#SAFERCARS FOR INDIA PROGRESS REPORT 2018
In January 2014 the first results of the Safer Cars for India for project were released at a conference in Delhi hosted by our partner the Institute for Road Traffic Education (IRTE). Now we have completed 31 ratings which we are delighted to see acting as a catalyst to improve the safety of cars in India. We very much appreciate how some manufacturers are responding to our call to end zero-star cars by improving the safety of the vehicles they sell. Three models have reached four stars and others have been improved from an unacceptable zero-star rating. Now we look forward to awarding the prestigious accolade of India’s first five-star car!

Global NCAP is also very pleased to see the engagement of the Government of Prime Minister Narendra Modi in road safety and the commitment of the Minister for Transport & Highways, Nitin Gadkari. We especially welcome the new crash test regulations introduced in new models from October 2017. We also look forward eventually to the launch of the Bharat New Car Assessment Programme to join the family of NCAPs that are promoting a market for safer vehicles across the world. India can, and is already, playing a world leading role in vehicle safety; for example, by mandating anti-lock brakes in motorcycles. Global NCAP is very proud to contribute to this effort in partnership with the IRTE. We are also pleased to acknowledge support from Bloomberg Philanthropies and the FIA Foundation who have done so much to support our work in this United Nations Decade of Action for Road Safety.

LAUCHLAN MCINTOSH
Chairman
Global NCAP
In January 2014 the Safer Cars for India project was launched with the release of the country’s first ever independent crash tests. In partnership with the Institute of Road Traffic Education (IRTE), Global NCAP tested five popular and important models to assess their performance in the UN's frontal impact crash test (Reg. 94) carried out at 56 km/h and at also at the higher speed of 64 km/h typically used by New Car Assessment Programmes. The models tested included India’s best-selling cars, the Suzuki-Maruti Alto 800, the Tata Nano, Ford Figo, Hyundai i10 and Volkswagen Polo. Combined sales of these five cars account for around 20% of all the new cars sold in India in 2013.

The body shells of the Alto 800, the Nano, and the i10 collapsed resulting in high risks of life-threatening injuries to the occupants. The Figo and Polo had structures that remained stable. However, all but one of the five models failed the UN test at 56km/h and all scored zero stars at 64 km/h. The news coverage generated by the launch was extensive in both the Indian and international media and was featured on NDTV’s influential Car and Bike Show.

In November 2014 a second set of test results were released at a conference in Delhi hosted by IRTE in association with the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways. The test results featured the Datsun Go, a new design launched in 2014, and the Maruti Suzuki Swift both with and without airbags. The Go scored zero stars as its body structure collapsed making it redundant to even fit an airbag. With no airbags, the Swift also scored zero stars but a separate test of a version sold in Latin America with air bags scored three stars which clearly demonstrated the model’s potential for improvement.

Speaking at the Delhi conference, Shri Krishan Pal, then Minister of State for Road Transport, Highways and Shipping, stressed that “safety should be required not just for cars to be exported but also those sold in India”. Also commenting on the results, Shri Vijay Chibber, then IAS Secretary said that the Safer Cars for India project served as “a wake-up call to industry” and outlined the Government’s proposal to launch a new Bharat New Vehicle Safety Assessment Programme (BNVSAP).

In first, reaction to the Safer Cars for India project from some senior figures in the automobile industry was quite hostile. Andy Palmer, then Vice President of Nissan, complained that “people who criticise these cars for not meeting US or European crash standards are living in a dream world”. But things change and dreams come true. Today India is applying the UN’s crash test standards and there is powerful evidence that a market for safer cars in India is growing fast.

Global NCAP is proud that the Safer Cars for India project has acted as a powerful catalyst for action by industry and Government. Coinciding with the first set of results tests, VW decided to withdraw the non-airbag version of the Polo from sale in India. Global NCAP then agreed to test the upgraded version with two airbags fitted as standard and the model received India’s first ever four-star rating for adult occupant protection.

After the second set of results, Nissan reacted to the poor test result of the Datsun Go by offering a new variant, the Go plus, and both models were strengthened with a driver air bag as an option. In 2015, in response to growing customer demand, Toyota confirmed that airbags would be standard in all its Indian passenger cars. This was a significant development as when the first test results were released industry representatives argued that there was no market for airbags in the country at all. Then in 2016 after an early version of the Kwid performed very badly in a further phase of Safer Cars for India testing, Renault agreed to modify the car, working with Global NCAP on a number of repeat tests. The company improved the body shell and offered an optional drivers air bag and seat belt pretensioner. These upgrades ensured that the improved version would comply with the UN frontal crash test. Today the best-selling variant of the Kwid in India is the optional air bag version. This proves that safety does sell and that it is possible to successfully produce cars that meet UN crash test standards.

That is why Global NCAP strongly welcomed the Indian Government’s announcement in 2015 that UN equivalent crash test standards for front and side impact will be applied in India for new models from 1 October 2017 and for all cars from 1 October 2019. In addition, the Government also committed to apply the standard for pedestrian protection, again in two phases from 1 October 2018 and 1 October 2020. These very positive
steps have been combined with measures to promote motorcycle safety by mandating anti-lock brakes and automatic headlights on. The new legislation is in line with the United Nations General Assembly which in April 2018 recommended that Member States “implement UN vehicle safety regulations or equivalent national standards to ensure that all new motor vehicles meet applicable minimum regulations for the protection of occupants and other road users, with seat belts, airbags, and active safety systems fitted as standard”.

