LANDING.AERO

LANDING.AERO / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Swiss Pilot Logbook Electronic Signature FOCA: Route Guide

> 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 · swiss pilot logbook · foca electronic logbook · bazl pilot logbook requirements · pilot logbook electronic signature · signed pdf pilot logbook · hours confirmation · sep revalidation · easa amc1 fcl.050 · capzlog · pilot logbook

Original article: https://www.landing.aero/articles/en/swiss-electronic-pilot-logbook-pdf-signatures-foca



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. The Three FOCA Submission Routes
4. Applicant Certification, Entry Signatures and Hours Confirmation
5. Key Changes and Differences Across the FOCA Sources
6. Implementation Considerations and Process Changes
7. Data Analysis and Evidence
8. Case Studies and Real-World Examples
9. Implications and Future Directions
10. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
11. Conclusion

Executive Summary

A Swiss-licensed pilot preparing a licence or rating application faces three submission routes at the **Federal Office of Civil Aviation (FOCA, German: BAZL)**, not one. On the FOCA accepted-logbooks page as read on **21 November 2026**, both paper logbooks and ordinary electronic logbooks go in as a PDF signed "in handwriting or digitally page by page by the applicant", with a confirmation of the hours by an approved entity (www.bazl.admin.ch). The third route covers a logbook product that FOCA has accepted and listed: it is submitted as a PDF, and an approved-entity confirmation "is not required for SEP revalidation" (SEP means single-engine piston) (www.bazl.admin.ch).

That exception is narrow. The same page says that whenever a logbook is used to demonstrate minimum flight times for a licence or rating endorsement, the hours must be confirmed during the application (www.bazl.admin.ch). One product, **capzlog.aero**, was listed on the day of reading (www.bazl.admin.ch). Pilot Logbook (the vendor's page is branded Blue Hour Logbook) is not on that list, so its exports belong on the ordinary electronic route.

FOCA's sources do not fully agree. The linked **GM/INFO Accepted Logbook Formats** (valid from **1 February 2024**, listed on the webpage as **7 March 2024**) describes handwriting only, and describes a listed-product route built on a dataset link that "will be available at the end of 2024 only", with a PDF as the interim format (www.bazl.admin.ch). The webpage now allows digital signing and asks for a PDF. Nothing read for this report shows that the dataset link is live: FOCA's dLIS page lists selected applications and keeps the rest on a "paper and scan" procedure (www.bazl.admin.ch).

Four facts are easy to merge: a PDF that looks digital, a signature, a listed product, and a confirmation of hours. The Swiss federal IT office states that scanned images of a handwritten signature are not an electronic signature (www.bit.admin.ch), and that only a qualified electronic signature with a qualified timestamp is legally equivalent to a handwritten one (www.bit.admin.ch). FOCA does not define "digitally", so this report names no signature technology as approved.

The practical sequence is to choose the route, identify who confirms the specific hours on the specific form, and assemble applicant-signed pages with the original instructor and examiner certifications. In a hypothetical ten-page export (worked through below), ten page signatures would not by themselves establish confirmed hours or accepted-software status. Where the webpage, PDF and forms diverge, ask FOCA in writing. The vendor describes configurable PDF and Word exports for an ordinary-electronic pack, and says logbooks are by invitation; these are the vendor's own statements. The link is the vendor's invitation page, a product page offered for interested readers and not as evidence for any claim here. This is record-keeping information, not operational advice and not a FOCA decision.

Introduction and Background

Switzerland applies EASA Part-FCL rules to licences that FOCA issues, and FOCA's logging guidance applies to "all licence holders of an EASA licence issued by FOCA Switzerland" (www.bazl.admin.ch). The underlying duty is short: FCL.050 requires a pilot to keep a reliable record of the details of all flights flown (www.easa.europa.eu). The acceptable means of compliance, **AMC1 FCL.050**, allows electronic recording but requires electronic entries to be certified by the pilot and held in a format the competent authority accepts (www.easa.europa.eu). The form is therefore left to the authority, which in Switzerland is FOCA.

This report is for holders of Swiss-issued aeroplane or helicopter licences preparing a FOCA application, including professional pilots who maintain an ordinary electronic log. It addresses one decision: which submission route applies to the record the pilot already has, who must confirm hours, and which signatures belong on the exported evidence. It is not a consumer guide to SEP flying and not a software procurement guide. How roles such as PICUS are credited is outside the scope of this report and is not repeated.

