LANDING.AERO

LANDING.AERO / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Combining Flights in an EASA Logbook: The 30-Minute Rule

> 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 · 2026-11-08 · combine flights easa logbook · easa logbook 30 minute rule · amc1 fcl.050 · fcl.050 recording of flight time · series of flights logbook · easa pilot logbook format · electronic pilot logbook · logbook audit evidence · touch and go logbook · pilot logbook

Original article: https://www.landing.aero/articles/en/combine-flights-easa-logbook-30-minute-exception



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. What a Logbook Row Is, and What It Is Not
4. The Exception, Condition by Condition
5. Worked Example: 29, 30 and 31 Minutes, Elapsed Versus Flown
6. Boundary Cases and Reviewing Existing Grouped Rows
7. Paper Line Versus Electronic Export
8. Data Analysis and Evidence
9. Implications and Future Directions
10. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
11. Conclusion

Executive Summary

Flights can be combined into one line of an EASA pilot logbook, but only inside a narrow, optional exception. **AMC1 FCL.050 (b)(1)(vi)** says that when a licence holder makes a number of flights on the same day, returning on each occasion to the same place of departure, and "the interval between successive flights does not exceed 30 minutes", the series "may be recorded as a single entry" (www.easa.europa.eu). The Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) is non-binding guidance; the binding duty in Part-FCL (Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011, Annex I) is a short record-keeping duty: keep a reliable record of the details of all flights flown (eur-lex.europa.eu) (www.easa.europa.eu). The logbook instructions set the default as one line for each flight (www.easa.europa.eu).

The boundary is inclusive on the primary text: "does not exceed 30 minutes" admits a gap of exactly **30 minutes** and excludes **31 minutes**. In the synthetic example used throughout this report (Hypothetical Example, not real flight records), two 40-minute flights from and to the same aerodrome, 08:00 to 08:40 UTC and 09:10 to 09:50 UTC, have a 30-minute gap. Their durations sum to **80 minutes (1:20)**, while the elapsed span from first departure to last arrival is **110 minutes (1:50)**. A single line may carry 1:20, never 1:50. At a 09:11 second departure the gap is 31 minutes and the exception is not met.

A same-tail, same-date label is not enough. A point-to-point chain (A-B then B-C) does not return to the departure point, a changed registration departs from the text "an aircraft", and a flight on a different UTC date fails the date convention. A compact line must still preserve the total time of each flight, the landings by day or night, night and instrument time, and the countersignatures that supervised functions require.

For existing grouped rows, the report recommends keeping the original, testing only what the evidence supports, and never treating an unknown gap as zero. The text read here is the EASA Easy Access Rules for Aircrew, October 2026 edition, whose publication page tells readers to check rules adopted after 16 October 2026 (www.easa.europa.eu); none was found. National acceptance remains with each competent authority (eur-lex.europa.eu); for example, Ireland's authority reproduces the same 30-minute wording (www.iaa.ie). The

studio that publishes Pilot Logbook describes roster-derived individual flights and data export (a vendor description, not verified here) and does not publicly document a grouped-flight feature, so this report supplies a manual worksheet (request an invite from the studio).

Introduction and Background

Pilots who fly repeated local sorties, whether circuits, short charter hops or instructional details, regularly ask whether one logbook line can stand for several flights. The question also reaches professionals who build a logbook entry from a daily or roster summary. As anecdotal context only, a public airline-pilot forum thread has a first officer describing adding the flight times of each leg together into one entry for the same day and the same tail number (www.reddit.com). The replies disagree, and they rely on unsourced statements about legality and employer acceptance, so the thread shows only that pilots ask the question. It is a United States context and is not authority for EASA practice.

This report answers the question for pilots licensed under **EASA Part-FCL**, the flight crew licensing rules in Annex I of Commission Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011. It is personal record-keeping analysis, not scheduling or operating advice, and it does not replace an operator's approved procedures or the decision of a competent authority or examiner. The incremental contribution is a small rule-test matrix with leg-level source rows: for each proposed grouped line, the reader tests every condition against the underlying flights, calculates the supported duration separately from the elapsed span, and records whether the outcome is supported, not supported, or needs authority clarification.

