



# Opel/Vauxhall Omega

RATING	SCORE
<b>ADULT OCCUPANT</b> ★★☆☆☆	<b>22</b> Front: 11 Side: 11
<b>PEDESTRIAN</b> ★☆☆☆☆	<b>16</b> Pre 2002 rating

**Adult occupant protection**

■ GOOD  
■ ADEQUATE  
■ MARGINAL  
■ WEAK  
■ POOR

**Child restraints**

<b>18 month old Child</b>	No information available
<b>3 year old Child</b>	No information available

**Pedestrian protection**

No image car front 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"/>

**Car details**

<b>Hand of drive</b>	LHD
<b>Tested model</b>	Opel Omega 2.0 GL/GLS
<b>Body type</b>	4 door saloon
<b>Year of publication</b>	1998
<b>Kerb weight</b>	1455

**Comments**

The Omega is one of the older designs of car in this group and, unlike others here, the car does not have passenger or side-impact airbags fitted as standard – they are options. The car merited three stars but this rose to four when side airbags were fitted. And although the car passes side-impact legislation taking effect from October without them, the airbags reduced chest injury risks for the driver. The car's front-impact performance was reasonable although the driver's feet and ankles risked injury. Pedestrian protection was better than for some cars here, although parts of the bonnet provided poor cushioning.

**Front impact**

The bodysell remained stable, no points were lost for distortion of the passenger compartment and the driver's airbag worked well. The front belts had buckle-mounted pre-tensioners and web locks but, even so, chest loading, especially for the passenger, lowered the test score. The knee impact areas were free of hard contact points but the amount of brake pedal rearward travel put the driver's feet and ankles at risk of injury.

**Side impact**

The standard car (without side airbags) gains a lower score because of the loads on the driver's ribs and the consequent risk of chest injury. A stiff webbing guide and some trim clips on the door pillar could have injured the driver, while the arm-rest fitted to the door also presented a threat.

## **Child occupant**

A European manufacturer's association-approved (ACEA) pictogram was fixed to the end of the fascia so that it was visible when the door was opened. However, there was no supporting text to warn of the risks of serious injury if a child seat were to be fitted to the front passenger seat. Both child seats were manufacturer-supplied but neither had colour coding to show the correct route for the adult belt, in accordance with regulation R44.03. What's more, instruction labels were not visible for all fixing positions, and were not colour coded. In operation the seats controlled forward head movement but did not contain the older child's head in a side impact. Impact forces acting on his chest were also higher than regulations allow.

## **Pedestrian**

The bumper gave more protection to pedestrians than others tested, while the bonnet's leading edge was less aggressive. The adult head impact area gave poor protection and four of the six tests gave high readings, but the zone where a child's head would impact fared better.