

---

**Javni prevoz - Izmenjava omrežnih in voznorednih podatkov (NeTEx) - 4. del:  
Evropski profil za informacije o potnikih**

Public transport - Network and Timetable Exchange (NeTEx) - Part 4: Passenger  
Information European Profile

Öffentlicher Verkehr - Netzwerk- und Fahrplan-Austausch (NeTEx) - Teil 4: Europäisches  
Profil für Reisenden Informationen

Transport public - Échange des données réseau et horaires (NeTEx) - Partie 4 : Profil  
Européen pour l'Information Voyageur

**Ta slovenski standard je istoveten z: CEN/TS 16614-4:2020**

---

**ICS:**

03.220.01	Transport na splošno	Transport in general
35.240.60	Uporabniške rešitve IT v prometu	IT applications in transport

**SIST-TS CEN/TS 16614-4:2020****en,fr,de**

**iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW**  
**(standards.iteh.ai)**

Full standard:  
<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/e6b07a9b-aeaf-4200-81ee-eb670204931b/sist-ts-cen-ts-16614-4-2020>

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION  
SPÉCIFICATION TECHNIQUE  
TECHNISCHE SPEZIFIKATION

**CEN/TS 16614-4**

April 2020

ICS 35.240.60

English Version

**Public transport - Network and Timetable Exchange  
(NeTEx) - Part 4: Passenger Information European Profile**

Transport public - Échange des données réseau et horaires (NeTEx) - Partie 4 : Profil Européen pour l'Information Voyageur

Öffentlicher Verkehr - Netzwerk- und Fahrplan-Austausch (NeTEx) - Teil 4: Europäisches Profil für Reisenden Informationen

This Technical Specification (CEN/TS) was approved by CEN on 2 March 2020 for provisional application.

The period of validity of this CEN/TS is limited initially to three years. After two years the members of CEN will be requested to submit their comments, particularly on the question whether the CEN/TS can be converted into a European Standard.

CEN members are required to announce the existence of this CEN/TS in the same way as for an EN and to make the CEN/TS available promptly at national level in an appropriate form. It is permissible to keep conflicting national standards in force (in parallel to the CEN/TS) until the final decision about the possible conversion of the CEN/TS into an EN is reached.

CEN members are the national standards bodies of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of North Macedonia, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and United Kingdom.



EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR STANDARDIZATION  
COMITÉ EUROPÉEN DE NORMALISATION  
EUROPÄISCHES KOMITEE FÜR NORMUNG

**CEN-CENELEC Management Centre: Rue de la Science 23, B-1040 Brussels**

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
European foreword .....	8
Introduction .....	9
1 Scope .....	13
2 Normative references .....	13
3 Terms and definitions .....	13
4 Presentation conventions .....	16
4.1 Recap of NeTeX presentation conventions .....	16
4.2 Additional EPIP presentation conventions .....	17
4.3 Transmodel definitions and EPIP .....	18
5 Framework .....	19
5.1 Introduction .....	19
5.2 DataManagedObject, Version and Codespace .....	19
5.2.1 Overview .....	19
5.2.2 Entity (Abstract) .....	21
5.2.3 EntityInVersion (Abstract) .....	21
5.2.4 DataManagedObject (Abstract) .....	22
5.2.5 AlternativeText (Subcomponent of DataManagedObject) .....	23
5.2.6 KeyValue (Subcomponent of DataManagedObject) .....	23
5.2.7 Version .....	24
5.2.8 Codespace .....	24
5.2.9 ValidityCondition .....	26
5.2.10 ValidBetween .....	27
5.2.11 ResponsibilitySet .....	27
5.2.12 ResponsibilityRoleAssignment (Subcomponent of ResponsibilitySet) .....	27
5.2.13 DataSource .....	28
5.3 Relationships and entity references .....	29
5.3.1 General rules .....	29
5.3.2 VersionOfObjectRef .....	30
5.3.3 Integrity Checking of XML Documents .....	31
5.3.4 Identity uniqueness scope .....	32
5.4 Frames .....	33
5.4.1 Overview .....	33
5.4.2 Version Frame (Abstract) .....	34
5.4.3 TypeOfFrame .....	35
5.4.4 Specific frames and General Frames .....	36
5.4.5 Composite Frame .....	37
5.4.6 FrameDefaults .....	37
5.5 Generic elements .....	38
5.5.1 Introduction .....	38
5.5.2 TypeOfValue (Abstract) .....	38
5.5.3 ValueSet .....	39
5.5.4 GroupOfEntities (Abstract) .....	40
5.5.5 Point (Abstract) .....	40
5.5.6 Location (Subcomponent of Point) .....	41
5.5.7 Link (Abstract) .....	41

