





TEST RESULTS

Nissan Micra

RATING	SCORE
 ADULT OCCUPANT 	15 Front: 4 Side: 11
 PEDESTRIAN 	16 Pre 2002 rating



Adult occupant protection



Frontal impact driver



Frontal impact passenger



Side impact driver

	GOOD
	ADEQUATE
	MARGINAL
	WEAK
	POOR

Child restraints

18 month old Child Roemer King, forward facing

3 year old Child Roemer Peggy, forward facing

Safety equipment

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

Pedestrian protection

No image car front available

Car details

Hand of drive	RHD
Tested model	Nissan Micra L 1.0
Body type	3 door hatchback
Year of publication	2000
Kerb weight	836
VIN from which rating applies	SJNEDAK114000321 (July 2000)

Comments

The Micra was first tested by Euro NCAP in 1997 and there have not been any major changes to its safety design since then. It did not perform very well in the frontal impact test, picking up most of its score in the side impact test. Neither child restraint performed very well. Its pedestrian performance is poor but similar to most cars in this class.

Front impact

The driver's airbag worked well in protecting the head. There was no passenger airbag, but in the event there was also no head contact with the facia. The driver's door remained reasonably straight, but despite the side impact beam remaining intact it was not effective because its end was no longer bearing on the front screen pillar. The front seat belts were fitted with reel mounted pretensioners, which reduce the slack in the belt before the occupant is thrown forwards. However despite the pretensioners the drivers chest contacted the steering wheel, which is undesirable as it can cause serious injuries. There was a particularly aggressive structure close to the driver's left knee which could cause severe injury. The passenger in our test was very well protected. Only a simple two point static belt was fitted in the centre rear seat, which can cause severe spinal and abdominal injuries.

Side impact

There was a head contact above the door window which is likely to cause injury. The loading on the chest was reduced by an interaction between the dummy and seat structure that could not occur with a human torso. The abdomen was struck by a rigid, protruding arm rest and the pelvis was contacted by a polyurethane block.

Child occupant

Both child restraints were forward facing and contained the dummies reasonably well but the 1½-year old's restraint had bad points and was rated as poor. They both stopped the children's heads moving too far forward in frontal impact. In side impact the 3-year-old's head came outside the restraint. For the 1½-year old in the frontal impact the neck loading was very high and in the side impact the head was not contained within the seat and was subjected to a severe blow to the side of the head. The labelling was good being permanent on both the seats, but on the 3-year-old's the belt guides were not shown as red. The seat belts were of a type that can be used to increase the security of fixing the child restraints; however they were not used in this mode as there was insufficient labelling to explain how they should be used.

Pedestrian

The protection offered to pedestrians was not good and similar to many cars of this class. Most of the front of the car was aggressive with the exception of one point on the bumper, but other than this most of the score came from soft spots on the bonnet and windscreen.