



LANDING.AERO / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Pilot Logbook Requirements by Authority: Fields, Retention

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 · 2026-10-27 · pilot logbook requirements · faa logbook requirements · transport canada logbook requirements · easa logbook requirements · casa pilot logbook requirements · electronic pilot logbook · fcl.050 · 14 cfr 61.51 · car 401.08 · pilot logbook retention

Original article: <https://www.landing.aero/articles/en/pilot-logbook-requirements-by-authority>



In this article

1. Executive Summary
 2. Introduction and Background
 3. Step One: Identify the Authority and the Purpose
 4. Required Flight and Lesson Fields by Authority
 5. Certification: Personal, Instructor, Examiner and Captain Signatures
 6. Retention, Inspection and Submission Triggers
 7. Inspecting a Sample Export Before Relying on an App
 8. Data Analysis and Evidence
 9. Unresolved National Conditions and Source and Version Register
 10. Implications and Future Directions
 11. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
 12. Conclusion
-

Executive Summary

Pilot logbook requirements are set separately by each licensing authority, and a single personal logbook can satisfy one authority while leaving gaps for another. This report compares five administrations as of 27 October 2026: the **United States (FAA)**, **Canada (Transport Canada)**, **EASA** with **Ireland (Irish Aviation Authority, IAA)** as a national example, the **United Kingdom (UK CAA)** and **Australia (CASA)**. It does not cover every authority a logbook product may print for. The United Kingdom row is incomplete: the UK CAA's AMC1 FCL.050 field list was not retrieved, so no UK field list is asserted.

The binding rules differ in how much they say. In the United States, 14 CFR 61.51 requires experience to be recorded "in a manner acceptable to the Administrator" (www.ecfr.gov) and lists the per-flight entries, including departure and arrival location and aircraft type and identification (www.ecfr.gov). Canada's CAR 401.08 lists personal-log entries, including the flight crew position (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca) and, for aeroplanes, all intermediate take-offs and landings (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca). EASA's FCL.050 is a single sentence requiring a reliable record (www.easa.europa.eu); the field list sits in AMC1 FCL.050, which is guidance rather than law, and includes the pilot's name and address (www.easa.europa.eu). Australia is the only one of the five whose cited provisions state a personal-logbook retention period: 7 years after the last entry (www.legislation.gov.au).

Electronic logbooks are accepted in some form by every authority examined, but on different terms. The UK CAA asks for an electronic signature showing who the logbook belongs to (www.caa.co.uk). Transport Canada guidance dated October 2022 accepts digital logbooks that include the CAR 401.08 information and are signed by the pilot (tc.canada.ca), and a Transport Canada application page modified in April 2026 invites applicants to email an e-logbook (tc.canada.ca). CASA requires a printed copy with each page certified as a true copy when an electronic logbook is produced (www.casa.gov.au). EASA's AMC requires electronic records to be certified by the pilot and in a format the competent authority accepts (www.easa.europa.eu).

Retention and inspection triggers are where logbooks most often fall short of expectations. The FAA text requires presenting the logbook on reasonable request (www.ecfr.gov) but sets no personal-logbook retention period in that section; the only Part 61 period found is 3 years for flight instructor records (www.ecfr.gov).

Neither the EASA nor the UK sources opened state a retention period for a pilot's own log. Ireland's IAA says it will not accept logbooks that do not comply with FCL.050, AMC1 FCL.050 and its advisory memorandum (www.iaa.ie), which shows that administrative acceptance sits above the EASA text.

The practical conclusion is a pre-submission test: identify the receiving authority, export a sample, check every field against that authority's source, and confirm the signature route and the retained original. No source opened for this report approves a particular app or layout, and nothing here predicts how any authority will treat a given export.

Introduction and Background

A professional pilot's logbook is read by different people for different purposes. An airline records crew flight time in its own systems. An aircraft owner keeps a journey log. A licensing authority, however, looks at the pilot's personal record to decide whether experience requirements for a licence, rating or revalidation have been met. The question this report answers is narrow and practical: can an existing personal logbook produce the fields, the certification and the retained evidence that the receiving licensing authority requires?

Scope and what this report does not cover

The comparison covers **five administrations**: the FAA (United States), Transport Canada, EASA with an Irish example, the UK CAA and CASA (Australia). Some logbook products print layouts for more authorities than these, but no coverage of the others is implied here. The report does not calculate role credit (for example, how second-in-command or supervised time counts) or simulator credit; those calculations are treated as separate subjects and are only referenced where they change what must be recorded.