5.5.8	LinkSequence (Abstract).....	42
5.5.9	PointInLinkSequence (Abstract).....	43
5.5.10	Zone (Abstract).....	43
5.5.11	Transport Mode and Submode .....	43
5.5.12	Assignment (Abstract) .....	44
5.5.13	Presentation (Subcomponent – Multipurpose) .....	45
5.5.14	Locale (Subcomponent – Multipurpose) .....	46
5.5.15	Booking Arrangements (Subcomponent – Multipurpose).....	46
5.5.16	ContactDetails (Subcomponent – Multipurpose) .....	47
5.6	Accessibility.....	47
5.6.1	Overview .....	47
5.6.2	AccessibilityAssessment (Subcomponent – Multipurpose) .....	48
5.6.3	AccessibilityLimitation (Subcomponent of AccessibilityAssessment).....	49
5.7	Facility sets .....	50
5.7.1	Overview .....	50
5.7.2	FacilitySet (Abstract).....	51
5.7.3	ServiceFacilitySet.....	51
5.7.4	Accommodation – (Subcomponent of ServiceFacilitySet) .....	51
5.7.5	SiteFacilitySet.....	52
6	Stop Profile.....	52
6.1	Overview .....	52
6.2	Stop Place hierarchies.....	54
6.3	Other types of Place .....	57
6.3.1	Introduction.....	57
6.3.2	Place (Abstract).....	58
6.3.3	AddressablePlace (Abstract).....	58
6.3.4	SiteElement (Abstract).....	59
6.3.5	Site (Abstract) .....	60
6.3.6	Address (Abstract) .....	61
6.3.7	PostalAddress (Subcomponent of SITE in EPIP) .....	62
6.3.8	RoadAddress (Subcomponent of SITE in EPIP).....	62
6.3.9	Topographic Place.....	63
6.3.10	TopographicPlaceDescriptor (Subcomponent).....	64
6.3.11	Point of Interest.....	64
6.4	Stop Places.....	65
6.4.1	StopPlace .....	65
6.4.2	SiteComponent (Abstract) .....	67
6.4.3	StopPlaceSpace (Abstract) .....	67
6.4.4	Quay (Subcomponent of Quay) .....	67
6.4.5	Entrance (Abstract).....	68
6.4.6	StopPlaceEntrance .....	69
6.5	GroupOfStopPlaces .....	69
6.6	TariffZone.....	69
7	Network and Timetables.....	70
7.1	General .....	70
7.2	Basic network topology .....	70
7.2.1	Overview .....	70
7.2.2	Line .....	71
7.2.3	AllowedLineDirection (Subcomponent of Line).....	73
7.2.4	GroupOfLines .....	73
7.2.5	Network.....	74
7.2.6	DestinationDisplay.....	74

