LANDING.AERO

LANDING.AERO / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

EASA Multi-Pilot Time in Single-Pilot Aircraft: Evidence 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 · 2026-11-09 · easa multi pilot time · multi-pilot operation · single-pilot aircraft · atpl(a) experience · pilot logbook · fcl.050 logbook · multi-pilot time logging · electronic pilot logbook · easa part-fcl · flight time subtotal

Original article: https://www.landing.aero/articles/en/easa-multi-pilot-time-single-pilot-aircraft-evidence



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Three Separate Questions: Certification, Operation and Function
4. What Each Record Layer Can and Cannot Prove
5. Building the Evidence-and-Uncertainty Matrix
6. Data Analysis and Evidence
7. How Logbook Tools Document the Multi-Crew Field
8. Implications and Future Directions
9. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
10. Conclusion

Executive Summary

Under the European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) licensing rules, **"multi-pilot operation"** describes how a flight was conducted, not what the aircraft's type label says. Part-FCL (the licensing annex to Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011) defines it as "an operation requiring at least two pilots using multi-crew cooperation" (eur-lex.europa.eu) and extends the definition to flights "in either a multi-pilot or a single-pilot aircraft" (eur-lex.europa.eu). The Swiss aviation authority's logging guidance repeats the same wording (www.bazl.admin.ch). A "multi-pilot aeroplane", by contrast, is defined by certification, as "aeroplanes certificated for operation with a minimum crew of at least two pilots" (eur-lex.europa.eu). A single-pilot-certified aeroplane can therefore appear in a multi-pilot-operations subtotal, but only flight by flight, and only where the records show that the operation actually required two pilots working as a crew.

The number that makes this matter is in point FCL.510.A, the experience requirement for the Airline Transport Pilot Licence for aeroplanes, ATPL(A). The ordinary route lists "500 hours in multi-pilot operations on aeroplanes" (eur-lex.europa.eu) (the **500-hour** multi-pilot figure) alongside a **1,500-hour** flight-time minimum (www.easa.europa.eu). EASA's own aircraft-list notes state that SP-certified aircraft may be operated in a multi-crew environment, with the crew qualification and air operations requirements still applying (www.easa.europa.eu). The examiner-signed logbook entry in point FCL.725(db) records the form of operation of a specified skill test or proficiency check (eur-lex.europa.eu). That entry is evidence about a check, not automatic proof that every later flight was a qualifying multi-pilot operation.

This report offers a per-flight evidence-and-uncertainty matrix (Table 1), a three-case comparison (Table 2) and a mapping from source rows to totals (Table 3). In the synthetic worked example, a logbook shows **100 hours** on one single-pilot-certified type. Sixty hours carry matching flight, operation and role evidence, 25 hours are documented under a different operating form and are excluded from this claim on the stipulated facts, and 15 hours are unresolved. The three groups partition the 100 hours (60 + 25 + 15 = 100); the 60-hour supported subset sits inside the 100-hour aircraft total and is not added on top of it. A hypothetical 500-hour comparison would show a **440-hour** difference from the supported 60 hours, which is arithmetic and not an eligibility finding.

Edition control matters. EASA's Easy Access Rules for Aircrew carries a generation date in October 2026 (www.easa.europa.eu), and the consolidated Regulation text was read on EUR-Lex on the same date as this report. The United Kingdom, the United States and Canada are separate jurisdictions, and the United States test for logging second-in-command time, which refers to the aircraft's type certificate (www.ecfr.gov), is not the EASA test. This guide covers record preparation only. It makes no determination of eligibility, of the crew an aircraft needs, or of how a receiving authority will treat a claim.

Introduction and Background

Professional aeroplane pilots with single-pilot-certified aircraft in their history, such as charter and corporate pilots, often reach the same question while preparing an ATPL(A) application: which of these hours can be described as multi-pilot operations time? Search results for the topic mix EASA, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Transport Canada material, and a long-running professional forum thread includes the observation that one regulator's view of an aircraft does not necessarily match another's (www.pprune.org). That is a reminder to name the jurisdiction every time a rule is quoted.

