U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Non-Precedent Decision of the Administrative Appeals Office

In Re: 37630225

Date: APR. 15, 2025

Appeal of Service Center Operations (SCOPS) Decision

Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Workers (Extraordinary Ability)

The Petitioner, a ballroom dance choreographer, requests classification under the employment-based, first-preference (EB-1) immigrant visa category as an alien with "extraordinary ability." *See* Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act) section 203(b)(1)(A), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(A). Successful petitioners for U.S. permanent residence in this category must demonstrate "sustained national or international acclaim" and extensively document recognition of their achievements in their fields. Section 203(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act.

Service Center Operations (SCOPS) denied the petition, concluding that the Petitioner met two of ten initial evidentiary requirements for the category – one less than needed for a final merits determination. On appeal, the Petitioner contends that he met five other evidentiary criteria by submitting documentation of his:

- Receipt of nationally or internationally recognized awards for excellence in his field;
- Membership in associations in the field requiring outstanding achievements;
- Original contributions of major significance to the field;
- Performance in a leading or critical role for organizations with distinguished reputations; and
- Commandment of a high salary or other significantly high remuneration relative to others in the field.

8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i), (ii), (v), (viii), (ix).

The Petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating eligibility for the requested benefit by a preponderance of the evidence. *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. 369, 375-76 (AAO 2010). Exercising de novo appellate review, *see Matter of Christo's, Inc.*, 26 I&N Dec. 537, 537 n.2 (AAO 2015), we conclude that he has not satisfied the other evidentiary requirements he claims to have met. We will therefore dismiss the appeal.

I. LAW

To qualify for this immigrant visa category, a petitioner must demonstrate that they:

- Have "extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics;"
- Seek to continue work in their field of expertise in the United States; and
- Would substantially benefit the country as a permanent resident.

Section 203(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iii) of the Act.

The term "extraordinary ability" means expertise commensurate with "one of that small percentage who have risen to the very top of the field of endeavor." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(2). Unless a petitioner received "a major, international recognized award," they must satisfy at least three of ten lesser evidentiary criteria. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3).[1]

If a petitioner meets either evidentiary standard and the requirements at section 203(b)(1)(A)(ii), (iii) of the Act, USCIS must make a final merits determination. To merit approval, the record – as a whole – must establish a petitioner's "sustained national or international acclaim" and recognized achievements placing them among the small percentage at their field's very top. *See Amin v. Mayorkas*, 24 F.4th 383, 391 (5th Cir. 2022) (finding U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services' (USCIS') two-step extraordinary ability analysis "consistent with the governing statute and regulation"); *see generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.2(B), www.uscis.gov/policy-manual.

II. ANALYSIS

A. The Petitioner and His Field

The record shows that the Petitioner, a Russian native and citizen, envisioned a dance career for himself after enrolling in a state sports school for ballroom dancing at age 7. He won a medal in his first dance tournament in 2003 and soon after began taking private dance lessons. Training five hours a day, he competed in several dance championships as a youth.

In 2010, the Petitioner began working as a dance coach and continued dance training and coaching while pursuing higher education. He earned a bachelor's degree in state and municipal administration in 2015 and a master's degree in economics and marketing in 2018. While in school, he established a drinking water supply business. In 2019, he began working as a "head coach" for a Russian chain of dance sport schools.

Now in the United States, the Petitioner states that U.S. dance schools have offered him jobs as a choreographer. He said he hopes to eventually open his own dance school in the United States and to develop an online dance course.

B. The Evidentiary Criteria

The record does not indicate – nor does the Petitioner claim – his receipt of a major internationally recognized award. He must therefore meet at least three of the ten evidentiary criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i-x).

[1] If an evidentiary criterion does not "readily apply" to a petitioner's occupation, they may submit "comparable evidence" to establish eligibility. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(4).

The record supports USCIS' findings that the Petitioner submitted evidence of his participation as a judge of others' work in his field and display of his work at artistic exhibitions or showcases. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(iv), (vii).

