or method	What its own documentation says about time and date	Limit to check
Paper logbook	The AMC notes specify the date column and UTC times; the pilot writes the converted values by hand	No tool catches a wrong offset; the worksheet is the control
MyFlightbook	All times are in Zulu (UTC) (myflightbookblog.blogspot.com); the local-time option in the apps changes display only (myflightbookblog.blogspot.com); the date field can be reset to the local date of engine, flight or block start (myflightbook.com)	Import conversion is described by its own FAQ as fragile (myflightbook.com)
Logbook Pro (NC Software)	Data is always stored in UTC, the time zone is for input and display only (docs.nc-software.com)	The Desktop version is not time zone aware (docs.nc-software.com)
LogTen	A setting lets the user track times by the time zone of the Place associated with the entry (support.logten.com)	Times must be entered according to the mode that is set (support.logten.com)
Safelog	States it integrates the IANA time zone database (www.dauntless-soft.com)	Release used per entry is not stated in the page reviewed
ForeFlight Logbook	Import template defines Date as the date of the flight in YYYY-MM-DD format (support.foreflight.com)	The page reviewed does not state whether that date is UTC or local
Pilot Logbook (publisher's product)	Publisher's own description (not independent evidence): roster import, OFP attachment, OUT and IN entry, calculated block time, editable records with history and configurable exports; invitation-only (publisher page)	The public page does not document its time-zone database release or repeated-hour handling; ask before relying on it for an ambiguous entry

The table shows that the established products agree on storing or accepting UTC but differ on how the date is chosen and how local entry is converted. For the pilot's own record, the useful test is the same for every tool: enter one repeated-hour case and one midnight case from *Table 1*, then look at the printed or exported result. The publisher's own page for Pilot Logbook makes no stated claim on tz data version or ambiguous-hour handling, and no authority acceptance should be assumed.

Data Analysis and Evidence

Naive result versus evidence-supported result

Table 3 compares the answer a reader gets from subtracting bare clocks, or from using a remembered offset, with the answer the evidence supports and the fact that is still missing. All figures are from the synthetic cases above.

Case	Naive result	Evidence-supported result	Missing fact
New York, 1 Nov 2026, 01:30 and 01:45	15 min (clocks subtracted)	75 min if -04:00 then -05:00; 15 min if both -04:00	Offsets for each time, if not printed
Paris, 29 Mar 2026, 01:50 to 03:40	110 min	50 min (+01:00 then +02:00)	None if offsets known
Paris, 25 Oct 2026, 02:20 to 02:50	30 min	30 min if both readings earlier or both later; 90 min if OUT is earlier and IN is later	Which occurrence of 02:xx each time is
Havana, 1 Nov 2026, 19:30 to Miami 19:35	5 min (bare clocks, or a pre-2026f database)	65 min on 2026f	tz version in the source, national notice
Tokyo, 2 Nov 2026 07:30	Local date 2 Nov	UTC date 1 Nov	Recipient's date convention
New York, 2 Nov 2026 23:20 to 00:50	Negative result (-1,350 min) if the IN date is ignored	90 min	The date on the IN side

Table 3 shows that in these synthetic cases the largest effects come from a repeated hour (a 60 minute difference between two plausible durations), a nonexistent hour (60 minutes) and a changed offset (60 minutes). None of these figures is a measured error rate for any population of pilots. The Paris 25 October row has a result of 30, 30 or 90 minutes depending on which occurrence is meant, which is why the "ambiguous hour" outcome exists.

Counting the 2026 transition dates

For the 2026 calendar year, the clock-change dates referenced in this report are: US spring forward 8 March (computed), EU spring forward 29 March, UK and EU fall back 25 October, and US fall back 1 November. NIST states the US end date of 1 November (www.nist.gov), GOV.UK states the UK end date (www.gov.uk), and the EU dates follow from the Directive's last-Sunday rule (eur-lex.europa.eu). The gap between the EU and US fall-back (7 days) creates a week (25 October to 1 November) in which the clock difference between Paris (+01:00) and New York (-04:00) is five hours instead of the usual six, and a new row of the worksheet may be needed for transatlantic sectors flown in that week.

The Cuban announcement was reported on 24 October, three days before the IANA release and eight days before the 1 November change (www.cubadebate.cu) (www.iana.org).

Implications and Future Directions

For individual pilots, the first implication is to save more than the clock: operator extracts that include date and offset, or UTC, for each event are more valuable than a roster showing only local clocks. A reconstructed offset is a derived value and should be tagged as such.

Second, a recipient-first approach is more robust than a rule-first approach. The EASA text does not settle every convention, and the competent authority sets form and manner. Asking the authority, or reading its published format, takes less effort than defending an unexplained date later. If the answer is in writing, the

reviewer column of the worksheet is the place to keep it.

Third, tz data release is part of the evidence. A calculator on a database older than 2026f would give a different Havana answer on 1 November 2026, and a tool that does not state its release cannot show which.