Four layers that are easy to confuse

Each source in this report is labelled by what kind of statement it makes:

- **Law**: a regulation that binds the pilot, such as 14 CFR 61.51 or Canadian Aviation Regulations (CARs) section 401.08.
- **Acceptable means of compliance (AMC) and guidance**: EASA and UK material that explains how to comply. AMC is not law, but it determines what is practically expected.
- **Administrative acceptance**: what a particular authority's office accepts in a submission, such as the IAA's notary requirement for copied pages (www.iaa.ie).
- **Suggested audit practice**: prudent habits that no cited source requires. These are labelled as suggestions and are never presented as legal duties.

Personal log, journey log and operator records

A personal pilot logbook is a different record from an aircraft journey log or an operator's crew records. In Canada, the owner of an aircraft keeps technical records, the first of which is the journey log (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca), and the owner retains journey log entries (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca). In Part 121 operations in the United States, the certificate holder maintains current records of each crewmember (www.law.cornell.edu). In the European air operations rules (read in the United Kingdom's assimilated text, because the EU-published copy could not be retrieved), the operator maintains individual crew records for 24 months

(www.legislation.gov.uk). None of these replaces the personal logbook that 14 CFR 61.51 puts on each person (www.ecfr.gov). A pilot cannot assume that an operator's records will stand in for a personal log in a licence application, and this report does not infer any retention period for a personal log from an operator's period.

Why the version of each source matters

Several sources are recent or scheduled to change: the eCFR text of §61.51 links to an amendment published on 1 October 2024 (www.ecfr.gov), and an endorsement paragraph changes on 1 March 2027 (www.federalregister.gov). The register near the end records each version and its limits.

Step One: Identify the Authority and the Purpose

The first decision is not about the logbook but about the recipient. The same flight entries may be submitted for a first licence, a rating, a conversion, a revalidation, a recency check or an inspection, and the recipient's source text differs for each.

Matching purpose to the governing text

- **United States:** §61.51(a) ties the recording duty to experience used to meet requirements for a certificate, rating or flight review, and to recent flight experience, and requires it to be recorded in a manner acceptable to the Administrator (www.ecfr.gov).
- **Canada:** CAR 401.08 requires applicants for and holders of flight crew permits, licences and ratings to maintain a personal log (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca), and requires it to follow the personnel licensing standards for documentation (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca).
- **EASA states:** FCL.050 requires the pilot to keep a reliable record of all flights (www.easa.europa.eu), in a form set by the competent authority, which is the national authority receiving the application.
- **United Kingdom:** UK FCL.050, in the assimilated Annex I, repeats the one-sentence rule (www.legislation.gov.uk), and the CAA's documentation page governs how logbooks accompany applications (www.caa.co.uk).
- **Australia:** CASA describes the logbook as an official record of aeronautical experience (www.casa.gov.au), and CASR 61.345 makes keeping a personal logbook a legal requirement (www.legislation.gov.au).

Authority-specific purposes that change what is read

A foreign licence conversion in Canada asks applicants to be ready to present their flight logbook for review (tc.canada.ca). A UK ICAO licence validation checklist requires logbook evidence as copies of logbook pages (www.caa.co.uk). A UK instrument rating application lists copies of flying logbooks as supporting evidence (www.caa.co.uk). The IAA distinguishes an application for a licence or upgrade, for which it asks for all logbooks (www.iaa.ie), from a rating or extension, for which it needs only the pages showing compliance, certified by the pilot (www.iaa.ie).

Required Flight and Lesson Fields by Authority

This section compares what each source says must be entered. *Table 1* below is a source-labelled matrix. Where a cited section does not list an item, the cell says "not specified in the cited section", which is a statement about the cited text and not a claim that the item is unnecessary elsewhere.

