LANDING.AERO

LANDING.AERO / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Hong Kong ATPL Logbook Requirements: P1, P1 U/S, P2/P2X

> 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 · 2026-11-21 · hong kong atpl logbook requirements · dca 607 pilot logbook · p1 u/s flight time · p2x logbook · cad 54 atpl(a) · hong kong cad flying experience declaration · electronic pilot logbook · pilot logbook crosswalk

Original article: https://www.landing.aero/articles/en/hong-kong-atpl-logbook-evidence-dca-607



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. The Hong Kong Documents: Version, Route and Evidence Cut-off
4. The Capacity Categories: P1, P1 U/S, P2/P2X and P U/T
5. Building the Crosswalk: From Original Row to Declaration Field
6. Part C: Supporting Pages and Certification
7. Electronic Logbooks, Print Layouts and Their Limits
8. Data Analysis and Evidence
9. Implications and Future Directions
10. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
11. Conclusion

Executive Summary

A pilot preparing a Hong Kong ATPL(A) flying-experience declaration cannot copy a familiar PIC and co-pilot summary into the form. The Civil Aviation Department (CAD) declaration, form **DCA 607** for aeroplanes, is marked September 2019 (www.cad.gov.hk), and its companion Important Notes are marked June 2021 (www.cad.gov.hk). The form splits experience into civil multi-crew, civil single-crew and military blocks (www.cad.gov.hk), and the multi-crew block has separate **P1**, **P1 U/S**, **P2 / P2X**, **P U/T**, night, instrument and simulator columns (www.cad.gov.hk).

The practical answer is a two-layer record. Keep every original label (FAA second in command, EASA PICUS, co-pilot, and so on) untouched, and add a separate, evidence-backed Hong Kong mapping beside it. CAD's Notes define P1 U/S narrowly: a co-pilot on an aircraft whose type certificate requires at least two pilots, who carried out the pilot-in-command duties, with certification on request (www.cad.gov.hk). CAD 54, the licensing requirements document, treats P2 and P2X time on a multi-crew aircraft as counted at full rate for the ATPL(A) (www.cad.gov.hk), and the Notes' half-rate P2 sentence applies to helicopter licences only (www.cad.gov.hk).

Part C of the form asks for certified copies of logbook pages showing the applicant's name and, for the ATPL(A), a cumulative total of at least 1,500 hours on the last page (www.cad.gov.hk), either a 500-hour P1 U/S total or entries covering 250 hours as P1 and/or P1 U/S (www.cad.gov.hk), and entries covering 500 hours on multi-crew transport aircraft (www.cad.gov.hk). Night and instrument columns are overlapping conditions inside flights already counted, so they must never be added to role time. Simulator time has its own column and its own credit limit, which CAD 54 sets at up to 100 hours of the 1,500 (www.cad.gov.hk).

Two source conflicts matter. First, the Notes and the form still describe email, post or in-person delivery (www.cad.gov.hk), while CAD's current FAQ directs professional licence applications to its Personnel Licensing Information System, PLIS (www.cad.gov.hk), and its home-page notice dates mandatory electronic submission from 2 July 2024 (www.cad.gov.hk). Second, the CAD 54 pages that carry these rules show June 2019 revision dates (www.cad.gov.hk), so they should be described as older text still linked, not as a 2026 change. No evidence was obtained that CAD accepts any commercial logbook layout. A CAD-style PDF is a preparation aid; acceptance for assessment is CAD's decision.

Introduction and Background

Professional aeroplane pilots with long careers usually hold their history in a logbook built around another authority's vocabulary. A United States record is organised around pilot in command and second in command under 14 CFR 61.51, a European record around the pilot-function entries described in EASA's AMC1 FCL.050, a Canadian one around the flight crew position under CAR 401.08. The Hong Kong declaration asks a different question: which of those hours were flown in which operating capacity, on which kind of aircraft, with which special conditions. This report examines how to answer that question from the pilot's own record, using CAD's published documents, without importing another jurisdiction's definitions and without overstating what CAD has said.

