

6.2. Safety

COMMON ANALYSIS
Last update: March 2026

The analysis below is based on the following EUAA COI reports: Country Focus 2025, 2.; Security 2025, 2.1.2., 2.6.6.; Country Guidance should not be referred to as a source of COI.

☐ 6.2.1. Absence of persecution or serious harm

When examining the element 'absence of persecution or serious harm', the decision-maker should refer to chapters 2 to 5 of this document.

When assessing the requirement of safety with regard to the applicability of IPA in individual cases of applicants from Nigeria, the following elements should be taken into account:

- **General security situation in relation to indiscriminate violence**

  Based on the analysis under 4.3.3. Indiscriminate violence, the conclusions with regard to the two cities of Lagos and Abuja are as follows:

  In **Lagos** (Lagos state): there is no real risk for a civilian to be personally affected within the meaning of Article 15(c) QD/QR.

  In **Abuja** (Federal Capital Territory): indiscriminate violence takes place in FTC, however not at a high level.

- **Actor of persecution or serious harm and their reach**

  In case where the person fears persecution or serious harm by the Nigerian State (e.g. persons with diverse SOGIESC, critical journalists and other media workers),

there is a presumption that IPA would not be available.

The presence of other actors of persecution or serious harm, including Boko Haram, herders' and farmers' armed groups, student cults, trafficking networks, etc. is generally geographically limited. Therefore, in case of persecution by such actors, the safety requirement could be satisfied in other parts of the country, outside of their reach.

In some cases, where the applicant faces persecution or serious harm for reasons related to the prevalent social norms in Nigeria and the actor of persecution or serious harm is Nigerian society at large (e.g. persons with noticeable mental or physical disabilities), IPA would in general not be considered safe.

For certain particularly vulnerable categories, such as some women and children, if the actor of persecution or serious harm is the (extended) family of the applicant (e.g. FGM/C, forced marriage, some cases of trafficking), considering the reach of these actors, the lack of State protection and their potential vulnerability to other forms of violence or exploitation, IPA may not be safe.

For the area of operations and influence of actors, see also 2. Actors of persecution or serious harm and 4.3.3. Indiscriminate violence.

- **Whether the profile of the applicant is considered a priority target and/or a threat by the actor of persecution or serious harm**

  The applicant's profile could make him or her a priority target, increasing the likelihood that the actor of persecution or serious harm would attempt to trace them in the potential IPA location (e.g. religious leaders and politicians targeted by Boko Haram).

- **Behaviour of the applicant**

  An applicant cannot be reasonably expected to abstain from practices fundamental to their identity, such as those related to religion or sexual orientation and gender identity, in order to avoid the risk of persecution or serious harm10.

- **Other risk-enhancing circumstances**

  The information under 3. Refugee status should be used to assist in this assessment.

☐ 6.2.2. Availability of protection against persecution or serious harm

Alternatively, it may be determined that the requirement of safety is satisfied if the applicant would have access to protection against persecution or serious harm, as defined in Article 7 QD/QR, in the area where IPA is considered. In the case of persecution by the State, a presumption of non-availability of State protection applies. See also 5. Actors of protection.

☐ 6.2.3. Conclusion on safety

The requirement of safety may be satisfied in Lagos and Abuja, depending on the profile and the individual circumstances of the applicant.

- 10

  CJEU, *Minister voor Immigratie en Asiel v X and Y, and Z*, joint cases C-199/12 to C-201/12, judgment of 7 November 2013, paras. 70-76; Bundesrepublik Deutschland v Y and Z, joined cases C-71/11 and C-99/11, judgment of 5 September 2012, para. 80.

© European Union Agency for Asylum 2026 | Email: info@euaa.europa.eu