Two scope notes apply. First, general FCL.050 field lists and retention are outside the scope of this report and appear here only where a field affects the exception. Second, the text analysed is the online Easy Access Rules edition of 16 October 2026. The edition was read in its online HTML form, so no printed page numbers are cited. Paragraph labels such as (b)(1)(vi) and (f) are given instead. Nothing here claims the grouping rule is new: the same wording appears in national copies of the AMC (www.iaa.ie) (ulc.gov.pl).

Each rule below names its jurisdiction, because EASA, the United Kingdom Civil Aviation Authority (UK CAA), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in the United States and Transport Canada use different wording.

What a Logbook Row Is, and What It Is Not

Four records that are easily confused

A **personal logbook row** is part of the record that FCL.050 requires: the pilot "shall keep a reliable record of the details of all flights flown" in a form and manner established by the competent authority (eur-lex.europa.eu). That record must be presented without undue delay for inspection on request of an authorised representative of the authority (eur-lex.europa.eu). Other records look similar but are governed elsewhere:

- **A trip or pairing** and **a roster day** are operator scheduling constructs. They group duties by day and place, with boundaries set for duty planning, not for the flight-time boundaries the logbook uses.
- **An aircraft journey log** is an operator or aircraft record under Part-ORO (organisation requirements for air operators) in Commission Regulation (EU) No 965/2012. Its content is the particulars of the aircraft, crew and journey, kept "for each flight, or series of flights" (www.easa.europa.eu), and it may sit in

documentation other than a log book.

A roster export or journey log may be evidence behind a logbook line, but its grouping logic is not the logbook's.

Binding rule, acceptable means, national practice and audit steps

The report separates four layers, because the layers carry different weight.

- **Binding rule (EU).** FCL.050 requires the reliable record (eur-lex.europa.eu). It does not itself mention a 30-minute series.
- **Acceptable means (EASA).** AMC1 FCL.050 contains the series exception. EASA describes AMC as "non-binding standards" that illustrate how to comply, and a person using other means does not keep the presumption of compliance that the AMC provides. The exception is therefore a route to presumed compliance, and it is optional: the text says a series "may be recorded as a single entry".
- **National submission practice.** FCL.050 delegates "form and manner" to the competent authority. Ireland's Irish Aviation Authority (IAA) requires records "in a standard and format acceptable to the IAA" (www.iaa.ie). Switzerland's Federal Office of Civil Aviation (FOCA) points holders of an EASA licence it issued to AMC1 FCL.050 (ffac.ch). Germany's Luftfahrt-Bundesamt (LBA) requires flight-experience evidence to be confirmed by an authorised person (in German: "durch eine berechtigte Person") (www.lba.de).
- **Recommended audit steps.** Tests that no source states, such as reconciling printed totals to leg durations, are labelled below as audit checks. They are this report's recommendations, not conditions of the AMC.

The edition and what changed

The Easy Access Rules for Aircrew are a consolidated reading aid. The publication page tells readers to "check if any rule was adopted after" 16 October 2026. The checks run for this report found no amendment, decision, notice of proposed amendment or opinion changing FCL.050 or AMC1 FCL.050 after 16 October. That is a "nothing found in the pages checked" result, not proof of absence. In the October edition, the series exception sits in AMC1 FCL.050, while the separate logbook instructions restate it at (f).

The Exception, Condition by Condition

The text

Two paragraphs carry the exception. In AMC1 FCL.050 (b)(1)(vi), under logging of pilot-in-command (PIC) flight time, the licence holder "carries out a number of flights upon the same day", returns "on each occasion to the same place of departure", and the interval "does not exceed 30 minutes" (www.easa.europa.eu). In the logbook instructions at (f), the default is "using one line for each flight", and the exception applies "if an aircraft carries out a number of flights upon the same day" (www.easa.europa.eu). National copies reproduce the same words: Ireland's IAA memorandum PLAM.024 (www.iaa.ie), a Polish authority download of the AMC (ulc.gov.pl), and, for the United Kingdom regime, a 2024 CAA draft showing (b)(1)(vi) unchanged (consultations.caa.co.uk).

