



Ford C-MAX
Standard Safety Equipment

2017



Adult Occupant



76%

Child Occupant



60%

Pedestrian Impact Protection



59%

Safety Assist



29%

SPECIFICATION

Tested Model	Ford Grand C-MAX 1.5 diesel 'Titanium', LHD
Body Type	- 5 door MPV
Year Of Publication	2017
Kerb Weight	1606kg
VIN From Which Rating Applies	- WFOVXXGCEWHE77742
Class	Small MPV

General comments

The Ford Grand C-MAX and the Ford Compact C-MAX are identical apart from the way the rear doors operate. Euro NCAP tested the heavier Grand C-MAX and the results of those tests are used in this assessment.

SAFETY EQUIPMENT

	Driver	Passenger	Rear
FRONTAL CRASH PROTECTION			
Frontal airbag	●	●	✗
Belt pretensioner	●	●	✗
Belt loadlimiter	●	●	✗
Knee airbag	✗	✗	✗
SIDE CRASH PROTECTION			
Side head airbag	●	●	●
Side chest airbag	●	●	✗
Side pelvis airbag	●	●	✗
CHILD PROTECTION			
Isofix	—	✗	●
Integrated CRS	—	✗	✗
Airbag cut-off switch	—	○	—
SAFETY ASSIST			
Seat Belt Reminder	●	●	✗
OTHER SYSTEMS			
Active Bonnet (Hood)	✗		
AEB Pedestrian	✗		
AEB City	●		
AEB Inter-Urban	○		
Speed Assistance System	●		
Lane Assist System	○		

Note: Other equipment may be available on the vehicle but was not considered in the test year.

- Fitted to the vehicle as standard ○ Fitted to the vehicle as part of the safety pack
 ○ Not fitted to the test vehicle but available as option or as part of the safety pack ✗ Not available — Not applicable

ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 28.9 Pts / 76%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

Frontal Offset Deformable Barrier 7.8 Pts




Passenger
Driver

Frontal Full Width 2.5 Pts




Rear Passenger
Driver

Whiplash Rear Impact 2.1 Pts



Front seat
Rear seat

Lateral Impact 14.6 Pts



Car
Pole

AEB City 1.9

Performance: ■ Adequate

 ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 28.9 Pts / 76%



 GOOD	 ADEQUATE	 MARGINAL	 WEAK	 POOR
--	--	--	--	--

 ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 28.9 Pts / 76%

Comments

The passenger compartment of the C-MAX remained stable in the frontal offset test. Dummy readings indicated good protection of the knees and femurs of the driver and passenger. Ford demonstrated that a similar level of protection would be provided to occupants of different sizes and to those sat in different positions. Protection was good for all critical body areas of the passenger dummy in this test. In the full-width rigid barrier test, the pelvis of the driver dummy slipped beneath the lap section of the seatbelt and protection of this area was rated as poor. Dummy readings of chest compression indicated marginal protection. For the rear passenger dummy, a combination of chest compression and high shoulder belt load indicated poor chest protection, and that of the neck was rated as marginal. In the side barrier test, protection of all critical body areas was good and the C-MAX scored maximum points in this test. In the more severe side pole impact, protection of the chest was rated as marginal, based on dummy readings of rib compression. In that test, the sliding door unlatched at the front, creating a gap between the door and the car body, and the score was penalised for this. Tests on the front seats and head restraints demonstrated good protection against whiplash injury in the event of a rear-end collision. A geometric assessment of the rear seats indicated marginal whiplash protection. Cars from VIN WF0WXXGCEWHE77742 have a standard-fit autonomous emergency braking system. In tests of its functionality at the low speeds at which many whiplash injuries are caused, the system performed adequately.


CHILD OCCUPANT

Total 29.6 Pts / 60%

GOOD ADEQUATE MARGINAL WEAK POOR

Crash Test Performance based on 6 & 10 year old children

20.3 Pts



Restraint for 6 year old child: *Britax Römer KidFix XP*

Restraint for 10 year old child: *Graco Booster*

Safety Features

2 Pts

	Front Passenger	2nd row outboard	2nd row center	3rd row outboard *
Isofix	✗	●	✗	✗
i-Size	✗	●	✗	✗
Integrated CRS	✗	✗	✗	✗

* Third row seats available as option

● Fitted to test car as standard ○ Not on test car but available as option ✗ Not available

CRS Installation Check

7.3 Pts

● Install without problem ● Install with care ● Safety critical problem ✗ Installation not allowed

i-Size CRS



CHILD OCCUPANT

Total 29.6 Pts / 60%

■ ISOFIX CRS

Maxi Cosi Cabriofix & FamilyFix (ISOFIX)