We will now review USCIS' findings regarding the other five evidentiary requirements that the Petitioner claims to have met. To satisfy these criteria, his evidence must objectively meet the parameters of the applicable regulatory descriptions. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.2(B). "[N]either USCIS nor [the] AAO may unilaterally impose novel substantive or evidentiary requirements beyond those set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5." *Kazarian v. USCIS*, 596 F.3d 1115, 1121 (9th Cir. 2010).

1. Lesser Nationally or Internationally Recognized Awards

This criterion requires "[d]ocumentation of the alien's receipt of lesser nationally or internationally recognized prizes or awards for excellence in the field of endeavor." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i).

When adjudicating this requirement, USCIS first determines if a petitioner – as opposed to their employer, for example – received prizes or awards. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.2(B)(1), Criterion 1. If so, the Agency then determines whether awards are for excellence in the applicable field and nationally or internationally recognized. *Id.*

The Petitioner submitted letters and copies of photographs regarding several dance-related awards he claims to have won between 2006 and 2011. The awards include first-place finishes in the [redacted] and [redacted]

SCOPS found insufficient independent and objective evidence – such as media attention or public announcements – of the Petitioner's receipt of the awards and their purported national or international recognition.

Many photographs of record do not support the Petitioner's receipt of the awards. He does not appear in these photos, which simply show trophies that he claims to have won. But letters from his former coach and a president of a Russian dance sport federation detail his awards and match the translated information on the plaques in the trophy photos. Also, letters from a branch dance school manager with whom he worked and a dance studio director state his receipt of numerous national and international dancing awards. A preponderance of the evidence therefore demonstrates the Petitioner's receipt of the awards.

On appeal, the Petitioner contends that SCOPS overlooked "the context of how international sports events like these are documented and recognized within their respective fields." He argues that SCOPS disregarded "the fundamental nature of these events as international championships. The awards are not isolated or regional but are part of a globally respected competitive circuit."

The Petitioner contends that the organizations that issued the awards are leaders in dance sport. He states: "Their reputation ensures that the awards conferred by them meet the standard of national or international recognition." He argues that SCOPS improperly discounted "the significance of awards given by globally reputable organizations in highly specialized fields like dance sport. The awards

reflect excellence on an international stage, as determined by respected and established organizations with global influence." He states that recognition from professional communities, official governing bodies, and industry-specific platforms "are standard methods of acknowledgement for excellence in fields that may not be covered extensively by mainstream media but are nonetheless internationally recognized within their domain."

We agree with SCOPS, however, that the record lacks sufficient evidence of the awards' purported national or international recognition. The Petitioner argues that the awards stem from international competitions involving dancers from various countries. But this evidentiary criterion requires evidence of national or international *recognition*. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(i). The competitions' international nature does not demonstrate that people from multiple countries (other than those involved in the competitions) know of the awards. *See Guida v. Miller*, No. 20-CV-01471-LB, 2021 WL 568850, at *9 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2021) (upholding USCIS' determination "that an event that is open to international participants does not establish its international or national significance or recognition").

The Petitioner argues that the awards have international recognition because of their issuance by "globally reputable organizations." But, again, the Petitioner must demonstrate that people beyond the organizations that granted the awards recognize them. *See Krasniqi v. Dibbins*, 558 F. Supp. 3d 168, 182 (D.N.J. 2021) (quoting *Visinscaia v. Beers*, 4 F. Supp. 3d. 126, 136 (D.D.C. 2013) ("[E]vidence solely from the awarding organization itself may be insufficient if it does not show 'how a larger audience viewed [the] awards'").

The letter from the dance sport federation president states that the organization selects media coverage for dance competitions and that all the competitions the Petitioner won had media coverage. But the record lacks corroborating evidence of publications about his dance wins.

The Petitioner cites to websites of the organizations that issued the awards. The sites indicate that the organizations have international scope. But, to the extent he claims that these sites publicly announced his awards, he must document those announcements and show that people in Russia or in other countries read about his awards on the sites. *See* section 203(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act (requiring EB-1 petitioners to demonstrate recognition of their achievements "through extensive documentation").

