





## Ford Mondeo

RATING	SCORE
 <b>ADULT OCCUPANT</b> ★★☆☆☆	<b>17</b> Front: 5 Side: 12
 <b>PEDESTRIAN</b> ★☆☆☆☆	<b>N/A</b> Pre 2002 rating

### 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>	No information available
<b>3 year old Child</b>	No information available

### Safety equipment

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

### Pedestrian protection

No image car front available

### Car details

<b>Hand of drive</b>	RHD
<b>Tested model</b>	Ford Mondeo 1.8 LX
<b>Body type</b>	5 door hatchback
<b>Year of publication</b>	1997
<b>Kerb weight</b>	1200

### Comments

Although this top-selling family hatchback received a three-star rating for its overall performance, the results from the side-impact test failed to meet standards laid down for the crash testing of new models from next year. In the side-impact test, the loading on the dummy's chest meant poor protection for this body region. The driver's head, abdomen and pelvis were generally well protected. In the frontal-impact test, the metal beam supporting the fascia and steering column broke away from its side mounting. The impact resulted in excessive footwell intrusion. The Mondeo was fitted with a standard driver airbag that provided good protection, and no contact between the driver's chest and the steering wheel was detected. Stiff structures present in the lower fascia increased the likelihood in frontal impacts of injury to the driver's knees thighs and pelvis.

### Front impact

The driver's front screen pillar was pushed back by 70mm (2.8in). The beam supporting the fascia and the steering column broke away and compromised the integrity of the passenger cabin. The driver's door had to be prised open, though the front passenger's door opened easily. The steering wheel was pushed back by 97mm (3.6in) and up by 52mm (2.0in) but the brake pedal was pushed backwards by 259mm (10.2in) and intrusion into the footwell was rated excessive. Protection for the head and neck was good, but protection for the chest was rated 'weak'. While the car's airbag and seat belt restrained the driver effectively, the way that the beam supporting the fascia became detached posed a threat, and injury risks would have been even greater in slightly

different circumstances to those of the test. The impact meant that the driver's left knee hit the steering column adjustment lever, column shroud and facia, but if his knee had struck the facia in a slightly different position horizontally, it would have hit stiffer structures. The driver's right knee brushed the column shroud and hit the facia. But had it been in a slightly different horizontal position immediately prior to impact, it could have struck the steering column lock. Had either knee penetrated the facia further than they did, the risk of injury would have been increased. Concentrated loads could also cause localised damage to both knee. For these reasons, results gained from the test dummy were down-graded. Protection for both lower legs was assessed as weak, using data from the dummy alone, and an excessive amount of intrusion into the footwell meant that feet and ankle protection were rated as poor. In general, protection for the front passenger was good. The areas where concern was noted included the way the seat belt loaded the passenger's chest, and forces acting on the right lower leg. Protection for both feet and ankles was also assessed as good.

### **Side impact**

The Mondeo would have failed the side-impact legislation due to be applied to new models launched from next year. The reason for this was that high levels of loading from the car's side were measured by instrumentation attached to two of the dummy's ribs, indicating that protection for this body region was poor. However, the level of protection that the Ford Mondeo provided for the driver's head, abdomen and pelvis in the side impact was rated as good in each case.

### **Pedestrian**

**Child head impact** Two of the six locations met proposed legislation: one above the oil filler cap, the other above a bonnet strengthener. Three points were better than average, one worse: at the bonnet/wing join. **Upper leg impact** None of the three tests met proposed legislation and all three tests were worse than average: on the bonnet leading edge at the centre-line of the car, in line with the towing eye mount, and in line with the headlight's inboard edge. **Adult head impact** None of the tests met proposed legislation. Four points were better than average, two were worse: above the bonnet hinge and over the wiper spindle. **Leg impact** None of the three tests met the proposed requirements. Two points were better than average – at the inboard edge of the headlight and at the car's centre-line. One was worse: in line with the towing eye bracket.