## CEN/TS 16614-4:2020 (E)

7.2.7	Via.....	75
7.2.8	DestinationDisplayVariant.....	75
7.2.9	Organisation (Abstract).....	76
7.2.10	Operator.....	77
7.2.11	Authority.....	77
7.3	Routes.....	77
7.3.1	Overview.....	77
7.3.2	RoutePoint.....	78
7.3.3	RouteLink.....	78
7.3.4	Route.....	79
7.3.5	PointOnRoute (Subcomponent of Route).....	79
7.4	Service patterns.....	80
7.4.1	Overview.....	80
7.4.2	JourneyPattern (Abstract in EPIP).....	81
7.4.3	ServicePattern.....	82
7.4.4	PointInJourneyPattern (Abstract in EPIP).....	82
7.4.5	StopPointInJourneyPattern (Subcomponent of JourneyPattern).....	83
7.4.6	Direction.....	84
7.4.7	TimingPoint (Abstract in EPIP).....	85
7.4.8	ScheduledStopPoint.....	85
7.4.9	Service Link.....	86
7.5	Assigning Stops.....	87
7.5.1	Overview.....	87
7.5.2	StopAssignment (Abstract).....	87
7.5.3	PassengerStopAssignment.....	88
7.5.4	DynamicStopAssignment.....	88
7.5.5	TrainStopAssignment (Subcomponent of Passenger Stop Assignment).....	89
7.6	Connections, transfers and interchanging.....	90
7.6.1	Overview.....	90
7.6.2	Transfer (Abstract).....	90
7.6.3	Transfer Duration (Subcomponent of Transfer).....	91
7.6.4	Connection.....	91
7.6.5	ConnectionEnd (Subcomponent of Connection).....	92
7.6.6	SiteConnection.....	92
7.6.7	SiteConnectionEnd (Subcomponent of SiteConnection).....	93
7.6.8	DefaultConnection.....	93
7.6.9	DefaultConnectionEnd (Subcomponent of DefaultConnection).....	94
7.7	Vehicle journeys and passing times.....	94
7.7.1	Overview.....	94
7.7.2	Journey (Abstract).....	96
7.7.3	ServiceJourney.....	96
7.7.4	PassingTime.....	97
7.7.5	PassingTime (Abstract).....	98
7.7.6	TimetabledPassingTime (Subcomponent - Service Journey).....	98
7.7.7	GroupOfServices.....	98
7.7.8	GroupOfServicesMember (Subcomponent of GroupOfServices).....	99
7.8	Very frequent journeys.....	100
7.8.1	Introduction.....	100
7.8.2	TemplateVehicleJourney.....	100
7.8.3	JourneyFrequencyGroup (Abstract).....	101
7.8.4	HeadwayJourneyGroup (Subcomponent of TemplateJourney).....	101
7.9	Transferring between services.....	102
7.9.1	Introduction.....	102

7.9.2	Interchange (Abstract) .....	102
7.9.3	ServiceJourneyInterchange .....	103
7.10	Trains and train coupling .....	103
7.10.1	Overview .....	103
7.10.2	TrainNumber.....	104
7.10.3	JourneyPart (Subcomponent of ServiceJourney).....	105
7.10.4	JourneyPartCouple.....	105
7.10.5	JourneyPartPosition (Subcomponent of JourneyPartCouple) .....	106
7.11	Vehicles and Trains.....	107
7.11.1	Overview .....	107
7.11.2	VehicleType .....	107
7.11.3	Train .....	108
7.11.4	TrainElement (Subcomponent of Train).....	109
7.11.5	TrainComponent (Subcomponent of Train) .....	109
7.12	Notices .....	110
7.12.1	Introduction.....	110
7.12.2	Notice (Subcomponent - Multipurpose) .....	110
7.12.3	NoticeAssignment (Subcomponent - Multipurpose) .....	111
7.13	Calendars.....	112
7.13.1	Overview .....	112
7.13.2	DayType .....	112
7.13.3	PropertyOfDay (Subcomponent of DayType).....	113
7.13.4	Timeband (Subcomponent of DayType) .....	114
7.13.5	ServiceCalendar .....	115
7.13.6	OperatingDay (Subcomponent of ServiceCalendar) .....	115
7.13.7	DayTypeAssignment (Subcomponent of ServiceCalendar).....	116
7.13.8	Operating Period (Abstract in EPIP).....	117
7.13.9	UicOperatingPeriod (Subcomponent of ServiceCalendar).....	117
7.14	Flexible services.....	118
7.14.1	Introduction.....	118
7.14.2	FlexibleLine .....	118
7.14.3	FlexiblePointProperties (Subcomponent - Multipurpose).....	118
7.14.4	FlexibleServiceProperties (Subcomponent of SERVICE JOURNEY) .....	119
8	Common rules .....	120
8.1	Version management of data.....	120
8.2	Use of validity conditions in EPIP .....	121
8.3	Populating creation and change dates.....	121
8.4	Codespaces and the structure of identifiers .....	122
8.4.1	Introduction.....	122
8.4.2	Use of codespaces in EPIP .....	123
8.4.3	Identifier structure for EPIP data objects.....	123
8.4.4	Identifier structure for EPIP version frames.....	124
8.5	Versions of the EPIP .....	129
8.6	Dependencies between frames.....	129
8.7	Organisation and nesting of elements within an EPIP document.....	130
8.8	Responsibility for data.....	130
8.9	Handling large data sets.....	131
8.10	Available types of frame.....	132
8.10.1	Type of Frame list .....	132
8.10.2	Classes for SPECIFIC FRAMES.....	133
8.10.3	Classes for COMPOSITE FRAMES .....	137
8.10.4	Classes for EPIP Metadata FRAMES .....	138