Four facts that are easy to confuse

- **A document that looks digital.** A PDF is a file format. FOCA's page asks for a PDF on all three routes, so the format alone distinguishes nothing.
- **A signature.** A handwritten signature, a scanned image of one, a drawn touchscreen signature and a cryptographic electronic signature are different objects with different standing under Swiss law.
- **A listed product.** FOCA lists products that completed its acceptance process. That is a statement about the product, and the list is short and dated.
- **A confirmation of hours.** Confirmation by an approved entity is separate from the pilot certifying their own pages.

Evidence base and limits

The report rests on pages read on 21 November 2026: the FOCA page in English, German and French, two FOCA guidance PDFs, an application form and fee texts, the EASA Easy Access Rules for Aircrew, Swiss federal signature guidance, and the listed vendor's pages. No search-demand figures or acceptance statistics were available and none are asserted. No worldwide count of certified products is asserted, because the sources count differently. The FOCA product list, form versions and dLIS release information are volatile; re-check them against the FOCA pages before publication or any later reuse of this report.

The Three FOCA Submission Routes

The FOCA page begins from the FCL.050, SFCL.050 and BFCL.050 duty to keep a reliable record of all flight hours, and states that FOCA "encourages the use of electronic or digital logbooks". *Table 1* sets the three routes side by side, with Pilot Logbook placed where its exports would sit. Source wording is cited in the sections that follow the table.

Route	Required export	Applicant page signatures	Entry-specific signatures	Confirming entity	Exception limits
1. Paper logbook in the AMC1 FCL.050 format	PDF attachment of the pages	In handwriting or digitally, page by page	Original countersignatures where AMC1 FCL.050 calls for them (www.easa.europa.eu)	An approved entity	None stated
2. Ordinary electronic logbook meeting AMC1 FCL.050	PDF extract compliant with AMC1 FCL.050	Same wording as route 1	Same as route 1	An approved entity	None stated
3. FOCA accepted digital logbook listed on FOCA's website	PDF (the 2024 PDF describes a dLIS dataset instead)	None named on the page	Supported by the product under FOCA's acceptance conditions	Not required for SEP revalidation	Limited to SEP revalidation
Pilot Logbook (invitation-only), ordinary electronic route	Configurable PDF or Word export, checked by the pilot	Pilot signs each printed page	Original instructor and examiner certifications attached	An approved entity, as for route 2	None: no FOCA acceptance, dLIS link or Swiss signature capability is established

Routes 1 and 2 are identical in what FOCA asks of the applicant. A pilot who prints a standard electronic log and signs each page is on route 2 whatever software produced it. Route 3 differs on three points: the product has been through FOCA's acceptance process, the submission is a PDF, and for SEP revalidation the hours are confirmed within the logbook service. The Pilot Logbook row reflects where an export would sit, not any listing.

Route 1: paper logbook

A paper logbook in the AMC1 FCL.050 format is submitted to FOCA as a PDF attachment, signed in handwriting or digitally, page by page, by the applicant (www.bazl.admin.ch). EASA's text for paper records adds that entries are made in ink or indelible pencil. A scan of a paper logbook remains a paper-route submission.

Route 2: ordinary electronic logbook

FOCA states that an industry electronic logbook can be used provided it meets AMC1 FCL.050, with a PDF extract signed page by page and hours confirmed by an approved entity. The page does not ask for software approval on this route. The provider-side conditions in the 2024 PDF (data backup, user identity, change log,

signature handling) are conditions for FOCA to accept a product onto its list (www.bazl.admin.ch); they are not a rule that every ordinary-electronic user must obtain vendor approval.

Route 3: FOCA accepted digital logbook

The third route applies to an industry electronic logbook "that has been accepted by FOCA and is listed below". FOCA says it issues an acceptance letter to the provider subject to conditions, and may withdraw acceptance if necessary. The page adds that the former FOCA dLogbook service remains available through capzlog.aero and that existing subscriptions are honoured at the current price until expiry. FOCA's **dLIS** is its digital platform for licence applications; the dataset channel in the older PDF refers to it. The vendor describes instructors and examiners signing flights directly on tablets or smartphones (capzlog.aero), states that digital-only records are allowed where AMC1 FCL.050 and national requirements are met (capzlog.aero), and says that once signed the data can no longer be changed (www.capzlog.aero). These are vendor descriptions of its own product, not FOCA statements.

Who can confirm hours

The page names "an ATO/DTO/AOC holder or Examiner when stipulated in the regulation (see application form)" (www.bazl.admin.ch). ATO means approved training organisation, DTO declared training organisation and AOC air operator certificate. For SEP revalidations it adds Swiss airport authorities, a FOCA-registered examiner, or FOCA Flight Personnel against an additional fee (www.bazl.admin.ch). The application form, not the logbook software, decides the right confirming entity, which is why the checklist below starts from the form.