Alongside this regulatory progress some manufacturers are now raising their performance well above minimum statutory requirements. After testing 26 models in total, four have achieved an impressive ‘four star’ rating; the VW Polo, the Toyota Etios, the Tata Nexon and the Tata Zest. It surely won’t be long before India sees its first ‘five star’ car. To encourage this milestone in Indian automotive safety, in February 2018, Global NCAP launched the ‘Safer Choice’ Award at the Delhi Motor Show. This will be given to any manufacturer that can offer for sale a car in India that meets the following criteria: a 5-star score for Adult Occupant Protection; at least a 4-star result in Child Occupant Protection; meet UN Pedestrian Protection requirements and include electronic stability control (ESC).

Boosting fitment rates of ESC, the most important vehicle safety technology since the seat belt, is the next major challenge for improved automotive safety in India. Worldwide just over 70% of new passenger cars have ESC fitted. This compares with just 7% in India. When a vehicle starts to skid, ESC corrects the slide by reducing engine torque and braking individual wheels to bring the vehicle back onto the path intended by the driver. Many studies have shown ESC to be highly effective, avoiding single vehicle crashes by approximately 40%. ESC is now mandatory in Australia, Canada, the European Union, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Russia, South Korea, Turkey and the USA, and will soon also be in Argentina, Brazil and Malaysia. Last year in China, where the fitment rate is currently 69%, the major domestic brands made a voluntary commitment to fit ESC as standard. So ESC fitment rates keep growing worldwide and Global NCAP hopes that this life saving technology will become more widely available in India too.

India is now the fifth largest vehicle producer in the world after China, USA, Japan and Germany and is becoming a major force in the global automotive industry. We hope it will increasingly take on a leadership role in vehicle safety and we look forward to the eventual launch of a Bharat NCAP to build on the success so far of the Safer Cars for India project. The results since 2014 show an NCAP in India will strengthen consumer awareness of the importance of choosing the safest car they can afford and encourage manufacturers to compete in a growing market for safety.

In 2017 India achieved a small decrease in road fatalities which is most welcome. But the country is still losing over 150,000 people a year in road crashes. Improved vehicle safety can make an important contribution to reducing appalling toll of wasted lives and human misery as car occupants are the third highest source of fatalities accounting for about 17% of the total. But more needs to be done to improve road design, enforcement, and traffic management. Global NCAP is fully aware that vehicle safety is just one part of the very large road injury prevention challenge India faces. Action is needed on all fronts, including vehicle safety and we are impressed by the commitment to this shown by the Government of Prime Minister Shri Narendra Modi. Global NCAP is enormously grateful to the IRTE and to our main donors, the Bloomberg Philanthropies and the FIA Foundation for their support for the ‘Safer Cars for India’ project. Just four years ago we were dismissed as dreamers but today we can see how dreams can become a reality.
# SAFER CARS FOR INDIA

**RESULTS 2014 - 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car Model</th>
<th>Test Score</th>
<th>Adult Protection</th>
<th>Child Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tata Nexon*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tata Nexon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahindra Marazzo**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyota Etios</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tata Zest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzuki Maruti Vitara Brezza</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkswagen Polo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Aspire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honda Mobilio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renault Duster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzuki Maruti Swift</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renault Kwid (IV)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renault Kwid (III)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renault Kwid (II)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renault Kwid (I)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkswagen Polo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Figo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzuki Maruti Eeco</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyundai Eon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzuki Maruti Alto</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renault Duster</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahindra Scorpio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renault Lodgy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datsun Go</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevrolet Enjoy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tata Zest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzuki Maruti Celerio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honda Mobilio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzuki Maruti Swift</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyundai i10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tata Nano</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This result is valid for all Nexon units produced as from December 7th, 2018 (from VIN MAT627165JLP51255)*

**TATA NEXON - 2 AIRBAGS**

- **Adult Occupant Protection**
  - GOOD
  - ADEQUATE
  - MARGINAL
  - WEAK
  - POOR

- **Tested Model**: Tata Nexon, RHD
- **Body Type**: 5 Door SUV
- **Crash Test Weight**: KG 1490
- **Year of Publication**: 2018

**Child Restraints**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Restraint</th>
<th>Head / Chest</th>
<th>CRS Type</th>
<th>Adjust</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 MONTH OLD CHILD</td>
<td>PROTECTED / GOOD</td>
<td>ISOFIX/LEG</td>
<td>0+</td>
<td>ISOFIX/TT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 YEAR OLD CHILD</td>
<td>PROTECTED / VULNERABLE</td>
<td>ISOFIX/TT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FWF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safety Equipment**

- **Front Seatbelt Pretensioners**: YES
- **Side Body Airbags**: NO
- **Driver Frontal Airbag**: YES
- **Side Head Airbags**: NO
- **Driver Knee Airbag**: NO
- **ABS (4 Channel)**: YES

**Adult Occupant**

Tata Nexon provided adequate protection to the driver and passenger's head and neck. The bodyshell integrity was stable and capable of withstanding further loadings. Footwell area was rated as stable.

**Child Occupant**

- The child seat for the 3 year old was installed forward-facing with ISOFIX and top tether.
- The 18 month old child showed adequate protection.
- The child seat for the 1 year old showed good protection for the head and chest.

*This result is valid for all Nexon units produced as from December 7th, 2018 (from VIN MAT627165JLP51255)*
ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION
The protection offered to the driver and passenger head and neck was good. Driver and passenger chest showed adequate protection. Driver and passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the behind the dashboard supported by the Tranfasctube. The bodyshell was rated as stable and it was capable of withstanding further loadings. The car offers standard SBR for driver and standard ABS.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old was installed FWF with ISOFIX and top tether and was able to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact with good protection for the head and marginal protection to the chest. The 18 month old CRS was installed with ISOFIX and leg support RWF and it showed good protection for head and chest. The recommended CRS did not show incompatibility. The installation instructions on both child seats were not permanently attached to the seat. The vehicle offers standard ISOFIX and Top tether anchorages in the 2 outboard rear seats.