Authority and source	Person, aircraft, route and time	Role and conditions	Simulator or FSTD	Rule or guidance
FAA (US) 14 CFR 61.51, eCFR current to 23 October 2026 (www.ecfr.gov)	Date, total flight or lesson time, departure and arrival location (www.ecfr.gov); aircraft type and identification (www.ecfr.gov). Pilot name: not specified in the cited paragraph.	Type of experience and conditions of flight; safety pilot's name where required (www.ecfr.gov); each instrument approach's location and type for recency (www.ecfr.gov).	Type and identification of the device is entered in the same field (www.ecfr.gov); device time for instrument recency needs a logbook or training record (www.ecfr.gov).	Law. Format is "acceptable to the Administrator" (www.ecfr.gov).
Transport Canada CAR 401.08, Justice Laws page modified 2026-10-15 (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca)	Holder's name; aircraft type and registration mark (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca); departure and arrival places (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca); aeroplane intermediate take-offs and landings (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca).	Flight crew position (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca); day, night, VFR and IFR conditions (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca). Gliders: launch method (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca).	Not specified in the cited section.	Law , with documentation detail delegated to the personnel licensing standards (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca). TP 15419 is guidance .
EASA FCL.050 and AMC1 FCL.050, Easy Access Rules, Revision from October 2026 (www.easa.europa.eu)	Name and address (www.easa.europa.eu); date, PIC name, place and time of departure and arrival (www.easa.europa.eu); aircraft make, model, variant and registration (www.easa.europa.eu); accumulated total time.	Pilot function: PIC (including solo, SPIC and PICUS), co-pilot, dual, instructor (www.easa.europa.eu); night and IFR operational conditions (www.easa.europa.eu).	Each session: device type and qualification number (www.easa.europa.eu), with instruction, date and time.	FCL.050 is law (one sentence). The fields are AMC .
UK CAA UK FCL.050 and AMC1 FCL.050 as replaced by Decision No. 47	UK FCL.050 states the reliable-record rule only (www.legislation.gov.uk). The AMC1 (a) minimum field list was not retrieved from the CAA library for this report.	Column 12 must include the PIC's name and signature for SPIC or PICUS time (www.caa.co.uk); supervised PIC time can be logged by both pilot and supervisor (www.caa.co.uk).	Not confirmed in the sources opened.	UK FCL.050 is law . Decision No. 47 amends the AMC and came into force on 30 October 2025 (www.caa.co.uk).
CASA (Australia) CASR 61.345, Compilation No. 103 (29 September 2026)	Flight entries as soon as practicable after each flight (www.legislation.gov.au), with date, aircraft type, registration, take-off and landing points and time by capacity.	Day or night, instrument time, and whether an instrument approach was conducted (www.legislation.gov.au).	Separate entries for each simulated flight in a flight simulation training device (www.legislation.gov.au).	Law (regulation), with guidance on the CASA page (www.casa.gov.au).

Table 1 shows that the five administrations are not simply variations of one list. The FAA rule is the most explicit about instrument-approach and safety-pilot details, because those support recency. Canada's section is short and adds an aeroplane-specific item (intermediate take-offs and landings) that other lists treat differently. EASA places its richest field list in AMC rather than in the rule. The UK row is deliberately incomplete: the CAA's regulatory library could not be read in the tools used, so the AMC1 (a) field list is not asserted for the United Kingdom. A reader preparing a UK submission should open that text directly.

United States: the fields serve currency as well as licensing

The FAA text lists the information to be entered for each flight or lesson logged (www.ecfr.gov). The experience categories carry their own conditions. Solo time may be logged only when the pilot is the sole occupant (www.ecfr.gov). PIC time may be logged while sole manipulator of the controls of an aircraft for which the pilot is rated (www.ecfr.gov). Second-in-command time may be logged only in the circumstances the paragraph lists (www.ecfr.gov). Instrument time is limited to flight operated solely by reference to instruments in actual or simulated instrument conditions (www.ecfr.gov). Flight time is also loggable only in the aircraft types the section lists, such as aircraft of US registry with a standard or special airworthiness certificate (www.ecfr.gov).

Canada: a short statutory list, with detail in the standards

CAR 401.08(2) is brief. The section also limits who may write in the log: only the holder, or a person the holder has authorized (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca). It does not mention electronic form, signatures or retention in the text read. CAR 401.11 separately restricts recording co-pilot flight time as pilot-in-command under supervision (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca); that role-credit subject is outside this report. Standard 421 asks an applicant claiming supervised PIC time for an ATPL to submit a personal log or other reliable record containing a summary (tc.canada.ca), so the standards add content that the regulation section does not itself list.

EASA and Ireland: rule, AMC and national administration

FCL.050 sets the duty and leaves form to the authority (www.easa.europa.eu). AMC1 FCL.050 supplies the minimum content: personal details (www.easa.europa.eu), flight particulars, FSTD sessions, pilot function and operational conditions, and requires that entries be made as soon as practicable, in ink or indelible pencil if on paper (www.easa.europa.eu). A Remarks column (column 12) has its own guidance for recording the nature of particular flights (www.easa.europa.eu), and a "CRCP" remark applies when the pilot acted as cruise-relief co-pilot (www.easa.europa.eu). Two certification points matter for fields: PICUS time counts as PIC only if countersigned by the PIC (www.easa.europa.eu), and instruction time is logged only if certified by the instructor who gave it (www.easa.europa.eu).

Ireland adds national conditions that must not be generalised across EASA. The IAA's advisory memorandum PLAM 024 requires records in a standard and format acceptable to the IAA (www.iaa.ie) and accepts only a single logbook entry for each pilot function (www.iaa.ie). A pilot whose export combines several functions in one row may meet the AMC field list yet still differ from this Irish format rule.

United Kingdom: assimilated rule, amended AMC

The CAA's Aircrew page states that the regulation was last amended on 21 September 2026 (www.caa.co.uk) and the UK AMC and guidance on 21 July 2026 (www.caa.co.uk). The AMC1 FCL.050 text in Decision No. 47 is introduced as a replacement (www.caa.co.uk), but it shows only amended paragraphs. The CAA also added guidance allowing the remarks column to record any activity deemed necessary for evidence purposes (www.caa.co.uk). Whether the July 2026 amendment affected FCL.050 was not established.