What each condition requires

- **Same day.** The logbook date is "the date (dd/mm/yy) on which the flight commences" (www.easa.europa.eu), and "All times should be in UTC" (www.easa.europa.eu). Read together, the day test is a comparison of UTC start dates. The AMC does not say what to do when a pilot's source data use local time; that is an authority question.
- **Same aircraft.** Paragraph (b)(1)(vi) speaks of the licence holder's flights; paragraph (f) speaks of "an aircraft" carrying out the series. The logbook line has a single type and registration field, so a changed registration cannot be represented without losing a particular the line must carry.
- **Return to the same place of departure, on each occasion.** Each flight in the series must come back to the point it left. A chain A-B, B-C has no return to A and fails on the plain words.
- **Interval not more than 30 minutes.** "Does not exceed" is inclusive. The AMC does not define the instants between which the interval is measured. For aeroplanes, flight time itself runs from first movement for the purpose of taking off to final rest at the end of the flight (eur-lex.europa.eu), so measuring the interval from final rest to the next first movement is the reading that matches the flight-time boundaries. This is an inference, not a stated rule.
- **A single entry is optional.** "May be recorded" leaves the default of one line per flight in place.

Table 1: the rule-test matrix

Table 1 below sets out each condition, its source and status, how to test it against leg-level rows, and the three permitted outcomes. Conditions stated in the AMC are separated from audit checks that this report adds.

Condition	Source and status	Test on leg-level rows	Outcome rule
1. Same date	AMC1 FCL.050 (b)(1)(vi) "upon the same day"; date and UTC convention in the logbook instructions at (i)	Compare the UTC start date of every leg	**Supported** if all equal. **Not supported** if any differ on UTC dates. **Needs authority clarification** if sources are in local time and the UTC date cannot be derived
2. Same recorded aircraft	Instructions at (f) "an aircraft". Paragraph (b)(1)(vi) itself is silent	Same registration on every leg	**Supported** if identical. **Not supported** if any leg differs
3. Return to original departure on each flight	AMC text "returning on each occasion to the same place of departure" (ulc.gov.pl)	Arrival equals departure for every leg, and all departures share one place	**Supported** if all legs are A-A. **Not supported** for A-B then B-C, or for A-B then B-A on the plain reading
4. Known interval of 30 minutes or less	AMC text, inclusive (ulc.gov.pl)	Start of leg n+1 minus end of leg n, for every adjacent pair, using the same boundary instants	**Supported** at 30 or fewer. **Not supported** at 31 or more. **Needs authority clarification** if an instant is missing

Condition	Source and status	Test on leg-level rows	Outcome rule
5. Retained total duration	Total time of flight is a required item for each flight, item (a)(2) of the AMC; the sum rule is an **audit check**	Printed total equals the sum of leg durations, not the elapsed span	**Supported** if equal. **Not supported** if the total includes gaps
6. Landings and conditions	Landings by day or night, night or IFR time; preserving them on a grouped line is an **audit check**	Column totals equal the sums over legs	**Supported** if every event count survives. **Not supported** if any is lost
7. Function, source and certification	Supervised functions are countersigned (www.easa.europa.eu); the certification of electronic records, where required, should also be preserved; completeness of these particulars is an **audit check** for grouping	Each leg has function and a certification reference where one is required	**Supported** if all particulars survive on the line or in remarks. **Needs authority clarification** if functions differ across legs

The matrix shows why the exception is easy to state and hard to apply from an aggregate. Conditions 1 to 4 are tests on leg instants and places, so they cannot be run from a daily total. Conditions 5 to 7 are audit checks, not AMC conditions: they test whether the proposed line is still a faithful summary.

Worked Example: 29, 30 and 31 Minutes, Elapsed Versus Flown

Assumptions (Hypothetical Example)

Everything in this section is synthetic arithmetic, not an actual flight record. The assumptions are: one aeroplane with one registration; one aerodrome "A" is the departure and arrival of every flight; times are UTC, so all legs share one UTC date; the start instant is the first movement for the purpose of taking off and the end instant is final rest, matching the flight-time boundaries for aeroplanes (eur-lex.europa.eu); and the pilot is PIC on every leg.

Table 2: underlying flights and the proposed print rows

Table 2 lists three synthetic legs (Hypothetical Example) with their source IDs, instants, durations, gaps and landings, and shows which print row each belongs to.