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION
TESTED MODEL  TATA NEXON, RHD
BODY TYPE  5 DOOR SUV
CRASH TEST WEIGHT KG 1490
YEAR OF PUBLICATION 2018

SAFETY EQUIPMENT
FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS  YES
DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG  YES
FRONT PASSENGER FRONTAL AIRBAG  YES

CHILD RESTRAINTS
18 MONTH OLD CHILD  BRITAX BABY SAFE/ISOFIX BASE  PROTECTED/ GOOD
3 YEAR OLD CHILD  MAXI BRITAX DUO PLUS  PROTECTED/ VULNERABLE

CAR DETAILS
TATA NEXON - 2 AIRBAGS
13.56 max. 17.00 Adult
25.00 max. 49.00 Child
Tested at 64 km/h  Bodyshell integrity: STABLE

CHILD OCCUPANT
FRONT PASSENGER DRIVER

ADULT OCCUPANT
The protection offered to the driver and passenger head and neck was good. Driver and passenger chest showed adequate protection. Driver and passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the behind the dashboard supported by the Tranfasctube. The bodyshell was rated as stable and it was capable of withstanding further loadings. The car offers standard SBR for driver and standard ABS.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old was installed FWF with ISOFIX and top tether and was able to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact with good protection for the head and marginal protection to the chest. The 18 month old CRS was installed with ISOFIX and leg support RWF and it showed good protection for head and chest. The recommended CRS did not show incompatibility. The installation instructions on both child seats were not permanently attached to the seat. The vehicle offers standard ISOFIX and Top tether anchorages in the 2 outboard rear seats.

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION
TESTED MODEL  Mahindra Marazzo, RHD
BODY TYPE  5 DOOR MPV
CRASH TEST WEIGHT KG 1890
YEAR OF PUBLICATION 2018

SAFETY EQUIPMENT
FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS  YES
DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG  YES
FRONT PASSENGER FRONTAL AIRBAG  YES

CHILD RESTRAINTS
18 MONTH OLD CHILD  BRITAX BABY SAFE/ISOFIX BASE  PROTECTED/ GOOD
3 YEAR OLD CHILD  BRITAX DUO PLUS  VULNERABLE/ FAIR

CAR DETAILS
MAHINDRA MARAZZO - 2 AIRBAGS
12.85 max. 17.00 Adult
22.22 max. 49.00 Child
Tested at 64 km/h  Bodyshell integrity: STABLE

CHILD OCCUPANT
FRONT PASSENGER DRIVER

**This result is valid for all Marazzo units produced as from November 16th, 2018 (from VIN MA1WA2E5J2L11253)
### ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION

In the frontal impact the driver and passenger heads were both well protected by the airbags and seatbelts. Both seatbelts were equipped with pretensioners. There were hazardous structures in the area of the facia that could be impacted by an occupant’s knees. The structure was able to withstand further loadings.

### CHILD OCCUPANT

The child seat for the 1.5 year old child was able to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The 3 year old exceeded the forward excursion limit. The biomechanical limits of the child dummies were reached during the test. There is no possibility to disconnect the passenger airbag.

### SAFETY EQUIPMENT

**FRONT SEAT BELT PRETENSIONERS**: Yes  
**SIDE BODY AIRBAGS**: No  
**SIDE HEAD AIRBAGS**: No  
**ISOFIX ANCHORAGES**: No  
**DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG**: Yes  
**DRIVER KNEE AIRBAG**: No  
**ABSORBERS (4 CHANNEL)**: No

---

### ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION

The protection offered to the driver head was adequate due to bottoming out of the driver airbag. Driver chest protection as marginal. Passenger’s head and chest protection was good. The front passenger’s knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard lie the Tran fascia tube. The bodyshell was rated as unstable and it was not capable of withstanding any further loadings. The car offers driver Seat Belt Reminder.

### CHILD OCCUPANT

The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The recommended CRSs did not show incompatibility. The installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The vehicle was equipped with a passenger airbag but it could not be disabled in order to prevent high risks of injuries when installing a rearward facing CRS.

### SAFETY EQUIPMENT

**FRONT SEAT BELT PRETENSIONERS**: Yes  
**SIDE BODY AIRBAGS**: No  
**SIDE HEAD AIRBAGS**: No  
**ISOFIX ANCHORAGES**: No  
**DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG**: Yes  
**DRIVER KNEE AIRBAG**: No  
**ABSORBERS (4 CHANNEL)**: No

---

### TOYOTA ETIOS - 2 AIRBAGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Description</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Adult Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototypes</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypes</td>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAR DETAILS**

- **Tested Model**: TOYOTA ETIOS, RHD
- **Body Type**: 4 DOOR HATCHBACK
- **Crash Test Weight**: KG 1131
- **Year of Publication**: 2016
- **Bodyshell Integrity**: STABLE

### TATA ZEST - 2 AIRBAGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Description</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Adult Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototypes</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypes</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAR DETAILS**

- **Tested Model**: TATA ZEST, RHD
- **Body Type**: 4 DOOR SEDAN
- **Crash Test Weight**: KG 1395
- **Year of Publication**: 2016
- **Bodyshell Integrity**: UNSTABLE

---

### CHILD RESTRAINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Restraint</th>
<th>Head / Chest</th>
<th>CRS Type</th>
<th>Adjust</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 MONTH OLD CHILD</td>
<td>PROTECTED / FAIR</td>
<td>0+</td>
<td>BELTED</td>
<td>WRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 YEAR OLD CHILD</td>
<td>VULNERABLE / POOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BELTED</td>
<td>FWF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUZUKI MARUTI VITARA BREZZA - 2 AIRBAGS

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION

12.51 max. 17.00 Adult

17.93 max. 49.00 Child

Bodyshell integrity: STABLE
Tested at 64 km/h

CHILD OCCUPANT

The child seat for the 3 year old was installed FWF with ISOFIX and top tether and was able to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The head protection for the child was excellent, it was able to absorb the impact energy. The chest protection was also good, it was able to prevent excessive forward movement. The installation instructions on both child seats were sufficient and permanently attached to the seat. The car did give warnings as to the hazards associated with installing a rearward facing child seat on the front passenger seat with an active airbag but it's marking is not enough to meet the protocol criteria.