Pilot-education sites already explain the basic distinction. The **capzlog** academy states that "Single pilot aircraft may be operated in multi pilot operations in certain situations." (www.capzlog.aero) and says of two pilots flying together that "this is not the same as multi crew operations" (www.capzlog.aero). **Pilot EFB** frames the same idea as a gate, noting that "Before any of these columns apply, there is a gate to pass" (pilotefb.com), and that a right-seat pilot in a single-pilot-certificated aircraft has no crew function to log where the flight is "neither a multi-pilot aircraft nor a multi-pilot operation" (pilotefb.com). This report does not claim the basic distinction is new. Its contribution is narrower: a conditional evidence workflow for the pilot whose history contains the same aircraft flown under different documented operating forms, where one aircraft-level checkbox cannot support a licensing subtotal on its own.

The scope is deliberately limited. The report covers aeroplanes, EASA Part-FCL and the pilot's own records. It does not cover helicopters, State-aircraft credit (EASA's GM6 FCL.010(a) says that, for crediting prior experience, ‘multi-pilot operation’ can be understood to include State aircraft operations where two pilots are required by national regulations or the operations manual, so pilots with such history should read it separately), PICUS (pilot-in-command under supervision) certification, or cruise-relief credit beyond clearly labelled boundaries, and it gives no advice on what crew any aircraft needs. Missing evidence is not proof that a flight was unlawful; it only means the record does not yet support one specific claim. The pilot, the operator and the receiving authority decide the outcome. Software and spreadsheets help assemble the pack. They do not decide the question.

As of 9 November 2026, the sources read for this report are the EASA Easy Access Rules for Aircrew PDF, the EUR-Lex consolidated Regulation (EU) No 1178/2011 (as available on 9 November 2026), the EASA type rating and endorsement lists and their explanatory notes, the Air Operations Regulation (EU) No 965/2012 in the consolidated version dated 14 June 2023 (CELEX 02012R0965-20230614, which may not reflect later amendments), and the national authority and vendor documents named in the text. Where a source is older than the current EASA edition, the report says so. Binding rules, guidance (acceptable means of compliance, AMC, and guidance material, GM), national submission practice and the recommended audit steps are kept apart throughout, because only the first is binding law.

Three Separate Questions: Certification, Operation and Function

The aircraft certification label

The **certification label** answers one question: what crew was the aircraft certificated for?

EASA's Part-FCL defines aircraft categories by certification. A multi-pilot aeroplane is one certificated for operation with a minimum crew of at least two pilots, and a single-pilot aircraft is one certificated for operation by one pilot (both definitions are quoted above). The EASA type rating and licence endorsement lists carry the resulting SP (single-pilot) and MP (multi-pilot) classification, and their explanatory notes describe SP aircraft as "certified for a minimum of one pilot (SP)" (www.easa.europa.eu), with MP aircraft correspondingly certified for a minimum of two pilots. EASA's regulations FAQ says the lists are the class and type of aircraft categorisations used in Part-FCL (www.easa.europa.eu), so the label is a categorisation tied to rating privileges. It is not a statement about how any given flight was crewed.

The certified minimum crew is a certification fact. For large aeroplanes, EASA's certification specification CS-25 provides that "The minimum flight crew must be established (see AMC 25.1523)" (www.easa.europa.eu), and the figure then appears in the approved aircraft documents. This is the layer the licensing definition of a multi-pilot aircraft refers to. It says nothing, by itself, about a particular date, operator or flight.

The operating form

The **operating form** is a separate layer. The Air Operations regulation requires flight crew composition not below the minimum in the aircraft flight manual (eur-lex.europa.eu), and also provides that the crew must include additional members when the type of operation requires them (eur-lex.europa.eu). An operator can therefore require more pilots than the certified minimum, and its operations manual and approvals are where the requirement for a given operation is documented. The Air Operations text read here is a 2023 consolidated version, so the current numbering and wording should be checked against EASA's latest Air Operations publication before any citation in an application.