Also, the Petitioner has not demonstrated that his dance awards are in his stated ballroom choreography field. The certificates, letters, and photos of record indicate his receipt of awards for dancing, not choreography.

On the Form I-140, Petition for Alien Workers, the Petitioner stated that, as a ballroom choreographer, he "[d]irect[s] rehearsals to instruct dancers in dance steps and in techniques to achieve desire effects." He said he also "[t]each[es] students, dancers, and other performers about rhythm and interpretive movement." Thus, the record indicates that a choreographer is like an athletic coach for dancers.

Federal courts have found that USCIS properly distinguishes between the fields of coaches and athletes. *See, e.g., Mussarova v. Garland*, 562 F. Supp. 3d 837, 843-45 (C.D. Cal. 2022) (holding that awards given to a petitioner as a water polo player did not reflect excellence in the water polo coaching

field); *see also* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.2(A)(2) ("Competitive athletics and coaching rely on different sets of skills and in general are not in the same area of expertise.") USCIS policy states that:

> Where [a petitioner] has had an extended period of time to establish his or her reputation as a coach beyond the years in which he or she had sustained national or international acclaim as an athlete, depending on the specific facts, officers may place heavier, or exclusive, weight on the evidence of the [petitioner]'s achievements as a coach or a manager.

6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.2(A)(2).

The record shows that the Petitioner competed as a dancer in his youth but, for about the past 15 years, has primarily served as a choreographer or dance coach. Thus, he has had an extended period to establish his reputation as a choreographer/coach. Consistent with USCIS policy, he cannot rely on his awards as a dancer to demonstrate his claimed extraordinary ability as a choreographer. The Petitioner has not established that his awards fall under his stated ballroom dance choreography field.

For the foregoing reasons, the Petitioner has not submitted evidence of his receipt of nationally or internationally recognized awards for excellence in his field. We will therefore affirm SCOPS' finding regarding this evidentiary criterion.

2. Membership in Associations

To meet this evidentiary requirement, a petitioner must submit "[d]ocumentation of [their] membership in associations in the field for which classification is sought, which require outstanding achievements of their members, as judged by recognized national or international experts in their disciplines or field." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(ii).

The Petitioner submitted copies of his dance judge license, requirements for dance judges from the Russian dance sport federation, and a certificate and by-laws from a choreographers' union. The Petitioner states that he has membership in the federation based on his status as a dance judge.

SCOPS found insufficient evidence that the Petitioner's receipt of his judge's license or admission into the dance sport federation required outstanding achievements or judgments by national or international experts.

On appeal, the Petitioner claims that SCOPS' decision "overlooks the rigor and specificity" of the admissions requirements for sports judges in the federation. He states that a candidate must first be a "first category sports judge" and have trained at least two athletes who achieved high-level skill classifications. The Petitioner states: "These requirements far exceed those for basic membership or participation, illustrating that only individuals who have demonstrated significant accomplishments and expertise are eligible for the roles of adjudicator and sports judge within these associations." According to the Petitioner, "panels of recognized national experts in Dance Sport" conduct qualification and certification processes for both associations. He states: "The adjudication exams, as referenced in the requirements, are administered and evaluated by established professionals with

expertise in the field, thereby satisfying the criterion that membership is judged by national or international experts."

SCOPS found no mention of experts in the evidence regarding the dance sport federation. But the Petitioner states that "[t]he assessment process itself inherently involves evaluation by recognized authorities in Dance Sport. The adjudication and licensing commissions are composed of experts selected based on their qualifications, ensuring that membership reflects outstanding achievement as judged by authorities in the field." The Petitioner states that the federation is a nationally recognized governing body that represents Russia in international dance sport organizations and whose affiliates and members are widely recognized within the dance sport community, both nationally and internationally. He contends: "Membership within this organization signifies a level of expertise and achievement consistent with the plain language of the EB-1 membership criterion."