Australia: statutory fields plus a guidance page

CASR 61.345 requires entries after each flight, and separate FSTD entries (www.legislation.gov.au). CASA's guidance adds that only one pilot can log PIC for a given flight (www.casa.gov.au) and that flight time is recorded from when the aircraft begins moving (www.casa.gov.au). The guidance states that logbooks may vary in layout and format (www.casa.gov.au), which supports flexibility in layout but does not remove any statutory field.

Certification: Personal, Instructor, Examiner and Captain Signatures

Fields are only half of the test. Each authority also decides who must sign, what a signature means, and how signatures work in electronic records. *Table 2* below, in the next section, adds the electronic and retention columns; this section covers the certification logic.

Whose signature is needed for which entry

- **FAA:** training time must be endorsed in a legible manner by the authorized instructor (www.ecfr.gov), and a flight instructor must sign the logbook of each person to whom flight training has been given (www.ecfr.gov). From 1 March 2027 the endorsement wording changes (www.federalregister.gov); the text current in October 2026 still lists a certificate expiration date or recent experience end date (www.ecfr.gov).
- **Canada:** the log is the holder's, and entries may be made by the holder or an authorized person (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca). The Authorized Person (AP) manual tells APs to ensure that flight details meet CAR 401.08 (tc.canada.ca).
- **EASA:** the pilot certifies the record (www.easa.europa.eu); the prescribed form ends with the pilot's statement that the entries are true (www.easa.europa.eu); PICUS needs the PIC's countersignature (www.easa.europa.eu); instruction needs the instructor's certification (www.easa.europa.eu).
- **Ireland:** training must be certified by the instructor who gave it, and an employer's letter may supplement but not replace it (www.iaa.ie). PICUS hours not certified by the PIC cannot be counted in total flying time for licence issue (www.iaa.ie).
- **United Kingdom:** the PIC's name and signature are recorded where the pilot logs SPIC or PICUS time (www.caa.co.uk).
- **Australia:** the logbook holder certifies each printed page of an electronic logbook as a true copy (www.casa.gov.au).

Captain and operator certification

None of the cited logbook provisions says that an airline captain's signature is generally required on routine line flying. A captain's countersignature appears only against specific credits: PICUS in EASA and the UK, and supervised PIC time in the UK text (www.caa.co.uk). The EASA AMC says flights under commercial air transport may be recorded in an electronic format maintained by the operator (www.easa.europa.eu); whether an authority accepts an operator printout instead of personal certification is not answered by the sources opened.

Electronic signatures are general law, not logbook approval

Electronic signature statutes support the legal effect of a digital signature but do not say that a regulator accepts a particular logbook export. The US E-SIGN Act says a signature cannot be denied legal effect solely because it is electronic (www.law.cornell.edu). The UK Electronic Communications Act 2000 makes electronic signatures admissible in evidence on questions of authenticity (www.legislation.gov.uk). UK-retained eIDAS Article 25 provides that an electronic signature is not denied legal effect or admissibility solely because of its form (www.legislation.gov.uk). Australia's Electronic Transactions Act 1999 provides that a transaction is not invalid because it took place by electronic communications (www.legislation.gov.au). In the United States the FAA's own advisory circular says that using electronic signature or recordkeeping systems under the listed parts does not require formal FAA approval or acceptance (www.faa.gov), and defines an electronic signature as functionally equivalent to a handwritten one (www.faa.gov). The circular is non-binding guidance.

Retention, Inspection and Submission Triggers

Table 2 below summarises, for each administration, whether electronic form is accepted, who certifies, what original evidence stays with the pilot, whether the cited text states a retention period, and what triggers inspection or submission.

Authority	Electronic form	Certification	Original evidence	Explicit personal-log retention rule	Inspection or submission trigger	Unresolved
FAA (US)	Format acceptable to the Administrator (www.ecfr.gov); a 2008 Chief Counsel interpretation says a logbook can be a separate book with rows and columns (www.faa.gov) and the FAA does not define the term (www.faa.gov).	Instructor endorsement of training time (www.ecfr.gov).	Not specified in the cited section.	Not specified in 61.51. Flight instructors must keep their records 3 years (www.ecfr.gov).	Presentation on reasonable request to the FAA, a National Transportation Safety Board representative or a law enforcement officer (www.ecfr.gov) (www.faa.gov).	Which electronic layouts a given Flight Standards office finds acceptable.