Source ID	Date (UTC)	Departure to arrival	Start	End	Actual duration	Gap from previous	Landings (day / night)	Function and certification reference	Proposed print row
L1	2026-03-14	A to A	08:00	08:40	40 min	none	1 / 0	PIC; none required	**P1**
L2	2026-03-14	A to A	09:10	09:50	40 min	**30 min** (08:40 to 09:10)	1 / 0	PIC; none required	**P1**
L3	2026-03-14	A to A	10:21	11:01	40 min	**31 min** (09:50 to 10:21)	1 / 0	PIC; none required	**P2**

Row P1 combines L1 and L2: total time of flight **1:20**, landings 2 by day, and a remark listing the two leg intervals so that the supporting detail is retained on the line. The AMC allows remarks for "any activity deemed necessary to be recorded for evidence purposes" (www.easa.europa.eu). Row P2 holds L3 alone: the gap before it is 31 minutes, so it cannot join the series. The day totals are 2:00 flown across 3 landings, identical whether the day is printed as two lines or three.

The arithmetic

The supported duration of a series is the sum of the individual flight durations. The elapsed span is last end minus first start. The difference between them is the sum of the gaps.

- **L1 duration:** 08:40 minus 08:00 = 40 minutes. **L2 duration:** 09:50 minus 09:10 = 40 minutes.
- **Gap L1 to L2:** 09:10 minus 08:40 = 30 minutes, which "does not exceed 30 minutes" (www.iaa.ie).
- **Supported duration:** 40 + 40 = **80 minutes = 1:20**.
- **Elapsed span:** 09:50 minus 08:00 = **110 minutes = 1:50**.
- **Check:** 110 minus 80 = 30 minutes, equal to the single gap, so the leg-level data are internally consistent.

Total time of flight may be entered in hours and minutes or in decimal notation, so 1:20 and 1.33 hours are both permissible presentations; 1:50 is not a presentation of the same quantity, because the extra 30 minutes is ground time between flights. A grouped line must not create flight time that no flight contained.

Testing 29, 30 and 31 minutes

Keep L1 as 08:00 to 08:40 and vary only the second departure, with a 40-minute second flight in each case.

- **Second departure 09:09 (gap 29 minutes).** Interval met. Supported duration 80 minutes. Elapsed span 09:49 minus 08:00 = 109 minutes.
- **Second departure 09:10 (gap 30 minutes).** Interval met on the inclusive reading ("does not exceed"). Supported duration 80 minutes. Elapsed span 110 minutes.
- **Second departure 09:11 (gap 31 minutes).** Interval not met. The two flights stay on separate lines, 40 minutes each, and the cited grouping exception does not apply. The elapsed span would be 111 minutes and the supported total for the day is still 80 minutes.

A third flight tests the chain. If L3 departs 31 minutes after L2 lands, as in Table 2, it breaks the series even though L1 and L2 qualified. Each adjacent gap must meet the interval; a cumulative or average measure is not what the AMC says.

Boundary Cases and Reviewing Existing Grouped Rows

Table 3: exception cases

Table 3 applies the matrix to the cases most likely to appear in a charter, instructional or airline logbook (all facts are a Hypothetical Example). The outcome column uses the same three labels as Table 1.

Case	Facts (synthetic)	Outcome	Reason and open question
Exact 30 minutes	A-A 08:00 to 08:40, A-A 09:10 to 09:50, same date and tail	**Supported**	"Does not exceed" is inclusive; confirm that the interval is measured between the flight-time boundaries
More than 30 minutes	Second departure 09:11	**Not supported**	31 minutes exceeds the limit; keep two lines
Point-to-point chain	A-B then B-C, same tail, same date	**Not supported**	No return to the place of departure on each occasion (ulc.gov.pl); a same-tail, same-date label does not substitute
Out and back with a stop	A-B then B-A, same tail, short turnaround	**Not supported on the plain reading** (a reading of the AMC wording, not an authority ruling)	Neither flight returns to its own departure; any wider reading needs the authority's confirmation
Date rollover	A-A ends 23:55 UTC; next A-A starts 00:20 UTC, gap 25 minutes	**Not supported on UTC dates** (a reading of the AMC wording, not an authority ruling)	Different UTC dates; **needs authority clarification** if a local-date convention is claimed
Tail change	A-A on one registration, then A-A on another, gap 20 minutes	**Not supported**	Paragraph (f) refers to "an aircraft"; one registration field per line
Changed function	First flight dual instruction received, second flight PIC, same tail, gap 15 minutes	**Needs authority clarification**	The AMC does not enumerate this case, and it is not unlawful merely because it is silent; the test is whether function time, countersignature and remarks survive for each flight (help.flightlogger.net)
Incomplete gap evidence	Historical row shows only first start 08:00 and last end 09:50, total 1:20	**Needs authority clarification**	Gaps and the number of legs are not recorded; the reasons are developed below
Airline sectors	Several scheduled sectors on one tail and date, each to a different airport	**Not supported**	No return to a common departure point; the operator's electronic record may be the source for the individual lines