The scope is deliberately narrow. It covers the personal record behind the Hong Kong ATPL(A) declaration for aeroplanes. It does not cover recruitment, career planning, operator software, helicopter credit rules or a general guide to who is eligible to convert a foreign licence. CAD 54 states that conversion terms for a foreign professional licence are assessed individually and notified in writing (www.cad.gov.hk), so nothing here predicts an outcome. The report is record-keeping analysis, not an instruction from the authority and not a substitute for CAD's or an examiner's decision.

Why the question exists

A historical question shows the friction. On 4 March 2015 a self-described American pilot posted on the PPRuNe forum that "we log time slightly differently" and asked whether flying as a type-rated non-captain meant flying as PIC under supervision (www.pprune.org). The thread concerned the commercial-pilot version of the declaration, and it is a single dated anecdote. It is not evidence of current demand or of how widespread the confusion is, and the unsourced shortcut offered in a reply is not used here.

What was opened, and when

The evidence base is CAD's own documents, opened in November 2026: the public forms index, which lists the aeroplane declaration and the Important Notes (www.cad.gov.hk), the Flight Standards page that still links CAD 54 (www.cad.gov.hk), the FAQ, and the home-page notice. Regulators' texts from the United States, Europe and Canada are used only to explain the original labels a pilot may be carrying. No PLIS account was used, no upload was tested, and no commercial logbook was submitted to CAD.

The Hong Kong Documents: Version, Route and Evidence Cut-off

Step 1: select the licence, the current form and the cut-off

The declaration is one form for several licences. Its title block reads "ATPL / CPL / IR (A)", and the Part E compliance table has separate CPL/IR(A) and ATPL(A) columns (www.cad.gov.hk). Because the numeric checks differ by licence, a pilot should read only the column for the licence being sought. A value that appears elsewhere on the page, such as the 250-hour total for the CPL/IR(A), is not an ATPL(A) minimum. The ATPL(A) column shows at least 1,400 hours of flight time and at least 1,500 hours of flight and simulator time (www.cad.gov.hk).

CAD 54, paragraph 2.2.1, gives the same headline: 1,500 hours of flight time as a pilot of aeroplanes, including at least 500 hours in multi-crew operations on civil registered transport aircraft, one of three pilot-in-command routes, 200 hours of cross-country, 100 hours of night as PIC or co-pilot, and 75 hours of instrument time (www.cad.gov.hk). Paragraph 2.2.2 allows up to 100 hours of the 1,500 to be simulator or procedures-trainer time under instruction (www.cad.gov.hk). The form's two-line arrangement (flight time, then flight plus simulator) is therefore consistent with the document, but the pilot should treat the form as the declaration and CAD 54 as the explanation behind it.

A prudent evidence cut-off is the date the declaration is signed, with the form revision, Notes revision and CAD 54 revision recorded beside it. As of November 2026 the form carries "Sep 2019" in its footer (www.cad.gov.hk), the Notes "June 2021" (www.cad.gov.hk), and the relevant CAD 54 pages "June 2019" (www.cad.gov.hk). CAD 54's record of amendments lists two amendments, August 2020 and December 2020 (www.cad.gov.hk), but the pages relevant here retain the older date. This is disclosed rather than relabelled: nothing in the opened documents shows a 2026 rule change in the logging definitions.

Step 2: the current-versus-older delivery conflict

The form's own back page and the Notes say a completed application should be sent by email, by post or in person to the Personnel Licensing Office (www.cad.gov.hk). CAD's current FAQ says applications for professional pilot's licences and medical certificates shall be submitted on PLIS (www.cad.gov.hk), and the home-page notice states that from 2 July 2024 applicants for a professional pilot's licence shall submit electronically and that printed application forms will no longer be accepted (www.cad.gov.hk). The reasonable reading is that the logging definitions in the Notes remain the explicit text available, while the delivery paragraph appears to be overtaken by the PLIS requirement for submission. This report therefore uses the FAQ for the submission channel and the Notes for definitions, pending confirmation from CAD. It gives no upload, file-size, signature or page-count instruction, because none was verified.