## CEN/TS 16614-4:2020 (E)

8.11	Completeness of data.....	139
8.11.1	Introduction.....	139
8.11.2	Empty values.....	139
8.12	Data exchange .....	140
8.13	PublicationDelivery .....	140
8.13.1	Introduction.....	140
8.13.2	Publication Request (Subcomponent of PublicationDelivery) .....	141
8.13.3	NetworkFrameTopic (Subcomponent of PublicationDelivery) .....	141
8.13.4	NetworkFilterByValue (Subcomponent of PublicationDelivery).....	142
8.13.5	PublicationDelivery example .....	142
8.14	Names of files for EPIP documents .....	144
8.15	Extending the profile .....	145
9	Profile compliance and data quality checking .....	146
9.1	Introduction.....	146
9.2	Methods of checking the quality of data .....	146
9.3	Quality issue resolution.....	147
9.4	Profile validator rules .....	147
9.5	Metadata for profiles .....	148
9.6	Summary of data quality rules for EPIP .....	149
9.7	Referential integrity (automatic).....	155
Annex A	(normative) Data Dictionary .....	156
Annex B	(normative) Facility code list.....	166
B.1	AccessFacilityList.....	166
B.2	AccessibilityInfoFacilityList.....	166
B.3	AccessibilityToolList.....	166
B.4	AccommodationAccessList.....	167
B.5	AccommodationFacilityList.....	167
B.6	AssistanceFacilityList.....	167
B.7	BoardingPermissioin.....	167
B.8	BookingProcessFacilityList.....	168
B.9	CarServiceFacilityList.....	168
B.10	CateringFacilityList.....	168
B.11	CouchetteFacilityList.....	169
B.12	FamilyFacilityList.....	169
B.13	FareClasses.....	169
B.14	GenderLimitation.....	169
B.15	GroupBookingFacility.....	170
B.16	LuggageCarriageFacilityList.....	170
B.17	MealFacilityList.....	170
B.18	MedicalFacilityList .....	170
B.19	MobilityFacilityList .....	171
B.20	NuisanceFacilityList.....	171
B.21	PassengerCommsFacilityList.....	171
B.22	PassengerInformationEquipmentList.....	172
B.23	PassengerInformationFacilityList .....	172
B.24	RetailFacilityList .....	172
B.25	SafetyFacilityList.....	172
B.26	SanitaryFacilityList .....	173
B.27	ServiceReservationFacilityList .....	173
B.28	TicketingFacilityList .....	173
B.29	TicketingServiceFacilityList.....	174



<b>B.30</b>	<b>UicProductCharacteristicList</b> .....	<b>174</b>
<b>B.31</b>	<b>UicTrainRate</b> .....	<b>174</b>
<b>B.32</b>	<b>VehicleFacilityList</b> .....	<b>174</b>
	<b>Annex C (informative) Related EU Directive</b> .....	<b>175</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>177</b>

**iTeh STANDARD PREVIEW**  
**(standards.iteh.ai)**

Full standard:  
<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/e6b07a9b-aca1-4200-81ee-eb670204931b/sist-ts-cen-ts-16614-4-2020>

## CEN/TS 16614-4:2020 (E)

### European foreword

This document (CEN/TS 16614-4:2020) has been prepared by Technical Committee CEN TC 278 “Intelligent transport systems”, the secretariat of which is held by NEN.