SAFETY EQUIPMENT

FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS: YES
DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG: YES
FRONT PASSENGER FRONTAL AIRBAG: YES

CHILD RESTRAINTS

7 MONTH OLD CHILD
BRITAX DUO PLUS
PROTECTED / FAIR
1
ISOFIX/TT
FWF

3 YEAR OLD CHILD
BRITAX DUO PLUS
PROTECTED / FAIR
1
ISOFIX/TT
FWF

CAR DETAILS

TESTED MODEL: SUZUKI MARUTI VITARA BREZZA, RHD
BODY TYPE: 5 DOOR SUV
CRASH TEST WEIGHT: KG 1392
YEAR OF PUBLICATION: 2018

VOLKSWAGEN POLO - 2 AIRBAGS

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION

12.54 max. 17.00 Adult

29.91 max. 49.00 Child

Bodyshell integrity: STABLE
Tested at 64 km/h

CHILD OCCUPANT

The child seat for the 3 year old child was able to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The belted CRS for the 1.5 year old child was able to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact and protected the child adequately well. The installation instructions on both child seats were sufficient and permanently attached to the seat. The car did give warnings as to the hazards associated with installing a rearward facing child seat on the front passenger seat with an active airbag but its marking is not enough to meet the protocol criteria.

SAFETY EQUIPMENT

FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS: NO
DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG: NO
FRONT PASSENGER FRONTAL AIRBAG: NO

CHILD RESTRAINTS

7 MONTH OLD CHILD
BOBSY G0 PLUS
PROTECTED / FAIR
0+
BELTED
RWF

3 YEAR OLD CHILD
BOBSY G1 PLUS
PROTECTED / POOR
1
BELTED
FWF

CAR DETAILS

TESTED MODEL: VW POLO, RHD
BODY TYPE: 4 DOOR HATCHBACK
CRASH TEST WEIGHT: KG 1272
YEAR OF PUBLICATION: 2014
**FORD ASPIRE (NEXT GEN FIGO) - 2 AIRBAGS**

- **Adult Occupant Protection**
  - Driver chest protection: Marginal
  - Passenger chest protection: Adequate
  - Front passenger's knees could impact dangerous structures

- **Child Restraints**
  - 18 Month Old Child: Maxi Cosi Cabrio Fix
  - 3 Year Old Child: Maxi Cosi Priori XP

- **Safety Equipment**
  - Front Seatbelt Pretensioners: No
  - Side Body Airbags: No

- **Car Details**
  - **Tested Model**: Ford Aspire, RHD
  - **Body Type**: 4 Door Sedan
  - **Crash Test Weight**: KG 1212
  - **Year of Publication**: 2017

**HONDA MOBILIO - 2 AIRBAGS**

- **Adult Occupant Protection**
  - Driver's chest had weak protection
  - Passenger's marginal protection

- **Child Restraints**
  - 18 Month Old Child: Luster KA240
  - 3 Year Old Child: Luster KA500

- **Safety Equipment**
  - Front Seatbelt Pretensioners: Yes
  - Side Body Airbags: No

- **Car Details**
  - **Tested Model**: Honda Mobilio, RHD
  - **Body Type**: 5 Door Station Wagon
  - **Crash Test Weight**: KG 1451
  - **Year of Publication**: 2016
ADULT OCCUPANT
The protection offered to the driver head and neck was good. Driver chest protection was weak. Passenger's head protection was good and chest protection was marginal. The front passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard due to the Tranfascia tube. The bodyshell was rated as unstable and it was not capable of withstanding any further loadings.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The recommended CRSs did not show incompatibility. The installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

SAFETY EQUIPMENT
- Front seatbelt pretensioners: Yes
- Side body airbags: No
- SBR: No
- Driver frontal airbag: Yes
- Side head airbags: No
- ISOFIX anchorages: Yes
- Front passenger frontal airbag: Yes
- Driver knee airbag: No
- ABS (4 channel): No

ADULT OCCUPANT
The protection offered to the driver and passenger head and neck was good. Driver chest showed weak protection while passenger chest showed adequate protection. Driver's knees showed marginal protection and passenger's knees marginal and adequate protection as they could impact with dangerous structures behind the dashboard supported by the Tranfascia tube. The bodyshell was rated as unstable and it was not capable of withstanding further loadings. The car offers standard SBR for driver but it does not meet the minimum requirements ABS.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was installed FWF with ISOFIX and top tether and was able to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact while it offered good protection and marginal protection to the chest. The 18 month old CRS was installed with ISOFIX and top tether forward facing which explains the loss of head points, it showed poor protection for the head and chest. The recommended CRSs did not show incompatibility. The vehicle offers standard ISOFIX and top tether anchorages in the 2 outboard rear seats and does not offer 3 point belts in all seating positions.
### ADULT OCCUPANT

The protection offered to the driver head and neck by the airbag was good. However the protection to the chest due to high chest compression was poor and the passenger's chest received weak protection as well. The passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard. The bodyshell was rated as unstable and can not withstand further loadings. It was confirmed that Renault added reinforcements in the structure but only in the driver side and not in passenger side.