For tool makers, the practical direction is to surface the offset, the data version and an explicit "ambiguous" state rather than choosing silently; the public pages reviewed here mostly do not specify repeated-hour handling. EASA itself may revise the AMC; because the Easy Access Rules tell readers to check later adopted texts, this analysis should be rechecked against any text adopted after 16 October 2026.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Should an EASA pilot logbook use UTC or local time?

The AMC says times should be in UTC. Entries that were originally made in local time can be converted using the full date, airport and offset evidence. The reference for the date column is not spelled out, so confirm the recipient's expectation.

What date does an EASA logbook use for a flight that goes past midnight?

The AMC notes say to enter the date on which the flight commences (www.easa.europa.eu). A flight that crosses midnight in either local time or UTC therefore carries one date on its row; the second date can be shown in the remarks or in the underlying record. Which time scale defines "commences" is a question for the receiving authority's published format.

How should daylight saving time entries be logged?

Convert with the offset in force at that airport on that date. UTC does not observe daylight saving time (www.wingmanlog.in), so the UTC time of an event does not change; only the local clock does. For a repeated hour, require an offset or another source. For a nonexistent hour, treat the source as needing verification.

What causes time zone conversion errors?

The usual causes are missing or wrong offsets, a repeated or nonexistent clock hour, reading time zone abbreviations (CST means one thing in China and something else in North America (data.iana.org)), and stale time-zone data. The conversion also fails if a bare clock is subtracted without dates.

Do electronic logbooks need an audit trail for EASA?

The AMC conditions electronic records on being available at the request of a competent authority and containing the required items, and national documents such as the Irish memorandum add endorsement conditions (www.iaa.ie). A visible history of changes is good practice, but no EASA text reviewed here prescribes a specific audit trail format.

Conclusion

The evidence supports a narrow conclusion. EASA's FCL.050 requires a reliable record in the authority's form and manner, and AMC1 FCL.050 gives a date-of-commencement column and UTC times, but the reviewed text does not state which time scale determines the commencement date. A careful pilot therefore separates the roster date, the event instants and the logbook date; converts each local time using airport, full date, offset evidence and data version; reconciles the flight before editing; and keeps the original with a dated reason.

The checked cases show that a bare local clock cannot be trusted twice a year, and that a seasonal table can be out of date: the 2026f release changed the expected Cuban offset for 1 November 2026, and the national announcement reported by Cuban state media was dated 24 October. Where evidence does not resolve an hour, the correct entry is an explicit "unknown offset or ambiguous hour" outcome. The worksheet in this report is a proposal for organising that evidence, not an EASA requirement, and pilots should confirm the receiving authority's expectations before relying on any date convention.

Source links

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

1. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/downloads/115485/en
2. https://www.nist.gov/pml/time-and-frequency-division/popular-links/daylight-saving-time-dst
3. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML?uri=CELEX:32000L0084
4. https://www.iana.org/time-zones/releases/2026f
5. http://www.cubadebate.cu/noticias/2026/10/24/cuba-extiende-el-horario-de-verano-hasta-noviembre-de-2027
6. https://bluedecklogbook.com/guides/local-time-vs-utc
7. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/easy-access-rules-aircrew
8. https://www.iaa.ie/docs/default-source/publications/advisory-memoranda/personnel-licensing-advisory-memoranda-%28plam%29/recording-of-flight-time-and-formatting-acceptable-to-the-irish-aviation-authority.pdf
9. https://ffac.ch/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/2025.10.16-FOCA-GM-INFO-Logging-of-Flight-Time.pdf
10. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/easy-access-rules/4e4220/ERULES-1963177438-11953
11. https://www.bipm.org/en/committees/cg/cgpm/26-2018/resolution-2
12. https://www.nist.gov/node/1861406
13. https://data.iana.org/time-zones/theory.html
14. https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3339
15. https://www.wingmanlog.in/post/local-time-to-utc-pilot-logbook
16. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/C/2026/1660/oj/eng
17. https://www.gov.uk/when-do-the-clocks-change
18. https://data.iana.org/time-zones/tz-link.html
19. https://www.riotimesonline.com/cuba-keeps-summer-time-save-power-2026
20. https://docs.python.org/3/library/datetime.html
21. https://peps.python.org/pep-0495

22. https://myflightbookblog.blogspot.com/2024/01/support-for-local-time-on-import.html
23. https://myflightbook.com/logbook/mvc/faq
24. https://myflightbookblog.blogspot.com/2019/10/local-time.html
25. https://docs.nc-software.com/x/bQDw
26. https://support.logten.com/en/articles/11595166-settings-preferences-menus-on-logten-for-mac
27. https://www.dauntless-soft.com/helpdesk/phraseview.asp?PID=462
28. https://support.foreflight.com/hc/en-us/articles/215647217-What-are-the-formatting-requirements-for-each-field-in-the-Logbook-template
29. https://pilots.landing.aero

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.