LANDING.AERO

LANDING.AERO / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

UAE Pilot Logbook Certification: Flight-to-Signature Pack

> 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 · 2026-11-22 · uae pilot logbook certification · gcaa pilot logbook requirements · gcaa flight hours verification · electronic pilot logbook · pilot logbook signature · car-fcl issue05 · gm1 fcl.015 · pilot logbook audit trail · pilot logbook

Original article: https://www.landing.aero/articles/en/uae-pilot-logbook-certification-evidence-pack



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Definition and Taxonomy: What "Certified" Can Mean in a UAE Pack
4. The Evidence Chain: From Source Record to Personal Export
5. Role-Specific Countersignatures and Endorsements
6. Aircraft Time, FSTD Time and Reconciliation in Minutes
7. Implementation: Requests, Electronic Formats and the Dated Export
8. Data Analysis and Evidence
9. Implications and Future Directions
10. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
11. Conclusion

Executive Summary

A matching set of hours is not the same thing as a certified set of hours. For a professional pilot preparing UAE General Civil Aviation Authority (GCAA) licence or rating evidence, the practical question is who certified each entry, not whether a roster export adds up. This report builds a **flight-to-signature manifest** that separates three acts: (1) the pilot's own page or record certification, (2) role-specific countersignatures by a pilot-in-command (PIC) or flight instructor (FI), and (3) certification by the approved training organisation (ATO), operator or concerned authority described in GM1 FCL.015. A roster export can identify flights. It does not, by itself, establish any of the three.

The text this report treats as applicable is GCAA CAR-FCL **Issue05**, as identified by a specialist guide and not confirmed here against the official PDF. The GCAA publication page is where to check the current issue (www.gcaa.gov.ae), and a specialist guide reports a September 2025 record of issue with **1 January 2026** applicability (www.pilotaudit.com). GM1 FCL.015 is Guidance Material, not regulatory text. As quoted by PilotAudit, it says an application is not accepted where the logbook is not certified by the ATO, operator or concerned civil aviation authority (www.pilotaudit.com). The passage does not establish a particular seal, form, wet signature or certification interval, so none should be assumed.

Operator records matter because airline flights may live only there. In EASA's parallel text, commercial air transport details may be kept in an operator-maintained electronic format (www.easa.europa.eu), and the operator should make all flights, including differences and familiarisation training, available on request to the pilot (www.easa.europa.eu). "Available on request" is an access right. It is not a certification. Supervised time follows the same logic: a co-pilot's PICUS (pilot-in-command under supervision) time is loggable only where the PIC countersigns it (www.easa.europa.eu), and a typed PIC name does not reconstruct a missing signature.

The worked example shows why arithmetic is not enough. An operator lists three aircraft flights of 2:00, 1:30 and 2:15, which total **345 minutes (5:45)**, plus a separate **1:00** flight simulation training device (FSTD) session. The personal export matches both totals, yet one supervised entry lacks its referenced PIC signature

and the application-level certification is unknown. The totals reconcile while the evidence questions stay open, and the FSTD hour is never added to aircraft time.

Conversion of a paper logbook to a digital file is not certification and does not create missing evidence (www.pilotaudit.com). Electronic logbooks, including Pilot Logbook (invitation-only), are presentation and record-keeping tools beside the retained originals. No GCAA approval or automatic acceptance of any product is established. Check the current GCAA application form for the accepted certification format before submitting.

Introduction and Background

This report is written for professional aeroplane and helicopter pilots who hold their history in two places: an operator's flight record and a personal electronic or paper logbook. It addresses a single decision: whether a proposed export carries the source records and certifications needed for a GCAA licence or rating application, and which missing signatures or confirmations must be requested. It does not cover operator systems, crew-management integration, flight conduct or employment advice, and it does not decide eligibility for any licence. Only the GCAA, or an examiner acting for it, makes that decision.

The GCAA is the UAE's civil aviation regulator. Its Law establishes it as the authority for executing the Civil Aviation Law (www.gcaa.gov.ae). Licensing sits in Civil Aviation Regulation (CAR) Part II, and flight crew licensing text is in CAR-FCL. The international frame is ICAO Annex 1, which SKYbrary describes as the overarching framework for licensing all personnel (skybrary.aero); the ICAO store lists the current edition as the 14th Edition, July 2022 (store.icao.int).

Why another logbook article. The general GCAA requirements are already well covered by a specialist, PilotAudit, whose guide links the official publication and explains operator records and GM1 FCL.015. The gap that remains is practical: an item-by-item manifest saying, for each flight, which record shows it, who certified it, and where that certification sits.