The Capacity Categories: P1, P1 U/S, P2/P2X and P U/T

What CAD's Notes define

The Notes list the notation used to describe operating capacity: P1 is the commander or pilot-in-command (www.cad.gov.hk); P1 U/S is a co-pilot acting as pilot-in-command under the supervision of the pilot-in-command (www.cad.gov.hk); P2 is a co-pilot performing the duties of a required member of the operating crew under the direction of the pilot-in-command (www.cad.gov.hk); P2X is a co-pilot with a P2X rating performing duties in the operating seat under the direction of another properly qualified pilot (www.cad.gov.hk); and P U/T is a student or qualified pilot undergoing training (www.cad.gov.hk). Simulator time is time as a pilot under instruction in an approved full flight simulator or flight and navigation procedures trainer (www.cad.gov.hk).

Table 1 below sets these Hong Kong categories beside the labels that the same pilot may find in a historical record. It describes what each source says, and it is a reading aid rather than a conversion table.

Label and source	What the source says	Consequence for the Hong Kong worksheet
P1 (CAD Notes)	Commander or pilot-in-command. CAD 54 lets the nominated commander log the whole flight time as P1 or PIC (www.cad.gov.hk).	Needs evidence that the pilot was the nominated commander for the flight.
P1 U/S (CAD Notes and CAD 54)	Co-pilot performing pilot-in-command duties under supervision, on six stated conditions in CAD 54 Note 7 and a seven-item list in the Notes (www.cad.gov.hk).	Entry-by-entry evidence; certification on request (www.cad.gov.hk).
P2 / P2X (CAD Notes and CAD 54)	Co-pilot in a required crew seat; P2X is a rated cruise-pilot capacity. Counted at full rate for the ATPL(A) (www.cad.gov.hk).	On-seat duty and multi-crew aircraft evidence; rest periods excluded (www.cad.gov.hk).
PIC / SIC (United States, 14 CFR 61.51)	PIC may be logged when sole manipulator of controls of an aircraft for which the pilot is rated, or as PIC where the type certification requires more than one pilot (www.law.cornell.edu); SIC has its own conditions (www.law.cornell.edu).	Retain as the original label. Do not assume it equals P1 or P1 U/S.
PICUS (EASA, AMC1 FCL.050)	A co-pilot on an aircraft needing more than one pilot may log PICUS time as PIC when countersigned by the PIC (www.easa.europa.eu).	Logged as PIC in the logbook (www.iaa.ie); a Hong Kong P1 U/S claim needs the CAD conditions separately.
Co-pilot, cruise-relief co-pilot (EASA)	Function and remarks entries such as CRCP for a cruise-relief co-pilot (www.easa.europa.eu).	Candidate P2 or P2X only with seat and rating evidence.
Flight crew position (Canada, CAR 401.08)	The log records the position in which the holder acted (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca).	Position is the starting evidence, not the Hong Kong capacity.

The comparison shows why a summary column cannot be translated mechanically. The United States rule can credit PIC time to a pilot who is sole manipulator of the controls of an aircraft for which the pilot is rated, and to the PIC of an aircraft needing more than one pilot. The CAD sources opened define P1 as the commander and P1 U/S by supervised pilot-in-command duties. A rated first officer whose United States logbook shows PIC time as sole manipulator therefore has an original label that does not by itself establish Hong Kong P1 U/S. It is a lead, to be tested against the conditions below.

Reading foreign labels without translating them

Other authorities' definitions are useful only for understanding what an old entry meant. The United States requires pilots to document and record flight time in a manner acceptable to the Administrator (www.law.cornell.edu), so a United States record may be a summary-style book with no per-flight supervision evidence. In the EASA record guidance the remarks column carries the PIC's name and signature when the pilot records SPIC or PICUS time (www.easa.europa.eu), and a pilot licence holder in a pilot seat as co-pilot may log co-pilot time (www.easa.europa.eu). An Irish Aviation Authority memorandum implementing that guidance adds that a co-pilot may log as PIC the time flown as PICUS when all the duties are performed (www.iaa.ie). The ICAO Annex 1 definition of pilot-in-command under supervision, as reproduced in a Brazilian regulator's glossary, speaks of a co-pilot performing the duties and functions of a pilot-in-command under the supervision of the pilot-in-command (anacpedia.anac.gov.br). Canada's CAR 401.11(1) also addresses the

flight time acquired by a co-pilot while acting as pilot-in-command (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca). Each of these is a different rule with a different purpose. They show that "PIC under supervision" is a family of related ideas, which is why the original page, the original label and any countersignature are kept, and why none of them is relabelled P1 U/S on the strength of similar wording.

