U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Non-Precedent Decision of the Administrative Appeals Office

In Re: 29460839

Date: MAR. 27, 2024

Appeal of Texas Service Center Decision

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

The Petitioner seeks second preference immigrant classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree or as an individual of exceptional ability, as well as a national interest waiver of the job offer requirement attached to this EB-2 classification. 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 the Petitioner had not established eligibility for 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.

To establish eligibility for a national interest waiver, petitioners must 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. In addition, petitioners must show the merit of a discretionary waiver of the job offer requirement "in the national interest." Section 203(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Act. *Matter of Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. 884, 889 (AAO 2016) provides that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may, as matter of discretion,[1] grant a national interest waiver if:

- The proposed endeavor has both substantial merit and national importance,
- The individual is well-positioned to advance the proposed endeavor, and
- On balance, waiving the job offer requirement would benefit the United States.

[1] *See also Flores v. Garland*, 72 F.4th 85, 88 (5th Cir. 2023) (joining the Ninth, Eleventh, and D.C. Circuit Courts (and Third in an unpublished decision) in concluding that USCIS' decision to grant or deny a national interest waiver to be discretionary in nature).

Regarding the national interest waiver, the first prong relates to substantial merit and national importance of the specific proposed endeavor. *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 889. At initial filing, the Petitioner's cover letter stated that "[the Petitioner's] proposed endeavor is to work as an educator, motivator, leader, trainer, and lay minister to teach disadvantaged women a useful trade and thus bring them out of material and spiritual poverty while empowering them with a sense of their personal and economic worth." The Petitioner also provided a business plan for T-L- indicating the business "will help women by training them to develop sewing, tailoring, and business skills to become self-sufficient."

In response to the Director's request for evidence, the Petitioner's cover letter claimed:

> … [T]he very purpose of the petitioner's endeavor is to 'employ U.S. workers' by training them, as she has successfully done in Colombia, to lead productive lives. Moreover, her proposed activity will by nature 'broadly enhance societal welfare' for a segment of the population. While the immediate geographic impact is narrow, there are broader implications for the beneficiary's proposed program of empowerment. Nor does *Dhanasar* impose any geographical requirement. However, if the petitioner's program will be successful, it can be scaled to any community throughout the United States.

The Director determined the Petitioner demonstrated the proposed endeavor's substantial merit but not its national importance. As it relates to substantial merit, the endeavor's merit may be demonstrated in a range of areas such as business, entrepreneurialism, science, technology, culture, health, or education. *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 889. On appeal, the Petitioner argues the national importance of her proposed endeavor and submits a revised business plan. Because the Petitioner was put on notice and given a reasonable opportunity to provide this evidence, we will not consider it for the first time on appeal. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(11) (requiring all requested evidence be submitted together at one time); *Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764, 766 (BIA 1988) (declining to consider new evidence submitted on appeal because "petitioner was put on notice of the required evidence and given a reasonable opportunity to provide it for the record before the denial").

In determining national importance, the relevant question is not the importance of the 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. Here, the Petitioner must demonstrate the national importance of her specific, proposed endeavor of owning and operating a business to provide services for disadvantaged women rather than the importance of gender equality, young women empowerment, and other related topics.[2] In *Dhanasar*, we 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.

[2] The Petitioner's arguments and evidence relate to the substantial merit aspect of the proposed endeavor rather than the national importance part.

Moreover, to evaluate whether the Petitioner's proposed endeavor satisfies the national importance requirement, we look to evidence documenting the "potential prospective impact" of her work. *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 889. Here, the Petitioner did not demonstrate how her business and services largely influences the field and rises to the level of national importance. Similar to this case, in *Dhanasar*, we determined 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. The record does not show through supporting documentation how her particular endeavor sufficiently extends beyond her prospective clients in the [redacted] South Carolina area, to impact the field or the U.S. economy more broadly at a level commensurate with national importance.

Finally, the Petitioner did not show how her proposed endeavor has significant potential to employ U.S. workers or otherwise offers substantial positive economic effects for our nation. The Petitioner's business plan presented before the Director contained no employment projections, let alone indicate that such employment figures would utilize a significant population of workers in the area or would substantially impact job creation. In addition, while the plan claims $155K in revenue and sales in the first year of operation, even if credible, the Petitioner did not establish the benefits to the regional or national economy would reach the level of "substantial positive economic effects" as contemplated by *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 890. For all these reasons, the record does not establish that, beyond the limited benefits provided to its prospective clients and employees, the Petitioner's proposed endeavor has broader implications rising to the level of having national importance or that it would offer substantial positive economic effects.

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. Further analysis of her eligibility under the second and third prongs outlined in *Dhanasar*, therefore, would serve no meaningful purpose.[3]

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

[3] *See INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976) (stating that agencies are not required to make "purely advisory findings" on issues that are unnecessary to the ultimate decision); *see also Matter of L-A-C-*, 26 I&N Dec. 516, 526 n.7 (BIA 2015) (declining to reach alternate issues on appeal where applicants do not otherwise meet their burden of proof).