Applicant Certification, Entry Signatures and Hours Confirmation

Three kinds of attestation appear on an evidence pack, each with a different author.

Applicant certification

The applicant certifies their own pages. On routes 1 and 2 this is the page signature the FOCA page describes. This signature says the pilot stands behind the record. It does not say anyone else has checked it.

Entry-specific signatures

AMC1 FCL.050 asks third parties to countersign particular entries. Solo time, student pilot-in-command (SPIC) time, time under supervision and time in skill tests, proficiency checks and assessments may be logged as PIC only if countersigned by the instructor or examiner, as applicable. Pilot-in-command-under-supervision (PICUS) time on a multi-pilot aircraft is logged as PIC only if countersigned by the PIC (www.easa.europa.eu). Instruction summaries are certified by the instructor who gave the instruction, and the remarks column carries the instructor's name and signature when a flight is part of an SEP class rating revalidation (www.easa.europa.eu). LAPL(A) recency items must be signed by the instructor or examiner.

These signatures originate with someone other than the applicant. An export that reproduces the entries but not the original certification shows that the entry exists, not that the instructor or examiner attested to it. How a form treats a reproduced countersignature is a question for the form and for FOCA.

Hours confirmation

Confirmation is the third layer. On FOCA's SEP/TMG revalidation form (Form 60.521), the data block is confirmed by a Swiss airport authority duty manager or a FOCA authorised examiner (www.bazl.admin.ch), and copies of the relevant logbook pages must be attached (www.bazl.admin.ch). The refresher training inside the revalidation hours is a further attestation by a flight instructor (FI) or class rating instructor (CRI).

What "digitally" can mean

FOCA's page says "digitally" without defining it. Swiss and EU sources describe a range, from weakest to strongest:

- **Image of a handwritten signature.** The federal IT office (BIT) says scanned or inserted images of a handwritten signature do not constitute an electronic signature, and that a visible signature display in a PDF has no technical or legal implications for the electronic signature itself (www.bit.admin.ch). The Code of Obligations starts from the rule that a signature is written by hand (www.fedlex.admin.ch).
- **Simple electronic signature.** Swiss law defines it as data attached or logically linked to other electronic data (www.fedlex.admin.ch); BIT's glossary says it has no legal requirements and less evidential value than regulated types (www.bit.admin.ch).
- **Advanced electronic signature.** It must be exclusively assigned to its holder, among other requirements (www.fedlex.admin.ch), and the EU definition points to the requirements in Article 26 of eIDAS (eur-lex.europa.eu). BIT says signatures marketed as advanced are not subject to specific legal regulation (www.bit.admin.ch), and the signatory's identity cannot be verified in the federal validator (www.bit.admin.ch).
- **Qualified electronic signature (QES).** Swiss law equates a QES with a qualified time stamp to the handwritten signature (www.fedlex.admin.ch), and BIT repeats that only this combination is legally equivalent. EU law gives a qualified signature the equivalent legal effect of a handwritten one (eur-lex.europa.eu), while also providing that an electronic signature may not be denied legal effect solely because it is electronic (eur-lex.europa.eu).

Two further points concern pilots who work across borders. BIT says a foreign QES is considered an advanced signature in Switzerland and vice versa (www.bit.admin.ch), so an EU-qualified instructor signature does not automatically carry qualified status in a Swiss assessment. And BIT states that electronic submissions to the Federal Administration must bear a QES unless the person's identity can be verified by other means (www.bit.admin.ch), with the Federal Act on Administrative Procedure containing the underlying QES requirement (www.fedlex.admin.ch). Whether a licence application sent as an emailed PDF falls under that rule, or under FOCA's own wording, was not established by any source read.

Four further federal and EU points shape how much weight a signature carries. Printing out and re-scanning a signed document damages an electronic signature (www.bit.admin.ch), and the federal validator checks whether a document was modified after signing (www.validator.ch), although BIT says it cannot fully check simple or advanced signatures (www.bit.admin.ch). For unregulated signatures, BIT says the evidential value is much lower (www.bit.admin.ch) and that a judge decides whether to trust them (www.bit.admin.ch). A QES cannot be used where a handwritten document is required (www.bit.admin.ch), and the Code of Obligations accepts mechanical reproduction of handwriting only where customary (www.fedlex.admin.ch). BAKOM, the

communications regulator, says it regulates certification services but not the framework for their use (www.bakom.admin.ch), while confirming that Swiss law treats electronic signatures as equivalent to handwritten ones under conditions (www.bakom.admin.ch) and that no mutual recognition agreement with the EU has been concluded (www.bakom.admin.ch). The Federal Office of Justice offers a comparable two-route choice on its own forms: print and sign by hand, or sign electronically with a recognised qualified certificate (www.bj.admin.ch).