P1 U/S: two lists of conditions

The Notes allow P1 U/S time towards licence requirements only if the flight used an aircraft whose type certificate requires at least two pilots, the pilot checked the flight plan, loadsheet and fuel calculations (www.cad.gov.hk), carried out all pilot-in-command duties and conducted the take-off and landing (www.cad.gov.hk), the commander did not have to overrule proposed or taken actions (www.cad.gov.hk), and certification is obtained on CAD's request confirming all conditions. CAD 54's Appendix C, Note 7, covers the same ground but not identically. It words the aircraft condition as one certificated or required by the State of Registry's authority for a minimum crew of at least two pilots, and it softens the take-off and landing condition: under normal circumstances the pilot conducted both, and where an operational restriction applies at least the take-off or the landing (www.cad.gov.hk).

Two practical points follow. First, because the two texts differ, a worksheet should record which text a given flight was tested against, and where either would fail, the entry should not be counted as P1 U/S. Second, CAD 54 says the pilot flying who is seated at the flying controls and discharges the necessary duties may log PIC U/S, subject to Note 7, and that time outside the control seat for rest cannot be recorded as flight time for licensing purposes (www.cad.gov.hk). A seat and sector record is therefore needed, not just a trip total. Nothing in these sources supports reconstructing historic P1 U/S. If a flight cannot be shown to meet the conditions, it stays in its original category.

P2, P2X and the helicopter half-rate trap

CAD 54 says the pilot monitoring may log P2 when seated at the flying controls and discharging duties, and the in-flight relief pilot may log on-seat time as P2 (www.cad.gov.hk). The P2X rating holder who is seated at the controls as an in-flight relief co-pilot may log the on-seat time as P2X (www.cad.gov.hk). P2X is a Hong Kong rating category: it applies to pilots of certain Hong Kong air operators with specific approval, and to approved integrated-course students (www.cad.gov.hk), and the holder is restricted to operations above 20,000 ft (www.cad.gov.hk). Paragraph 2.2.4 then says that time logged as a co-pilot at a pilot station of an aircraft certificated for multi-crew operations, under the capacity of P2 and/or P2X, is counted at full rate for the ATPL(A) (www.cad.gov.hk).

The Notes contain a trap for the unwary reader: a sentence saying P2 time is counted at half rate. It is explicitly limited to grants of ATPL(H), CPL(H) and IR(H), the helicopter licences (www.cad.gov.hk). It must not be transferred to the aeroplane declaration, and this report excludes helicopter credit rules. The CAD 54 note also lists a category in which a pilot on the flight deck with no assigned duties is logged as supernumerary and not counted towards licence experience (www.cad.gov.hk), which is why rest and observer time cannot be quietly folded into P2.

Building the Crosswalk: From Original Row to Declaration Field

Step 3: inventory originals and map capacities

The core method is to leave the original logbook untouched and build a second layer. Each logbook row (or each summarised block, if the original is a page-total book) receives a worksheet line carrying the original book, page and flight, the original authority and label, the Hong Kong capacity proposed, the CAD source paragraph, the evidence that supports it, the duration included, and any unresolved item. Two properties are essential: the original label is retained verbatim, and the Hong Kong mapping is a separate column that may be blank.

Table 2 below is a field-level crosswalk, covering the columns and rows the declaration actually asks for. It uses wording from the form and the Notes and recommends worksheet fields that are practice suggestions, not columns CAD requires.