Authority	Electronic form	Certification	Original evidence	Explicit personal-log retention rule	Inspection or submission trigger	Unresolved
Transport Canada	TP 15419 (October 2022): digital logbooks acceptable if they include 401.08 information and are pilot-signed (tc.canada.ca); no need to print (tc.canada.ca).	Pilot signature on a digital log (tc.canada.ca).	AP keeps certified copies for at least two years, which is an AP record, not the pilot's (tc.canada.ca).	Not specified in 401.08 as read.	Applications: e-logbook may be emailed (tc.canada.ca); foreign conversion: present for review (tc.canada.ca).	Whether later bulletins changed the 2022 guidance.
EASA (general)	Electronic format permitted for most non-CAT flying, with all (a) data (www.easa.europa.eu).	Certified by the pilot; format acceptable to the competent authority (www.easa.europa.eu).	Records readily available to the authority (www.easa.europa.eu).	Not specified in FCL.050 or the AMC read.	Present flight time record for inspection without undue delay (www.easa.europa.eu).	National acceptance of a given signature or export.
Ireland (IAA)	Electronic logbooks acceptable if flights needing endorsement are signed (www.iaa.ie).	Notary certification of copied pages (www.iaa.ie).	Earlier books still needed: electronic logbook does not replace them (www.iaa.ie).	Not specified in the pages read.	Licence or upgrade: all logbooks; rating: relevant pages (www.iaa.ie).	Not generalisable to other EASA states.
UK CAA	Download and submit the electronic logbook (www.caa.co.uk); e-sign or digital signature on the file (www.caa.co.uk).	Alternative: hand-sign one printed page (www.caa.co.uk).	CAA may request the original at any time (www.caa.co.uk).	Not specified in the pages read.	Application evidence; copies must clearly show the requisite experience (www.caa.co.uk).	AMC1 (a) field list and electronic-format paragraph not retrieved.
CASA (Australia)	Logbooks may be paper or electronic (www.casa.gov.au).	Holder certifies each printed page as a true copy (www.casa.gov.au).	Entries retained unaltered (www.legislation.gov.au).	7 years after the last entry (www.legislation.gov.au).	Produce within 7 days of direction (www.legislation.gov.au); correct within 14 days of notice (www.casa.gov.au).	Treatment of exports that are not certified page by page: not stated in the page read.

The matrix makes three differences visible. First, the retention column is almost empty: only the CASA row states a personal-log retention rule in the cited text, and the FAA row's only period belongs to instructors. Second, the electronic columns converge on "signed by the pilot" but diverge on what form the signature

takes: a digital signature on a file in the UK, a certified printed copy in Australia, a notary-certified copy in Ireland's FAQ. Third, the unresolved column is not a defect in the sources: it records questions on which no cited text answers.

Retention: what the sources say and what they do not

The EASA text read states no retention period for the pilot's own log; it describes the logbook as a permanent record of the licence holder's flying without stating a period (www.easa.europa.eu). "Permanent record" is a description of purpose and should not be read as a lifetime legal retention rule. The CASA rule, by contrast, is explicit and keyed to the last entry (www.legislation.gov.au), and the CASA page repeats it (www.casa.gov.au). This report recommends no retention period for any other authority; keeping a logbook for a career is a suggested audit practice, not a cited requirement.

Lost or incomplete records

Each authority handles missing records differently. CASA says a lost logbook may be reconstructed from other records, with a statutory declaration for any records entered into a new logbook (www.casa.gov.au). Transport Canada's Standard 421 says affidavits or statutory declarations submitted without corroborating evidence are not accepted (tc.canada.ca), and allows certain foreign licence holders who cannot provide a certified personal log to be credited by the Minister at the ICAO minimum (tc.canada.ca). The UK CAA says it no longer accepts a sworn affidavit as the primary means of establishing hours and points to a lost-logbook notification process (www.caa.co.uk). The FAA and EASA sources opened give no lost-record procedure.

Inspecting a Sample Export Before Relying on an App

An export is the artefact that leaves the logbook, so it is what an authority sees. A useful check takes ten minutes and does not depend on any app being "approved". No authority cited here approves logbook apps; EASA's AMC1 FCL.050 asks only that electronic records be certified by the pilot and in a format acceptable to the competent authority (www.easa.europa.eu), and the text read describes no EASA approval step for a logbook app, and the FAA circular says formal FAA approval of an electronic recordkeeping system is not required (www.faa.gov). A print layout that resembles an authority's paper format is therefore a presentation choice. It is not evidence of acceptance.

The export test, step by step

1. **Name the receiving authority and purpose** (licence, rating, conversion, revalidation or inspection).
2. **Export the exact range** the submission needs, in the format you would send.
3. **Check person and ownership fields:** EASA's AMC lists name and address (www.easa.europa.eu); the UK CAA returns logbooks with a blank personal details section (www.caa.co.uk).
4. **Check flight fields** against the relevant row of *Table 1*.
5. **Check roles and conditions** separately: a combined "PIC" column may hide SPIC, PICUS or supervised time that the UK and EASA texts treat separately.
6. **Check totals:** EASA expects accumulated totals certified by the pilot at page level (www.easa.europa.eu).