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. CEN shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights.

This document presents a Passenger Information European Profile of the European Technical Specification known as “NeTEx”. NeTEx provides a framework for specifying communications and data exchange protocols for organizations wishing to exchange scheduled Information relating to public transport operations.

NeTEx is made up of three parts defining a single European Standard, which provides a complete exchange format for public transport networks, timetable description and fare information.

- Part 1 is the description of the public transport network topology exchange format. It also contains use cases shared with part 2, and modelling rules and the description of a framework shared by all parts.
- Part 2 is the description of the scheduled timetables exchange format.
- Part 3 is the description of the fare information exchange format.

Part 1 is fully standalone, Parts 2 and 3 rely on Part 1.

The XML schema can be downloaded from <http://netex-cen.eu>, along with available guidance on its use, example XML files, and case studies of national and local deployments.

This document is highly technical, and special care has been taken on keeping the text readable. This has been done through a set of editorial rules enhancing usual CEN writing rules:

- To avoid confusion with usual wording, Transmodel terms are in capital letters (JOURNEY PATTERN for example).
- To avoid confusion with usual wording, attribute names are in bold/italic style and use camelcase style with no spaces (***JourneyPattern*** for example).
- To avoid confusion with usual wording, attribute types are in italic style and use camelcase style with no spaces (*TypeOfEntity* for example).

According to the CEN/CENELEC Internal Regulations, the national standards organisations of the following countries are bound to announce this document: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of North Macedonia, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

## Introduction

Public transport services rely increasingly on information systems to ensure reliable, efficient operation and widely accessible, accurate passenger information. These systems are used for a range of specific purposes: setting schedules and timetables; managing vehicle fleets; issuing tickets and receipts; providing real-time information on service running, and so on.

This document specifies a Profile of Network and Timetable Exchange (NeTEx) for public transport. NeTEx is intended to be used to exchange information between Public Transport organisation systems containing scheduled public transport data. It can also be seen as a complement to the SIRI (Service Interface for Real-time Information) standard (EN 15531 series), as SIRI needs reference data exchanged in the scope of NeTEx before any possible real-time exchange.

Well-defined, open interfaces have a crucial role in improving the economic and technical viability of public transport Information Systems of all kinds. Using standardized interfaces, systems can be implemented as discrete pluggable modules that can be chosen from a wide variety of suppliers in a competitive market, rather than as monolithic proprietary systems from a single supplier. Interfaces also allow the systematic automated testing of each functional module, vital for managing the complexity of increasing large and dynamic systems. Furthermore, individual functional modules can be replaced or evolved, without unexpected breakages of obscurely dependent functions.

NeTEx improves a number of features of public transport information and service management:

- Interoperability – the standard will facilitate interoperability between information processing systems of the transport operators by:
  - introducing common architectures for message exchange;
  - introducing a modular set of compatible information services for real-time vehicle information;
  - using common data models and schemas for the messages exchanged for each service;
  - introducing a consistent approach to data management.
- Technical advantages include the following: reusing a common communication layer shared with SIRI for all the various technical services enables cost-effective implementations, and makes the standard readily extensible in future.

A profile is an ancillary document to the standard which specifies additional rules for implementation in a given context. The profile contains information such as:

- Details of the objects used in an exchange.
- Details on the options proposed by the standard.
- Details on optional elements.
- Precision on the identifier codes to be used.
- Advice on grouping elements.

The reason for having a detailed profile specification is that it facilitates implementation. A developer intending to implement a certain service or type of service in a given environment need only implement the smaller set of options and parameters specified in the profile, and is given a number of additional rules that restrict or simplify the required processing of data.

This European Passenger Information Profile (EPIP) for NeTEx is for exchanging passenger information; it describes a minimal information set to feed passenger information services in a

**CEN/TS 16614-4:2020 (E)**

European wide and multimodal context. It covers basic network and timetable data as explained further below.