DCA 607 element	What the form or CAD 54 asks	Evidence to hold beside the original row	Open question to resolve
Civil multi-crew block	Experience on civil registered aircraft certificated for multi-crew operations according to the type certificate (www.cad.gov.hk).	Aircraft type, registration, type-certificate crew requirement.	Does the type certificate, or the airline's two-pilot choice, meet the wording CAD uses?
Civil single-crew block	Aircraft certificated for single-crew operations, split by maximum take-off mass bands of ≤ 5,700 kg and above (www.cad.gov.hk).	Aircraft type and maximum take-off mass.	Which mass band applies to the registration flown?
Military block	Separate experience block, with P2 and no P2X column (www.cad.gov.hk).	Service logbook, aircraft type, crew role.	Whether the aircraft was a military type normally flown by more than one pilot (www.cad.gov.hk).
P1 / P1 U/S / P2 / P2X / P U/T columns	Capacity columns in the block (www.cad.gov.hk).	Original label, seat, duties, commander name.	Whether a P1 U/S claim meets Notes 2(a) to 2(g).
Night and instrument columns	Special conditions within the same flights (www.cad.gov.hk).	Entry-level night and instrument times.	Whether instrument time means control solely by reference to instruments.
Simulator column	Separate simulator time.	Device, approval, date, capacity.	Credit within the 100-hour limit.
Summary of Experience	Totals by operation type, with grand total (www.cad.gov.hk).	Reconciliation of block totals to underlying rows.	Does every subtotal tie to rows?

The table's interpretive point is that role is one dimension and condition is another. Night and instrument are columns on the same flights, not additional hours. The Notes define instrument time as time during which the holder manipulated the flying controls solely by reference to instruments, in actual or properly simulated conditions, so an IFR flight-plan label alone does not give the number. CAD 54 also requires the log to carry particulars of special conditions including night and instrument flying (www.cad.gov.hk).

Step 4: civil multi-crew, single-crew, military and simulator rows

The form separates experience by aircraft and operation, and the pilot must place each row in exactly one block. The multi-crew block carries P1, P1 U/S, P2 / P2X and P U/T columns, the single-crew block carries P1, P1 U/S and P U/T with the mass bands, and the military block has its own P2 column. CAD 54's Appendix C credits co-pilot time only if the aircraft was required by its certificate of airworthiness or by Article 18(3)(b) of the Air Navigation (Hong Kong) Order to carry two pilots (www.cad.gov.hk), or was an AOC holder's chosen two-pilot operation with the duties in the operations manual, or was a military aircraft normally flown by more than one pilot. The pilot must also hold an appropriate licence to perform co-pilot duties (www.cad.gov.hk).

Simulator rows deserve their own handling. The Notes define the device types, CAD 54 requires a test or examination in a simulator to be recorded with the date, the type of simulator, the capacity and the nature of the test (www.cad.gov.hk), and the credit limit is a separate check. A pilot with older device records should retain the approval evidence with the row, since historical device approvals and credit were not verified here.

Step 5: reconcile totals and the declaration

A worked arithmetic check shows the logic. The numbers are synthetic.

(Hypothetical Example) Suppose supported, mutually exclusive role entries total P1 100 hours, P1 U/S 200 hours and P2 900 hours, giving 1,200 aircraft hours. Within those same flights the pilot has 150 hours of night and 80 hours of instrument time. The aircraft total stays 1,200. The 230 hours of night plus instrument are overlapping conditions, not extra hours. A separate simulator subtotal is reported in its own column and its permitted credit is tested separately. This example establishes no ATPL eligibility and no CAD position.

The reconciliation steps follow from that logic:

- **Tie the rows to the blocks:** each block total must equal the sum of its own rows, with the original rows retained.
- **Tie the blocks to the summary:** the Summary of Experience repeats totals by type of operation.
- **Test conditions against the roles:** night and instrument within role time are checked against the ATPL(A) lines in Part E, including night, instrument and cross-country (www.cad.gov.hk).
- **Test the P1 / P1 U/S route:** the Part E choice is either the 500-hour P1 U/S route or the 250-hour P1 and/or P1 U/S route with at least 70 hours as P1 (www.cad.gov.hk).
- **Keep simulator separate:** the instrument-and-simulator line is a different check from the instrument-flight line (www.cad.gov.hk).

Part C: Supporting Pages and Certification

Step 6: build the supporting-page index

Part C says an applicant meeting the ATPL(A) flying-experience requirements must submit a certified true copy of logbook pages showing the applicant's name and, as listed, a cumulative total of no less than 1,500 hours on the last page, the P1 U/S sum or the 250-hour entries, and the 500-hour multi-crew entries (www.cad.gov.hk). The form adds that further evidence may be required at CAD's discretion (www.cad.gov.hk). No minimum page count is stated in the opened documents, so none should be invented.