FOCA's 2024 PDF is the only regulator text read that describes signatures inside a logbook product. For products seeking acceptance, it lists signing on a device screen and saving the signature as an image, or any format accepted officially by the Swiss Federation when such are defined (www.bazl.admin.ch). That concerns entry signatures inside an accepted product, not what the applicant's page signature on an exported PDF must be.

Key Changes and Differences Across the FOCA Sources

No new rule is asserted. The material differences are between documents of different dates that FOCA publishes side by side.

Signature wording: handwriting versus "handwriting or digitally"

The PDF says paper submissions are "signed in handwriting page by page by the applicant" (www.bazl.admin.ch). The webpage reads "signed in handwriting or digitally" for both paper and electronic routes. The German page says "handschriftlich oder digital" and the French page "à la main ou numériquement". The three language versions agree with each other, and the linked PDF is the outlier.

The listed-route datalink: a target date, not a channel

The PDF defines route 3 as submission "in the form of a dataset sent from the applicant to the dLIS", with the datalink expected "at the end of 2024 only". The webpage asks for a PDF. FOCA's dLIS flight-crew page shows a last release of October 2026, lists selected applications such as skill tests, and says unlisted applications continue by "paper and scan". A 2024 target date is not evidence of a live channel, and silence on one page is not proof that none exists.

The dLogbook and capzlog: counting products carefully

FOCA lists only capzlog.aero and says the former dLogbook service continues through it. The vendor's academy page, which links to the FOCA page as support, says in a FAQ that there are two FCL.050 certified pilot logbooks worldwide: capzlog.aero and "the dLogbook provided by FOCA for Swiss licence holders" (www.capzlog.aero). The vendor says elsewhere that it is the first pilot logbook software officially certified (www.capzlog.aero) and still the only software platform audited by an EASA member-state authority (capzlog.aero). These statements cannot be reduced to a product count without FOCA's help, because one treats dLogbook as a second product and the regulator's page treats it as a service continuing through the listed one. Vendor wording about data quality is marketing language, not regulator evidence, and is not relied on.

Form 60.521 still names the "official FOCA dLogbook"

The SEP/TMG revalidation form, version ISS 01 REV 03 / 05.2025, says airport-authority or examiner confirmation is not needed if the form is completed and sent "through the official FOCA dLogbook" (www.bazl.admin.ch). The webpage speaks of FOCA accepted digital logbooks and capzlog.aero, and says hours are "confirmed as part of the logbook service". The vendor says SEP revalidation requests can be generated with one click and sent directly to the authority (www.capzlog.aero), which is a vendor description, not a FOCA statement. Whether the listed product satisfies the form's phrase is not answered by any source.

The October 2025 logging guidance is not an approval

The GM/INFO Logging of Flight Time, valid from **15 October 2025** (issue 2, revision 1), is national guidance on how time is logged, not an approval of any product. Its revision log shows a new issue on 1 April 2024. It states that all hours flown shall be logged according to AMC1 FCL.050 and refers to the Formats document by a file name containing 20240201.

Source-conflict register

Table 2 lists each divergence, what is established, and the action. "Ask FOCA" means a written query to the Flight Personnel section, which the webpage lists with telephone hours on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

#	Topic	What the sources say	Established	Action
1	Applicant page signature	PDF (2024): handwriting. Webpage in EN, DE, FR: handwriting or digitally	The webpage permits digital signing	Keep handwritten pages as fallback; ask what "digitally" means
2	Listed-route submission	PDF: dLIS dataset, PDF in the interim. Webpage: PDF	A PDF is what the webpage asks for; a dataset channel is unconfirmed	Submit the PDF; ask whether any logbook dataset channel is live
3	Document date	Webpage lists 7 March 2024. PDF cover: valid from 1 February 2024. Logging guidance cites a 20240201 file name	Likely the same document at different stages, but no source says so	Record both dates in the snapshot
4	Hours confirmation, listed route	EN: "confirmed as part of the logbook service", in a sentence that also carries a double negative. DE: hours "automatisch validiert". Form 60.521: via the "official FOCA dLogbook"	All say additional confirmation is not required for SEP revalidation; the mechanism is worded differently	Ask FOCA to confirm the mechanism and whether it extends beyond SEP
5	Product naming and count	Webpage: dLogbook continues through capzlog.aero. Vendor academy: two certified logbooks including dLogbook	The webpage lists one product	Do not rely on any product count
6	Entity lists	Webpage: ATO/DTO/AOC holder or examiner when stipulated. Form 60.521: airport authority duty manager or FOCA authorised examiner	The form is the specific authority for that application	Follow the form; ask where two lists conflict

#	Topic	What the sources say	Established	Action
7	Vendor date format	Vendor FAQ: "As of today (11/1/2026)" (capzlog.aero)	The format is ambiguous (1 November or 11 January)	Do not use it as a dated acceptance claim

Implementation Considerations and Process Changes

The seven steps follow the order in which the decisions depend on one another.