Three tiers of text. The report keeps three kinds of source apart, because their weight differs:

- **Regulatory text:** for example FCL.015 (application) and FCL.050 (recording of flight time).
- **Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC):** compliance guidance such as AMC1 FCL.050.
- **Guidance Material (GM):** explanatory material such as GM1 FCL.015, the passage on which the application-level certification question rests.

Evidence limits. The official Issue05 PDF was not checked directly for this article. The Issue05 issue date, its 1 January 2026 applicability and the GM1 FCL.015 wording are attributed to PilotAudit, a secondary source, and must be checked against the official GCAA CAR-FCL document before anyone relies on them. The other texts cited are EASA's and Oman's parallel texts, used only as reference models and never as UAE authority, and a historic 2013 GCAA proposal. Retention periods, accepted certification formats and the application form's wording are flagged as unresolved rather than inferred.

Publisher note. This article is published by LANDING.AERO, which makes Pilot Logbook, an invitation-only electronic pilot logbook (invitations are requested on the product's own site). Its role here is limited to the placement section below. Nothing in this report is operational guidance or a substitute for an operator's

approved procedures or the authority's decision.

Definition and Taxonomy: What "Certified" Can Mean in a UAE Pack

"Certified" is used loosely in pilot conversation. In the evidence pack it names at least three separate acts by three different kinds of person, and a pack can have one without the others.

Layer 1: the pilot's page and record certification

Oman's AMC/GM (the October 2023 text), a GCC regulator's version of the model, asks the pilot to enter accumulated flight time when each page is completed (www.caa.gov.om), and its sample page carries a pilot statement beside the signature that the entries in the log are true (www.caa.gov.om). For electronic records, EASA's parallel instructions say they must be certified by the pilot and be in a format the competent authority accepts (www.easa.europa.eu). In the GCAA material this layer is the one the pilot controls directly, which is why it is the easiest to supply and the weakest on its own.

Layer 2: role-specific PIC and FI countersignatures

Some entries need a second person who was in a position to observe the flying. EASA's text lets a co-pilot log PICUS time as PIC only if the PIC countersigns it (www.easa.europa.eu), and allows SPIC (student pilot-in-command) time and other supervised time to be logged only when countersigned by the instructor or examiner as applicable (www.easa.europa.eu). An instruction summary can be logged only if certified by the instructor who gave it (www.easa.europa.eu). In the GCAA's 2013 Notice of Proposed Amendment, which is historic and not current text, the same pattern appeared: PICUS or SPIC entries to be certified by the PIC or FI in the Remarks column (www.gcaa.gov.ae).

Layer 3: ATO, operator or concerned authority certification

GM1 FCL.015 addresses the application as a whole. PilotAudit quotes it as saying that an application is not accepted where the logbook is not certified by the ATO, operator or concerned civil aviation authority (www.pilotaudit.com). An ATO is an organisation approved by and operating under the supervision of a Contracting State (www.gcaa.gov.ae). This report relies only on PilotAudit's quotation of the GM text and has not checked the official file. What the passage does not say is just as important: it does not prescribe a seal, a form, a wet signature or an interval. The certifier's identity depends on where the time was earned, which is why the certification route depends on the source of the time and on the application made.

Where the GCAA's own service page fits

The GCAA e-service for the "Issue of PPL, CPL, ATPL, MPL, IR" lists a copy of the logbook among required documents (www.gcaa.gov.ae), was established to facilitate issue of a UAE licence on the basis of a foreign licence (www.gcaa.gov.ae), and tells pilot applicants to approach a GCAA-approved training organisation to apply on their behalf (www.gcaa.gov.ae). That is an application channel, and it indicates that an ATO sits in the submission path. It does not define what that ATO certifies about the logbook. The pack therefore treats the application-level certification as an open question to confirm with the ATO and the current form.