The label "same tail, same date" never decides the outcome; only leg-level facts do, and when they are absent the correct outcome is clarification, not a favourable default.

Local flights, circuits and touch-and-go landings

Local and training flying is where the exception is most useful, and where care about events matters most. For aeroplanes, a flight begins at first movement and ends at final rest. A circuit with touch-and-go landings does not come to rest between circuits, so on that definition it is one flight; the exception concerns separate flights between which the aircraft stops. The AMC text read for this report contains no wording on touch-and-go landings, and the landing column asks for "the number of landings as pilot flying by day or night" (www.easa.europa.eu). How a touch-and-go counts in that column is a question to put to the competent authority or the training organisation, not something this text answers. Landings matter because Part-FCL

recent-experience rules count them: three take-offs, approaches and landings as pilot flying in the preceding 90 days for certain operations (eur-lex.europa.eu), and one at night in the preceding 90 days for night operations without an instrument rating (eur-lex.europa.eu). Night itself is defined by civil twilight (eur-lex.europa.eu). A grouped line must keep those counts exactly.

Reviewing an existing aggregate without inventing legs

An existing grouped row may carry only a first start, a last end and a total. The review rule is simple: retain the original, test only what the evidence supports, and show the uncertainty. The following screen uses the recorded total T, the elapsed span S (last end minus first start) and the number of legs k, when k is known. It assumes T is meant to be the sum of leg durations.

1. **T greater than S.** The total exceeds the span in which the flying is supposed to have occurred. This is an arithmetic inconsistency and needs the source records.
2. **T equal to S.** Either one continuous flight or a total that was computed from the span. The two cannot be told apart from the row alone.
3. **T less than S.** The difference G = S minus T is unexplained time. With two legs it is the single gap, so G of 30 or less is consistent with the interval limit and G above 30 is not. With k legs, a necessary condition is G of at most 30 times (k minus 1); it is not sufficient, because an individual gap could still exceed 30 while the sum stays low.
4. **k unknown.** No classification is possible. Do not guess the ground gaps, and do not record missing evidence as zero minutes.

For example (Hypothetical Example), a row showing 08:00 to 09:50 with a total of 1:20 has G of 30 minutes. That fits two legs with an exactly 30-minute gap, or three legs with gaps of 15 and 15, and the row cannot say which. The same span with a total of 1:00 has G of 50 minutes: two legs cannot satisfy the interval limit, and three could only if source records show three legs. In neither case should a leg, gap or landing be added to the row. A vendor marketing line, offered as context and not as evidence, describes catching errors "before a checkride or interview" (www.aculog.com); the point here is only that review of this kind starts from source records.

Paper Line Versus Electronic Export

Paper

On paper, entries should be made in ink or indelible pencil, and as soon as practicable after the flight. A grouped paper line should show the date, the common aerodrome, the registration, the total flight time as the sum of legs, the landings by day and night, and a remark that lists the leg start and end times, so that the line can be traced to its sources. The remarks column may record "any activity deemed necessary to be recorded for evidence purposes". Switzerland's FOCA recommends separate logbooks for different aircraft categories (ffac.ch).