The licensing rules then connect the two layers. Point FCL.725(d)(1) says a single-pilot aircraft type rating includes the privileges to fly in single-pilot operations and in multi-pilot operations, subject to conditions (eur-lex.europa.eu). EASA's guidance material adds that multi-pilot operation in single-pilot aircraft takes place only in accordance with the approved operational procedures of an operator subject to Part-ORO, the Air Operations organisation requirements (www.easa.europa.eu). In practical terms, the operating form for a past flight sits in operator-held procedures, not in the aircraft type list. EASA's guidance GM6 FCL.010 states a boundary for Part-NCO, the non-commercial operations rules for other-than-complex aircraft: such operations are not treated as multi-pilot operations, with an exception for operations at an approved training organisation providing multi-pilot training (www.easa.europa.eu).

The pilot function

The third layer, the **pilot function**, is what the pilot did. AMC1 FCL.050, an acceptable means of compliance (guidance, not a binding rule), requires "details on pilot function, namely PIC, including solo, SPIC and PICUS time" (www.easa.europa.eu), and lets a co-pilot log co-pilot time on an aircraft on which more than one pilot is required. The co-pilot definition itself requires a pilot operating other than as commander on an aircraft for

which more than one pilot is required (eur-lex.europa.eu). PICUS is defined as a co-pilot performing the commander's duties under supervision (eur-lex.europa.eu), so it stays inside the co-pilot definition. The Swiss authority, which applies EASA Part-FCL to the licences it issues, notes that "only one pilot may act as PIC for any given flight" (www.bazl.admin.ch).

Function and form are recorded in different places. AMC1 FCL.050 tells the pilot to "indicate whether the operation was SP or MP" (www.easa.europa.eu) in the operation column, and the pilot-function column is separate. A flight can therefore be multi-pilot operation with the pilot as commander, as co-pilot, or in a supervised role. That is why the matrix in Table 1 carries "actual role" and "claimed multi-pilot duration" as different fields. Whether a particular receiving authority counts commander hours in a multi-pilot operation toward its subtotal is a question for that authority, so this report does not decide it.

Jurisdiction boundaries

The following are separate jurisdictions and must not inherit the EASA conclusions:

- **United Kingdom (UK CAA):** the UK retained text of FCL.010 uses similar wording for multi-pilot operation (www.legislation.gov.uk), but the UK Civil Aviation Authority's ATPL(A) page sets its own evidence expectations: it says the approval of the operator must have included a legal requirement for two pilots (www.caa.co.uk), that "the law that applies to the flight must require 2 pilots" (www.caa.co.uk), and that documentary evidence is needed from both the operator and the national authority (www.caa.co.uk). Its AMC1 FCL.050 text for co-pilot time refers to the aircraft's certification, the regulations or the operator's operations manual (www.caa.co.uk).
- **United States (FAA):** under 14 CFR 61.51(f), second-in-command time can be logged where the type certificate requires more than one pilot (www.ecfr.gov), where the regulations under which the flight is conducted require it (www.ecfr.gov), and in some operations even where a second pilot is not otherwise required (www.ecfr.gov). This differs from EASA's operation-based definition.
- **Canada (Transport Canada):** its co-pilot flight time criteria page (marked as modified in 2019) says that an operator certificate stating that aircraft are to be operated with a co-pilot establishes the operational requirement (tc.canada.ca), and adds that "quoting the company Operations Manual clarifies individual situations" (tc.canada.ca).
- **Switzerland (FOCA/BAZL):** a national authority applying EASA Part-FCL; its logging guidance is valid from 15 October 2025 (www.bazl.admin.ch) and applies to holders of EASA licences issued by the Swiss authority (www.bazl.admin.ch).

What Each Record Layer Can and Cannot Prove

The type list and certification documents

The EASA lists give a categorisation and pointers. EASA says complete OSD (operational suitability data) information is held by the applicant, normally the type-certificate holder (www.easa.europa.eu). For a record-preparation exercise, the list proves the label for the type. It does not prove how a historical flight was

operated, and a public list row is not a complete historical operator evidence pack. The pilot should note which list version was in force on the date of the flights, because the categorisation and OSD columns change as new data are added.

Operator documents and records

Operating-form evidence for a given date normally sits with the operator. Under the Air Operations regulation the operator must make training, checking and qualification records available, on request, to the crew member concerned (eur-lex.europa.eu). A pilot can therefore request their own training and checking records, and cite an operations manual provision by its reference without requesting or publishing the confidential manual itself.

