



Peugeot 3008/5008
Standard Safety Equipment

2016



Adult Occupant



86%

Child Occupant



85%

Pedestrian



67%

Safety Assist



58%

SPECIFICATION

Tested Model	Peugeot 3008 1,6l Hdi Active
Body Type	- 5 door SUV
Year Of Publication	2016
Kerb Weight	1300kg
VIN From Which Rating Applies	- all 3008s (including 3008 Hybrid4) and 5008s
Class	Small Off-Road

✗ Rating Expired

General comments

The Peugeot 5008 is structurally identical to the 3008 except for extra length in the rear and a third row of seats. Euro NCAP has reviewed data and conducted additional tests to confirm that the 5008 shares the same rating as the 3008 originally tested.

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 32.9 Pts / 86%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

Frontal Offset Deformable Barrier 7 Pts

Passenger Driver

Frontal Full Width 7.5 Pts

Rear Passenger Driver

Whiplash Rear Impact 2.5 Pts

Front seat Rear seat

Lateral Impact 15.9 Pts

Car Pole

AEB City 0.0

Performance:



ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 32.9 Pts / 86%



GOOD



ADEQUATE



MARGINAL



WEAK



POOR

 ADULT OCCUPANT

Total 32.9 Pts / 86%

Comments

The passenger compartment of the 3008 remained stable in the offset frontal impact test. Dummy readings of chest compression revealed marginal protection of the driver's chest. Good protection was seen for the knees and femurs of both the driver and passenger. Peugeot demonstrated 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 test, protection was good for critical body areas except the neck for the rear passenger and the chest and neck for the driver, protection of which was adequate. In the side barrier test, the 3008 scored maximum points with good protection of all critical body regions. In the more severe side pole impact, the chest was adequately protected and all other body areas were well protected. Tests on the front seats and head restraints showed good protection against whiplash injury in the event of a rear-end collision and a geometric assessment of the rear seats indicated the same level of protection there. In the 5008, the third row seats did not pass the whiplash assessment. For this car, the score for adult occupant protection is reduced from 86 percent to 85 percent but the star rating is unaffected. Some grades of the 3008 are equipped with an autonomous emergency braking system which would further protect against whiplash injury. Tests showed good performance but, as the system is not standard across the model range, its results are not included in this assessment.



CHILD OCCUPANT

Total 42.0 Pts / 85%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

Crash Test Performance based on 6 & 10 year old children

22.0 Pts



Restraint for 6 year old child: *ROMER kidfix XP*
 Restraint for 10 year old child: *GRACO Booster*

Safety Features

8.0 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

■ i-Size CRS



■ ISOFIX CRS



 CHILD OCCUPANT

Total 42.0 Pts / 85%

■ 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 42.0 Pts / 85%

	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 offset frontal impact, protection of the 10 year dummy's chest and neck was adequate and that of the head was good. Dummy readings of chest deceleration indicated marginal protection of the 6 year old's chest, with good protection of the head and neck. The 3008 provided good protection to all critical body areas of both dummies in the side barrier test. 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 regarding the status of the airbag and the system was rewarded. All of the child restraint types for which the 3008 is designed could be properly installed and accommodated in the vehicle. A check of the 5008 showed that all suitable restraints could be properly installed there also, and the score for child occupant protection is the same as the 3008.

PEDESTRIAN

Total 28.2 Pts / 67%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

Pedestrian	28.2 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;">16.2 Pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pelvis Impact</td> <td style="text-align: right; padding: 5px;">6.0 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	16.2 Pts	Pelvis Impact	6.0 Pts	Leg Impact	6.0 Pts
Head Impact	16.2 Pts						
Pelvis Impact	6.0 Pts						
Leg Impact	6.0 Pts						

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

Comments

The bonnet provided predominantly good or adequate protection to the head of a struck pedestrian, with poor results recorded at the base of the windscreen and on the stiff windscreen pillars. The 3008 provided good protection to the pelvis and to pedestrians' legs, with maximum points scored for these parts of the assessment. The pedestrian-detecting autonomous emergency braking system performed well in tests but the results of this part of the assessment are not included as the system is not standard on every grade.

 SAFETY ASSIST

Total 7 Pts / 58%

■ GOOD
 ■ ADEQUATE
 ■ MARGINAL
 ■ WEAK
 ■ POOR

Speed Assistance

2.5 Pts

System Name	Speed Limit Recognition and Recommendation
Speed Limit Information Function	Camera based, subsigns supported
Warning Function	System advised
Speed Limitation Function	System advised (accurate to 5km/h)

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

1.5 Pts

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

AEB Inter-Urban

0 Pts



SAFETY ASSIST

Total 7 Pts / 58%

Comments

A seatbelt reminder system is standard for the front and rear seats. A standard camera-based speed assistance system can identify the local speed limit allowing the driver to set the speed limiter appropriately. A lane departure warning system is also standard across the model range.

RATING VALIDITY

Variants of Model Range

Annual Reviews and Facelifts

Date	Event	Outcome
September 2016	Rating Published	2016 ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ✓
October 2020	Facelift Review	2016 ★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ✓