U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Non-Precedent Decision of the Administrative Appeals Office

In Re: 34888229

Date: NOV. 25, 2024

Appeal of Texas Service Center Decision

Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Workers (National Interest Waiver)

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

The Director of the Texas Service Center denied the petition, concluding that although the Petitioner qualified for the EB-2 classification as an individual of exceptional ability, she had not established that a waiver of the required job offer, and thus of the labor certification, would be in the national interest. The matter is now before us on appeal pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3.

The Petitioner bears the burden of proof to demonstrate eligibility by a preponderance of the evidence. *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375-76 (AAO 2010). We review the questions in this matter de novo. *Matter of Christo's, Inc.*, 26 I&N Dec. 537, 537 n.2 (AAO 2015). 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. Section 203(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Act. Because this classification requires that the individual's services be sought by a United States employer, a separate showing is required to establish that a waiver of the job offer requirement is in the national interest.

An advanced degree is any United States academic or professional degree or a foreign equivalent degree above that of a bachelor's degree. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2). A United States bachelor's degree or a foreign equivalent degree followed by five years of progressive experience in the specialty is the equivalent of a master's degree. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2).

Exceptional ability means a degree of expertise significantly above that ordinarily encountered in the sciences, arts, or business. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2). A petitioner must initially submit documentation that satisfies at least three of six categories of evidence:

> (A) An official academic record showing that the [noncitizen] has a degree, diploma, certificate, or similar award from a college, university, school, or other institution of learning relating to the area of exceptional ability;
>
> (B) Evidence in the form of letter(s) from current or former employer(s) showing that the [noncitizen] has at least ten years of full-time experience in the occupation for which he or she is being sought;
>
> (C) A license to practice the profession or certification for a particular profession or occupation;
>
> (D) Evidence that the [noncitizen] has commanded a salary, or other renumeration for services, which demonstrates exceptional ability;
>
> (E) Evidence of membership in professional associations; or
>
> (F) Evidence of recognition for achievements and significant contributions to the industry or field by peers, governmental entities, or professional or business organizations.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(3)(iii) provides, "If the above standards do not readily apply to the beneficiary's occupation, the petitioner may submit comparable evidence to establish the beneficiary's eligibility."

Meeting at least three criteria, however, does not, in and of itself, establish eligibility for this classification.[1] If a petitioner does so, we will then consider the totality of the material provided in a final merits determination and assess whether the record shows that the petitioner is recognized as having a degree of expertise significantly above that ordinarily encountered in the field. *See Kazarian v. USCIS*, 596 F.3d 1115 (9th Cir. 2010) (discussing a two-part review where the documentation is first counted and then, if fulfilling the required number of criteria, considered in the context of a final merits determination). This two-step analysis is consistent with our holding that the "truth is to be determined not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality," as well as the principle that we examine "each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, to determine whether the fact to be proven is probably true." *Matter of Chawathe,* 25 I&N Dec. at 376.

If a petitioner demonstrates eligibility for the underlying EB-2 classification, they must then establish that they merit a discretionary waiver of the job offer requirement "in the national interest." Section 203(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Act.

---

[1] USCIS has confirmed the applicability of this two-part adjudicative approach in the context of aliens of exceptional ability. 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.5(B)(2), https://www.uscis.gov/policy-manual/volume-6-part-f-chapter-5.

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). *Dhanasar* states that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may, as matter of discretion,[2] grant a national interest waiver of the job offer, and thus the labor certification, to a petitioner classified in the EB-2 category if the petitioner demonstrates that (1) the noncitizen's proposed endeavor has both substantial merit and national importance; (2) the noncitizen 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 noncitizen 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 noncitizen. To determine whether the noncitizen 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, progress towards achieving the proposed endeavor, and the interest of potential customers, users, investors, or other relevant entities or individuals are also key considerations.

The third prong requires the petitioner to demonstrate that, on balance of applicable factors, it would be beneficial to the United States to waive the requirements of a job offer and thus of a labor certification. USCIS may evaluate factors such as whether, in light of the nature of the noncitizen's qualification or the proposed endeavor, it would be impractical either for the noncitizen 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 noncitizen's contributions; and whether the national interest in the noncitizen's contributions is sufficiently urgent to warrant forgoing the labor certification process. Each of the factors 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.

II. ANALYSIS

The Petitioner seeks to establish and operate [redacted] a technology-driven financial consulting firm. The Director found that the Petitioner qualifies as an individual of exceptional ability. For the reasons discussed below, we conclude that the Petitioner has not sufficiently demonstrated the national importance of her proposed endeavor under the first prong of the *Dhanasar* analytical framework.

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

A. Eligibility for the EB-2 Classification

With respect to the underlying EB-2 classification, the Director found that the Petitioner met at least three of the six categories listed above and concluded, without conducting a final merits determination, that the Petitioner qualified as an individual of exceptional ability. Meeting at least three criteria, however, does not, in and of itself, establish eligibility for this classification. Where a petitioner meets initial evidence requirements, we then consider the totality of the material provided in a final merits determination and assess whether the record shows the petitioner possesses exceptional ability. *See Kazarian v. USCIS*, 596 F.3d 1115 (9th Cir. 2010) (discussing a two-part review where the documentation is first counted and then, if fulfilling the required number of criteria, considered in the context of a final merits determination); *see also Visinscaia v. Beers*, 4 F. Supp. 3d 126, 131-32 (D.D.C. 2013); *Rijal v. USCIS*, 772 F. Supp. 2d 1339 (W.D. Wash. 2011). This two-step analysis is consistent with our holding that the "truth is to be determined not by the quantity of evidence alone but by its quality," as well as the principle that we examine "each piece of evidence for relevance, probative value, and credibility, both individually and within the context of the totality of the evidence, to determine whether the fact to be proven is probably true." *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. at 376. In our de novo review of the Petitioner's eligibility for the underlying classification, we will withdraw the portion of the Director's decision concluding that the Petitioner has established that she is an individual of exceptional ability.