BeSafe iZi Kid X4 ISOfix (ISOFIX)



Britax Römer Duo Plus (ISOFIX)



Britax Römer KidFix XP (ISOFIX)



■ Universal Belted CRS

Maxi Cosi Cabriofix (Belt)



Maxi Cosi Cabriofix & EasyBase2 (Belt)



Britax Römer King II LS (Belt)



Britax Römer KidFix XP (Belt)



CHILD OCCUPANT

Total 29.6 Pts / 60%

	Seat Position					
	Front	2nd row			3rd row	
	PASSENGER	LEFT	CENTER	RIGHT	LEFT	RIGHT
Maxi Cosi 2way Pearl & 2wayFix (rearward) (iSize)	□	●	□	●	□	□
Maxi Cosi 2way Pearl & 2wayFix (forward) (iSize)	□	●	□	●	□	□
BeSafe iZi Kid X2 i-Size (iSize)	□	●	□	●	□	□
Maxi Cosi Cabriofix & FamilyFix (ISOFIX)	□	●	□	●	□	□
BeSafe iZi Kid X4 ISOfix (ISOFIX)	□	●	□	●	□	□
Britax Römer Duo Plus (ISOFIX)	□	●	□	●	□	□
Britax Römer KidFix XP (ISOFIX)	□	●	□	●	□	□
Maxi Cosi Cabriofix (Belt)	●	●	●	●	●	●
Maxi Cosi Cabriofix & EasyBase2 (Belt)	●	●	●	●	●	●
Britax Römer King II LS (Belt)	●	●	●	●	●	●
Britax Römer KidFix XP (Belt)	●	●	●	●	●	●

● Install without problem
 ● Install with care
 ● Safety critical problem
 ✗ Installation not allowed

Comments

In the frontal offset test, readings of neck tension indicated poor protection of this part of the body for the 10-year dummy and marginal protection for the 6-year dummy. In the side barrier test, protection of all critical body areas was good. The front passenger airbag can be disabled in cars fitted with an optional cut-off switch, to allow a rearward-facing child restraint to be used in that seating position. As this switch is not standard equipment, no points are awarded in this assessment and the installation check of rearward-facing restraints is deemed a fail. ISOFIX and i-Size compatible anchorages are available only on the second row outboard seats.

PEDESTRIAN IMPACT PROTECTION

Total 25.0 Pts / 59%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

Pedestrian Impact Protection	25 Pts						
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Head Impact</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">15.9 Pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pelvis Impact</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">4.3 Pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Leg Impact</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">4.8 Pts</td> </tr> </table>	Head Impact	15.9 Pts	Pelvis Impact	4.3 Pts	Leg Impact	4.8 Pts
Head Impact	15.9 Pts						
Pelvis Impact	4.3 Pts						
Leg Impact	4.8 Pts						

AEB Pedestrian	0 Pts
----------------	-------

Comments

The protection provided to the head of a struck pedestrian was predominantly adequate or marginal. Protection of pedestrians' legs by the bumper was mostly good but weak in places, and that of the pelvis was also generally good but with some poor results.

SAFETY ASSIST

Total 3.5 Pts / 29%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

Speed Assistance

1.5 Pts

System Name	ASLD (Adjustable Speed Limiting Device)
Speed Limit Information Function	N/A
Warning Function	Manually set
Speed Limitation Function	Manually set (accurate to 5km/h)

Seat Belt Reminder

2 Pts

Applies To	Front seats		
	Driver Seat	front passenger(s)	rear passenger(s)
Warning			
Visual	●	●	●
Audible	●	●	●

● Pass
 ● Fail
 — Not available

Lane Support

0 Pts

AEB Interurban

0 Pts



SAFETY ASSIST

Total 3.5 Pts / 29%

Comments

The C-MAX has a seatbelt reminder system for the front seats only. It also has, as standard, a driver-set speed limiter.

RATING VALIDITY

Variants of Model Range

Body Type	Engine	Drivetrain	Rating Applies	
			LHD	RHD
5 door MPV	1.5 diesel	4 x 2	✓	✓
5 door MPV	2.0 diesel	4 x 2	✓	✓
5 door MPV	1.0 petrol	4 x 2	✓	✓
5 door MPV	1.5 petrol	4 x 2	✓	✓
5 door MPV	1.6 petrol	4 x 2	✓	✓

Ford Grand C-MAX, 1.5 diesel was tested

Annual Reviews and Facelifts

Date	Event	Outcome
December 2017	Rating Published	2017 ★★☆☆☆ ✓