Different jurisdictions, different acts

The same word means different things elsewhere, which is a reason not to import assumptions:

- **United States (14 CFR 61.51):** logged training time must be endorsed in a legible manner by the authorized instructor (www.law.cornell.edu), supervised pilot-in-command training is attested by the supervising PIC's signature (www.law.cornell.edu), and a logbook must be presented on request (www.law.cornell.edu).
- **Canada (Canadian Aviation Regulations 401.08 and 401.11):** every holder must maintain a personal log (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca), only the holder or an authorized person may make entries (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca), and co-pilot supervised time is restricted from recording (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca).
- **United Kingdom:** the CAA guidance says an electronic logbook submitted should be electronically signed to show who it belongs to (www.caa.co.uk), and the Air Navigation Order requires flight details to be recorded as soon as reasonably practicable after each flight (www.legislation.gov.uk).
- **Australia (Civil Aviation Safety Regulations 61.365):** a printed copy of an electronic logbook must have each page certified by the holder as a true copy (www.legislation.gov.au), and details are recorded as soon as practicable after each flight (www.legislation.gov.au).

None of these is UAE authority. Their value here is comparative: they show that "who certifies a page" is a jurisdiction-specific question.

The Evidence Chain: From Source Record to Personal Export

Every line in a personal export should trace back to a source that shows the flight, and every certification to a named certifier. The steps below assemble records already in existence; they do not change history.

Step 1: define the authority and the intended application

State which GCAA application the pack supports: a licence, a rating, or a conversion based on a foreign licence. The GCAA runs separate e-services; the rating service, for example, lists certificates of course completion among its required documents (www.gcaa.gov.ae), a different list from the licence service. The first line of the manifest names the service and the date its page was read.

Step 2: inventory personal books, operator flights and training records

List every source holding flights in the period: paper and electronic logbooks, operator records, ATO training records and examiner or check records. Record them as found; corrections go in as annotations, with the original retained.

Step 3: request the operator's records

In the EASA reference text, commercial air transport details may be recorded in an operator-maintained electronic format (www.easa.europa.eu), and the operator should make all flights, including differences and familiarisation training, available on request to the pilot (www.easa.europa.eu). Oman's AMC repeats the electronic-record permission (www.caa.gov.om). The request should ask for the full set, training and differences included, and say what the record will be used for.

Step 4: map each source to the personal export

Each personal entry gets an identifier, its original record and page, and the fields compared: date, aircraft type, registration, route, duration, remarks. EASA's minimum content list for the record is a useful completeness checklist for these fields (www.easa.europa.eu). The distinction that matters is between a **missing field** (the duration is blank in the export) and a **missing certification** (the duration is present but no one with the authority to certify it has done so). They are fixed by different requests.

Step 5: attach the certifier manifest

Table A below lists the three certification layers with their source paragraph, what each certifies, the person or entity, where the evidence lives and its status. *Table A* is built so that a blank certifier cell is visible instead of implied.

Certification layer	Source paragraph (and label)	What is certified	Person or entity	Evidence location	Status to record
1. Pilot page or record certification	AMC1 FCL.050 and model logbook instructions (compliance guidance); paragraph labels taken from the EASA reference text, not from the GCAA PDF	Entries are true; page totals carried forward	The pilot	Page remarks or certification statement; for electronic records, the certified export	Present / absent per page
2a. PICUS or SPIC countersignature	AMC1 FCL.050 model, remarks column; paragraph label taken from the EASA reference text, not from the GCAA PDF	That supervised time was flown as logged	Aircraft PIC or FI	Remarks column of the entry; PIC name and signature column	Present / absent per entry
2b. Instruction or check summary	AMC1 FCL.050 (instructor certification); paragraph label taken from the EASA reference text, not from the GCAA PDF	Instruction time received	Appropriately rated or authorised instructor; examiner for checks	Instruction summary lines; check records	Present / absent per summary
3. ATO, operator or concerned authority certification	GM1 FCL.015, Guidance Material (not regulatory text), as quoted by PilotAudit (secondary; official text not checked)	Logbook as submitted is complete and certified	ATO, operator or concerned civil aviation authority, depending on the source of the time	Attached to the application; format not established by the passage	Unknown until the current form is checked
Operator flight record	AMC1 FCL.050(c); paragraph label taken from the EASA reference text, not from the GCAA PDF	Flight details held by the operator	Operator	Operator electronic record, available to the pilot on request	Request issued / received
FSTD session record	AMC1 FCL.050 model (separate FSTD columns); paragraph label taken from the EASA reference text, not from the GCAA PDF	Session date, time and device	Instructor or ATO record (certifier not established by the passage)	FSTD session entry and ATO record	Present / absent

Table A shows that only layer 1 is under the pilot's own control. Layers 2 and 3 require another party to act, which is where packs most often stall. The operator row is deliberately separate from layer 3: the AMC makes the operator's electronic record available to the pilot, but it does not say that availability equals certification.