However, resolution of the issues pertaining to the Petitioner's eligibility for a waiver of the job offer requirement, and thus of a labor certification, under the *Dhanasar* analytical framework are dispositive of this appeal. For that reason, we will reserve consideration of the Petitioner's eligibility for the requested EB-2 category. *See INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976) (stating that agencies need not make "purely advisory findings" on issues unnecessary to their ultimate decisions); *see also Matter of L-A-C-*, 26 I&N Dec. 516, 526 n.7 (BIA 2015) (declining to reach alternate issues on appeal in removal proceedings where an applicant did not otherwise qualify for relief).

B. *Dhanasar's* First Prong: The Proposed Endeavor's Substantial Merit and National Importance

The Director concluded that the Petitioner did not establish the proposed endeavor's substantial merit and national importance because she "introduced a new proposed endeavor" in response to the Director's request for evidence (RFE). On appeal, the Petitioner contends that the Director incorrectly "assessed the national importance and substantial merit" of her proposed endeavor and "failed to properly consider the evidence" under the *Dhanasar* framework. In the petition, the Petitioner stated her intention to pursue a leadership role in the financial and budget management sector within U.S. companies. However, in her response to the RFE, the Petitioner shifted her plans, stating instead that she now intends to open and operate a financial consulting firm to provide comprehensive support and guidance to businesses of all sizes. This is not permissible and, in denying the Petition, the Director determined that the Petitioner's business plan was insufficient to establish the proposed endeavor's national importance, as its effective date of May 2024 occurred after the petition's initial filing date of September 15, 2023. We agree. The Petitioner's initial description of her proposed endeavor did not include plans to open and operate a business. It was only upon issuance of the RFE that the Petitioner, for the first time, presented her proposed endeavor of establishing a business to offer financial consulting services.

The Petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(12); *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Comm'r 1971). Further, the purpose of an RFE is to elicit information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established, as of the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(1), 103.2(b)(8), 103.2(b)(12). A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to USCIS requirements. *See Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm'r 1998). Here, the Petitioner has made significant changes to her initial proposed endeavor of seeking a financial/budget management position. As the *Dhanasar* framework requires an analysis of the proposed endeavor's substantial merit and national importance, such a change is material to her eligibility for a national interest waiver.

The Petitioner's new proposed endeavor in the RFE reply, and contended in this appeal, describe a new set of facts regarding the proposed endeavor. The Petitioner's proposed endeavor to open and operate her financial consulting firm was presented after the filing date and cannot retroactively establish eligibility. Accordingly, we conclude that the Petitioner made an impermissible material change to her proposed endeavor. We will therefore adjudicate the petition under the fact pattern as originally presented: the Petitioner's plan to seek leadership positions in the financial/budget management sector of U.S. companies. We will consider the material changes she made post-filing.

The record includes a brief, recommendation letters, and industry reports and articles. While we do not discuss every piece of evidence individually, we have reviewed the record and have considered the Petitioner's eligibility for the national interest waiver. The Petitioner underscores the role of a financial manager and states that the position holds substantial merit and national importance by "ensuring the financial stability and security of key industries." In determining whether the proposed endeavor has national importance, we consider its potential prospective impact. The relevant question is not the importance of the field, industry, or profession in which the individual will work; instead, we focus on "the specific endeavor that the foreign national proposes to undertake." *See Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 889. In *Dhanasar*, we further noted 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. Here, the record does not include adequate corroborating evidence, to show that the Petitioner's specific proposed endeavor offers broader implications in the financial management industry, enhancements to U.S. societal welfare, or substantial positive economic effects for the country that rise to the level of national importance.

The Petitioner highlights her 12 years of financial management experience and asserts that her professional background qualifies her as a person of substantial merit and national importance. Although an individual's experience, qualifications, contributions, and achievements are material, they are misplaced in the context of the first *Dhanasar* prong. The Petitioner's professional experience is generally material to *Dhanasar*'s second prong—whether an individual is well positioned to advance a proposed endeavor—but they are generally immaterial to the first *Dhanasar* prong—whether a specific, prospective, proposed endeavor has both substantial merit and national importance. *See id.* at 888-91. The first prong focuses on the proposed endeavor itself, not the petitioner. *Id.* The Petitioner must establish that her specific endeavor has national importance under *Dhanasar*'s first prong. The Petitioner however has not shown that the specific endeavor she proposes to undertake

has significant potential to employ U.S. workers or otherwise offers substantial positive economic effects for the United States.

The Petitioner states that she intends to add value to companies by training the next generation of professionals and sharing her knowledge with employees who will carry it into their future business ventures. She also notes that, as a financial manager, she will play a crucial role in making strategic financial decisions that can significantly impact a company's growth and success. Although we acknowledge the Petitioner's evidence and assertions, we conclude that the Petitioner has not shown that her proposed endeavor stands to sufficiently extend beyond her clients to enhance societal welfare on a broader scale indicative of national importance. 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, the record does not establish that the Petitioner's proposed endeavor's impact will be nationally important. It is insufficient to claim an endeavor has national importance or will create a broad impact without providing evidence to corroborate such claims. The Petitioner must support her assertions with relevant, probative, and credible evidence. *See Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 376 (AAO 2010).

For the aforementioned 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 her 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 also reserve the appellate arguments regarding her eligibility under the second and third prongs outlined in *Dhanasar*. *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

As the Petitioner has not met the requisite first prong of the *Dhanasar* analytical framework, we conclude that she has not established she 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.