### CHILD OCCUPANT

The child seat for the 3 year old child was not able to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact and, the biomechanical readings were high. The dynamic performance of the 18 month child allowed head contact with the frontal backrest and biomechanical readings were high. The installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The static three point belts in the rear seats made more difficult the proper installation of the CRS. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

### CHILD RESTRAINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Restraint Type</th>
<th>Head/Chest</th>
<th>CRS Type</th>
<th>Adjust</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 MONTH OLD CHILD</td>
<td>MAXI COSI CABRIO FIX</td>
<td>VULNERABLE / FAIR</td>
<td>0+</td>
<td>BELTED / RWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 YEAR OLD CHILD</td>
<td>MAXI COSI PRIORI XP</td>
<td>VULNERABLE / FAIR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BELTED / FWF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAFETY EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Side Body Airbags</th>
<th>Driver Airbags</th>
<th>Isofix Anchorages</th>
<th>Knee Airbags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Seatbelt Pretensioners</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Frontal Airbag</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Passenger Frontal Airbag</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAR DETAILS

**TESTED MODEL**: RENAULT KWID (IV), RHD  
**BODY TYPE**: 5 DOOR HATCH  
**CRASH TEST WEIGHT**: KG 928  
**YEAR OF PUBLICATION**: 2016

---

### RENAULT KWID (IV) - DRIVER AIRBAG

**ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Passenger</th>
<th>8.28 max. 17.00 Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRIVER</td>
<td>10.91 max. 49.00 Child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tested at 64 km/h  
Bodyshell integrity: UNSTABLE

### RENAULT KWID (III) - DRIVER AIRBAG

**ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Passenger</th>
<th>0.00 max. 17.00 Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRIVER</td>
<td>16.63 max. 49.00 Child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tested at 64 km/h  
Bodyshell integrity: UNSTABLE

---

### ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Passenger</th>
<th>8.28 max. 17.00 Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRIVER</td>
<td>10.91 max. 49.00 Child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tested at 64 km/h  
Bodyshell integrity: UNSTABLE

### Child Restraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Restraint Type</th>
<th>Head/Chest</th>
<th>CRS Type</th>
<th>Adjust</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 MONTH OLD CHILD</td>
<td>MAXI COSI CABRIO FIX</td>
<td>VULNERABLE / FAIR</td>
<td>0+</td>
<td>BELTED / RWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 YEAR OLD CHILD</td>
<td>MAXI COSI PRIORI XP</td>
<td>VULNERABLE / FAIR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BELTED / FWF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAFETY EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Side Body Airbags</th>
<th>Driver Airbags</th>
<th>Isofix Anchorages</th>
<th>Knee Airbags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Seatbelt Pretensioners</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SIDE BODY AIRBAGS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SBR</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Frontal Airbag</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>SIDE HEAD AIRBAGS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ISOFIX ANCHORAGES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Passenger Frontal Airbag</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DRIVER KNEE AIRBAG</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ABS (4 CHANNEL)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RENAULT KWID (IV) - DRIVER AIRBAG**

**TESTED MODEL**: RENAULT KWID (IV), RHD  
**BODY TYPE**: 5 DOOR HATCH  
**CRASH TEST WEIGHT**: KG 928  
**YEAR OF PUBLICATION**: 2016

**ADULT OCCUPANT**

The protection offered to the driver head and neck by the airbag was good. However the protection to the chest due to high chest compression was poor and the passenger's chest received marginal protection. The passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard. The bodyshell was rated as unstable and can not withstand further loadings. It was confirmed that Renault added reinforcements in the structure but only in the driver side and not in passenger side.

**CHILD OCCUPANT**

The child seat for the 3 year old child was not able to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact and, the biomechanical readings were high. The dynamic performance of the 18 months child restraint was adequate but biomechanical readings were high. The installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The static three point belts in the rear seats made more difficult the proper installation of the CRS. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

### Child Restraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Restraint Type</th>
<th>Head/Chest</th>
<th>CRS Type</th>
<th>Adjust</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 MONTH OLD CHILD</td>
<td>MAXI COSI CABRIO FIX</td>
<td>PROTECTED / FAIR</td>
<td>0+</td>
<td>BELTED / RWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 YEAR OLD CHILD</td>
<td>MAXI COSI PRIORI XP</td>
<td>VULNERABLE / FAIR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BELTED / FWF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAFETY EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Side Body Airbags</th>
<th>Driver Airbags</th>
<th>Isofix Anchorages</th>
<th>Knee Airbags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Seatbelt Pretensioners</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SIDE BODY AIRBAGS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SBR</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Frontal Airbag</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>SIDE HEAD AIRBAGS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ISOFIX ANCHORAGES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Passenger Frontal Airbag</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>DRIVER KNEE AIRBAG</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ABS (4 CHANNEL)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADULT OCCUPANT
The protection offered to the driver head and chest was poor and the passenger's chest received marginal protection. The passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard. The bodyshell was rated as unstable and can not withstand further loadings.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was not able to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact and, the biomechanical readings were high. The dynamic performance of the 18 months child restraint was adequate but biomechanical readings were high. The installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The static three point belts in the rear seats made more difficult the proper installation of the CRS. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

CHILD RESTRAINTS
18 MONTH OLD CHILD
MAXI COSI CABRIO FIX
PROTECTED / GOOD
0+
BELTED
RWF

3 YEAR OLD CHILD
MAXI COSI PRIORI XP
VULNERABLE / FAIR
1
BELTED
FWF

SAFETY EQUIPMENT
FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS
NO
SIDE BODY AIRBAGS
NO
SBR
NO
DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG
NO
SIDE HEAD AIRBAGS
NO
ISOFIX ANCHORAGES
NO
FRONT PASSENGER FRONTAL AIRBAG
NO
DRIVER KNEE AIRBAG
NO
ABS (4 CHANNEL)
NO