Electronic

For aeroplanes, helicopters and powered-lift aircraft outside commercial air transport, the AMC allows the logbook format to be kept in electronic format provided all the listed data are included. Electronic records must be readily available to the authority, certified by the pilot and "in a format acceptable by the competent authority" (www.easa.europa.eu). For commercial air transport, flight details may be recorded in an electronic format maintained by the operator (www.iaa.ie). National statements differ in detail: Ireland's IAA accepts electronic logbooks provided flights needing endorsement are signed by the relevant holder (www.iaa.ie), while Switzerland's FOCA refers to electronic format "according to the approval" of FOCA (ffac.ch). Ireland's authority also states that only a single entry for each pilot function is acceptable (www.iaa.ie); the passage read does not address how that interacts with a grouped line, which is one of the open questions below. Where a licence application is involved, Ireland's licensing FAQ says all logbooks must be sent for inspection (www.iaa.ie), and Germany's LBA asks applicants not to submit a copy of the logbook ("Bitte reichen Sie keine Kopie des Flugbuches ein") (www.lba.de).

What established tools document

Product pages describe their own features and are not a legal source. As of the pages read on 8 November 2026:

- **ForeFlight** describes switching a logbook to a European region and provides "an FCL.050 report template" (foreflight.com), and says the FCL.050 report relies on the category and class on each aircraft to total experience hours (www.foreflight.com).
- **MyFlightbook** describes a print layout "following EASA FCL.050 guidelines" (myflightbook.com) and a CSV download of the logbook (myflightbook.com). Its FAQ also has an entry on merging flights (myflightbook.com), which is a convenience feature and not a statement of regulatory compliance.
- **capzlog** describes the series of flights as a special case and notes that, for aeroplanes, helicopters and powered-lift aircraft, the logbook format can be electronic (capzlog.aero).
- **FlightLogger** states that supervised functions must be certified by the commander or instructor (help.flightlogger.net).

None of the pages read describes an automated test of the 30-minute interval across stored legs. That is a statement about what was read, not a finding that the products lack such features.

Pilot Logbook

Pilot Logbook is the invitation-only electronic logbook published by the same studio as this site; readers can request an invite from the studio. The studio's own promotional description, which is not independent evidence and was not verified for this report, mentions roster-imported flights to which the pilot adds times after landing, an EASA print layout among its layouts, and an export of every field as a spreadsheet. It does not describe a grouped-flight feature or an automated 30-minute test, and no regulator approval is implied by any of it. A pilot using it, or any logbook that stores flights individually, can apply the manual worksheet in this report: keep individual flights as source rows, build the grouped print line by hand, and check the exported spreadsheet against the source rows. This research did not inspect a sample export, so no claim is made about whether an export reproduces leg start and end instants. That check belongs to the reader, using the list below.

Checking a sample export

- **Instants:** does each flight carry a start and end instant, or only a duration?
- **Date basis:** are dates and times UTC, matching the logbook instructions at (i)?
- **Registration and places:** are registration, departure and arrival stored per flight?
- **Landings:** are day and night landings stored per flight, and do they total correctly?
- **Function and certification:** are PIC, supervised or instructional functions and any countersignature references stored per flight?
- **Reproducibility:** can the grouped line be regenerated from the individual flights, with the same totals?

Unresolved authority questions

- How is the interval measured: final rest to next first movement, or landing to next take-off?
- Does a local-date convention ever replace UTC for the "same day" test?
- Does the series exception, which sits under PIC flight time at (b)(1)(vi), extend to co-pilot, dual or instructional time, given the broader wording of (f)?
- How should a changed function within a series be recorded and certified?
- How does a touch-and-go count in the landings column?
- Does the competent authority that will inspect the record accept grouped lines, and in what form?

Data Analysis and Evidence

The numerical content of this topic is small and exact, so this section collects the thresholds and their sources. The 110, 80 and 30 minute figures in the worked example are arithmetic from stated assumptions, not statistics.

Thresholds and their sources

- **30 minutes:** the maximum interval between successive flights in the Part-FCL (EASA) series exception (consultations.caa.co.uk).
- **24 hours:** the period within which a "series of flights" must begin and end in the separate Part-ORO journey-log AMC (www.easa.europa.eu). That definition also requires the same aerodrome, operating site or a local area specified in the operations manual and the same pilot-in-command.

The Part-ORO boundary note

The ORO.MLR.110 journey log (Air Operations, March 2026 online edition) uses a different notion of series from Part-FCL. Its AMC defines consecutive flights beginning and ending within 24 hours, at the same aerodrome or operating site or within a local area, and with the same commander. It is an aircraft and operator record. Its tests must not be imported into Part-FCL: the personal-logbook exception has no local-area or 24-hour test, and the journey-log series has no 30-minute test. The Air Operations definition of flight time, written for flight and duty time limitation, ends at rest on the designated parking position with engines or propellers shut down (eur-lex.europa.eu), which is a different purpose from the licence-experience definition in Part-FCL.