Role-Specific Countersignatures and Endorsements

Layer 2 is the most mechanical part of the manifest: each supervised or instructed entry should reference a signature that exists and can be located.

What a countersignature is, and is not

A countersignature is a second person's confirmation of a specific entry, distinct from the pilot's own page certification, which covers truthfulness and totals. Oman's AMC carries the same PICUS rule as EASA's (www.caa.gov.om). The GCAA's CAR-DEF defines PICUS as a co-pilot performing, under the supervision of the pilot in command, the duties and functions of a PIC (www.gcaa.gov.ae).

What this report does not do. It does not calculate whether a given pilot qualifies to log PICUS time, and it does not certify another pilot's eligibility. Whether a claimed PICUS or training category was valid under UAE rules is a fact to be verified against the current text and, where needed, with the GCAA, not assumed from a parallel regulator.

A typed name is not a signature

When an entry references a PIC who is named in the operator's records but whose countersignature is not on the page, the pack has an unresolved gap. The manifest should list the entry, the named PIC and the date requested. It should not carry a typed name as if it were the signature. The same applies to electronic tools: a system that stores a name has recorded a name, and whether it has recorded an acceptable certification depends on the authority's format.

How historic signatures survive an export

Electronic logbooks differ in how signatures travel. The vendor documentation below is not UAE evidence; it shows why the "does the signature survive?" question must be asked of each tool.

- **MyFlightbook:** a flight can only be signed once and by one instructor (myflightbook.com), and any change to the remaining attributes of the flight will invalidate the signature (myflightbook.com); values the student should be allowed to change are excluded from the signature (myflightbook.com). Its design document states the implementation has not been vetted by the FAA (myflightbook.com).
- **ForeFlight Logbook:** entries are locked when an instructor signs (support.foreflight.com), and its CSV export excludes signatures, endorsements, photos and track logs (support.foreflight.com), whereas its PDF export includes endorsements, certificates and licence information (support.foreflight.com).
- **LogTen Pro:** the associated signature is automatically deleted, and must be signed again, if a signed record is unlocked (support.logten.com).
- **Safelog:** users can attach signatures to flight records (www.dauntless-soft.com), and the vendor says it does not provide legal advice on signatures (www.dauntless-soft.com).
- **CrewLounge PILOTLOG:** endorsements captured on the phone sync to the desktop application (pilotlog.crewlounge.aero).

Each statement is the vendor's own and concerns that vendor's product; none establishes that the GCAA accepts the resulting file.

The 2013 proposal: context only

The 2013 proposal had a planned entry into force of 15 November 2013 (www.gcaa.gov.ae). It shows that the PIC or FI countersignature convention is long established in the GCAA's drafting, but it is not Issue05 text and is not current rule.

Aircraft Time, FSTD Time and Reconciliation in Minutes

The model logbook separates aircraft flight time from FSTD sessions. In the EASA reference text, FSTD sessions have their own entries, listed under their own heading (www.easa.europa.eu). For evidence packs, the practical rule is: keep the two totals separate, never roll one into the other, and reconcile each in minutes.

Why minutes

Hours-and-minutes figures such as 2:15 are not decimals, and adding them as decimals (2.15) produces silent errors. The manifest converts every duration to integer minutes, sums them, and converts back only for display.

(Hypothetical Example) An incomplete pack that reconciles

This synthetic example uses invented flights and no real pilot or operator. An operator's record lists three aircraft flights and one separate FSTD session. The pilot's personal export lists the same. *Table B* below is the item-by-item manifest for the example.

Flight identifier	Original operator record and page	Personal entry	Date, type, registration, route, duration	Remarks	Pilot certification	PIC or FI certification	Application-level certification reference	Unresolved question
F1	Operator record, page 1, line 1	Entry 101	Day 1, Type X, SYN-A, route 1, 2:00 (120 min)	None	Page certified	Not applicable (PIC)	Unknown	Which entity certifies the submitted export?
F2	Operator record, page 1, line 2	Entry 102	Day 1, Type X, SYN-A, route 2, 1:30 (90 min)	Supervised flight; references a PIC signature	Page certified	**Referenced signature absent**	Unknown	Is the category valid under UAE rules? Who supplies the signature?
F3	Operator record, page 1, line 3	Entry 103	Day 2, Type X, SYN-B, route 3, 2:15 (135 min)	None	Page certified	Not applicable (PIC)	Unknown	Same as F1
S1 (FSTD)	ATO or operator training record, page 2	Entry 104	Day 3, FSTD type Y, session, 1:00 (60 min)	None	Page certified	Instructor record not attached	Unknown	Who certifies the session record?