7. **Check the signature route** against *Table 2*.

8. **Keep the original and the export** together with the date of export (a suggested audit practice).

(Hypothetical Example) A sample export checked against three authorities

Table 3 is a worked hypothetical. It describes an invented export from a fictional line pilot's electronic logbook. The columns are those the export contains. It makes no claim about how any authority would react to the export, and it does not predict acceptance or rejection.

Export contains (hypothetical)	Possible gap against FAA 61.51(b)	Possible gap against CAR 401.08(2)	Possible gap against AMC1 FCL.050 (EASA)
Date, registration, aircraft type, from, to, total time	None on these items: location of departure and arrival, type and identification (www.ecfr.gov).	None on these items (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca).	Place and time of departure and arrival: the export has places but no times (www.easa.europa.eu).
PIC and SIC columns only	Type of experience is covered where PIC, SIC, solo or instruction received are shown.	Position held is covered (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca).	PICUS, SPIC, dual and instructor are not separable (www.easa.europa.eu).
Night and IFR totals, no approach list	Approach location and type are needed to log instrument time for recency (www.ecfr.gov).	Day, night, VFR and IFR conditions are covered (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca).	Night and IFR conditions are covered (www.easa.europa.eu).
No take-off and landing counts per segment	Not specified in 61.51(b) as read.	Intermediate take-offs and landings are required for aeroplanes (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca).	Not a separate field in the (a) list read.
No pilot address on any page	Not specified in the cited paragraph.	Holder's name is required (the address is not specified in the cited section).	Name and address of the pilot (www.easa.europa.eu).
Simulator sessions entered as flights	Device type and identification must be shown (www.ecfr.gov).	Not specified in the cited section.	Device type and qualification number, plus session time (www.easa.europa.eu).
Typed "signed" field, no signature file	Instructor endorsements need a legible endorsement (www.ecfr.gov).	Digital log must be signed by the pilot per guidance (tc.canada.ca).	Pilot certification (www.easa.europa.eu).

The hypothetical shows how one export can leave a question under one test and none under another. The cells are prompts to open the source, not findings; whether a missing arrival time matters to a particular EASA authority depends on that authority's administration.

One proportionate note on product options

Established electronic logbooks differ in export formats. MyFlightbook's FAQ, for instance, describes a CSV download of the logbook (myflightbook.com) and warns that spreadsheet software may push users away from CSV format (myflightbook.com). Pilot Logbook, an invitation-only electronic logbook from the studio that publishes this site, is described by its own product page (the publisher's description, not independent evidence) as printing layouts modelled on the paper logbooks of 14 authorities; the same export test applies to

it as to any product, and a printed layout is not an approval. Pilot Logbook has no open sign-up. An independent pilot-focused guide published at ngpa.org notes that electronic logbooks are not immune to errors and often require more attention (www.ngpa.org), which supports checking exports regardless of source.

Data Analysis and Evidence

The evidence base for this topic is mostly regulatory text, so the quantitative core is a set of dated numbers: periods, deadlines, versions and counts. Each is reproduced from the source named, with its as-of date.

Periods and deadlines found in the cited sources

- **7 years** after the last entry: CASA personal logbook retention (www.legislation.gov.au), as of Compilation No. 103 dated 29 September 2026.
- **7 days**: CASA time limit to produce the logbook after a direction (www.legislation.gov.au).
- **14 days**: CASA time limit to correct an entry after notice (www.casa.gov.au).
- **3 years**: FAA flight instructor record retention, 14 CFR 61.189(c) (www.ecfr.gov). This is not a personal-logbook rule.
- **2 years**: Transport Canada Authorized Person copies of licensing documents, TP 15419 (tc.canada.ca). Also not a pilot-logbook rule.
- **24 months**: operator crew record retention in the air operations rules (UK assimilated text) (www.legislation.gov.uk).

Versions and dates

- **23 October 2026**: eCFR currency for 14 CFR 61.51 as read (www.ecfr.gov).
- **1 March 2027**: scheduled effective date for the revised instructor endorsement paragraph (www.federalregister.gov).
- **30 October 2025**: UK Decision No. 47 in force (www.caa.co.uk).
- **21 July 2026**: UK AMC and guidance last amended per the CAA Aircrew page (www.caa.co.uk).

What the numbers say, and what they do not

Counting the six rows of *Table 2* (the EASA general row, Ireland as its own row, and four others, which together cover the five administrations in this report), exactly one states an explicit retention period for the personal logbook in the cited text. That count is this report's own tally of the cited provisions, not a statistic about the world, and it reflects the limits of the sections read. Absence of a period in a cited section does not establish that no period exists elsewhere in that country's law. Pilots should not borrow the CASA period, an operator's period or an instructor's period as a proxy.