Step 1: receiving authority, licence and purpose

Confirm the application goes to FOCA and identify the form. SEP/TMG revalidation by hours uses Form 60.521, which lists its own minimums: 12 hours in the 12 months before expiry, 6 of them as PIC, with 12 take-offs and 12 landings. The Part-FCL basis, FCL.740.A, requires 12 hours in the 12 months preceding expiry (www.easa.europa.eu) and refresher training of at least 1 hour with an FI or CRI (www.easa.europa.eu). Other applications use their own forms, and the confirmation rule applies whenever minimum hours are demonstrated.

Step 2: choose the route from the current FOCA list

Read the accepted-logbooks page on the day of submission. If the record sits in a listed product, route 3 is available; otherwise the record is route 2 (electronic) or route 1 (paper). A pilot with a mixed history, early hours on paper and recent hours in an electronic product, may need more than one route in one application. The sources do not say how mixed records are handled, which is a question for FOCA.

Step 3: separate the three attestations

Mark each page of the intended export with the applicant signature, the entries that need a third-party countersignature, and the hours that need confirmation by the entity the form names.

Step 4: build the PDF evidence pack

- **Period.** Pages covering the whole period the application needs, or the revalidation window.
- **Identity.** Name and licence details on the pages. FOCA's acceptance conditions for listed products require user data (forenames, surnames, date of birth, licence number, address) in exports; that is a useful benchmark for an ordinary export, not a stated requirement for ordinary logs.
- **Required flight details.** The data in AMC1 FCL.050(a), including place and time of departure and arrival (www.easa.europa.eu).
- **Time zone clarity.** FOCA's product conditions require UTC and local time entry with UTC as default, and exports that indicate clearly when local time is used. An ordinary export should state which it uses.
- **Original certifications.** Copies of the original instructor and examiner countersignatures, kept with the entry they support.
- **Change visibility.** FOCA expects a listed product's exports to include a complete change log; an ordinary export has no stated requirement, but a record of post-certification edits helps a reviewer.

Step 5: check the form and the SEP exception

Read the specific form for the confirming entity. The exception applies where the listed route's hours are confirmed within the logbook service for SEP revalidation; it does not follow from a signed PDF. Pilots whose record is held by an operator should note that AMC1 FCL.050 lets commercial air transport flights be recorded electronically by the operator (www.easa.europa.eu), with the record made available to the pilot on request.

Step 6: document the differences and ask FOCA

Use *Table 2*. A concise written query should ask: what "digitally" requires for the applicant page signature; whether an electronic signature must be qualified; whether an emailed PDF falls under the federal rule on electronic submissions; who confirms the specific hours; whether the March 2024 dataset channel is live; and whether Form 60.521's "official FOCA dLogbook" includes the listed product. Obtain answers in writing.

Step 7: retain the source-version snapshot and the submitted export

Keep dated copies of the webpage, both PDFs, the form version and the exact export submitted. EASA requires the pilot to present the flight-time record to the competent authority on request (www.easa.europa.eu), and the sources here carry different dates that are hard to reconstruct later.

Evidence checklist

Label each line **present**, **unknown** or **ask FOCA**.

- **Route chosen from the current list.** Present only if the page was read on the submission date.
- **Applicant signature on every page.** Present, with the method (handwritten or digital) recorded; ask FOCA if the method is unclear.
- **Third-party countersignatures located.** Present per entry; unknown where an original cannot be found.
- **Confirming entity named by the form.** Present if the form names it; ask FOCA where it conflicts with the webpage.
- **Hours reconcile to the form's minimums.** For SEP revalidation: 12, 6, 12 and 1.
- **Export reproduces AMC1 FCL.050 content.** Present only after a page-by-page check.
- **Source snapshot retained.** Present if saved with dates.