The Petitioner submitted insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the dance sport federation requires outstanding achievements as judged by national or international experts in their fields. The admission requirements show that his judge's license in the federation required: completion of dance and sports activities; "a mastery class" in certain disciplines; training of at least two athletes who reached certain levels; and passage of a qualifying exam. But the evidence does not establish that any of these requirements constitute an outstanding achievement. Under "Grounds for license granting" on the Petitioner's license, the document states only: "Training in the panel of adjudicators of [the dance sport federation], passing the exam "Rules of competitions." Also, a printout from the federation's website states that 180 judges belong to the organization, suggesting that the Petitioner's license is not that outstanding in the field.

The evidence also does not support counsel's assertions that "[t]he adjudication and licensing commissions are composed of experts selected based on their qualifications." *See, e.g., Matter of S-M-*, 22 I&N Dec. 49, 51 (BIA 1998) ("[S]tatements in a brief, motion, or Notice of Appeal are not evidence and thus are not entitled to any evidentiary weight"). The record does not identify the commissions' members or establish their national or international recognition as experts.

Documentation of the Petitioner's membership in the choreographers' union also does not meet this criterion. The union's by-laws state that membership candidates must submit a written application to an executive body of the union. But the record does not state the membership criteria or identify the executive body's members. The Petitioner therefore has not demonstrated that the union requires outstanding achievements of its members as judged by nationally or internationally recognized experts. *See, e.g., IK Sch. of Gymnastics v. Neilson*, No. 1:17-cv-02822 (TNM), 2018 WL 5312190, at *5 (D.D.C. Oct. 26, 2018) ("As USCIS stated in its decision, the School submitted no evidence to show that Ukrainian National Rhythmic Gymnastics membership and a 'Master of Sports' designation require outstanding achievements, as judged by national or international experts in their fields."

The Petitioner has not demonstrated his membership in associations requiring outstanding achievements of their members as judged by nationally or internationally recognized experts. We will therefore uphold the SCOPS' finding regarding this evidentiary requirement.

3. Original Contributions of Major Significance

This criterion requires "[e]vidence of the alien's original scientific, scholarly, artistic, athletic, or business-related contributions of major significance in the field." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(v).

USCIS first determines whether a petitioner has made original contributions in their field. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.2(B)(1), Criterion 5. If so, the Agency then determines whether the original contributions are of major significance in the field. *Id.*

The Petitioner submitted a copy of a training manual he wrote regarding his dance methodology. He also provided support letters from the dance sport federation and officials from the dance school chain in Russia where he served as head coach.

SCOPS did not question the training manual's originality. But SCOPS found insufficient evidence that it has major significance in the field.

On appeal, the Petitioner contends that his training methodology has "substantial impact . . . on the Dance Sport community, both in Russia and internationally." He states that students who have trained under his program "have achieved notable results in competitions." He says that the dance school chain and the dance sport federation have adopted his methods. Also, a letter from a Russian professional dancer/choreographer/coach, who coached the Petitioner from 2007 to 2010, states that U.S. coaches have adopted the Petitioner's methodology. The Petitioner contends that his program's adoption by U.S. coaches "demonstrates its global relevance and impact, solidifying its status as a contribution of major significance."

Despite the Petitioner's evidence, we agree with SCOPS that he has not demonstrated that his training methodology has "major significance" to his field. We acknowledge the dance school chain's apparent adoption of his methodology and the chain's operation of 100 branches in more than 20 Russian cities. But the record lacks sufficient information about the field's scope to determine whether the chain's use of the Petitioner's methodology has major significance.

Also, most of the evidence regarding the training manual's significance comes from the Petitioner's former employers, coworkers, and coach. The record lacks sufficient independent, objective evidence of his manual's significance in the broader field. *See Strategati, LLC v. Sessions*, No. 18-cv-1200, 2019 WL 2330181, at *6 (S.D. Cal. May 31, 2019) (affirming USCIS' statement that "the phrase 'contributions of major significance in the field' requires substantial influence beyond one's employers, clients, or customers.") Further, the record lacks documentation confirming that U.S. coaches use his methodology and does not indicate how many U.S. coaches use his program. Thus, we are also unable to determine the manual's international significance.

For the foregoing reasons, the Petitioner has not demonstrated that his original contribution has major significance to his field. We will therefore affirm SCOPS' finding regarding this evidentiary criterion.