Unresolved National Conditions and Source and Version Register

Several questions cannot be answered from the sources opened, and they are stated here to avoid false precision.

Open questions

- **EASA and national administration:** the IAA's conditions, including notarised copies (www.iaa.ie), are not shown to apply in other EASA states.
- **UK AMC1 field list:** not retrieved. The UK CAA's own page makes the clearest statement on electronic signature (www.caa.co.uk), but not on the field list.
- **Transport Canada later guidance:** TP 15419 is dated October 2022. A newer application page says applicants can email an e-logbook (tc.canada.ca), but no later authorised-person bulletin on electronic logbooks was found. This is a gap in what was found, not a statement that none exists.
- **Lost records:** procedures are documented for Australia, Canada and the UK in the sources above, but not for the FAA or EASA.

Source and version register

- **14 CFR 61.51, eCFR (www.ecfr.gov):** Current to 23 October 2026. Law. Instructor endorsement paragraph changes 1 March 2027 (www.federalregister.gov).
- **CAR 401.08, Justice Laws (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca):** Page modified 2026-10-15. Law. One rendering displayed a currency notice of 2026-09-30 and a last-amended date of 2026-06-17 that a second rendering did not reproduce, so only the modified date is relied on.
- **TP 15419 second edition (tc.canada.ca):** October 2022. Guidance, not regulation. Age should be considered.
- **EASA Easy Access Rules, Aircrew (www.easa.europa.eu):** Revision from October 2026 (16 October 2026). The October 2026 PDF could not be opened in the tools used (size limit and access block), so page numbers were not verified; the same revision was read in EASA's online rules.
- **IAA FAQ and PLAM 024 (www.iaa.ie):** FAQ undated; PLAM Rev 01 dated 24 August 2023. National administration.
- **UK CAA documentation guidance (www.caa.co.uk):** Undated page, read 27 October 2026. Administrative guidance.
- **UK FCL.050 and Decision No. 47 (www.caa.co.uk):** In force 30 October 2025. AMC replaced; text partly retrieved.
- **CASA guidance and CASR Part 61 (www.casa.gov.au):** Guidance updated 20 October 2026; CASR Compilation No. 103. Law plus guidance.

Several rows carry stated limits, and where a limit exists the matrix cell says so.

Implications and Future Directions

Three implications follow for professional pilots, without any operating advice.

First, the field list is less likely to be the weak point than the evidence around it: the signature route, the retained original and the page-level certification. The UK CAA's request to download and sign electronic logbooks (www.caa.co.uk) and CASA's requirement for certified printed pages (www.casa.gov.au) are practical examples.

Second, rules continue to move. The FAA endorsement wording changes on 1 March 2027 (www.federalregister.gov), the UK AMC1 FCL.050 was replaced by a decision in force from 30 October 2025 (www.caa.co.uk), and the CAA lists a further AMC and guidance amendment dated 21 July 2026 (www.caa.co.uk). A pilot's checklist should carry a date and a source version, and should be rechecked when an application is prepared.

Third, national administration may continue to diverge inside EASA: Ireland shows conditions sitting on top of AMC1 FCL.050 (www.iaa.ie). This report offers no forecast of harmonisation.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

What are the pilot logbook requirements?

They depend on the authority. The FAA requires recording of experience in a manner acceptable to the Administrator (www.ecfr.gov); Canada requires a personal log with the CAR 401.08 entries (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca); EASA requires a reliable record (www.easa.europa.eu); CASA requires a personal logbook (www.legislation.gov.au).

How do FAA vs EASA vs Transport Canada logbook requirements compare?

The FAA text lists entries for each flight or lesson (www.ecfr.gov). EASA places fields in AMC1 FCL.050 (www.easa.europa.eu). Canada lists entries in the regulation and delegates documentation detail to standards (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca). See *Table 1*.

What are the required fields in a pilot logbook, and what does 14 CFR 61.51 require?

It requires the recording of training and aeronautical experience (www.ecfr.gov), with listed flight and lesson entries (www.ecfr.gov), instrument approach details for recency (www.ecfr.gov) and instructor endorsement of training time (www.ecfr.gov).

What does Transport Canada's CAR 401.08 personal log require?

It requires a personal log (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca) with aircraft type and registration (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca), crew position (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca), conditions (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca), places of departure and arrival (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca) and, for aeroplanes, intermediate take-offs and landings (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca).

What does EASA FCL.050 require, and what is in the AMC?

FCL.050 requires a reliable record (www.easa.europa.eu). The AMC supplies content such as name and address (www.easa.europa.eu) and FSTD session details (www.easa.europa.eu), and permits electronic format with certification (www.easa.europa.eu).

How long should I keep pilot logbook records?

Only CASA's cited text states a period for a pilot's own logbook: 7 years after the last entry (www.legislation.gov.au). For the other administrations, the cited sections do not specify one. Any longer period is a personal practice.