Where Pilot Logbook fits

The vendor describes **Pilot Logbook** (the vendor's own page is branded "Blue Hour Logbook", so a reader following the invite link will find that name) as an invitation-only electronic logbook made by a line pilot; these are the vendor's own statements and were not independently verified. Its product page, read on 21 November 2026, lists a Switzerland (FOCA) paper layout among its printable layouts, PDF or Word export, and the option to add the pilot's name, logo and signature; it also describes instructor and examiner signing by link with a certificate number. Those are product features. Matching a paper layout is not acceptance, and nothing read establishes FOCA acceptance, a dLIS connection or a national signature capability for it. FOCA's list does not include it.

For a pilot whose record is in Pilot Logbook, the sensible route is therefore route 2: export the relevant pages, review them against AMC1 FCL.050, sign each page (by hand or in whatever digital form FOCA confirms), attach the original instructor and examiner certifications, and obtain the confirmation the form names. A pilot who needs the listed route is pointed by FOCA to capzlog.aero, and paper stays available. The tools suit different record states, and the choice depends on where the hours already live. To see whether Pilot Logbook fits, the vendor's invitation page is the place to ask; it is a product page, not evidence for any regulatory point above.

Data Analysis and Evidence

The quantitative material is thresholds, fees and dates from regulator sources, collected so a pilot can see the scale of the evidence and the cost of submission.

Source versions

Table 3 separates each source, its date and what it does and does not establish, keeping the datalink target date apart from evidence of an available channel.

Source	Date or version	Supports	Does not establish
FOCA accepted-logbooks webpage	Read 21 Nov 2026	Three routes; "handwriting or digitally"; one listed product; SEP exception	Meaning of "digitally"; acceptance of any unlisted product
FOCA GM/INFO Accepted Logbook Formats	Valid from 1 Feb 2024 (www.bazl.admin.ch); listed as 7 March 2024; replaces the ALTMOC Digital Logbook dLOG	Provider conditions; handwriting wording; end-2024 datalink target	A live dLIS logbook channel in 2026
FOCA GM/INFO Logging of Flight Time	Issue 2 revision 1, valid 15 Oct 2025	National logging guidance	Approval of any logbook product
FOCA Form 60.521	ISS 01 REV 03 / 05.2025	Hours minimums; confirming entities; logbook page copies	Whether the listed product is the "official FOCA dLogbook"
FOCA dLIS flight-crew page	Last release October 2026	Selected applications online; others by paper and scan	A logbook dataset channel
Fee ordinance (GebV-BAZL) on Fedlex	Dated 28 Sep 2007, status 1 Aug 2024 (www.fedlex.admin.ch)	Per-request fees	Any separate fee for hours confirmation

Thresholds and fees

- **SEP revalidation by hours:** 12 hours in the 12 months before expiry, 6 as PIC, 12 take-offs and landings, and 1 hour of refresher training with an FI or CRI.
- **Rating validity:** 1 year, except 2 years for single-pilot single-engine class ratings.
- **Per-request fee:** CHF 45 for a request in a non-professional licence and CHF 75 in a professional licence, per the fee ordinance (res.cloudinary.com). FOCA gives no separate figure for confirmation by its Flight Personnel, only "an additional fee".

- **Experience thresholds logbooks evidence:** 45 hours of flight instruction for a PPL(A) (www.easa.europa.eu), 200 hours of flight time for the modular CPL(A) (www.easa.europa.eu), and at least 1 500 hours for the ATPL(A) (www.easa.europa.eu).
- **Series of flights:** same-day flights returning to the same place at intervals up to 30 minutes may be one entry.
- **Change-log window:** FOCA's product conditions allow an exception for 48 hours after the initial entry.

A single revalidation involves a handful of small numbers (12, 6, 12, 1) that the pack must reconcile and a modest per-request fee. A new licence or rating involves far larger totals, more pages and more countersignatures, so a page-by-page review pays for itself.

Signature types compared

For signatures the evidence is legal definitions, not statistics. BIT adds that a QES is recognised, for example, when submitting documents to public authorities (www.bit.admin.ch). EASA's published guidelines on electronic documents, records and signatures are for the Continuing Airworthiness domain (www.easa.europa.eu), and tell stakeholders to contact their competent authority first; they are not Part-FCL logbook guidance. Under the EU eIDAS definitions and the Swiss ZertES definition, the three layers also differ in what they define: a simple signature is data linked to other data (eur-lex.europa.eu), while an advanced signature created with a qualified device and certificate becomes a qualified one (eur-lex.europa.eu); ZertES defines the QES as a regulated signature based on a qualified certificate (www.fedlex.admin.ch).

Case Studies and Real-World Examples

A synthetic ten-page ordinary-electronic export (Hypothetical Example)

(Hypothetical Example.) A pilot with a Swiss-issued PPL(A) and an SEP class rating keeps an ordinary electronic log and prepares a revalidation by hours. The export is ten pages, 14 flights in the 12 months before expiry, one of them the refresher flight with an instructor. The pilot signs each page: ten applicant certifications.