Records may not exist for every historical flight. In that case the honest outcome is an "unresolved" line in the matrix, plus a note of what was requested, from whom, and when. The Irish Aviation Authority's frequently asked questions, for example, say "The IAA cannot stamp a logbook to verify hours." (www.iaa.ie), which places the burden of evidence on the pilot's own records and the operator that holds the underlying data.

Training and check records

Examiner-signed entries help but have a specific scope. As noted above, point FCL.725(db) requires the form of operation of a specified skill test or proficiency check in a single-pilot class or type rating to be entered in the logbook and signed by the examiner. The Appendix 9 provisions state that a skill test for a single-pilot aircraft operated in multi-pilot operations is performed in a multi-crew environment (eur-lex.europa.eu), and that a pilot holding single-pilot privileges passes a proficiency check in multi-pilot operations to exercise multi-pilot privileges (eur-lex.europa.eu). AMC1 FCL.050 gives logbook remarks entries for these checks: "SP/MP" is used "in the case of a combination of single-pilot operation and multi-pilot operation" (www.easa.europa.eu), and "MP only" applies where the check was solely multi-pilot.

These are dated, signed statements about privileges and checking. They are worth retaining with their dates as inputs to the matrix. They do not substitute for flight-specific evidence, because a check conducted in multi-pilot operation says what was tested on that day, not what every subsequent flight required.

The logbook entry itself

FCL.050 is brief, and the detail lives in AMC1 FCL.050, which describes logbook columns and remarks. Swiss guidance for accepted digital logbooks expects them to calculate single-pilot and multi-pilot values (www.bazl.admin.ch), which shows the SP/MP split is an expected output of a compliant record and not an optional extra.

National practice

National authorities publish their own forms and guidance, and the details differ:

- **Switzerland (FOCA):** the Swiss document repeats the Part-FCL definition covering flights in either a multi-pilot or a single-pilot aircraft (www.bazl.admin.ch), conditions co-pilot logging on the aircraft requiring more than one pilot under its type certification or operational requirements (www.bazl.admin.ch), and lists, among its PICUS conditions, that the method of supervision is documented in the operations manual (www.bazl.admin.ch).

- **Ireland (IAA):** memorandum PLAM 024 (dated 24 August 2023) requires that PICUS supervision is acceptable to the competent authority (www.iaa.ie).
- **France (DGAC):** form 11i-Formlic for the multi-pilot type rating lists, as one evidence route, a copy of the last page of a closed logbook showing 500 hours of multi-pilot operation on single-pilot aeroplanes (www.ecologie.gouv.fr).
- **Germany (federal notice):** a notice on logbook keeping states that there can only be one commander during a flight (www.strassenbau.niedersachsen.de).

The lesson is not that any of these decide a particular claim. It is that the route, the document and the criteria are national, so the recipient's current requirements come first.

Building the Evidence-and-Uncertainty Matrix

The matrix turns the three layers into a worksheet with one row per flight, or per consecutive block of identical flights. It is an audit practice, not a schema mandated by EASA or any authority.

Seven steps

1. **Separate the three labels.** For each flight, write down the aircraft certification label, the operating form and the pilot function as three different cells.
2. **Name the receiving purpose and authority.** The ATPL(A) experience route is one purpose. A type-rating prerequisite that refers to multi-pilot operations is a different purpose with different wording. State which.
3. **Inventory flight-specific evidence.** For each flight, list the document that shows the required crew and the actual role, referenced by the pilot's own document identifier, not by copying confidential content.
4. **Retain dated training and check endorsements** without treating them as flight evidence.
5. **Reconcile type defaults and individual flights.** If an aircraft-level default exists in a logbook tool, compare it with each flight's evidence.
6. **Produce supported and unresolved subtotals** with provenance, and preserve the original records.
7. **Resolve missing operator records with the recipient.** Ask what the receiving authority accepts, then request the records from the operator.

