U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

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

In Re: 36401930

Date: JAN. 29, 2025

Appeal of Nebraska Service Center Decision

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

The Petitioner, an environmental educator, 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 Nebraska Service Center denied the petition, concluding that the Petitioner did not establish eligibility for a national interest waiver of the job offer requirement; as relevant to this appeal, the Director determined that the national importance of the proposed endeavor had not been established. 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.

On appeal, the Petitioner presents additional evidence and asserts that the national importance of the endeavor has been established, because the proposed environmental awareness education program aligns with Environmental Protection Agency initiatives. In addition, the Petitioner argues that the program has been implemented across multiple schools and organizations. To show adoption in churches, schools, and other organizations, the Petitioner includes letters from agencies in Zimbabwe, local churches in Tennessee, and other community organizations such as retirement centers. The Petitioner stresses that the program will equip individuals in various sectors of society to care for the environment, and that he will continue to extend this impact by holding environmental awareness program workshops. The Petitioner includes letters of support from professors and former colleagues highlighting his critical thinking, teaching ability, commitment to sustainability, and background in environmental issues. Finally, the Petitioner contends that his endeavor has advanced because he has accepted a position with the Office of Sustainability Initiatives at [redacted]

We adopt and affirm the Director's 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 "is not only common practice, but universally accepted").

While the Petitioner has provided evidence showing that his work on sustainability initiatives continues, and that he has provided lectures and presentations to churches and other community organizations, this evidence does not address the Director's determination that the Petitioner's teaching activities are insufficient to show national importance.

The Director fully credited the Petitioner's abilities in the arena of environmental education and discussed his qualifications. However, as noted in the Director's decision, an endeavor must show broader implications including impacting a particular field or broadly enhancing societal welfare. Here, the Petitioner has demonstrated that additional workshops have been held and other workshops are planned. We do not doubt that the participants in the Petitioner's program may receive valuable insights. However, the Petitioner has not shown that he will have an impact beyond his students or community participants; he has not shown, for instance, that he employs a particular methodology that will impact the environmental education field, that the endeavor offers significant employment potential for U.S. workers, or that the proposed endeavor otherwise meets the national importance criterion as outlined in our precedent decision in *Matter of Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. 884 (AAO 2016).

The remaining evidence submitted on appeal, such as the Petitioner's work with [redacted] has not been explained in detail, nor has it been adequately related to the proposed endeavor; a general nexus to the field of environmental education or to sustainability initiatives is insufficient to demonstrate the national importance of the Petitioner's proposed endeavor.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.