The ten signatures establish that the pilot stands behind ten pages. They do not establish the following:

- **Confirmed hours.** The page requires an approved entity on routes 1 and 2; Form 60.521 names an airport authority duty manager or FOCA authorised examiner.
- **The instructor's attestation.** The refresher training is attested by an FI or CRI, and the remarks column carries the instructor's name and signature. The original evidence belongs in the pack.
- **Accepted-software status.** A signed PDF from an ordinary electronic logbook is a route 2 submission; the listed-product exception does not apply.
- **Signature technology.** Ten handwritten signatures on a printout and ten pasted signature images are different artefacts, and whether FOCA treats the second as "digitally" is the open question in the register.

Checklist outcome: route chosen (route 2, present); applicant signature (present, method recorded); countersignatures (present, originals attached); confirming entity (present if the form's named person signs, otherwise ask FOCA); hours reconciled (present); snapshot retained (present). The example is invented to

show structure and carries no outcome claim.

Implications and Future Directions

A dataset channel may arrive, but a date is not a channel

If a live dLIS logbook channel exists or is introduced, the listed route could change from PDF to dataset, and the signature question would move into the product and its acceptance conditions. The 2024 PDF treats the channel as a target; planning around a dataset should wait for written confirmation.

The signature definition is the open dependency

Everything on routes 1 and 2 turns on what "digitally" means. Swiss sources describe a range from an image to a qualified signature with matching evidential weight. If FOCA specified a qualified signature, instructors using foreign-issued qualified signatures would need to know that these count as advanced in Switzerland. If FOCA accepts less, the page should say so. Either answer is workable; no answer is the problem.

Other authorities handle the question differently

New Zealand's CAA says its Director may approve software for an electronic logbook (www.aviation.govt.nz). The Irish Aviation Authority's advisory memorandum, dated 24 August 2023, accepts electronic logbooks provided flights requiring endorsement have been signed by the relevant holder (www.iaa.ie). Australia's CASA requires a printed copy of an electronic logbook when directed, with each page certified as a true copy (www.casa.gov.au). In the United States, 14 CFR 61.51 requires time documented in a manner acceptable to the Administrator (www.ecfr.gov). These are different jurisdictions with different rules; none applies to a FOCA application. The UK CAA says a pilot with an electronic logbook must download it and submit it (www.caa.co.uk), that the logbook should be electronically signed to show who owns it (www.caa.co.uk), and that this may be a digital signature applied to the file in a program such as Adobe (www.caa.co.uk); it also allows copies that are printed and hand signed (www.caa.co.uk), and elsewhere accepts electronic logbooks for all application types if printed, signed and dated (www.caa.co.uk). Transport Canada tells foreign-licence applicants they can use digital logbooks or digital copies of paper logbooks (tc.canada.ca). In Germany, NfL 2212-21 says flights outside commercial operations need a separate logbook where an operator keeps the commercial record (www.strassenbau.niedersachsen.de), and the LuftPersV requires instructor or examiner entries to be certified with the type and number of their licence (www.gesetze-im-internet.de).

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Is an electronic pilot logbook accepted by FOCA?

FOCA distinguishes an ordinary electronic logbook meeting AMC1 FCL.050 (signed PDF extract, hours confirmed by an approved entity) from a FOCA accepted digital logbook on its list. Both can be used under different conditions; one product was listed on 21 November 2026.

What are the BAZL pilot logbook requirements for electronic logs?

The record must meet AMC1 FCL.050, which allows electronic recording in a format the competent authority accepts, and FOCA's guidance sets national logging rules. FOCA is the English name of the authority known in German as BAZL.

Is a signed PDF pilot logbook accepted for submission in Switzerland?

For routes 1 and 2, FOCA asks for a PDF signed in handwriting or digitally, page by page. Whether a particular digital method is acceptable is not defined and should be put to FOCA.

Who confirms pilot logbook hours?

The approved entity named on the application form. For SEP revalidation, Form 60.521 names a Swiss airport authority duty manager or a FOCA authorised examiner.

Does the SEP exception apply to a licence application?

Only to SEP revalidation on the listed digital route. Any other use of a logbook to demonstrate minimum hours requires confirmation.

Is a qualified electronic signature needed on the PDF?

No source read establishes that FOCA requires one for logbook pages. Swiss law equates a QES with a qualified time stamp to a handwritten signature, and federal guidance describes simpler signatures as having less evidential value. Ask FOCA which applies to the submission.

What do EASA rules say about digital signatures on logbooks?

