# **TEST RESULTS**



Adult occupant protection	VW Polo   RATING   Image: Constraint of the second se	score VPANT ☆☆ 26 Front: 11 Side: 15	ing
Frontal impact driver	Frontal impact passenge	er Side impact of	GOOD ADEQUATE MARGINAL WEAK POOR
Child restraints		Pedestrian protection	
18 month old Child Roem	er Baby-Star, rearward facing	No image car front available	
3 year old Child Bobsy G1	ISOFIX, forward facing		
Safety equipment		Car details	
Front seatbelt pretensioners	M	Hand of drive	LHD
Front seatbelt load		Tested model	Volkswagen Polo 1.4
limiters	$\mathbf{M}$	Body type	3 door hatchback
Driver frontal airbag		Year of publication	2000
Front passenger frontal airbag	M	Kerb weight VIN from which rating applies	940 WVWZZZ6NZYY000001
Side body airbags		Taring applies	
Side head airbags			
Driver knee airbag			

# ISOfix rear Comments

This is a strong small car with an all-round performance that protects the adult occupants. The structure was stable and the driver's door could still be opened after the frontal impact. The 3 year-old's child restraint used was a vehicle specific ISOFIX type that connected to mounting points within the rear seat, but it failed to contain the child's head in both front and side impact.

⊻

### **Front impact**

The steering wheel vertical movement was outside the allowed limits which could cause problems for smaller drivers. The front seat belts are fitted with pretensioners which are designed to limit forward movement in the event of a crash. Load limiters are fitted and for both driver's and passenger's the loads were well managed. There were hard areas under the facia which could cause injuries to the driver's knees and upper legs. The rearward movement of the brake pedal is also a hazard to the driver's feet. Only a simple two point static belt was fitted in the centre rear seat, which can cause severe spinal and abdominal injuries.

#### Side impact

The side glass failed to break, which is unusual, and the driver' head hit this hard enough to give rise to the risk of serious injury. Other areas of the body were protected, but the loading on the chest was reduced by an interaction between the dummy and seat structure that could not occur with a human torso. However the polo scored well in side impact.



## **Child occupant**

A passenger airbag is standard and Volkswagen need to take seriously the risk to children in rear facing child restraints fitted onto the front passenger's seat. Only a poorly understood pictogram and a removable label on the windscreen were fitted and neither explained the risk of serious injury or death. A special vehicle specific child restraint is recommended for the 3-year-old in the Polo, the performance was disappointing as it did no protect the child's head in either frontal or side impact. The 1½-year-old's seat was rear facing and used the adult seat belts. The child's feet had to be propped up on the car seat; so it is questionable whether this type of restraint is suitable in a small car. Also 1½-year-old's head was not contained in the frontal test, and the seat belt routing was confusing as there was two possible routes for the lap belt.

### Pedestrian

Pedestrian protection was poor with the front of the car being very aggressive to legs and pelvis. The head impact zones provided the total protection offered to pedestrians.