Table 3 below is a page index a pilot can maintain. The first column quotes the request, the others are recommended fields.

Part C request	Pages that substantiate it	Subtotal each page supports	Certification reference
Sum of 1,500 hours on the last page	Last page of each logbook volume used, with the running total.	Cumulative flight time.	Who certified the copy and the date.
P1 U/S sum of 500 hours on the last page, or 250 hours as P1 and/or P1 U/S	Pages with P1 and P1 U/S entries plus any commander countersignature.	P1 and P1 U/S by page.	Commander or supervising pilot certification, where obtainable.
500 hours on civil transport aircraft certificated for multi-crew operations	Pages showing type and registration of multi-crew flights (www.cad.gov.hk).	Multi-crew subtotal.	Type-certificate evidence, held with the page.

Part D has the applicant declare hours of experience as recorded in the personal flying log book (www.cad.gov.hk), and Part B (e) says the applicant may be required to produce the personal log book at any time (www.cad.gov.hk). CAD 54 adds that the log is to be kept up to date and produced when required (www.cad.gov.hk). Article 22 of the Air Navigation (Hong Kong) Order, as reproduced by a secondary legal-text site that was used because the official legislation portal did not render, requires a personal flying log book and an entry of the capacity in which the holder acted (lawplayer.com). The order's wording should be checked on the official portal before reliance.

Who certifies, and what is not established

The Notes tie certification to the P1 U/S conditions "upon requested by the Civil Aviation Department". The opened documents do not name a certification signatory for foreign records, do not describe how a retired operator's crew records are certified, and do not state PLIS file or signature requirements. Those are listed below as questions for CAD.

Electronic Logbooks, Print Layouts and Their Limits

Many pilots hold records in an electronic logbook. Regulators vary in how they treat electronic records: the UK CAA states that electronic logbooks are acceptable for all types of application provided they have been printed, signed and dated (www.caa.co.uk), and New Zealand's rule lets the Director approve logbook software (www.aviation.govt.nz). The Hong Kong documents opened say nothing equivalent, so no Hong Kong acceptance rule is claimed here.

Table 4 summarises what several products' own pages document about print layouts and exports. The statements are the vendors' own, for each vendor's own product, and none is evidence that CAD accepts a layout.

Tool	Documented print and export features	Hong Kong specificity
Excel Pilot Logbook	Headings set up as per the CAD pilot logbook format (excelpilotlogbook.com); totals summarised per aircraft type (excelpilotlogbook.com).	Hong Kong CAD headings; the page says night hours are not calculated automatically (excelpilotlogbook.com).
MyFlightbook	Print view, PDF download and CSV download (myflightbook.com); an EASA FCL.050-style layout (myflightbook.com); custom columns in some layouts (myflightbook.com).	No Hong Kong layout named on the page read.
ForeFlight Logbook	An FCL.050 report template (www.foreflight.com); full logbook download (www.foreflight.com).	No Hong Kong layout named on the pages read.
LogTen	Reports said to look like official US, European and Canadian formats (logten.com).	No Hong Kong layout named on the page read.
Safelog	A Transport Canada style and export to PDF, Word, Excel, CSV and XML (www.dauntless-soft.com).	No Hong Kong layout named on the page read.
Pilot Logbook (landing.aero; publisher's own product, listed for completeness)	Described by its own product page as an invitation-only electronic logbook that lists a Hong Kong CAD layout among paper-logbook print layouts, with PDF or Word printouts, totals by type and custom headings.	No dedicated DCA 607 generator, no PLIS integration, no automatic Hong Kong role conversion and no CAD approval was found in the sources opened.

The table shows that print-format coverage is common and Hong Kong-specific coverage is not. Even a layout that mirrors the CAD column order solves only presentation. The pilot still has to decide, flight by flight, which Hong Kong capacity the evidence supports, and a template does not make that decision. One vendor page states plainly that its sheet "does not automatically calculate night hours", a reminder to check every total independently.

