



Suzuki Baleno
Standard Safety Equipment

2016



Adult Occupant



80%

Child Occupant



73%

Pedestrian



65%

Safety Assist



25%

SPECIFICATION

Tested Model	Suzuki Baleno
Body Type	5 door hatchback
Year Of Publication	2016
Kerb Weight	890kg
VIN From Which Rating Applies	- all Balenos
Class	Supermini

× Rating Expired

General comments

The Suzuki Baleno has two star ratings: one based on the safety equipment which is fitted as standard to all cars in the range and another which also includes an optional safety pack called 'Radar Brake Support'. This assessment is for standard-fit safety equipment only.

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/i-Size	—	✘	●
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 30.8 Pts / 80%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

Frontal Offset Deformable Barrier 7.5 Pts

Passenger Driver

Frontal Full Width 7 Pts

Rear Passenger Driver

Whiplash Rear Impact 2.6 Pts

Front seat Rear seat

Lateral Impact 13.6 Pts

Car Pole

AEB City 0.0

Performance:



ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 30.8 Pts / 80%



GOOD



ADEQUATE



MARGINAL



WEAK



POOR

 ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 30.8 Pts / 80%

Comments

The passenger compartment remained stable in the frontal offset test. Dummy readings indicated good protection of the knees and femurs of both the driver and passenger. Suzuki 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 rigid barrier impact, protection of the driver was rated as good except for the chest, protection of which was adequate. Dummy readings of chest compression indicated marginal protection for this part of the body but good or adequate protection elsewhere. In the side barrier test, dummy numbers showed good protection but the score for the head was penalised as the side curtain airbag was deemed not to have deployed in the correct manner in the side pole test (see Child Occupant Protection). In the more severe side pole impact, dummy readings of lateral rib compression indicated weak chest protection and the head protection was downgraded to adequate as a result of the incorrect airbag deployment. The front seats and head restraints demonstrated good protection against whiplash in the event of a rear-end collision. A geometric assessment of the rear seats also indicated good protection. The optional 'Radar Brake Support' was not included in this assessment.



CHILD OCCUPANT

Total 36.1 Pts / 73%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

Crash Test Performance based on 6 & 10 year old children

17.1 Pts



Restraint for 6 year old child: *Britax Römer Kid Fix 'XP'*
 Restraint for 10 year old child: *Fisher Price Safe Voyage*

Safety Features

7.0 Pts

	Front Passenger	2nd row outboard	2nd row center
Isofix	✗	●	✗
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

■ i-Size CRS

Maxi Cosi 2way Pearl & 2wayFix (rearward) (iSize)



Maxi Cosi 2way Pearl & 2wayFix (forward) (iSize)



BeSafe iZi Kid X1 i-Size (iSize)



■ ISOFIX CRS

Maxi Cosi Cabriofix & FamilyFix (ISOFIX)



BeSafe iZi Kid X3 ISOfix (ISOFIX)



Britax Römer Duo Plus (ISOFIX)



Britax Römer KidFix XP (ISOFIX)



 CHILD OCCUPANT

Total 36.1 Pts / 73%

■ 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 36.1 Pts / 73%

	Seat Position			
	Front	2nd row		
	PASSENGER	LEFT	CENTER	RIGHT
Maxi Cosi 2way Pearl & 2wayFix (rearward) (iSize)	✘	●	✘	●
Maxi Cosi 2way Pearl & 2wayFix (forward) (iSize)	✘	●	✘	●
BeSafe iZi Kid X1 i-Size (iSize)	✘	●	✘	●
Maxi Cosi Cabriofix & FamilyFix (ISOFIX)	✘	●	✘	●
BeSafe iZi Kid X3 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

— Not available

Comments

In the frontal impact, both the 6 and the 10 year dummies were properly restrained and forward movement was not excessive. However, dummy readings revealed high values of neck tensile forces in the 10 year dummy and marginal protection of the neck and chest of the six year dummy. In the side impact, there was insufficient pressure in the side curtain airbag to prevent the head of the 10 year dummy striking the interior of the car, around the C-pillar. This contact led to very high decelerations and protection was rated as poor. Dummy readings of chest deceleration also indicated poor protection of that part of the body. The side wing of the child restraint used for the six year dummy was found to be broken after the test. High-speed film revealed that the dummy's head was not properly contained during the impact, increasing 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.

 PEDESTRIAN

Total 27.6 Pts / 65%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

Pedestrian	27.6 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;">17.5 Pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pelvis Impact</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">4.1 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	17.5 Pts	Pelvis Impact	4.1 Pts	Leg Impact	6.0 Pts
Head Impact	17.5 Pts						
Pelvis Impact	4.1 Pts						
Leg Impact	6.0 Pts						

AEB Pedestrian	0.0 Pts
----------------	---------

Comments

The bumper provided good protection to pedestrians' legs and the bonnet gave predominantly good or adequate results, with poor protection only on the stiff windscreen pillars. The protection provided to the pelvis region was mixed, with areas of good and poor protection. An autonomous braking system capable of detecting pedestrians is not available on the Baleno.

 SAFETY ASSIST

Total 3 Pts / 25%

GOOD
 ADEQUATE
 MARGINAL
 WEAK
 POOR

Speed Assistance 0 Pts

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 0 Pts

AEB Inter-Urban 0 Pts



SAFETY ASSIST

Total 3 Pts / 25%

Comments

The Baleno has a seatbelt reminder system as standard for all seating positions. The optional autonomous braking system was not included in this assessment. A speed assistance system is also an option but is not included in the 'Radar Brake Support' option pack so was not included in this assessment. A lane assistance system is not available for the Baleno.

RATING VALIDITY

Variants of Model Range

Annual Reviews and Facelifts

Date	Event	Outcome
April 2016	Rating Published	2016 ★ ★ ★ ☆ ☆
April 2017	Annual Review	2016 ★ ★ ★ ☆ ☆
April 2018	Annual Review	2016 ★ ★ ★ ☆ ☆
April 2019	Production stopped	2016 ★ ★ ★ ☆ ☆