



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

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

In Re: 16302241

Date: JUL. 20, 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 medical epidemiologist, 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 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 submits additional documentation and a brief asserting that 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. 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.

Furthermore, 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).<sup>1</sup> *Dhanasar* states that after a petitioner has established eligibility for EB-2 classification, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may, as matter of discretion<sup>2</sup>, 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 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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*).

<sup>2</sup> See also *Poursina v. USCIS*, No. 17-16579, 2019 WL 4051593 (Aug. 28, 2019) (finding USCIS’ decision to grant or deny a national interest waiver to be discretionary in nature).

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.<sup>3</sup>

## II. ANALYSIS

The Director concluded that the Petitioner qualifies as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree. The remaining issue to be determined is whether the Petitioner has established that a waiver of the requirement of a job offer, and thus a labor certification, would be in the national interest. The Petitioner proposes to “advanc[e] public health preparedness and emergency response in resource-challenged environments with a focus on vaccine preventable diseases such as polioviruses and Ebola virus.” For the reasons discussed below, we agree with the Director that the Petitioner has not sufficiently demonstrated eligibility under *Dhanasar*'s three-prong analytical framework.

The first prong relates to substantial merit and national importance of the specific proposed endeavor. *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 889. The Director concluded that the Petitioner's proposed endeavor met the substantial merit and national importance requirements, and the record supports that determination.

The second prong shifts the focus from the proposed endeavor to the petitioner in order to determine whether he or she is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor. *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 890. While we recognize that research must add information to the pool of knowledge in some way in order to be accepted for publication, presentation, funding, or academic credit, not every individual who has performed original research will be found to be well positioned to advance his or her proposed endeavor. Rather, we examine the factors set forth in *Dhanasar* to determine whether, for instance, the individual's progress towards achieving the goals of the proposed research, record of success in similar efforts, or generation of interest among relevant parties supports such a finding. *Id.* In determining that the Petitioner did not meet the second prong, the Director indicated and discussed the Petitioner's submitted documentation, such as his curriculum vitae, education credentials, employment record, reference letters, publication record, citation history, manuscript reviews, research projects, and media reports. On appeal, the Petitioner does not address the Director's specific findings or particularly identifies any erroneous conclusion of law.

Instead, the Petitioner contends that his “current engagement with the [redacted] [redacted] on a full time basis, enables [him] to be well positioned to advance [his] proposed endeavor.” In addition, the Petitioner submits a position description, dated July 2020, for a senior epidemiologist with [redacted] and a job confirmation letter reflecting that he “served as a contractor Senior Epidemiologist on the [redacted] Support Team from October 1, 2019 until October 1, 2020 when he became a full time employee.” He filed his petition in June 2019, prior to his positions with [redacted]. Eligibility must be established at the time of filing. 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(1), (12); *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg'l Comm'r 1971). A petition cannot be approved at a future date after the petitioner becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 175 (Comm'r 1998). That decision further provides, citing *Matter of Bardouille*, 18 I&N Dec. 114 (BIA 1981), that USCIS cannot “consider facts that come into being

---

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

only subsequent to the filing of a petition.” *Id.* at 176. Accordingly, we will not consider his positions with [redacted] on appeal under *Dhanasar*’s second prong.

The Petitioner also submits a reference letter from [redacted]. However, the Petitioner did not offer this letter either at initial filing or after the Director afforded him an opportunity in a request for evidence (RFE).<sup>4</sup> *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764, 766 (BIA 1988) (providing that if “the petitioner was put on notice of the required evidence and given a reasonable opportunity to provide it for the record before the denial, we will not consider evidence submitted on appeal for any purpose” and that “we will adjudicate the appeal based on the record of proceedings” before the Chief); *see also Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533 (BIA 1988). Accordingly, we will not consider this evidence on appeal.

As the Petitioner has not overcome the grounds of the Director’s decision and has not shown on appeal that he is well positioned to advance his proposed research endeavor, he has not established that he satisfies the second prong of the *Dhanasar* framework. Accordingly, the Petitioner has not demonstrated eligibility for a national interest waiver. Further analysis of his eligibility under the third prong outlined in *Dhanasar*, therefore, would serve no meaningful purpose.

### III. CONCLUSION

As the Petitioner has not met the requisite second prong of the *Dhanasar* analytical framework, we conclude that he has not demonstrated that 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, with each considered as an independent and alternate basis for the decision.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.

---

<sup>4</sup> In the Director’s RFE, he specifically stated “[t]o show your education, skills, knowledge, and record of success in related or similar efforts, you may submit one or more pieces of evidence from the following non-exhaustive list: . . . letters from experts in the field, describing your past achievements and providing specific curriculum vitae.”