Data Analysis and Evidence

The quantitative material in this topic is a set of thresholds, each tied to a document and a revision date. The figures are listed here with their source paragraph, and each applies only to the ATPL(A) route.

- **Total flight time:** 1,500 hours in CAD 54; the form shows 1,400 flight hours plus simulator to reach 1,500.
- **Multi-crew transport time:** 500 hours, matched by the Part C entries request.
- **Pilot-in-command routes:** 500 hours P1 U/S, or 250 hours P1, or 250 hours with at least 70 hours as P1 and the rest P1 U/S (www.cad.gov.hk).
- **Cross-country:** 200 hours, of which at least 100 as PIC or PIC under supervision; the form lists 100 as P1 and P1 U/S and 200 overall (www.cad.gov.hk).
- **Night:** 100 hours as PIC or co-pilot; the form lists at least 100 hours of night flight time.
- **Instrument:** 75 hours with no more than 30 hours of simulator or trainer time; the form shows 45 flight hours and 75 flight and simulator hours.
- **Simulator credit:** up to 100 hours of the 1,500, of which not more than 25 in a procedures trainer.

Two observations follow. The form and CAD 54 are consistent on the headline thresholds, with the form splitting flight-only and flight-plus-simulator rows, so the Part E checks can be read as a restatement of paragraph 2.2.1. And the totals never add: night, instrument and cross-country sit inside the role hours. A spreadsheet that sums columns across will overstate experience, which is the central arithmetic risk in this topic.

There is also a wording difference. The form refers to aircraft certificated for multi-crew operations "according to the Type Certificate", while CAD 54 refers to certification for multi-crew operations "according to the manufacturer's aircraft flight manual". The pilot should hold both type-certificate and flight-manual evidence for the aircraft types involved.

Implications and Future Directions

Implementation considerations for the personal record

Step 7 of the method is to flag outstanding authority questions rather than guess. The questions that remain open after reading CAD's documents are these:

- **Delivery and format:** what PLIS accepts as a supporting file, what signature or certification it expects, and whether the older Notes delivery paragraph has been formally superseded.
- **Revision status:** whether the September 2019 form, June 2021 Notes and June 2019 CAD 54 pages are the versions CAD will apply at the date of a given application.
- **P1 U/S evidence for foreign records:** which certification CAD wants from a pilot whose commander is no longer reachable, and whether an operator letter suffices.
- **Historical simulator approvals:** how CAD treats devices approved by another authority.
- **Foreign original logbooks:** whether original or certified copies, and what language, are expected.

Step 8 is retention: keep the signed declaration, the certified source pages and an export snapshot of the electronic logbook as it stood at signing, along with the crosswalk worksheet. The Part B text states the applicant may be required to produce the personal log book and licences, and the snapshot lets the pilot show what was declared and why.

Where a logbook product helps, and where it does not

A logbook product can support preparation in three ways: keeping the original rows with their original labels, printing a Hong Kong-style layout for reading, and producing totals by aircraft type for reconciliation. **Pilot Logbook**, an electronic logbook that describes itself as invitation-only, lists Hong Kong among its print layouts and offers PDF and Word printouts, per its own product page (a self-description, not independent evidence); readers can request an invite on the publisher's own product page. It is one preparation aid beside the original signed pages and the manual crosswalk in this report. No DCA 607 generator, PLIS integration, automatic conversion of FAA or European labels into Hong Kong capacities, or CAD approval was found in the sources opened. A reader who needs those features will not find them there, and a reader who prefers a spreadsheet or another product has the options in Table 4.

What could change

CAD may issue a new form revision or CAD 54 amendment. The Flight Standards page continues to link CAD 54, and the public forms page continues to link the aeroplane declaration and Notes, but a link is not proof of an amendment. A new revision would change the worksheet's source and version table, which is why that table is a recommended asset: it records the source, version, date and current role of CAD 54, DCA 607, the Notes, the FAQ and the print template used.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

What are the Hong Kong ATPL logbook requirements?

CAD's declaration asks for supporting logbook pages certified as true copies and showing the applicant's name, with entries and totals that substantiate the declared experience. The experience thresholds sit in CAD 54 paragraph 2.2.1. There is no separate CAD logbook format mandated in the opened documents.

Is DCA 607 a logbook?