Wording across authorities

- **EASA (Part-FCL):** the exception is optional and the AMC lists three conditions: same day, return to the same place of departure and an interval that does not exceed 30 minutes. The same-aircraft test comes from paragraph (f) and the single registration field, not from (b)(1)(vi).
- **Ireland (IAA):** advisory memorandum PLAM.024 reproduces the 30-minute wording (www.iaa.ie).
- **Poland (civil aviation authority):** a download reproduces the AMC in English, including the return-to-departure and interval wording (ulc.gov.pl).
- **Switzerland (FOCA):** the guidance applies to holders of an EASA licence it issued and sends them to AMC1 FCL.050 (ffac.ch).
- **United Kingdom (UK CAA, UK Part-FCL):** a 2024 draft amendment document shows the same (b)(1)(vi) wording and identifies itself as relating to the United Kingdom regulation (consultations.caa.co.uk). The retained UK text of FCL.050 is the same one-sentence duty (www.legislation.gov.uk). This is a draft, so it is not evidence of the in-force text.
- **United Kingdom (UK Part-SFCL, sailplane licences):** the AMC adopted as CAA ORS9 Decision No. 52 has a series provision with the same-day and return-to-departure wording and, in the text read, no 30-minute figure (regulatorylibrary.caa.co.uk). It is a different regime and aircraft category, shown only to illustrate that wording varies.
- **United States (FAA, 14 CFR 61.51):** records are documented "in a manner acceptable to the Administrator" (www.ecfr.gov), with an entry "for each flight or lesson logged" (www.ecfr.gov). Training time is endorsed by the authorized instructor (www.ecfr.gov). A search of the retrieved section for "combin" found no match.
- **Canada (Transport Canada, CARs 401.08):** a personal log is maintained (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca), for aeroplane flights all intermediate take-offs and landings are logged (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca), and entries are made by the holder or someone the holder has authorized (laws-lois.justice.gc.ca). The retrieved section contains no combining rule.

The 30-minute exception is a feature of the EASA-derived AMC and national documents that copy it; it should not be assumed to travel to the United States or Canada.

Implications and Future Directions

For pilots who record repeated local flying, the practical implication is that the compact line is available, optional and conditional, and that its value depends on being able to regenerate the legs. A grouped line that cannot be traced to its legs gives an inspector less to review than an ungrouped one. The best case is a uniform series, such as short training details from one aerodrome, where each leg has a start, an end, a gap and a landing.

For professional pilots building a licensing record from a daily or roster summary, the implication is the opposite. Ordinary airline point-to-point sectors are a boundary case, not presumed eligible. A roster day or operator summary is evidence for lines, not a replacement for them, and where an operator maintains the electronic record, the individual sectors are the natural source for individual lines.

Three developments would change the analysis and are worth watching, without prediction. First, the Easy Access Rules are revised periodically, so the edition should be re-checked. Second, national authorities may publish format guidance that addresses grouped lines, mixed functions or touch-and-go counting. Third, tool vendors may document how stored legs map to printed lines; until a vendor documents that, treat it as unverified. No tool can make a grouped line "compliant" by itself; acceptance rests with the competent authority.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Can you combine flights in a pilot logbook under EASA rules?

Only within the AMC1 FCL.050 exception: same day, return to the same place of departure on each occasion, and an interval that does not exceed 30 minutes (ulc.gov.pl). The combination is optional, and the default is one line for each flight.

Is the EASA 30-minute exception inclusive?

On the primary wording, yes: "does not exceed 30 minutes" admits exactly 30 (www.iaa.ie).

How do you log multiple flights as one entry?

Keep each flight as a source row with start, end and landings; confirm every condition; enter the sum of the flight durations as the total, not the elapsed span; carry landings, night or IFR time and function through; and record the leg intervals in remarks.

What does EASA FCL.050 require, and what format and fields apply?