Evidence pack checklist

A review pack for one claim typically holds the following items, each kept with its date and source:

- **Logbook pages or a full export** with the original entries preserved unaltered.
- **Rating and privilege records**, including the dates on which single-pilot and multi-pilot privileges were held.
- **Examiner-signed check entries** for the form of operation, kept as dated checking evidence.
- **Operator document references**, by identifier and revision date, without copying confidential content.
- **Roster or flight-plan context**, treated as supporting detail only.
- **Record requests** sent to operators, with the replies or the absence of a reply.
- **A rule-edition note** stating which text was used for which flight date.

- **The recipient's own instructions**, since the national route decides what is accepted.

Table 1: the per-flight matrix

Table 1 below lists the suggested fields. They are review fields, not a regulatory form.

Field	What to record	What it can support	What it cannot support
Flight ID and date	Unique reference and UTC date	Selecting the rule edition in force on that date	Anything about the operating form
Original tail and model	As logged originally	Identifying the aircraft and certification source	The crew actually required
Certification source and version	Type list row, data sheet issue, list date	The SP or MP label for the type	The operating form for a given flight
Operating-form evidence	Document reference for that date (operator approval or operations manual provision, by reference only)	Whether two pilots were required for that operation	Confidential manual content, which should not be copied
Pilot qualification and check evidence	Rating, privileges, dated examiner-signed check entry	That multi-pilot privileges were held or checked	That every flight afterwards was a qualifying operation
Actual role	Commander, co-pilot or other function from the logbook	The function column	The form of operation
Supported duration	Minutes with all evidence matching	The conservative subtotal	Flights with a gap
Claimed multi-pilot duration	What the pilot proposes to claim	A comparison against supported time	A conclusion
Recipient purpose	Authority, route, form number	Aligning definitions	Eligibility
Unresolved question	Specific missing item and who can supply it	A request list	A finding of non-compliance

The table works as a checklist. Each column answers a different question, which is why a single "multi-crew" checkbox cannot capture all of them. The column "operating-form evidence" is the one most often empty for historical flights, and it is the column the recipient is most likely to ask about, because the form of operation, not the label, is what the definition turns on.

Table 2: three cases

Table 2 applies the matrix to three situations.

Case	Evidence present	Treatment in the worksheet	Remaining question
1. Fully supported multi-pilot operation in a single-pilot-certified aircraft	Type list row (SP); operator provision reference for that date requiring two pilots; dated examiner-signed check entry for the form of operation; logbook shows operation MP and a co-pilot or commander function	Supported against the multi-pilot claim	Whether the recipient accepts the document set
2. Same tail flown under a different documented form	Same type row; operating-form evidence for those dates shows a different form, for example a single-pilot operation	Excluded from this claim on the stipulated facts; original records kept; other logging status decided separately	Which operating-form document governs each date
3. A right-seat or "FO" roster label with no operating evidence	Roster heading or printed rank only; no document showing a required second pilot	Unresolved; not automatically eligible and not shown to be unlawful	Which operator record, if any, can still be obtained

The cases show why an aircraft-level flag is a starting point and not a conclusion. In case 3 the label is a roster artefact: EASA's co-pilot definition requires an aircraft for which more than one pilot is required, so a seat position alone does not establish the role. Case 2 does not say a flight is invalid. It says the flight does not support this particular claim.

Data Analysis and Evidence

The numbers in the rules

The multi-pilot figure sits within a larger set of ATPL(A) experience numbers in point FCL.510.A(b), which also covers cross-country, instrument and night hours and the pilot-in-command alternatives. The current text requires a minimum of 1,500 hours of flight (www.easa.europa.eu), including 500 hours in multi-pilot operations on aeroplanes (eur-lex.europa.eu). Credits for other service exist, for example flight engineer time with the total credit against any of the paragraphs not exceeding 250 hours (eur-lex.europa.eu). Cruise-relief and restricted-rating credits belong to the separate relief article and are not calculated here.

Worked example (Hypothetical Example)

A logbook shows 100 hours on one single-pilot-certified aircraft type. The pilot proposes to claim all 100 hours as a multi-pilot subtotal. Applying the matrix produces three groups, summarised in *Table 3*.

