U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Non-Precedent Decision of the Administrative Appeals Office

In Re: 36774069

Date: FEB. 24, 2025

Appeal of Texas Service Center Decision

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

The Petitioner, a chief executive officer, seeks employment-based second preference (EB-2) 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 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 classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, he 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. 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 U.S. employer, a separate showing is required to establish that a waiver of the job offer requirement is in the 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,[1] 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

[1] *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).

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 proposes to operate a consulting firm, [redacted] The Director found 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. For the reasons discussed below, we conclude that the Petitioner has not sufficiently demonstrated the national importance of his proposed endeavor under the first prong of the *Dhanasar* analytical framework.

The Director concluded that the Petitioner's proposed endeavor has substantial merit. The Director determined, however, that the Petitioner did not establish the proposed endeavor's national importance, that he is well positioned to advance it, and that, on balance, it would benefit the United States to waive the job offer requirement. On appeal, the Petitioner asserts that the Director's denial was erroneous and that he submitted sufficient evidence with the petition and in response to the Director's request for evidence to demonstrate his proposed endeavor's national importance.

The Petitioner states that he seeks to operate his business, which focuses on establishing, initiating, and optimizing business development strategies based on business intelligence. The Petitioner explains that the primary objective of his company is to expand businesses globally through foreign trade while also supporting the import and export of products with a focus on the automation and electronic security segment. The Petitioner intends to work as a self-employed consultant and states that he is currently working for two companies in the security integration sector. The record includes a business plan, expert opinion letter, recommendation letters, and industry reports and articles. While we do not discuss every piece of evidence individually, we have reviewed and considered each one.

The Petitioner argues that his proposed endeavor is of national importance because it will produce significant national benefits and meet the demands of clients from all over the country. 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 Petitioner contends that his proposed endeavor aimed at helping other businesses will create more employment opportunities, increase tax revenues, and improve the economy. The Petitioner, nonetheless, has not demonstrated that his proposed endeavor offers broader implications in his field or substantial positive economic effects for the country that rise to the level of national importance.

In denying the Petition, the Director determined that the Petitioner "has not offered sufficient information and evidence to demonstrate that the prospective impact of his endeavor rises to the level of national importance." The Director further noted that the Petitioner failed to establish that his proposed endeavor "stands to sufficiently extend beyond an organization and the clients [he] would serve to impact the industry or field more broadly."

While we acknowledge the substantial merits of the Petitioner's proposed endeavor, we, like the Director, conclude the record does not establish that the Petitioner's proposed endeavor's impact will be nationally important. Similarly, while we also acknowledge the additional documents submitted in support of the appeal, the Petitioner did not provide additional insight in response to the Director's finding that the proposed endeavor does not have significant potential to employ U.S. workers or otherwise offers substantial positive economic effects for the country.

Accordingly, we adopt and affirm the Director's analysis and decision regarding the national importance of the proposed endeavor as required by the first prong of the *Dhanasar* precedent decision. *See Matter of Burbano*, 20 I&N Dec. 872, 874 (BIA 1994); *see also Giday v. INS,* 113 F.3d 230, 234 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (noting that the practice of adopting and affirming the decision below has been "universally accepted by every other circuit that has squarely confronted the issue"); *Chen v. INS,* 87 F3d 5, 8 (1st Cir. 1996) (joining eight U.S. Courts of Appeals in holding that appellate adjudicators may adopt and affirm the decision below as long as they give "individualized consideration" to the case). As the Petitioner has not met the *Dhanasar*'s first prong, we conclude

that he has not established eligibility for, or otherwise merits, a national interest waiver as a matter of discretion.

Since this issue is dispositive of the Petitioner's appeal, we decline to reach and also hereby reserve the appellate arguments regarding his 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 *Dhanasar* analytical framework's requisite first prong, we conclude that he has not established 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.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.