Renault Clio

RATING	SCORE	
ADULT OCCUPANT ★★☆☆☆	N/A	
PEDESTRIAN ☆☆☆☆	N/A	Pre 2002 rating

Adult occupant protection

Frontal impact driver

Frontal impact passenger

Side impact driver

Child restraints

18 month old Child	None fitted
3 year old Child	Renault Argonaut, forward facing

Pedestrian protection

No image car front available

Safety equipment

Front seatbelt pretensioners	☑
Front seatbelt load limiters	☐
Driver frontal airbag	☑
Front passenger frontal airbag	☐
Side body airbags	☐
Side head airbags	☐
Driver knee airbag	☐

Car details

Hand of drive	RHD
Tested model	Renault Clio 1.2RL
Body type	3 door hatchback
Year of publication	1997
Kerb weight	846

Comments

The Renault Clio was awarded two stars for protection in frontal and side impact. All the new criteria were met with the exception of chest protection in side impact and rearward and upward movement of the steering wheel in frontal impact. In frontal impact, the major problems related to intrusion and the instability of the passenger compartment. There were problems for the lower limbs and attention is required in the knee-impact areas. The unstable head contact on the airbag suggests potential problems for different-sized drivers and those in different seating positions. In side impact, improved protection is required for the chest while also controlling the loading on the pelvis.

Front impact
The instability of the passenger compartment was caused by the partial detachment of the facia from the side of the car. Actual structural deformation was judged moderate – the A-pillar moved back by 195mm at waist level – intrusion of the footwell and the facia was also moderate. There was moderate collapse of the door aperture. After the test, the driver's door could only be opened using tools. The passenger's door opened normally. The Clio's steering wheel was pushed back by a limited 105mm. It had also been forced upwards by 133mm under frontal impact, which is judged to be moderate. Because of this rearward and vertical intrusion of the steering wheel and an unstable head contact with the airbag – the dummy's head slid off the bag and scuffed the windscreen pillar – head protection was downrated to marginal. However, the neck protection was good. The facia intrusion and structural instability meant that the driver's chest protection, otherwise

assessed as adequate, was downrated to weak. Protection of both upper legs was downrated to poor because of the number of stiff structures which could concentrate loads on the knees in an impact. In the frontal crash, the dummy's left knee hit the bonnet release lever, rigidly mounted on the steering column. The right knee impacted against the headlight adjuster knob, displacing it so that loads strutted through to the engine compartment bulkhead. For both knees, further penetration into the facia would have resulted in sharply increased loads. Protection of the lower legs was assessed as adequate on the left side and weak on the right side. Intrusion of the footwell during the frontal impact caused feet and ankle protection to be rated as weak. Data from the passenger-side dummy showed protection for the head, neck, knee/femur/pelvis, left lower leg and feet and ankles was good. Adequate protection was provided for the chest and right lower leg.

Side impact
High loading on all the dummy's ribs in the side impact crash test resulted in a chest protection rating of poor, with only marginal protection being provided for the abdomen. However, the head protection was judged to be good. An instrumentation failure resulted in no data being available to assess pelvis protection. But information supplied by the manufacturer indicated that the ratings would have been within the range adequate to weak. Within this range, the overall rating for the car would not vary.

Child occupant
Renault recommended a Renault Argonaut rearward-facing child seat for the Clio. However, the restraint was too large to fit on the rear seat with the front seats in their standard position for the test. Renault's second recommendation of a Britax Freeway forward-facing child seat was therefore used. The forward movement of the child restraint under frontal impact was well controlled. However, there was insufficient restraint provided for the child's upper body that allowed a large degree of forward movement of the head to occur. The lateral movement of the child restraint under side impact was poor, with the upper part of the restraint moving nearly to the mid line of the car. The child's head then moved well beyond the sides of the child restraint.

Pedestrian
Two of the six test points gave better-than-average protection. The four bonnet areas which gave a worse-than-average result were above a battery terminal, electrical connector block, bonnet latch and suspension turret. Upper leg impact None of the three tests met the proposed requirements. One was better-than-average, two were worse, one at the centre-line of the car, the other in line with the centre of the headlight. Adult head impact One of the test points gave better-than-average protection. The poorer two test points were on the scuttle in front of the windscreen and above the wiper spindle. Leg impact One test point gave better-than-average protection. The two poorer areas were in line with the towing eye and the inside edge of the headlight.