Evidence group	Aircraft hours (original record)	Recorded role	Supported multi-pilot subset, this claim	Status
A: matching flight, operation and role evidence	60 h	Co-pilot or other documented function	60 h	Supported against this claim

Evidence group	Aircraft hours (original record)	Recorded role	Supported multi-pilot subset, this claim	Status
B: documented under a different operating form	25 h	As recorded	0 h	Excluded from this claim on the stipulated facts; evaluated separately for other purposes
C: operation evidence missing	15 h	As recorded	0 h so far	Unresolved pending operator records
Totals (A + B + C = 100 h)	100 h aircraft total		60 h supported (part of the 100 h, not additional)	25 h excluded, 15 h unresolved

The result is **60 hours** supported against this specific multi-pilot claim, **25 hours** excluded from this claim, and **15 hours** unresolved. Groups A, B and C partition the 100 hours (60 + 25 + 15 = 100). The 60-hour supported subset is part of the 100-hour aircraft total, so adding 60 to 100 to get 160 hours would double count, and the aircraft's whole history is not reclassified because some flights qualify. Group B flights keep their valid time and role on their own basis, because exclusion from this subtotal does not decide their other logging status.

If a separate, hypothetical requirement of 500 hours were compared with the supported figure, the difference would be 500 minus 60, or **440 hours**. That is arithmetic about this one subtotal. It says nothing about the pilot's complete eligibility, which depends on all other experience, credits and current exceptions, nor about the pilot's ability to act in any role.

Edition and date control

The October 2026 Easy Access Rules for Aircrew states that its date is the date the consolidated version was generated (www.easa.europa.eu), and EASA's page tells readers to check the Regulations page for rules adopted after that date (www.easa.europa.eu). In the editions read for this report we did not identify an amendment that revises FCL.010, FCL.050, FCL.510.A or FCL.725, but a pilot should re-check on the day of submission. Older editions of the rules and guidance remain in circulation, including archived online versions, so the edition matters. Source date matters: a flight flown before an amendment may be assessed against the text in force when it was flown, so the worksheet should record which edition was used and why.

How Logbook Tools Document the Multi-Crew Field

Vendor documentation shows that the aircraft-level versus flight-level choice is a configuration decision. The following are the vendors' documented methods, not tested behaviour:

- **Safelog:** its help page describes a method where a "multi-crew" characteristic is assigned to each aircraft flown multi-crew (www.dauntless-soft.com), and a second method with a per-flight field that requires manual management on every flight and is more error-prone (www.dauntless-soft.com). It states that some corporate jets are legal to fly single-crew in one regulatory regime (www.dauntless-soft.com) while the same aircraft must be flown multi-crew in another (www.dauntless-soft.com), so the characteristic is left for the user to set.

- **capzlog:** it says some of its fields are listed explicitly in AMC1 FCL.050 (www.capzlog.aero), and that its multi-pilot and co-pilot "columns are always empty for single pilot operated flights" (www.capzlog.aero).
- **FlightLogger:** defines multi-pilot time in its logbook as "Time obtained on duty in a pilot seat during operations where two or more pilots are required." (help.flightlogger.net) It defines a separate co-pilot field in the same terms (help.flightlogger.net).
- **ForeFlight:** its European logbook region announcement states "New field options let you log dedicated Co-Pilot time" (foreflight.com), and lists aircraft designations "such as complex, multi-pilot, and single-pilot high-performance" (foreflight.com).
- **LogTen:** its aircraft type help tells users to "choose this field if this is a type-rated aircraft that requires more than one pilot" (intercom.help), for its multi-pilot field.
- **MyFlightbook:** documents "a more traditional-style layout following EASA FCL.050 guidelines" (myflightbook.com), and notes that its second-in-command and instructor fields are hidden by default (myflightbook.com).
- **Pilot EFB:** describes its own logbook as "It is a convenient personal record, not a compliance system" (pilotefb.com), and cautions that "Rules differ by authority and change over time." (pilotefb.com) Its guide also explains that where "the second pilot is not required, so there is nothing to log as a crew function" (pilotefb.com), the flight does not generate a crew function to log.
- **Pilot Logbook** (the logbook made by the publisher of this report, invitation-only): its public page advertises roster import, flight-plan PDFs kept with each flight, totals by aircraft type and role, custom summaries, an EASA print layout and a full export. The page does not document a dedicated flight-specific legal-operation field or automatic EASA credit assessment. A pilot would use those features to assemble the review pack, keep the Table 1 worksheet alongside a sample export, and preserve the original evidence. A printed heading, a flight plan or a first-officer label does not by itself establish qualifying multi-pilot time. Readers can request an invite.