DCA 607 is a declaration form, not a logbook. It is completed from the personal flying log book, and the log book must record the capacity in which the holder acted in flight.

What do the Hong Kong CAD ATPL flight time requirements look like?

For the ATPL(A) route, 1,500 hours of flight time as a pilot of aeroplanes with at least 500 hours in multi-crew operations, plus the pilot-in-command, cross-country, night and instrument elements listed in the CAD 54 paragraph. Simulator credit is limited.

What is P1 U/S flight time for a Hong Kong ATPL?

Co-pilot time acting as pilot-in-command under supervision, claimable only when the Notes' conditions are met and certification can be produced on request.

What is P2X, and is it a pilot in command under supervision entry?

No. P2X is a co-pilot capacity with a P2X rating, performing duties in the operating seat, and CAD 54 counts it at full rate for the ATPL(A) in multi-crew aircraft.

How do P1, P2 and P1 U/S entries differ?

P1 is the commander, P2 is a required co-pilot, and P1 U/S is a supervised co-pilot performing commander duties.

How does CAD treat cross-country time for the ATPL(A)?

The opened documents describe no shortcut. CAD defines cross-country time in the Notes (www.cad.gov.hk) and Part E checks it explicitly.

Can an electronic pilot logbook be used for a CAD application?

The opened CAD documents say neither yes nor no. Other regulators have their own stated treatment. Confirm with CAD, and keep original signed pages.

Conclusion

The record question behind a Hong Kong ATPL(A) declaration is a mapping question with an evidence standard. CAD's own documents define P1, P1 U/S, P2, P2X and P U/T separately, require P1 U/S to meet stated conditions with certification on request, count P2 and P2X on multi-crew aircraft at full rate for the ATPL(A), and ask for certified logbook pages that substantiate declared totals. A familiar PIC and co-pilot summary from another jurisdiction is a starting point, not an answer.

Download the current form and Notes from CAD's public forms page on the day of signing, because the form (September 2019), the Notes (June 2021) and CAD 54 (June 2019) carry different revision dates. The defensible method is a two-layer worksheet: original label and page on one side, the Hong Kong capacity and its source paragraph on the other, with condition columns treated as overlapping and simulator time kept separate. Where the Notes, the form and CAD 54 differ, or where the older delivery wording differs from the current PLIS direction, the pilot should confirm with CAD rather than infer. No part of this report is an approval, and a CAD-style PDF layout is not the same as a declaration accepted for assessment.

Source links

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

1. https://www.cad.gov.hk/application/DCA607_ATPL-CPL-IR%28A%29.pdf
2. https://www.cad.gov.hk/application/DCA607_ImportantNotes.pdf
3. https://www.cad.gov.hk/english/pdf/CAD54.pdf
4. https://www.cad.gov.hk/english/faq.html
5. https://www.cad.gov.hk/english/index.html
6. https://www.pprune.org/south-asia-far-east-wannabes/557577-hong-kong-civil-aviation-department-cathay-pacific.html
7. https://www.cad.gov.hk/english/public_forms.html
8. https://www.cad.gov.hk/english/flightstandards.html
9. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/14/61.51
10. https://www.easa.europa.eu/sk/downloads/136948/en
11. 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
12. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/downloads/141594/en
13. https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-96-433/page-32.html
14. https://anacpedia.anac.gov.br/anacpedia/ing-fra/tr606.htm
15. https://lawplayer.com/hk/article/hk-cap-448C/00329
16. https://www.caa.co.uk/general-aviation/pilot-licences/introduction-to-licensing/documentation-guidance-for-pilot-licences/guidance-on-documentation

17. https://www.aviation.govt.nz/licensing-and-certification/pilots/pilot-logbook
18. https://excelpilotlogbook.com/cad-hong-kong-pilot-logbook
19. https://myflightbook.com/logbook/Public/FAQ.aspx
20. https://www.foreflight.com/blog/from-paper-to-portable-with-foreflight-logbook
21. https://logten.com/blog/land-your-dream-job-on-the-flight-deck-with-logten-pilot-logbook-reports
22. https://www.dauntless-soft.com/PRODUCTS/Safelog/printing
23. 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.