4. Performance in a Leading or Critical Role

To meet this requirement, a petitioner must submit "[e]vidence that [they] ha[ve] performed in a leading or critical role for organizations or establishments that have a distinguished reputation." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(viii).

USCIS first determines whether a petitioner has performed in a leading or critical role for an organization, establishment, or a division or department of an organization or establishment. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.2(B)(1), Criterion 8. A leading role means that a petitioner is (or was) a leader within the organization, establishment, division or department. *Id.* In contrast, a critical role means that a petitioner "has contributed in a way that is of significant importance to the outcome of the organization or establishment's activities or those of a division or department of the organization or establishment." *Id.*

Next, USCIS determines whether the organization, establishment, department, or division for which a petitioner holds or held a leading or critical role has a distinguished reputation. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.2(B)(1), Criterion 8. In this context, the word "distinguished" means "marked by eminence, distinction, or excellence" or "befitting an eminent person." *Distinguished*, Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, www.merriam-webster.com. Relevant factors include not only an organization's relative size or longevity but also other information such as the scale of its customer base or relevant media coverage. *See generally* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.2(B)(1), Criterion 8.

The Petitioner submitted letters from dance school chain officials and the dance sport federation's president. SCOPS found insufficient evidence that he performed in a leading or critical role for the organizations or that they have distinguished reputations.

On appeal, the Petitioner first contends that SCOPS erred in discounting the dance sport federation letter for lacking his employment dates, job title, and job duties. SCOPS found that "this criterion requires evidence such as an experience or employment verification letter." The Petitioner argues that "the plain language of the regulation does not impose a requirement of employment for this criterion." He states that he has never worked for the federation but that he has "collaborated" with the organization as a dancer, judge, and choreographer.

The Petitioner correctly notes that the plain language of 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(viii) requires "performance" in a leading or critical role, not necessarily employment in such a role. *See Kazarian v. USCIS*, 596 F.3d at 1121 ("[N]either USCIS nor [the] AAO may unilaterally impose novel substantive or evidentiary requirements beyond those set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 204.5.") Thus, SCOPS should have considered the letter from the dance sport federation's president.

The president's letter states the Petitioner's participation in various roles at the dance sport federation, including implementing his training methodology with federation dance coaches and mentoring federation dance judges. The president stated that "[the Petitioner]'s performance in all these roles has been of such significant importance that the success of our competitions and training programs would not be the same without his involvement." Perhaps so, but the evidence does not establish his performance in a leading or critical role for the federation. While training dance coaches and mentoring dance judges is important to the federation, the record does not sufficiently demonstrate

that the Petitioner's contributions had "significant importance" to the outcome of the organization's activities. *See* 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.2(B)(1), Criterion 8 (defining the term "critical role").

Also, while the record shows the federation's founding more than 30 years ago, the record does not demonstrate that the organization has a distinguished reputation. The Petitioner asserts that the federation's representation of its city in the Russian dance sport championship, collaboration with a world federation, and training supervision for "elite dancers and judges" demonstrate its distinguished reputation. But the record lacks sufficient evidence of how other organizations or people view the federation. *See Cuckic v. Jaddou*, No. 21-CV-8395, 2023 WL 2586031, at *5 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 21, 2023) ("USCIS rules at the time, still in effect today, reject as insufficient evidence solely gleaned from promotion material that an organization creates about itself.")

Regarding the Petitioner's work with the dance school, the chain's chief executive officer (CEO) indicated that the Petitioner played a critical role by developing the chain's training methodology. The CEO stated:

> Thanks to [the Petitioner]'s extraordinary methodology, our students achieved exceptional results, garnering widespread recognition, and enhancing the school's reputation throughout Russia. This, in turn, facilitated the rapid expansion of our company, evidenced by the numerous branches that were opened across Russia and the school's growing popularity within the dance community.

But a 2017 news article casts doubt on the importance of the Petitioner's methodology to the dance school chain. The article, which was published about two years before the chain hired the Petitioner, states that "the main feature of the company . . . is its own teaching methodology." The article quotes the CEO as saying: "We have developed our own system of teaching children, which helps to achieve the desired result depending on the age of the student."

