



Mazda CX-3  
Supermini

2015



Adult Occupant



85%

Child Occupant



79%

Pedestrian



84%

Safety Assist



64%

## SPECIFICATION

Tested Model	Mazda CX-3 2.0 'Core', LHD
Body Type	- 5 door wagon
Year Of Publication	2015
Kerb Weight	1231kg
VIN From Which Rating Applies	- all CX-3s
Class	Supermini

**X** Rating Expired

## 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	●	●	✘

Version 050122

## SAFETY EQUIPMENT (NEXT)

	Driver	Passenger	Rear
CHILD PROTECTION			
Isofix	—	✘	●
Integrated CRS	—	✘	✘
Airbag cut-off switch	—	●	—
SAFETY ASSIST			
Seat Belt Reminder	●	●	●

OTHER SYSTEMS	
Active Bonnet (Hood)	✘
ESC	●
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 option  
○ Not fitted to the test vehicle but available as option   
 ✘ Not Available   
 — Not Applicable

**ADULT OCCUPANT**

Total 32.4 Pts / 85%

■ GOOD   
 ■ ADEQUATE   
 ■ MARGINAL   
 ■ WEAK   
 ■ POOR

**Frontal Offset Deformable Barrier** 7.5 Pts

Passenger                      Driver

**Frontal Full Width** 7.1 Pts

Rear Passenger                      Driver

**Whiplash Rear Impact** 1.8 Pts

Front seat                      Rear seat

**Lateral Impact** 16.0 Pts

Car                      Pole

**AEB City** 0.0

Performance:



ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 32.4 Pts / 85%



GOOD



ADEQUATE



MARGINAL



WEAK



POOR



## ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 32.4 Pts / 85%

## Comments

The passenger compartment of the CX-3 remained stable in the offset frontal impact. For the front passenger dummy, all critical body areas were well protected. Dummy readings indicated good protection of the knees and femurs for both the driver and passenger. Mazda showed that a similar level of protection would be provided to occupants of different sizes and to those sat in different positions. In the full-width frontal test, the driver passenger scored maximum points with good protection of all body areas. However, readings of chest compression in the rear passenger dummy indicated weak protection of that body region, despite the standard-fit seatbelt pre-tensioners and load-limiters in the rear seats. In the side barrier test, the CX-3 scored full points with good protection of all critical areas. Even in the more severe side pole impact, full points were scored. The front seats and head restraints provided good protection against whiplash injury in the event of a rear-end collision. However, a geometric assessment of the rear seats and restraints indicated poor whiplash protection for the occupants of these seats. A low-speed autonomous emergency braking system is available as an option. As it is not standard equipment, it did not qualify for inclusion in the assessment.

**CHILD OCCUPANT**

Total 39.1 Pts / 79%

■ GOOD   
 ■ ADEQUATE   
 ■ MARGINAL   
 ■ WEAK   
 ■ POOR

**Crash Test Performance**

22.1 Pts

18 months old child 12 Pts

**Tested restraint (Fit):**  
Britax Römer BabySafe + ISOFIX Base

■ Good

36 months old child 10.1 Pts

**Tested restraint (Fit):**  
Britax Römer Duo Plus

■ Adequate

**Safety Features**

5.0 Pts

	Front Passenger	2nd row outboard	2nd row center
Isifix	✗	●	✗
i-Size	✗	●	✗
Integrated CRS	✗	✗	✗

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

**CRS Installation Check**

12.0 Pts

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

■ **Infants up to 13 kg**

Maxi Cosi Cabriofix (Belt)

Maxi Cosi Cabriofix & EasyFix (Belt)

Maxi Cosi Cabriofix & EasyFix (ISOFIX)

**CHILD OCCUPANT**

Total 39.1 Pts / 79%

■ **Infants and toddlers up to 18 kg**

BeSafe iZi Kid X3 ISOFix (ISOFIX)



■ **Toddlers from 9 to 18 kg**

Britax Römer King Plus (Belt)



Britax Römer Duo Plus (ISOFIX)



Maxi Cosi Pearl & Familyfix (ISOFIX)



■ **Toddlers over 18 kg**

Britax Römer KidFix (Belt)



Britax Römer KidFix (ISOFIX)