The common thread is that a tool total is only as good as the per-flight inputs behind it. Whichever method a pilot chooses, the worksheet checks it against the actual mixed-operation history.

Implications and Future Directions

Several recurring mismatches are worth screening for before a claim is submitted:

- **Type default against flight evidence:** an aircraft-level flag says multi-crew while the flight record shows a different form.
- **Roster label without a requirement:** a first-officer heading with no document showing a required second pilot.
- **Check date against flight dates:** an examiner-signed entry that postdates, or does not cover, the flights it is used to support.
- **Operator change:** the same tail flown for a different operator, with a different approval.
- **List version drift:** a type list that changed between the flight date and the date of review.
- **Overlapping dimensions added together:** an aircraft total combined with a role subtotal.

For individual pilots the main implication is a habit: keep operating-form evidence at the time of the flight. A short reference note per flight block (the operator's document identifier and revision, the date and the role) is cheap when written at the time and hard to reconstruct years later. Operator-held records are a reason to ask early, because the operator may not hold every historical item.

For software, the open question is whether aircraft-level defaults should carry a visible "unverified for this date" state. Safelog's documentation of regime-dependent aircraft (www.dauntless-soft.com) points the same way: some aircraft cannot be resolved by a type-level flag. No public benchmark of how often type-level defaults diverge from flight-level evidence exists, and this report does not estimate one. Search demand for the precise phrasing is not measured in any source cited here, so the report makes no claim about how many pilots face the problem. Community discussions show confusion, for example a forum view that some national authorities would accept such time as second-pilot time when the operator's manual has multi-pilot procedures (www.pprune.org). That view is informal and dated 2020, and it should not be read as a rule.

For regulation, the current text puts the form-of-operation record for specified tests and checks on firmer ground in point FCL.725(db) and the AMC1 FCL.050 remarks entries, but it does not create a flight-by-flight proof mechanism. Pilots should expect national submission practice to continue to differ, and should check the recipient's current guidance. Cruise-relief and restricted-rating credit routes have their own rules, and appear in the separate relief article, not here.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Can you log multi-crew time in a single-pilot aircraft under EASA? The definition of multi-pilot operation covers flights in either a multi-pilot or a single-pilot aircraft, so the aircraft label alone does not rule it out. Whether a specific flight qualifies depends on evidence for that flight.

What is the EASA flight crew licensing definition of multi-pilot time? Part-FCL defines the operation and aircraft certification separately. The logbook records the form of operation in its own column.

How does multi-pilot time differ from PIC time on an EASA logbook? One describes the operation, the other the pilot function. Both are recorded separately.

Is a first-officer roster label enough? No. A roster label is not operating-form evidence; in Table 2 it is case 3, unresolved.

What does the EASA ATPL 500-hour multi-pilot requirement say? The ordinary route lists 500 hours in multi-pilot operations on aeroplanes. Current exceptions and credits must be confirmed with the recipient.

How should a pilot log multi-pilot time in an electronic pilot logbook? Use the tool's per-flight field or aircraft characteristic as documented by the vendor, and keep the Table 1 worksheet for the evidence behind it.

Does an electronic logbook produce an EASA flight time subtotal automatically? Some produce EASA-style prints (myflightbook.com), and Swiss guidance expects computed single-pilot and multi-pilot values (www.bazl.admin.ch), but a total is only as reliable as the flight-level evidence behind it.

Conclusion

Under EASA Part-FCL, multi-pilot operation is defined by the operation and the aircraft label by certification, and the two can differ for the same tail. A single multi-crew checkbox on an aircraft record therefore cannot support a licensing subtotal for a history that includes different documented operating forms. A per-flight matrix that connects certification, operating requirement, pilot function and dated training or check records to the receiving purpose gives a defensible split into supported, excluded and unresolved hours, with the original records preserved and the supported subset reported as part of, not on top of, the aircraft total.