FCL.050 is the duty to keep a reliable record of all flights flown (eur-lex.europa.eu). The AMC lists the minimum content, such as date, departure and arrival with times, aircraft type and registration, and total time, and the electronic and paper format rules summarised above. Ireland's authority requires records "in a standard and format acceptable to the IAA" (www.iaa.ie), and Switzerland's FOCA sends holders to AMC1 FCL.050 (ffac.ch).

How are touch-and-go and local flights logged?

The text read does not address touch-and-go landings. A flight runs from first movement to final rest, and the landings column counts "landings as pilot flying by day or night". Ask the authority or training organisation how a touch-and-go counts.

Is an electronic pilot logbook EASA compliant?

The AMC permits an electronic format with all required data, certification by the pilot and a format acceptable to the authority. Acceptance rests with the competent authority; a vendor claim is not an approval.

How can combined training flights be logged?

Only if the series conditions hold and the function and certification particulars survive for each flight; mixed functions need clarification rather than an assumption.

What evidence supports a flight audit?

Source rows with start and end instants, registration, places, landings, function and certification, from which any printed line can be regenerated. A summary alone does not support a grouped line, and Ireland's authority states that an employer or training organisation letter may supplement a submission (www.iaa.ie).

Conclusion

The EASA series exception is real, narrow and optional. Applied to leg-level rows, it applies three AMC conditions, plus a same-aircraft consistency check, that a daily total cannot answer: are the flights on one UTC date, each returning to the place it left, with each gap at or under 30 minutes, and are they recorded on one aircraft. A grouped line must then carry the sum of the flight durations, never the elapsed span, and must keep every landing, condition and certification that the individual flights carried.

The worked example shows the argument in numbers: 80 minutes flown, 110 minutes elapsed, a 30-minute gap that qualifies and a 31-minute gap that does not. Where evidence is missing, the right output is a stated uncertainty. The authority questions that remain, namely how the interval is measured, how mixed functions are recorded and how touch-and-go landings count, belong to the competent authority that will inspect the record. Pilots who want a manual worksheet alongside an electronic logbook can request an invite to Pilot Logbook from the studio and apply the checks above to their own exports.

Source links

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

1. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/online-publications/easy-access-rules-aircrew?erules-id=ERULES-1963177438-10439
2. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML?uri=CELEX:02011R1178-20260430
3. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/node/15702
4. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/online-publications/easy-access-rules-aircrew?erules-id=ERULES-1963177438-10451
5. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/easy-access-rules-aircrew-regulation-eu-no-11782011
6. 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
7. https://www.reddit.com/r/AirlinePilots/comments/1xgg862/logbook_question
8. https://ulc.gov.pl/_download/personel_lotniczy/LPL4.pdf
9. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/online-publications/easy-access-rules-air-operations?erules-id=ERULES-1963177438-11920
10. https://ffac.ch/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/2025.10.16-FOCA-GM-INFO-Logging-of-Flight-Time.pdf

11. https://www.lba.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/L/L4/Generelle_Hinweise.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=1
12. https://consultations.caa.co.uk/flight-operations-policy/copy-of-awo-and-fuel-energy-planning-and-managemen/supporting_documents/20240125%20%20AMC%20%20GM%20%20FCL%20AWO%20T.pdf
13. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/online-publications/easy-access-rules-aircrew?erules-id=ERULES-1963177438-20391
14. https://help.flightlogger.net/knowledge/instructions-for-use-of-pilot-logbook
15. https://www.aculog.com
16. https://www.iaa.ie/personnel-licensing/pilot-licences-%28eu-regulations%29/licensing-faq/faq--logbook---eu-part-fcl-irish-national-licences
17. https://foreflight.com/enhancements/european-logbook-support
18. https://www.foreflight.com/blog/switching-to-the-european-logbook-region-in-foreflight
19. https://myflightbook.com/logbook/mvc/faq
20. https://capzlog.aero/academy/regulatory-frameworks/general-logbook-requirements
21. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML?uri=CELEX:32014R0083
22. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/eur/2011/1178/annexes/2019-01-30
23. https://regulatorylibrary.caa.co.uk/2018-1976/Content/Document%20Structure/03%20SFCL/3%20AMC/AMC1%20SFCL%20050%20Recording%20of%20flight.htm
24. https://www.ecfr.gov/api/versioner/v1/full/2026-11-01/title-14.xml?part=61&section=61.51
25. https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/regulations/SOR-96-433/section-401.08.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.