Are electronic pilot logbooks accepted?

Each authority examined accepts some electronic form, on different terms: signed by the pilot in Canada's guidance (tc.canada.ca), electronically signed in the UK (www.caa.co.uk), a certified printed copy in Australia (www.legislation.gov.au), and acceptable with signed endorsements in Ireland (www.iaa.ie).

What is a signed digital pilot logbook export?

It is an exported file that carries the pilot's signature. The UK CAA describes an electronic signature in the app or a digital signature applied to the file (www.caa.co.uk); whether another authority accepts that route is not established by the sources opened.

Conclusion

Whether an existing personal logbook meets a licensing authority's requirements is a question about four things: the fields the authority's text lists, the certification it expects, the original evidence the pilot can still produce, and the administrative conditions of the receiving office. This report compared five administrations on those points and found that the rules are specific in places (the FAA's recency details, the EASA field list, the CASA retention period) and silent in others, including retention in four of the five. Silence in a cited section is not permission, and an app's printed layout is not an approval.

The most defensible method is the export test: identify the authority and purpose, export a sample, compare it with the relevant source row, check the signature route, and keep the original. Readers should open the primary text before relying on any matrix, including this one. This report is not legal advice or operational guidance and does not replace the guidance of the receiving authority.

Source links

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

1. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/chapter-I/subchapter-D/part-61/subpart-A/section-61.51>
2. <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/sor-96-433/page-32.html>
3. <https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/online-publications/easy-access-rules-aircrew-regulation-eu-no-11782011?erules-id=ERULES-1963177438-10439>
4. https://www.legislation.gov.au/F1998B00220/2026-09-29/2026-09-29/text/original/epub/OEBPS/document_2/document_2.html
5. <https://www.caa.co.uk/commercial-industry/pilot-licences/introduction-to-pilot-licences/documentation-guidance-for-pilot-licences/guidance-on-documentation>
6. https://tc.canada.ca/sites/default/files/2023-06/tp_15419_second_edition_authorized_person_policy_manual_aeroplane_and_helicopter.pdf
7. <https://tc.canada.ca/en/aviation/licensing-pilots-personnel/flight-crew-licences-permits-ratings/apply-pilot-permit-licence-rating>
8. <https://www.casa.gov.au/licences-and-certificates/pilots/keeping-records-flight-crew-logbooks>
9. <https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/online-publications/easy-access-rules-aircrew-regulation-eu-no-11782011?erules-id=ERULES-1963177438-10451>
10. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/chapter-I/subchapter-D/part-61/subpart-H/section-61.189>

11. <https://www.iaa.ie/personnel-licensing/pilot-licences-%28eu-regulations%29/licensing-faq/faq--logbook---eu-part-fcl-irish-national-licences>
12. <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-96-433/section-605.92.html>
13. <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-96-433/section-605.94.html>
14. <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/14/121.683>
15. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/eur/2012/965/annex/III>
16. <https://www.federalregister.gov/citation/89-FR-80050>
17. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/eur/2011/1178/annex/I>
18. <https://tc.canada.ca/en/aviation/licensing-pilots-personnel/flight-crew-licences-permits-ratings/licensing-foreign-pilots>
19. <https://www.caa.co.uk/commercial-industry/pilot-licences/non-uk-licences/validating-an-icao-licence-for-work>
20. <https://www.caa.co.uk/general-aviation/pilot-licences/ratings/instrument-meteorological-conditions-imc>
21. <https://www.caa.co.uk/publication/download/25055>
22. <https://tc.canada.ca/en/corporate-services/acts-regulations/list-regulations/canadian-aviation-regulations-sor-96-433/standards/standard-421-flight-crew-permits-licences-ratings-canadian-aviation-regulations-cars>
23. <https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/online-publications/easy-access-rules-aircrew-regulation-eu-no-11782011?erules-id=ERULES-1963177438-20391>
24. <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>
25. <https://www.caa.co.uk/uk-regulations/aviation-safety/basic-regulation-the-implementing-rules-and-uk-cao-amc-gm-cs/aircrew>
26. <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/15/7001>
27. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/7/section/7>
28. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/eur/2014/910/article/25>
29. https://www.legislation.gov.au/C2004A00553/2025-12-05/2025-12-05/text/original/epub/OEBPS/document_1/document_1.html
30. https://www.faa.gov/documentLibrary/media/Advisory_Circular/AC_120-78B_FAA_Web.pdf
31. <https://www.faa.gov/media/14901>
32. <https://www.faa.gov/faq/are-pilots-required-show-their-logbook-government-official>
33. <https://myflightbook.com/logbook/mvc/faq>
34. <https://pilots.landing.aero>
35. https://www.ngpa.org/pencil_pen_or_pad_a_guide_to_pilot_logbook_requirements_and_options

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.