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION
0.00 max. 17.00 Adult
14.85 max. 49.00 Child

CAR DETAILS
TESTED MODEL RENAULT KWID (III), RHD
BODY TYPE 5 DOOR HATCH
CRASH TEST WEIGHT KG 914
YEAR OF PUBLICATION 2016

RENAULT KWID (III) - NO AIRBAG

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION
0.00 max. 17.00 Adult

CAR DETAILS
TESTED MODEL RENAULT KWID (I), RHD
BODY TYPE 5 DOOR HATCH
CRASH TEST WEIGHT KG 855
YEAR OF PUBLICATION 2016

RENAULT KWID (I) - NO AIRBAG
ADULT OCCUPANT
The protection offered to the driver head was poor and for this reason the star capping was applied driver’s and passenger’s chest protection was weak. The passenger’s knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard lie the Tran fascia tube. The bodyshell was rated as stable.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The dynamic performance of the child restraints was adequate. However, the installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The recommended CRS for the 3 year old dummy was found to be incompatible with the seat system on the vehicle, while the CRS for the 18 month dummy was. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

CHILD RESTRAINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRASHPAD RATING</th>
<th>18 MONTH OLD CHILD</th>
<th>3 YEAR OLD CHILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEAD / CHEST</td>
<td>PROTECTED / FAIR</td>
<td>PROTECTED / POOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS TYPE</td>
<td>0+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJUST</td>
<td>BELTED</td>
<td>BELTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>RWF</td>
<td>FWF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFETY EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRASHPAD RATING</th>
<th>FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS</th>
<th>SIDE BODY AIRBAGS</th>
<th>DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG</th>
<th>DRIVER KNEE AIRBAG</th>
<th>ABS (4 CHANNEL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FORD FIGO - NO AIRBAGS

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION
5.42 max. 17.00 Adult
26.97 max. 49.00 Child
Tested at 64 km/h Bodyshell integrity: STABLE

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The dynamic performance of the child restraints was adequate. However, the installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The recommended CRS for the 3 year old dummy was found to be incompatible with the seat system on the vehicle, while the CRS for the 18 month dummy was. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

CHILD RESTRAINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRASHPAD RATING</th>
<th>18 MONTH OLD CHILD</th>
<th>3 YEAR OLD CHILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEAD / CHEST</td>
<td>PROTECTED / FAIR</td>
<td>PROTECTED / POOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS TYPE</td>
<td>0+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJUST</td>
<td>BELTED</td>
<td>BELTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>RWF</td>
<td>FWF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFETY EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRASHPAD RATING</th>
<th>FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS</th>
<th>SIDE BODY AIRBAGS</th>
<th>DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG</th>
<th>DRIVER KNEE AIRBAG</th>
<th>ABS (4 CHANNEL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOLKSWAGEN POLO - NO AIRBAGS

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION
2.63 max. 17.00 Adult
20.75 max. 49.00 Child
Tested at 64 km/h Bodyshell integrity: STABLE

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The dynamic performance of the child restraints was adequate. However, the installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The recommended CRS for the 3 year old dummy was found to be incompatible with the seat system on the vehicle, while the CRS for the 18 month dummy was. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

CHILD RESTRAINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRASHPAD RATING</th>
<th>18 MONTH OLD CHILD</th>
<th>3 YEAR OLD CHILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEAD / CHEST</td>
<td>PROTECTED / FAIR</td>
<td>PROTECTED / POOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS TYPE</td>
<td>0+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJUST</td>
<td>BELTED</td>
<td>BELTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>RWF</td>
<td>FWF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFETY EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRASHPAD RATING</th>
<th>FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS</th>
<th>SIDE BODY AIRBAGS</th>
<th>DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG</th>
<th>DRIVER KNEE AIRBAG</th>
<th>ABS (4 CHANNEL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUZUKI MARUTI EECO - NO AIRBAGS

**ADULT OCCUPANT**
The protection offered to the driver chest was poor and the head protection was weak. The passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard like the Transfascia tube as well as the shock absorber mounts mainly from driver side. The bodyshell was rated as unstable and can not withstand further loadings.

**Children**
The child seat for the 3 year old child was able to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact however the biomechanical readings were above the limits. The dynamic performance of the 18 month child restraint was adequate. However, the installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. Both CRS were compatible with the belt system on the vehicle. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

**Child Restraints**
- 18 MONTH OLD CHILD: MAXI COSI CABRIO FIX
- 3 YEAR OLD CHILD: MAXI COSI PRIORI XP

**Safety Equipment**
- FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS: NO
- DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG: NO
- FRONT PASSENGER FRONTAL AIRBAG: NO

**Adult Occupant Protection**
- GOOD
- ADEQUATE
- MARGINAL
- WEAK
- POOR

**Car Details**
- Tested at 64 km/h
- Bodyshell integrity: UNSTABLE
- CRASH TEST WEIGHT: KG 1124
- YEAR OF PUBLICATION: 2016

**HYUNDAI EON - NO AIRBAGS**

**ADULT OCCUPANT**
The protection offered to the driver head was poor and for this reason the star capping was applied. Driver's chest protection was poor, Passenger's chest protection was marginal. The front passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard like the Tran fascia tube. The bodyshell was rated as unstable and it was not capable of withstanding any further loadings.