Table B shows the pack line by line. The aircraft flights total 120 + 90 + 135 = **345 minutes, or 5:45**, in both the operator record and the personal export. The FSTD session is **60 minutes** in both, reported separately and never added to the aircraft total. The arithmetic reconciles exactly. Three evidence questions nonetheless remain open: F2's referenced PIC signature is absent, the application-level certification is unknown, and the FSTD instructor record is not attached.

A missing field and a missing certification are different defects: here no field is missing, but one certification is. A typed PIC name in the remarks does not reconstruct the absent countersignature. The example deliberately makes no prediction about how a GCAA reviewer would treat the pack, because that decision belongs to the authority.

What to request in the example

- **From the PIC named on F2:** the countersignature for entry 102 in the form the current application accepts, or a written statement from that PIC if the authority's instructions allow one.
- **From the ATO or operator:** the training record for S1 and confirmation of who certifies the submitted export.
- **From the GCAA application channel:** the current form's certification format and the acceptable certifying entity.

Implementation: Requests, Electronic Formats and the Dated Export

Table D below is a pilot-facing document-request checklist. It separates **fields required in the EASA reference text** (not confirmed as GCAA requirements; Issue05 is only reported by PilotAudit to list similar content) from **suggested audit controls** (good practice that no cited source requires).

Item to request	Ask whom	Layer	Required in EASA reference text (not confirmed for GCAA), or suggested control	Basis
Complete flight list for the period, including differences and familiarisation training	Operator	Source record	Listed in EASA reference text (access)	Reference text cited above
Per-flight minimum content: date, places, times, aircraft type and registration, PIC name, function	Operator	Source record	Listed in EASA reference text (content)	Reference text cited above
Countersignature for each PICUS or SPIC entry	Aircraft PIC or FI	2a	Listed in EASA reference text (for such entries)	Reference text cited above
Certification of each instruction summary	Instructor	2b	Listed in EASA reference text (for such entries)	Reference text cited above
FSTD session record: date, device type and qualification number, session time	ATO or FSTD operator	Source record	Listed in EASA reference text (content)	Reference text cited above

Item to request	Ask whom	Layer	Required in EASA reference text (not confirmed for GCAA), or suggested control	Basis
Certification of the submitted logbook	ATO, operator or concerned authority	3	Guidance Material; format not established	GM1 FCL.015 (as quoted by PilotAudit)
Statement of the export's coverage: period, date extracted, fields included	Operator	Source record	Suggested audit control	Not required by any cited source
Retained originals and the dated submitted export	Pilot	All	Suggested audit control	Not required by any cited source
Snapshot of the current application page and form wording	GCAA application channel	3	Suggested audit control	Application page, read 22 Nov 2026

Table D keeps the pilot from presenting a good habit as if it were a rule. Rows marked as suggested controls make the pack easier to defend, but the cited sources do not require them, and the GCAA's current form governs what must actually be supplied.

Check the current form and the issue

GM1 FCL.015 is Guidance Material, and the application's form can differ in scope or format from the passage. Read the current GCAA page for the service before submitting. The licence service lists AED 2,820 for initial issue of a CPL, CPL/IR, ATPL or MPL (www.gcaa.gov.ae) and a normal track of 5 working days (www.gcaa.gov.ae); both may change.

Electronic logbooks and acceptance

The reference model does not exclude electronic records, but conditions apply: the model may be kept in electronic format with all the minimum data included (www.easa.europa.eu), certified by the pilot and in a format the authority accepts (cited in the Layer 1 discussion). PilotAudit reports that Issue05 permits electronic records, including operator-maintained records for commercial air transport. No source establishes which concrete file format the GCAA accepts for a given application; that is an open question for the current form.

Vendors say as much about their own tools. ForeFlight notes that the legality of electronic logbook endorsements may vary from one country to another (support.foreflight.com). Safelog says acceptance varies by regulatory agency (www.dauntless-soft.com). CrewLounge tells users to contact their aviation authorities (pilotlog.crewlounge.aero) and notes that recording rules may differ for the local authority (support.crewlounge.aero). LogTen says the FAA advisory circular on electronic signatures does not specifically refer to pilot logbooks (support.logten.com) and advises consulting the local Flight Standards District Office (FSDO) or FAA Principal Inspector (support.logten.com).