The article suggests that, before hiring the Petitioner, the dance school chain had its own successful training methodology. The article indicates that the chain, which was founded about two years before the article's publication, had already begun growing, having then opened 35 branches. The article casts doubt on whether the Petitioner developed the chain's methodology and the claimed significance of his methodology to the chain. The record therefore does not establish the Petitioner's performance in a leading or critical role for the chain.

For the foregoing reasons, the Petitioner has not established his performance in a leading or critical role for organizations with distinguished reputations.

5. Commandment of a High Salary or Significantly High Remuneration

This criterion requires "[e]vidence that the alien has commanded a high salary or other significantly high remuneration for services, in relation to others in the field." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(h)(3)(ix).

The Petitioner submitted a certificate of income from the dance school chain and printouts of online reports of salary rates for dance choreographers in Russia. The income certificate states that, from July 2022 to July 2023, as head coach at the dance school chain, the Petitioner received 150,000 rubles

a month, or about $18,000 a year. A printout from a Russian job search website states that, in 2023, the average monthly salary for choreographers in his city was 30,000 rubles, one-fifth of his salary.

The Director found insufficient evidence that the average monthly salary applies to the Petitioner's occupation. The income certificate states his job title as "Head Coach," but the job search website lists the average monthly salary for "choreographers." The Director stated: "The petitioner has not submitted conclusive evidence of similar individuals in the profession of dance that were Head Coaches."

USCIS policy states that, when comparing a petitioner's salary to a wage survey, an occupation's description "may be relevant." 6 *USCIS Policy Manual* F.2(B)(1), Criterion 9. "Broad descriptions that include multiple occupations or multiple industries may not provide an accurate comparison to others in the field." The Director therefore properly questioned the comparison occupation.

The Petitioner contends that "choreographers" is "the appropriate comparison group." But his arguments do not support that contention.

First, the Petitioner concedes that he served as more than a choreographer at the dance school chain. He states:

> The Petitioner's salary reflects the multifaceted nature of his position. As the Head Coach [for the chain], his responsibilities extend beyond choreography to include: developing innovative training methodologies; coaching elite dancers; judging high-level competitions; and mentoring other coaches and judges. These additional responsibilities justify higher remuneration compared to standard choreographers, whose roles are limited to choreography without such breadth of influence.

The Petitioner also states that SCOPS' questioning of the wage survey's comparison group:

> ignores the unique nature of the Petitioner's role and the absence of comparable roles within the field of Dance Sport. The Petitioner's responsibilities, which include choreography, judging, coaching, and training, place him in a class of his own. The remuneration reflects his exceptional contributions, *which cannot be directly compared to lower-level choreographers or less comprehensive roles.*

(emphasis added).[2]

The Petitioner's arguments regarding the scope of his head coaching responsibilities cast doubt on the use of choreographers as the appropriate wage comparison group. He has not established that his combination of duties is "unique" or that his field lacks more comparable occupations than choreographers. *See Skokos v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, 420 F. App'x 712, 713-14 (9th Cir. 2011)

[2] The Petitioner also argues that "Russia has a rich cultural tradition in the performing arts, and top professionals in this field command higher salaries than their peers due to the country's competitive and prestigious dance environment." But he submitted a wage survey covering only Russia. Thus, this argument does not explain the large difference between his salary and the average Russian choreographer salary listed on the survey.

(finding insufficient evidence of a petitioner's commandment of a high salary in comparison to others in his field where the "only evidence in the record of comparable salaries is that of the average 'security guard'" and, "[b]y [the petitioner]'s own description, he was much more than a security guard").

The Petitioner has not demonstrated that his salary as a head coach for the dance sport chain is high in relation to those of others in the field. We will therefore uphold the Director's finding regarding this evidentiary criterion.

III. CONCLUSION

The Petitioner did not meet the five evidentiary requirements he claims to have satisfied. He therefore has not met the requisite number of evidentiary criteria for the requested immigrant visa category. We will therefore affirm the petition's denial.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.