## **TEST RESULTS**



GOOD



# Fiat Brava RATING

Frontal



Adult occupant protection



Frontal impact driver

Child restraints

18 month old Child	No information available		
3 year old Child	No information available		
Safety equipment			
Front seatbelt pretensioners	M		
Front seatbelt load limiters			
Driver frontal airbag			
Front passenger frontal airbag			
Side body airbags			
Side head airbags			
Driver knee airbag			
Comments			

l impact pa	<i>ssenger</i> Pedestrian protection No image car front	Side impact driver	ADEQUATE MARGINAL WEAK POOR
Car details			
	Hand of drive	RHD	
	Tested model	Fiat Brava 1.4 S	
	Body type	5 door hatchback	
	Year of publication	1998	
	Kerb weight	1077	
	VIN from which rating applies	4726000	

#### Comments

The Brava was awarded two stars for frontal- and side-impact protection but, with only a small improvement, it would have been awarded a third star. The car's structure became overloaded in the frontal impact and there were significant intrusion problems. However, even without a side airbag, the car meets side-impact legislation to take effect across Europe for new models from October. Finally, the bonnet's leading edge provided better than average pedestrian protection.

#### **Front impact**

The passenger compartment became unstable in the impact. The driver's door lost its strength and its aperture's stability was compromised by damage at the bottom of the front pillar. Head contact with the airbag remained stable and there was limited displacement of the steering. An energy absorbing block in the steering column shroud should prevent local damage to the knees. Footwell intrusion was excessive and the footwell joint split slightly, although this did not present an additional hazard.

#### Side impact

The driver's top rib was struck by the door, while his middle and lower ribs were hit by the door and the centre pillar. The lower rib received the greatest loading but protection remained above standards required for new models



from next October. The driver's abdomen was loaded by the protruding armrest which contained a stiff plastic support. His pelvis was loaded by the centre pillar but protection still rated as adequate.

### **Child occupant**

The recommended restraints were forward-facing and compatible with the car belts. In the frontal impact, the restraints provided control over forward movement of the children's heads. However, the older child's head was not contained by the restraint during the side impact.

#### Pedestrian

Half of the pedestrian head impact areas met the proposed legislative requirement and gave fair protection but most of the adult sites rated as poor. The bonnet's leading edge gave better-than-average protection but this was not carried through to the bumper areas, which mostly gave poor protection.