



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

**Non-Precedent Decision of the
Administrative Appeals Office**

In Re: 18452660

Date: DEC. 2, 2021

Appeal of Nebraska Service Center Decision

Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Advanced Degree, Exceptional Ability, National Interest Waiver)

The Petitioner, a business analyst, seeks second preference immigrant classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, as well as a national interest waiver of the job offer requirement attached to this EB-2 classification. *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 203(b)(2), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2).

The Director of the Nebraska Service Center denied the petition, concluding that the Petitioner qualified for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, but had not established that a waiver of the required job offer, and thus of the labor certification, would be in the national interest.

On appeal, the Petitioner asserts he is eligible for a national interest waiver.

In these proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375 (AAO 2010). Upon *de novo* review, we will dismiss the appeal.

I. LAW

To establish eligibility for a national interest waiver, a petitioner must first demonstrate qualification for the underlying EB-2 visa classification, as either an advanced degree professional or an individual of exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business. Because this classification requires that the individual's services be sought by a U.S. employer, a separate showing is required to establish that a waiver of the job offer requirement is in the national interest.

Section 203(b) of the Act sets out this sequential framework:

- (2) Aliens who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or aliens of exceptional ability. –

(A) In general. – Visas shall be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or their equivalent or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business, will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States, and whose services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business are sought by an employer in the United States.

(B) Waiver of job offer –

(i) National interest waiver. . . . [T]he Attorney General may, when the Attorney General deems it to be in the national interest, waive the requirements of subparagraph (A) that an alien’s services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business be sought by an employer in the United States.

While neither the statute nor the pertinent regulations define the term “national interest,” we set forth a framework for adjudicating national interest waiver petitions in the precedent decision *Matter of Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. 884 (AAO 2016).¹ *Dhanasar* states that after a petitioner has established eligibility for EB-2 classification, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may, as matter of discretion², grant a national interest waiver if the petitioner demonstrates: (1) that the foreign national’s proposed endeavor has both substantial merit and national importance; (2) that the foreign national is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor; and (3) that, on balance, it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification.

The first prong, substantial merit and national importance, focuses on the specific endeavor that the foreign national proposes to undertake. The endeavor’s merit may be demonstrated in a range of areas such as business, entrepreneurialism, science, technology, culture, health, or education. In determining whether the proposed endeavor has national importance, we consider its potential prospective impact.

The second prong shifts the focus from the proposed endeavor to the foreign national. To determine whether he or she is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor, we consider factors including, but not limited to: the individual’s education, skills, knowledge and record of success in related or similar efforts; a model or plan for future activities; any progress towards achieving the proposed endeavor; and the interest of potential customers, users, investors, or other relevant entities or individuals.

The third prong requires the petitioner to demonstrate that, on balance, it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification. In performing this analysis, USCIS may evaluate factors such as: whether, in light of the nature of the foreign national’s qualifications or the proposed endeavor, it would be impractical either for the foreign

¹ In announcing this new framework, we vacated our prior precedent decision, *Matter of New York State Department of Transportation*, 22 I&N Dec. 215 (Act. Assoc. Comm’r 1998) (*NYSDOT*).

² See also *Poursina v. USCIS*, 936 F.3d 868, 2019 WL 4051593 (9th Cir. 2019) (finding USCIS’ decision to grant or deny a national interest waiver to be discretionary in nature).

national to secure a job offer or for the petitioner to obtain a labor certification; whether, even assuming that other qualified U.S. workers are available, the United States would still benefit from the foreign national's contributions; and whether the national interest in the foreign national's contributions is sufficiently urgent to warrant forgoing the labor certification process. In each case, the factor(s) considered must, taken together, indicate that on balance, it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification.³

II. ANALYSIS

The Director determined that the Petitioner did not establish the national importance of his proposed endeavor under the first prong of the *Dhanasar* analysis. As stated in the initial filing, he proposes “to work in the U.S. as a Business Analyst with an in-depth knowledge of the Brazilian oil and gas, consumer products and real estate industries.” We note that in response to the Director’s request for evidence, the Petitioner indicated that he “plan[s] to contribute to U.S. societal needs and economic prosperity through [his] role as an Executive” and listed his current position as chief executive officer of [redacted] a flower company. As this business opportunity materialized after the filing of the petition, and therefore would not establish the Petitioner’s eligibility at the time of filing, it does not assist the Petitioner in establishing the national importance of the proposed endeavor.⁴

In determining national importance, the relevant question is not the importance of the industry or profession in which the individual will work; instead, we focus on the “the specific endeavor that the foreign national proposes to undertake.” See *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 889. We further indicated that “we look for broader implications” of the proposed endeavor and that “[a]n undertaking may have national importance for example, because it has national or even global implications within a particular field.” *Id.* We also stated that “[a]n endeavor that has significant potential to employ U.S. workers or has other substantial positive economic effects, particularly in an economically depressed area, for instance, may well be understood to have national importance.” *Id.* at 890.

