



## Smart forfour

RATING	SCORE	Front: 12	Side: 13	Seatbelt reminder: 1
 <b>ADULT OCCUPANT</b> ★★☆☆☆	<b>26</b>			
 <b>CHILD OCCUPANT</b> ★☆☆☆☆	<b>18</b>			
 <b>PEDESTRIAN</b> ★☆☆☆☆	<b>7</b>			

### Adult occupant protection



Frontal impact driver



Frontal impact passenger



Side impact driver

<span style="color: green;">■</span>	GOOD
<span style="color: yellow;">■</span>	ADEQUATE
<span style="color: orange;">■</span>	MARGINAL
<span style="color: brown;">■</span>	WEAK
<span style="color: red;">■</span>	POOR

### Child restraints

<b>18 month old Child</b>	Britax Roemer Duo Plus, forward facing
<b>3 year old Child</b>	Britax Roemer Duo Plus, forward facing

### Pedestrian protection

No image car front available

### Safety equipment

Front seatbelt pretensioners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Front seatbelt load limiters	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Driver frontal airbag	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Front passenger frontal airbag	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Side body airbags	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Side head airbags	<input type="checkbox"/>
Driver knee airbag	<input type="checkbox"/>
ISOfix front	<input type="checkbox"/>
ISOfix rear	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Car details

<b>Hand of drive</b>	RHD
<b>Tested model</b>	Smart forfour 1.3 Pulse
<b>Body type</b>	SUPERMINI
<b>Year of publication</b>	2005
<b>Kerb weight</b>	965
<b>VIN from which rating applies</b>	WME4540312B106784

### Comments

The forfour achieved a four star adult occupant protection rating. This came after Euro NCAP allowed a re-run of the side test following improvements to the car's door structure and a latch release problem on the rear door. The forfour's body provided a stable passenger safety cell for all occupants. Protection for child occupants was poor, however, while the car gained only 7 points out of a possible 36 for pedestrian protection.

#### Front impact

The body suffered minimal deformation of its structure. The single stage airbags and belt pre-tensioners plus load limiters worked well, limiting the loads recorded by the adult dummies. However, the driver and front passenger risked knee injuries from contact with hard unforgiving structures behind the fascia. The footwell suffered little deformation, control of the foot pedals was reasonably good and there was very little intrusion.

#### Side impact

The side impact protection system includes seat mounted airbags. Loads recorded at the driver's chest were relatively high and were compromised because forces transferred unrealistically from his back to the seat, slightly reducing the loads measured at his chest.

#### Child occupant

The vehicle had a manual switch for the passenger airbag. Passenger airbag warnings consisted of a pictogram and a two-language text label attached to one side of the passenger's sun visor, which can be seen when in the stowed position. Another label was attached to the roof lining above the visor and is visible when the visor is lowered. Neither was permanently attached to the vehicle. The recommended restraints used for both children were Britax Romer Duo Plus installed forward facing using the car's adult belts.

The older child's head was not contained in the restraint in the frontal or side tests. The 18 month old was protected in the side impact but not in the frontal impact the loads recorded at his head and chest were high.

### **Pedestrian**

The areas where an adult's head might strike the bonnet and a small area of the bonnet's leading edge provided some cushioning but the child head areas and the bumper were very 'unfriendly'.