Placing Pilot Logbook beside paper and established tools

Pilot Logbook is the publisher's product, so placement is kept proportionate. As read on its product page on 22 November 2026 (a first-party description, not an independent verification), it lists a printable layout labelled "UAE · GCAA" among its paper-style layouts, offers print or save as PDF, describes instructor and examiner signatures that can be given by link or in person, and is available by invitation only. The page does not state GCAA approval, a connection to operator records or an automatic acceptance checker, and none is claimed here. A matching layout is a presentation choice, not an acceptance.

Table E below sets the signature and export handling documented by each vendor's own pages beside the paper method. It describes documented behaviour, not regulator acceptance.

Method	Signature and endorsement handling (as documented)	Export (as documented)	Regulator acceptance statement
Paper logbook	Pilot certification statement and countersignatures in the Remarks column (reference model: Oman AMC (www.caa.gov.om))	Scan or photocopy of pages (UK CAA guidance for its own submissions (www.caa.co.uk))	Authority-specific
MyFlightbook	One instructor signature per flight; edits to signed attributes invalidate it	CSV with a FlightID column; re-importing without it creates duplicates (myflightbook.com)	Design document says not vetted by the FAA
ForeFlight Logbook	Signed entries are locked	CSV excludes signatures; PDF includes endorsements	Legality of endorsements varies by country
LogTen Pro	Signatures tied to the instructor's CFI number and expiry (support.logten.com)	Not assessed here	Advises consulting the local authority
CrewLounge PILOTLOG	Pilot can generate a PDF and sign it by hand	PDF	Contact your aviation authorities
Pilot Logbook (invitation-only)	Instructor and examiner signing by link or in person, per its page	Print or save as PDF, per its page	No GCAA approval stated

Table E shows that every established tool defers the acceptance question to the authority, and that signatures survive export differently from tool to tool. For a UAE pack, the practical test is whether the exported file still carries or references the signatures the manifest needs. If a CSV drops them, the originals must be attached separately.

Retain a dated submitted export

Keep the exact file submitted, with its date, the manifest, and the originals it was built from. Do not assume a personal-log retention period: PilotAudit notes that the text it reviewed does not state one universal personal-logbook retention period. Training organisations have a distinct duty: CAR-ORA (organisation requirements for aircrew) requires ATO training records to be kept for at least five years after training completes (www.gcaa.gov.ae). That is the ATO's obligation, not a rule for the pilot's logbook. For contrast, Australia sets a seven-year retention for its own logbook rule (www.legislation.gov.au), a figure that is not a UAE rule.

Conversion and foreign-licence evidence

For conversion based on a foreign licence, the GCAA's 2018 information bulletin says a foreign ICAO-State licence is recognised, but this is not a recognition of the training course and examination system (www.gcaa.gov.ae). One independent guide reports that the logbook copy must be authenticated by the UAE operator (bestpilotjobs.com); as a secondary source it should be tested against the current form. ICAO notes that the Chicago Convention provides for worldwide recognition of licences issued by member States, subject to conditions (www.icao.int); the GCAA application decides the UAE specifics.

Questions to settle before submitting

- **Format:** which certification format and certifying entity does the current application accept?
- **Scope:** does the certification cover the whole logbook, only the ATO or operator period, or selected entries?
- **Category validity:** was each claimed PICUS or training category valid under UAE rules when flown?
- **Signature survival:** does each tool's export keep, drop or reference the historic signatures?

Data Analysis and Evidence

The evidence here is structural rather than statistical. The figures below are the dates, counts and arithmetic that bear on the decision (as of 22 November 2026 unless stated).

Source and currentness register

Table C records each source's revision, its applicability and the limit on what it proves. It is the pack's own currentness record.

Source	Revision / issue	Applicability	Retrieval	Currentness limit
GCAA CAR-FCL, official PDF	Issue05; issue record September 2025 (as reported by PilotAudit)	From 1 January 2026 per the same report	Official PDF not checked for this article; details not verified against it	Not confirmed as the latest issue; check the GCAA publication page for the current issue
GCAA CAR e-publication page	Listing of CARs, Part II	Official location for the issue check	Read 22 Nov 2026	Listing, not a statement that nothing newer exists
GM1 FCL.015	Within Issue05 (as quoted by PilotAudit; page location not verified)	Guidance Material	Quoted via PilotAudit (see above)	Secondary quotation; official text not checked for this article
EASA Easy Access Rules, Aircrew	Revision from October 2026 (www.easa.europa.eu)	European Union only	Read 22 Nov 2026	Reference model, not UAE authority
GCAA 2013 NPA	Proposal, planned entry 15 Nov 2013	Historic	Read 22 Nov 2026	Not current rule

Source	Revision / issue	Applicability	Retrieval	Currentness limit
GCAA e-service, licence issue	Service page	Application channel	Read 22 Nov 2026	Fee and timing may change

Table C makes plain that the central regulatory text could be confirmed here only through the GCAA listing and a specialist's quotation, and that EASA's October 2026 consolidation is a different jurisdiction's text.