On appeal, the Petitioner again relies, in part, on his experience and his prior career accomplishments to establish the national importance of his proposed endeavor. However, the Petitioner’s expertise and record of success in previous positions are considerations under *Dhanasar*’s second prong, which “shifts the focus from the proposed endeavor to the foreign national.” *Id.* at 890. The issue here is whether the Petitioner has demonstrated, by a preponderance of the evidence, the national importance of his proposed work.⁵

The Petitioner also makes a variety of general and unsupported claims, such as his “proposed endeavor is nationally important because of the ripple effects it generates upon the U.S. business industry, which is experiencing a growing shortage of professionals and an intensive demand for analytical services,” and that it “will contribute to enhancing the competitiveness of U.S. companies within the consumer goods industry.” The claimed “ripple effects,” however, are not well explained or documented in the

³ See *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 888-91, for elaboration on these three prongs.

⁴ The Petitioner has the burden of proof to establish eligibility for the requested benefit at the time of filing. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1); see also *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm’r 1971) (providing that “Congress did not intend that a petition that was properly denied because the beneficiary was not at that time qualified be subsequently approved at a future date when the beneficiary may become qualified under a new set of facts.”).

⁵ See *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 376 (BIA 2010) and *Matter of E-M-*, 20 I&N Dec. 77 (BIA 1989),

record. Similarly, the Petitioner has not connected the proposed endeavor's activities for his employer(s) or client(s) to any specific increase in the competitiveness of U.S. companies. We are also not persuaded by the Petitioner's arguments that the proposed endeavor has national importance due to the shortage of professionals. The Petitioner has not established that his proposed endeavor would impact or significantly reduce the claimed national shortage. Further, shortages of qualified workers are directly addressed by the U.S. Department of Labor through the labor certification process.

Here, beyond such general statements, the Petitioner does not offer sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the prospective impact of his proposed endeavor rises to the level of national importance. Furthermore, the Petitioner has not demonstrated that the specific endeavor he proposes to undertake has significant potential to employ U.S. workers or otherwise offers substantial positive economic effects for our nation. Without evidence regarding any projected U.S. economic impact or job creation directly attributable to his future work, the record does not show that benefits to the regional or national economy resulting from the Petitioner's endeavor would reach the level of "substantial positive economic effects" contemplated by *Dhanasar*. *Id.* at 890.

In *Dhanasar*, we determined that the petitioner's teaching activities did not rise to the level of having national importance because they would not impact his field more broadly. *Id.* at 893. Here, we similarly find the record does not show that the Petitioner's proposed endeavor stands to sufficiently extend beyond his employer(s) and/or clients to impact the industry more broadly at a level commensurate with national importance. Nor has he documented that the particular work he proposes to undertake offers original innovations that contribute to advancements in business analysis or otherwise has broader implications for his field. For all these reasons, the Petitioner's proposed work does not meet the first prong of the *Dhanasar* framework.

Because the documentation in the record does not establish the national importance of his proposed endeavor as required by the first prong of the *Dhanasar* precedent decision, the Petitioner has not demonstrated eligibility for a national interest waiver. Since this issue is dispositive of the Petitioner's appeal, we decline to reach and hereby reserve the appellate arguments regarding the remaining issues. *See INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976) ("courts and agencies are not required to make findings on issues the decision of which is unnecessary to the results they reach"); *see also Matter of L-A-C-*, 26 I&N Dec. 516, 526 n.7 (BIA 2015) (declining to reach alternative issues on appeal where an applicant is otherwise ineligible).

III. CONCLUSION

The Petitioner has not met the requisite first prong of the *Dhanasar* analytical framework. Accordingly, we conclude that he has not established he is eligible for or otherwise merits a national interest waiver as a matter of discretion. The appeal will be dismissed for the above stated reasons.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.