AMC1 FCL.050 requires electronic entries to be certified by the pilot and held in an authority-accepted format. EASA's e-signature guidelines address Continuing Airworthiness, not logbooks.

What proof of flight hours do Swiss licence applications need?

The form decides. SEP revalidation needs copies of the relevant logbook pages.

Conclusion

The Swiss submission decision is a sequence. First choose the route from the current FOCA list: paper, ordinary electronic, or a FOCA accepted digital logbook. Second identify who must confirm the hours on the specific form, remembering that the listed-route exception is limited to SEP revalidation. Third assemble applicant-signed pages with the original instructor and examiner certifications that AMC1 FCL.050 calls for, and retain a dated snapshot of the sources and the export.

Three differences between FOCA sources remain unresolved in the material read: what "digitally" means, whether the dataset channel in the March 2024 PDF exists in practice, and whether the form's "official FOCA dLogbook" includes the product now listed. This report does not resolve them; a written FOCA answer should come before anyone gives a definitive instruction.

Pilots who keep their record in Pilot Logbook can treat its PDF or Word export as the raw material of a route 2 pack, with the review, signatures and confirmations above; the vendor describes it as invitation-only, and its invitation page is a product page, not evidence for any regulatory point in this report. This report describes record-keeping and publicly stated authority wording only. It does not replace FOCA's decision on an application or an operator's approved procedures.

Source links

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

1. https://www.bazl.admin.ch/en/dlogbook-en
2. https://www.bazl.admin.ch/dam/en/sd-web/qcDpXt-Ox7VO/foca_gminfo_foca-acccepted-logbook_formats.pdf
3. https://www.bazl.admin.ch/en/dlis-fcl-en
4. https://www.bit.admin.ch/en/signaturanbringung-en
5. https://www.bit.admin.ch/en/e-signature-en
6. https://pilots.landing.aero
7. https://www.bazl.admin.ch/dam/en/sd-web/i13f9T9NXJ5Z/gm-info_loft.pdf
8. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/downloads/115485/en
9. https://capzlog.aero/faq
10. https://www.capzlog.aero/en-us/academy/regulatory-frameworks/digital-logbook-requirements
11. https://www.bazl.admin.ch/dam/de/sd-web/zMAX6j50C9uk/60.521.pdf
12. https://www.fedlex.admin.ch/eli/cc/27/317_321_377/de
13. https://www.fedlex.admin.ch/eli/cc/2016/752/de
14. https://www.bit.admin.ch/en/glossar-en
15. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2014/910/2024-10-18/eng
16. https://www.bit.admin.ch/en/signaturarten-en
17. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML?uri=CELEX:32014R0910
18. https://www.bit.admin.ch/en/commercial-certification-service-providers
19. https://www.bit.admin.ch/en/verwaltungsverfahren-en
20. https://www.fedlex.admin.ch/eli/cc/1969/737_757_755/en
21. https://www.validator.ch
22. https://www.bit.admin.ch/en/evidential-function
23. https://www.bit.admin.ch/en/vertragsrecht-en
24. https://www.bakom.admin.ch/en/electronic-signature
25. https://www.bj.admin.ch/de/formulare-fuer-parteieingaben
26. https://www.capzlog.aero/en-us/academy/regulatory-frameworks/officially-certified-digital-pilot-logbook
27. https://www.fedlex.admin.ch/eli/cc/2007/720/de
28. https://res.cloudinary.com/adminch/image/private/s--G5FjqXFp--/v1722566759/Bundespublikationen/748-112-11d.pdf

29. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/online-publications/easy-access-rules-aircrew-regulation-eu-no?page=46
30. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/downloads/137906/en
31. https://www.aviation.govt.nz/licensing-and-certification/pilots/pilot-logbook
32. 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
33. https://www.casa.gov.au/licences-and-certificates/pilots/flight-crew-logbooks
34. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/chapter-I/subchapter-D/part-61/subpart-A/section-61.51
35. https://www.caa.co.uk/commercial-industry/pilot-licences/introduction-to-pilot-licences/documentation-guidance-for-pilot-licences/guidance-on-documentation
36. https://www.caa.co.uk/general-aviation/pilot-licences/introduction-to-licensing/documentation-guidance-for-pilot-licences/guidance-on-documentation
37. https://tc.canada.ca/en/aviation/licensing-pilots-personnel/flight-crew-licences-permits-ratings/licensing-foreign-pilots
38. https://www.strassenbau.niedersachsen.de/download/101875/NfL_2212-21_Aufzeichnung_von_Flugzeiten.pdf
39. https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/luftpersv/__120.html

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.