**Children**
The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact.. The recommended CRS for the 3 year old dummy was found to be incompatible with the belt system on the vehicle, while the CRS for the 18 month dummy did not show incompatibility. The installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

**Child Restraints**
- 18 MONTH OLD CHILD: MAXI COSI CABRIO FIX
- 3 YEAR OLD CHILD: MAXI COSI PRIORI XP

**Safety Equipment**
- FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS: NO
- DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG: NO
- FRONT PASSENGER FRONTAL AIRBAG: NO

**Adult Occupant Protection**
- GOOD
- ADEQUATE
- MARGINAL
- WEAK
- POOR

**Car Details**
- Tested at 64 km/h
- Bodyshell integrity: UNSTABLE
- CRASH TEST WEIGHT: KG 972
- YEAR OF PUBLICATION: 2016
ADULT OCCUPANT
The protection offered to the driver head was poor due to the hard contact with the steering wheel and for this reason the star capping was applied. Driver's neck received poor protection. Driver's chest protection was poor due to its high compression. Passenger's chest protection was adequate. Both front passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard like the Tran fascia tube. The bodyshell was rated as unstable.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The dynamic performance of the child restraints was adequate. However, the installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The recommended CRS did not show incompatibilities with the belt system on the vehicle. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

CHILD RESTRAINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILD RESTRAINT</th>
<th>HEAD / CHEST</th>
<th>CRS TYPE</th>
<th>ADJUST</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 MONTH OLD CHILD</td>
<td>CHICCO AUTOFIX</td>
<td>PROTECTED / GOOD</td>
<td>0+</td>
<td>BELTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 YEAR OLD CHILD</td>
<td>CHICCO ELETTA</td>
<td>PROTECTED / POOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BELTED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFETY EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONT PASSENGER FRONTAL AIRBAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADULT OCCUPANT
The protection offered to the driver head was poor due to the hard contact with the steering wheel and for this reason the star capping was applied. Also, driver's neck received poor protection. Driver's chest protection was poor due to its high compression. Passenger's chest protection was adequate. Both front passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard like the Tran fascia tube. The bodyshell was rated as unstable.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The recommended CRS did not show incompatibilities with the belt system on the vehicle. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

CHILD RESTRAINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILD RESTRAINT</th>
<th>HEAD / CHEST</th>
<th>CRS TYPE</th>
<th>ADJUST</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 MONTH OLD CHILD</td>
<td>MAXI COSI CABRIO FIX</td>
<td>PROTECTED / GOOD</td>
<td>0+</td>
<td>BELTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 YEAR OLD CHILD</td>
<td>MAXI COSI PRIORI</td>
<td>VULNERABLE / FAIR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BELTED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFETY EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONT PASSENGER FRONTAL AIRBAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADULT OCCUPANT
The protection offered to the driver head was poor due to the hard contact with the steering wheel and for this reason the star capping was applied. Driver's neck received poor protection. Driver's chest protection was poor due to its high compression. Passenger's chest protection was adequate. Both front passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard like the Tran fascia tube. The bodyshell was rated as unstable.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The recommended CRS did not show incompatibilities with the belt system on the vehicle. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.
ADULT OCCUPANT
The protection offered to the driver head was poor due to the hard contact with the steering wheel and for this reason the star capping was applied. Driver's chest protection was poor due to its high compression, Passenger's chest protection was adequate. Both front passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard lie the Tran fascia tube. The bodyshell was rated as unstable.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The dynamic performance of the 18 month child restraint was adequate. However, the installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. Both CRS were compatible with the belt system on the vehicle. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION
The protection offered to the driver head and chest was poor and the passenger’s chest received marginal protection. The passenger’s knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard. The bodyshell was rated as unstable and can not withstand further loadings.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was not able to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact and the biomechanical readings were above the limits. The dynamic performance of the 18 month child restraint was adequate. However, the installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. Both CRS were compatible with the belt system on the vehicle. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.
ADULT OCCUPANT
The protection offered to the driver head and chest was poor and for this reason the star capping was applied. Passenger's head protection was weak while chest protection was adequate. The front passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard like the Tran fascia tube. The bodyshell was rated as unstable and it was not capable of withstanding any further loadings.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The recommended CRSs did not show incompatibility. The installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION
- Tested at 64 km/h
- Bodyshell integrity: UNSTABLE

SAFETY EQUIPMENT
- FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS: NO
- DRIVER FRONTAL AIRBAG: NO
- FRONT PASSENGER FRONTAL AIRBAG: NO

CHILD RESTRAINTS
- 18 MONTH OLD CHILD: BRITAX BABY SAFE
- 3 YEAR OLD CHILD: BRITAX DUO PLUS

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The recommended CRSs did not show incompatibility. The installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.
ADULT OCCUPANT
The protection offered to the driver head was poor and for this reason the star capping was applied. Driver's chest protection was poor, Passenger's chest protection was marginal. The front passenger's knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard like the Tran fascia tube. The bodyshell was rated as unstable and it was not capable of withstanding any further loadings.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The recommended CRSs did not show incompatibility. The installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

CHILD RESTRAINTS
- 18 MONTH OLD CHILD: MAXI COSI CABRIO FIX
- 3 YEAR OLD CHILD: MAXI COSI PRIORI

SAFETY EQUIPMENT
- FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS: NO
- SIDE BODY AIRBAGS: NO
- ISOFIX ANCHORAGES: NO
- DRIVER KNEE AIRBAG: NO
- ABS (4 CHANNEL): NO

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION
- TESTED MODEL: TATA ZEST, RHD
- BODY TYPE: 4 DOOR SEDAN
- CRASH TEST WEIGHT: KG 1310
- YEAR OF PUBLICATION: 2016