## CHILD OCCUPANT

Total 39.1 Pts / 79%

	Seat Position			
	Front	2nd row		
	PASSENGER	LEFT	CENTER	RIGHT
Maxi Cosi Cabriofix (Belt)	●	●	✘	●
Britax Römer King Plus (Belt)	●	●	✘	●
Britax Römer Duo Plus (ISOFIX)	✘	●	✘	●
Britax Römer KidFix (Belt)	●	●	✘	●
Maxi Cosi Cabriofix & EasyFix (Belt)	●	●	✘	●
Maxi Cosi Cabriofix & EasyFix (ISOFIX)	✘	●	✘	●
BeSafe iZi Kid X3 ISOfix (ISOFIX)	✘	●	✘	●
Maxi Cosi Pearl & Familyfix (ISOFIX)	✘	●	✘	●
Britax Römer KidFix (ISOFIX)	✘	●	✘	●

● Install without problem  
 ● Install with care  
 ● Safety critical problem  
 ✘ Installation not allowed  
 — Not available

## Comments

The CX-3 scored maximum points for its protection of the 1½ year dummy in the dynamic impact tests. In the frontal test, forward movement of the 3 year dummy, sat in a forward-facing restraint, was not excessive. In the side impact, both child dummies were properly contained within the protective shells of their restraints, minimising the likelihood of head contact with parts of the car interior. The front passenger airbag can be disabled to allow a rearward facing child restraint to be used in that seating position. Clear information is provided to the driver regarding the status of the airbag and the system was rewarded. All of the restraint types for which the CX-3 is designed could be properly installed and accommodated in the car.

 PEDESTRIAN

Total 30.3 Pts / 84%

■ GOOD   
 ■ ADEQUATE   
 ■ MARGINAL   
 ■ WEAK   
 ■ POOR

Pedestrian	30.3 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;">20.0 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;">6.0 Pts</td> </tr> </table>	Head Impact	20.0 Pts	Pelvis Impact	4.3 Pts	Leg Impact	6.0 Pts
Head Impact	20.0 Pts						
Pelvis Impact	4.3 Pts						
Leg Impact	6.0 Pts						

Comments

The bumper scored maximum points for its protection of pedestrians' legs, showing good results in all areas tested. However, protection of the pelvis region was mixed, with areas of good, poor and weak performance. The bonnet of the CX-3 performed well and results were good or adequate over almost the entire bonnet surface.

SAFETY ASSIST

Total 8.3 Pts / 64%

GOOD
  ADEQUATE
  MARGINAL
  WEAK
  POOR

Speed Assistance

1.3 Pts

System Name	Adjustable Speed Limiter
Speed Limit Information Function	N/A
Warning Function	Manually set
Speed Limitation Function	Manually set

Electronic Stability Control

3 Pts

System Name	DSC	
PERFORMANCE		
Vehicle Yaw Rate @ COS + 1.00 s	3.3%	meets ECE requirements
Vehicle Yaw Rate @ COS + 1.75 s	3%	meets ECE requirements
Lateral Displacement @ BOS + 1.07 s	2.98 m	meets ECE requirements

Seatbelt Reminder

3.0 Pts

Applies To	All seats		
	Driver Seat	Front Passenger(s)	Rear Passenger(s)
Warning			
Visual	●	●	●
Audible	●	●	●

● Pass
 ● Fail
 — Not available

Lane Support

1.0 Pts

System Name	LDWS
Type	Lane Departure Warning
Operational From	70 km/h
Warning	Audible & Visual
PERFORMANCE	
LDW Confirmation Test	Pass

Version 050122

AEB Inter-Urban

Euro NCAP © Mazda CX-3 Sept 2015 11/13 **0 Pts**



## SAFETY ASSIST

Total 8.3 Pts / 64%

## Comments

Electronic stability control is standard equipment, as is a seatbelt reminder for the front and rear seats. A driver-set speed limiter is available as an option and is expected to be fitted to most cars sold as is a lane departure warning system. An autonomous emergency braking system for the speeds typical of highway driving is available as an option but is not expected to be fitted enough vehicles to qualify for assessment.

## RATING VALIDITY

### Variants of Model Range

### Annual Reviews and Facelifts

Date	Event	Outcome
September 2015	Rating Published	2015 ★ ★ ★ ★ ☆ ✓
September 2016	Annual Review	2015 ★ ★ ★ ★ ☆ ✓
December 2016	Facelift Review	2015 ★ ★ ★ ★ ☆ ✓
September 2017	Annual Review	2015 ★ ★ ★ ★ ☆ ✓
September 2018	Annual Review	2015 ★ ★ ★ ★ ☆ ✓
September 2019	Annual Review	2015 ★ ★ ★ ★ ☆ ✓
September 2020	Annual Review	2015 ★ ★ ★ ★ ☆ ✓
September 2021	Annual Review	2015 ★ ★ ★ ★ ☆ ✓
January 2022	Rating Expired	2015 ★ ★ ★ ★ ☆ ✗