Quantitative anchors

- **Issue05 applicability:** September 2025 record of issue and 1 January 2026 applicability, as reported in the specialist guide cited above. This is the date the 2026 text applies from; it is not a newly enacted November 2026 rule.
- **Worked example:** 120 + 90 + 135 = 345 aircraft minutes (5:45), plus 60 FSTD minutes, reconciled separately.
- **ATO training records:** at least 5 years after completion (CAR-ORA, cited above).
- **Licence service timing and fee:** a normal track of 5 working days and AED 2,820 for initial issue of a CPL, CPL/IR, ATPL or MPL (e-service page, cited above).
- **Scale of the UAE pilot population:** a GCAA announcement, republished by a wire service, counted 9,622 registered pilots (www.zawya.com) and 929 registered aircraft in 2024 (www.zawya.com).
- **UAE digital licensing:** a working paper to an ICAO regional meeting says the UAE has a digital licensing framework for issuing pilot licences (www.icao.int). It concerns licensing, not logbook certification.

The population figures show why the problem is common, not how often packs are incomplete: no public data on pack completeness or acceptance rates were found, and none is claimed.

Implications and Future Directions

For pilots. The manifest turns "the hours add up" into three checkable claims. Layer 1 the pilot can complete at once; layers 2 and 3 need requests naming the entry, the record and the purpose. Split histories benefit most, because the operator and personal periods may have different certifiers.

For tools. Signature continuity through export is a feature to check, not assume: some tools drop signatures on CSV export or invalidate them on edit, as documented. The response is to retain the originals and the dated export beside them. Pilot Logbook, like the others, provides presentation and record-keeping, not certification, and no GCAA approval is established for it or any product.

For the regulation. Per PilotAudit, Issue05 applies from 1 January 2026, and a later amendment could change the passages cited here. The manifest should therefore carry its own revision record (Table C) and be rechecked against the GCAA publication page before each submission.

Open questions. Four remain unresolved by public evidence: the accepted certification format for each application, the certifying entity for mixed operator and personal histories, how historic signatures should be presented in an electronic export, and whether any superseding issue exists. Each should be put to the ATO or the GCAA channel in writing.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

What does the GCAA require of a pilot logbook?

A reliable record in the form the authority sets, with the minimum content listed in AMC1 FCL.050 (EASA's parallel list is cited above). For Issue05, the application-acceptance guidance is GM1 FCL.015. Check the current form for specifics.

How are pilot logbook hours certified in the UAE?

In three layers: the pilot certifies the page and totals, a PIC or FI countersigns supervised and instructional entries, and the ATO, operator or concerned authority certifies as GM1 FCL.015 describes. The passage prescribes no seal, form, wet signature or interval.

How are flight hours verified, and is an electronic logbook accepted?

Each personal entry should trace to an operator record, a training record or a signed page, and the operator should make its records available to the pilot on request. No source here establishes GCAA acceptance of any named electronic logbook product; the reference text allows electronic records certified by the pilot in a format the authority accepts.

What about signatures, endorsements and licence conversion?

PICUS and SPIC entries need a PIC or FI countersignature, and instruction summaries need the instructor's certification (reference text). A typed name does not replace a missing signature. For conversion, the GCAA service lists a copy of the logbook and routes applications through a GCAA-approved training organisation; secondary guides add authentication requirements to check against the current form.

How long must records be kept, and does a digital audit trail exist?

No universal personal-logbook retention period is established by the passage reviewed, so do not infer one. Among the vendors reviewed, only MyFlightbook documents a visible change record for signed flights (myflightbook.com), a vendor feature rather than a GCAA requirement. For an airline application, the employer sets what it accepts; this report concerns licensing evidence only.

Conclusion

A UAE evidence pack answers a different question from a hours total. The total says how much was flown. The manifest says who certified each part: the pilot for the page, a PIC or FI for supervised and instructional entries, and the ATO, operator or concerned authority at the application level as GM1 FCL.015 describes it. Guidance Material carries lesser weight than regulatory text and AMC, and the passage does not fix a seal, form, wet signature or interval, so none should be invented.