CAR DETAILS
- FRONT PASSENGER: GOOD
- DRIVER: ADEQUATE
- CHILD RESTRAINT: MARGINAL
- HEAD / CHEST: WEAK
- POSITION: POOR
- ADJUST: BELTED
- CRS TYPE: PROTECTED / FAIR
- 0+:

SUZUKI MARUTI CELERIO - NO AIRBAGS

0.00 max. 17.00 Adult

11.53 max. 49.00 Child

Tested at 64 km/h
Bodyshell integrity: UNSTABLE

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION
- TESTED MODEL: SUZUKI MARUTI CELERIO, RHD
- BODY TYPE: 5 DOOR HATCH
- CRASH TEST WEIGHT: KG 1019
- YEAR OF PUBLICATION: 2016

CAR DETAILS
- FRONT PASSENGER: GOOD
- DRIVER: ADEQUATE
- CHILD RESTRAINT: MARGINAL
- HEAD / CHEST: WEAK
- POSITION: POOR
- ADJUST: BELTED
- CRS TYPE: PROTECTED / FAIR
- 0+:

CHILD RESTRAINTS
- 18 MONTH OLD CHILD: MAXI COSI CABRIO FIX
- 3 YEAR OLD CHILD: MAXI COSI PRIORI XP

SAFETY EQUIPMENT
- FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS: NO
- SIDE BODY AIRBAGS: NO
- ISOFIX ANCHORAGES: NO
- DRIVER KNEE AIRBAG: NO
- ABS (4 CHANNEL): NO

ADULT OCCUPANT
The protection offered to the driver head neck and chest was poor and the passenger's chest received marginal protection. The bodyshell was rated as unstable and it was not capable of withstanding any further loadings.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was not able to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact and the biomechanical readings were above the limits. The dynamic performance of the 18 month child restraint was adequate. However, the installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. Both CRS were compatible with the belt system on the vehicle. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.
ADULT OCCUPANT

The protection offered to the driver’s head and chest was poor and for this reason the star capping was applied. Driver’s chest protection was weak due to contact with the steering wheel. The passenger’s knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard like the transfascia tube. The bodyshell was rated as unstable. The bodyshell was not capable of withstanding any further loadings.

CHILD OCCUPANT

The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The biomechanical readings were above the limits. The dynamic performance of the 18 month old child could not prevent head contact with the backrest of the rear seat. Installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. Both CRS were compatible with the belt system on the vehicle. This vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.

CHILD RESTRAINTS

18 MONTH OLD CHILD

LUSTER KA240

VULNERABLE / FAIR

0+

BELTED

RWF

3 YEAR OLD CHILD

LUSTER KA500

VULNERABLE / FAIR

1

BELTED

FWF

SAFETY EQUIPMENT

FRONT SEATBELT PRETENSIONERS

NO

SIDE BODY AIRBAGS

NO

SBR

NO

FRONT PASSENGER FRONTAL AIRBAG

NO

DRIVER KNEE AIRBAG

NO

ABS (4 CHANNEL)

NO

ADULT OCCUPANT PROTECTION

The protection offered to the driver’s head and chest was poor and for this reason the star capping was applied. Driver’s chest protection was weak due to contact with the steering wheel. The passenger’s knees could impact with dangerous structures in the dashboard like the transfascia tube. The bodyshell was rated as unstable. The bodyshell was not capable of withstanding any further loadings.

CHILD OCCUPANT

The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. 3 year old child showed high loadings in head and chest. The installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.
ADULT OCCUPANT
The protection offered to the driver head, neck, chest was poor due to the hard contact with the steering wheel as well as for the high decelerations and for this reason the star capping was applied. Also Passenger’s chest protection was marginal. Both front passenger’s knees could impact with dangerous structures, in the dashboard lie the Tran fascia tube, also the shock absorber mounts are offer potential risk. The bodyshell was rated as unstable and it can not withstand any further loading.

CHILD OCCUPANT
The child seat for the 3 year old child was unable to prevent excessive forward movement during the impact. The 3 year old dummy presented high loading in its chest and head. Both dummies heads’ contacted the front backrests. The recommended CRS for the 3 year old dummy was found to be incompatible with the belt system on the vehicle, while the CRS for the 18 month dummy did not show incompatibility. The installation instructions on both child seats were insufficient and not permanently attached to the seat. The vehicle was not equipped with a passenger airbag.
GLOBAL NCAP

Global NCAP aims to promote public safety and public health, the protection and preservation of human life and the conservation, protection and improvement of the physical and natural environment.

We encourage consumers to demand and manufacturers to supply safer vehicles by supporting independent testing programmes that assess the comparative safety performance of automobiles.

We provide an international platform for cooperation among New Car Assessment Programmes (NCAPs) and similar organisations to share best practice, exchange information, and promote the use of consumer information to encourage a market for safer motor vehicles worldwide.

We promote the development of NCAPs in emerging markets where vehicle growth is strong but consumer safety information is frequently unavailable. We do this by providing financial support and technical assistance to newly established NCAPs.

We carry out research on innovations in vehicle safety technologies, their application in global markets, and the range of policies that will accelerate their use and then track progress of vehicle safety across the globe.

We have also developed a global awards scheme to recognize achievement in vehicle safety, innovation in safety-related technologies and products.

Global NCAP has consultative status with the United Nations (ECOSOC), is a member of the UN Road Safety Collaboration, and supports the UN Decade for Action for Road Safety 2011-2020, the implementation of the Global Plan for the Decade, and the Sustainable Development Goals particularly its road safety target as part of an overall strategy to achieve a world free from road fatalities.

With thanks to our supporters:

@GLOBALNCAP

Bloomberg Philanthropies

FIA FOUNDATION