**Profiles – a Rationale**

Standards are by their nature and definition, consensus documents. In the case of the CEN and ISO standards, and more particularly in the field of traffic applications, these are established at an international level, with a significant number of different stakeholders involved in their development and discussion. This means that CEN and ISO standards take into account requirements that are far beyond many local implementations of such standards. Implementing a standard for a complex data model (such as that for transport) represents a significant investment, so care is taken to achieve a comprehensive and well abstracted solution and standards are written to have with the longest possible life and stability.

These factors tend to result in standards documents being large and detailed, consequently requiring significant effort to read and understand – and this is certainly the case for Transmodel and NeTEx. It may also be difficult to see how the standard can best applied in practice, since there are many subtle choices to make out of all the possibilities and there is insufficient space to include extensive examples in the formal documentation.

Another cause of complexity is that standards such as NeTEx and SIRI (since they were developed to harmonise different national standards), include features and options whose purpose is to ensure compatibility with the different systems developed in specific countries. For example, SIRI includes services dedicated to the advanced management of connection guarantees, as implemented in the German VDV standard, but used only in a few countries such as Switzerland and Germany; NeTEx also includes features to help compatibility with practices peculiar to particular countries, such as are found in the French NEPTUNE, British TransXChange, Swedish NOPTIS, etc. standards.

In addition, local or national specificities may require the specific use of a specific data sets and specific identifier systems for particular information. For example, the UK has a national system for the identification of stops (NaPTAN), which is naturally required to be used within NeTEx and SIRI exchanges, but which is not relevant for other European countries except in a few cross-border services.

Finally, some elements proposed by the standards are optional and relevant only for a particular business context: so that it needs to be decided if these items are relevant for a particular implementation or not.

A profile is intended to address some of the above issues by offering a predefined set of choices for use in specific context, and setting out additional explicit rules that help to simplify implementation.

Additionally, a profile can be accompanied by the definition of specific testing procedures to assess the conformance of the implemented solution with the profile.

A profile remains fully compliant with the standard; it merely implements a subset, using a well-defined code system.

From a practical point of view, profiles can be seen as a set of implementation guidelines; instead of having to face the challenge of analysing the whole standard, discovering the relevant parts for a given application, and then adjusting optional values and parameters for the intended application, a profile

can be specified to address the needs of a particular application and then used for any subsequent similar initiatives.

### The European Passenger Information Profile (EPIP)

The EPIP focuses on information relevant for feeding passenger information services, it therefore excludes operational information that is not relevant for this purpose. Fare information, apart from basic Tariff zones, though relevant for passengers, is also considered as out of scope, but will be addressed by a future separate profile.

Typical use cases for the Passenger Information Profile are:

- provision of data to a journey planner.
- provision of data to a mapping tool to show the network on a map (possibly interactive).
- provision of data to timetable printing/visualisation tools.
- provision of data to a stop or line finder.

The profile has been designed to be as concise as possible and to focus on the data elements needed to fulfil the EC's *Priority action A of ITS-Directive*.

- This means that features specific to a particular country will not in general not be included (the profile is designed to be sharable across Europe, and data sets compliant with it are expected to be usable by any NeTEx conformant passenger information system in Europe).
- Each country may also define a further national NeTEx Profile (for internal use nationally), extending the European profile and providing additional information.
- In the interests of simplicity, a number of the more complex features specific to certain modes have also been omitted from the formal profile, for example boarding position on train platforms.
- The EPIP is divided into three parts:
- **Common core elements** that are shared by the two other profile parts given in this document and that may also be reused later on by other future profiles (Fare Profile, Accessibility Profile, etc.)
- **Stop Profile**, describing the STOP PLACES and their hierarchy.
- **Network and Timetables Profile**, describing the network topology and all related timing information (timetables).

Dividing the profile into three parts allows for a modular implementation, with a minimal overlap between separate documents and their corresponding components. The modularisation also facilitates the separate exchange of stop data from that of timetable and other information (but it is, of course, still possible to exchange them together). One of the reasons for this partition is that there are more and more countries developing separate national or regional stop database registries who require the ability to exchange only the stop description.

The EPIP supports certain common features that are important in a European context:

- The ability to exchange translations of text elements in multiple alternative national languages.
- Basic accessibility information about sites and services.