The synthetic example, 60 hours supported, 25 excluded from the claim and 15 unresolved out of 100 aircraft hours, shows the output format. It is not a statement about any real pilot. The rules and their editions, the operator's historical documents and the recipient's national practice decide the outcome, and a pilot should confirm current exceptions and credits with the competent authority before relying on any requirement comparison. The worksheet is a record-preparation aid only.

Source links

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

1. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2011/1178/2026-04-30/eng
2. https://www.bazl.admin.ch/dam/en/sd-web/i13f9T9NXJ5Z/gm-info_loft.pdf
3. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/downloads/115485/en
4. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/downloads/11736/en
5. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-14/chapter-I/subchapter-D/part-61/subpart-A/section-61.51
6. https://www.pprune.org/biz-jets-ag-flying-ga-etc/636882-multi-crew-single-pilot-aircraft-easa.html
7. https://www.capzlog.aero/en-us/academy/regulatory-frameworks/how-to-keep-a-correct-pilot-logbook
8. https://pilotefb.com/learn/logging-multi-crew-and-cruise-time
9. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/product-certification/typeratings-and-licence-endorsement-lists
10. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/downloads/129014/en
11. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML?uri=CELEX:02012R0965-20230614
12. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML?uri=CELEX:02011R1178-20260430
13. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/eur/2011/1178/annexes
14. https://www.caa.co.uk/commercial-industry/pilot-licences/aeroplanes/airline-transport-pilot-licence-for-aeroplanes
15. https://www.caa.co.uk/publication/download/25055
16. https://tc.canada.ca/en/aviation/licensing-pilots-personnel/co-pilot-flight-time-criteria
17. https://www.iaa.ie/personnel-licensing/pilot-licences-%28eu-regulations%29/licensing-faq/faqs---pilot-licensing
18. https://www.bazl.admin.ch/dam/de/sd-web/qcDpXt-Ox7VO/foca_gminfo_foca-acccepted-logbook_formats.pdf
19. 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
20. https://www.ecologie.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/documents/11iFormlic.pdf
21. https://www.strassenbau.niedersachsen.de/download/101875/NfL_2212-21_Aufzeichnung_von_Flugzeiten.pdf

22. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/easy-access-rules-aircrew
23. https://www.dauntless-soft.com/helpdesk/phraseview.asp?PID=712
24. https://help.flightlogger.net/knowledge/instructions-for-use-of-pilot-logbook
25. https://foreflight.com/blog/switching-to-the-european-logbook-region-in-foreflight
26. https://foreflight.com/blog/foreflight-introduces-european-logbook-support-to-simplify-flight-logging-and-reporting-for-pilots-in-europe
27. https://intercom.help/pilotbase/en/articles/11557698-types-tab-on-logten-for-ios
28. https://myflightbook.com/logbook/public/faq.aspx
29. https://pilots.landing.aero

THE PUBLISHER

About LANDING.AERO

LANDING.AERO builds custom software for aviation operations teams at airlines, charter operators and flight departments. It is based in Montreal.

What it builds

Operations tools that reduce manual steps in day-to-day flight operations; integration of existing systems and data sources into one operational picture; workflow automation; real-time operational dashboards; bridges between legacy systems and modern applications; and mobile apps for staff in the field. Each application is designed around the operator's own workflows rather than sold as an off-the-shelf platform.

How it works

Work starts with discovery of the operator's workflows, continues with iterative development alongside the operator's team, and includes integration with the tools already in use and ongoing support.

Its own tools

LANDING.AERO also publishes tools for aviation professionals: Pilot Logbook, an invitation-only electronic logbook made by a line pilot that logs flights from the pilot's roster and flight plan, works offline and prints in the logbook layouts of 14 authorities; UTC Alarm, which sets alarms in Zulu time; and NOTAM Notifier, announced for NOTAM change alerts on chosen airports.

Visit

See LANDING.AERO and its projects.

Articles published here explain general practice and cite their primary sources, naming the jurisdiction of any rule they describe. They are not operational, regulatory or legal advice, do not replace an operator's approved procedures or manuals, and requirements change.

Website: https://www.landing.aero

This article is educational. Verify consequential medical, legal, financial, regulatory and technical decisions with appropriate professionals and the cited primary sources. Company services are described separately from the article's research findings.