The worked example is the shortest proof: 345 aircraft minutes and 60 FSTD minutes reconcile exactly while one countersignature is absent and the application-level certification is unknown. Tools can present and export records, and Pilot Logbook is one of several that do, but none supplies certification the pilot's counterparties

have not given. Before submitting, confirm the current form's certification format, confirm the issue against the GCAA publication page, request the missing signatures and records by entry, and retain the dated export beside the originals.

Source links

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

1. https://www.gcaa.gov.ae/en/epublication/civil-aviation-regulations
2. https://www.pilotaudit.com/middle-east/gcaa-pilot-logbook-requirements-uae
3. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/downloads/115485/en
4. https://www.gcaa.gov.ae/en/Pages/aboutgcaa/Laws.aspx
5. https://skybrary.aero/safety-regulations/personnel-licensing
6. https://store.icao.int/en/annex-1-personnel-licensing
7. https://www.caa.gov.om/upload/files/AMC-GM%20CAR-FCL%20%28Final%20Approved%29%20-%20V%200.10.pdf
8. https://www.gcaa.gov.ae/en/epublication/EPublications/Notice%20of%20Proposed%20Amendment%20%28NPA%29/NPA%2012-2013%20-%20FCL-AMC-GM%20-%201st%20September%202013.pdf
9. https://www.gcaa.gov.ae/en/epublication/EPublications/Civil%20Aviation%20Regulations%20%28CARs%29/CAR%20I%20-%20DEFINITIONS%20and%20BASIC%20REGULATION/CAR-DEF%20%E2%80%93%20DEFINITIONS%20%E2%80%93%20ISSUE%2002.pdf
10. https://www.gcaa.gov.ae/en/eservices/issue-of-pplcplatplmplir/158
11. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/14/61.51
12. https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-96-433/section-401.08.html
13. https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-96-433/section-401.11.html
14. https://www.caa.co.uk/general-aviation/pilot-licences/applications/documentation/guidance-on-documentation
15. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2016/765/article/228
16. https://www.legislation.gov.au/F1998B00220/2024-10-14/2024-10-14/text/original/epub/OEBPS/document_2/document_2.html
17. https://www.gcaa.gov.ae/en/pages/ServiceCard.aspx?SID=168
18. https://myflightbook.com/logbook/mvc/pub/CFISigs
19. https://support.foreflight.com/hc/en-us/articles/360035269394-How-can-a-locked-logbook-entry-be-unlocked
20. https://support.foreflight.com/hc/en-us/articles/27890005247639
21. https://support.logten.com/en/articles/11604207-is-the-signature-feature-compliant-with-faa-advisory-circular-120-78
22. https://www.dauntless-soft.com/helpdesk/phraseview.asp?PID=690
23. https://pilotlog.crewlounge.aero/features
24. https://support.foreflight.com/hc/en-us/articles/220211768-Are-electronic-logbook-endorsements-legal
25. https://pilotlog.crewlounge.aero/faq
26. https://support.crewlounge.aero/support/solutions/articles/24000034152
27. https://myflightbook.com/logbook/mvc/faq

28. https://www.gcaa.gov.ae/en/epublication/EPublications/Civil%20Aviation%20Regulations%20%28CARs%29/CAR%20II%20-%20LICENSING%20AND%20TRAINING%20ORGANISATION%20REGULATIONS/CAR-ORA%20-%20ORGANISATION%20REQUIREMENTS%20FOR%20AIRCREW%20ORA%20-%20ISSUE%2001.pdf
29. https://www.gcaa.gov.ae/en/epublication/EPublications/Safety%20Information%20Bulletin%20%28SIB%29/2018/INFORMATION%20BULLETIN%202018-12%20-%20AIR%20CREW%20LICENSING%20CURRENT%20AND%20FUTURE%20PROJECTS%20-%20ISSUE%2001.pdf
30. https://bestpilotjobs.com/licence-conversion
31. https://www.icao.int/personnel-licensing-faq
32. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/easy-access-rules-aircrew-regulation-eu-no-11782011
33. https://www.zawya.com/en/business/aviation/passenger-traffic-sees-10-growth-reaching-1478-million-in-2024-xy20eeac
34. https://www.icao.int/sites/default/files/MID/MeetingDocs/2026/MIDANPIRG-23%20%26%20RASG-MID-13/Meeting%20Documentation/WP-57.pdf

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.