U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Non-Precedent Decision of the Administrative Appeals Office

In Re: 37093421

Date: MAY 8, 2025

Appeal of Texas Service Center Decision

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

The Petitioner, a biomedical aesthetician and an entrepreneur in the aesthetic industry, 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 Service Center Operations (SCOPS) denied the petition, concluding that although the Petitioner qualified as an advanced degree professional, she did not establish 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 qualify for the underlying EB-2 visa classification, a petitioner must establish they are an advanced degree professional or an individual of exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business. Section 203(b)(2)(A) of the Act.

An advanced degree is any U.S. 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 U.S. bachelor's degree or foreign equivalent degree followed by five years of progressive experience in the specialty is the equivalent of a master's degree. *Id*.

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. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(3)(ii)(A)-(F).[1] Meeting at least three criteria, however, does not, in and of itself, establish eligibility for this classification. *See generally* 6 USCIS Policy Manual F.5(B)(2), https://www.uscis.gov/policy-manual. If a petitioner does so, we will then conduct a final merits determination to decide whether the evidence in its totality shows that they are recognized as having the requisite degree of expertise and will substantially benefit the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States. Section 203(b)(2)(A) of the Act.

If a petitioner establishes eligibility for the underlying EB-2 classification, they must then demonstrate that they merit 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 the framework for adjudicating national interest waiver petitions. *Dhanasar* states that U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may, as matter of discretion,[2] grant a national interest waiver if the petitioner demonstrates that:

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

Id.

II. ANALYSIS

A. EB-2 Visa Classification

As an initial matter, although SCOPS determined the Petitioner is a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, upon de novo review, we disagree.

In addition to the definition of "advance degree" provided at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2), the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(3)(i)(B) provides that a petitioner present "[a]n official academic record showing that the alien has a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree, and evidence in the form of letters from current or former employer(s) showing that the alien has at least five years of progressive post-baccalaureate experience in the specialty." The record indicates that the Petitioner's foreign baccalaureate degree is equivalent to a U.S. baccalaureate degree in biomedicine. However, the Petitioner did not submit the evidence required to establish five years of qualifying work experience. A petitioner must provide "evidence in the form of letters from *current or former employer(s)* showing that [the petitioner] has at least five years of progressive post-baccalaureate experience *in the specialty*." 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(3)(i)(B) (emphasis added). The Petitioner provided an employment letter verifying that she worked 44 hours a week as an administrative manager and biomedical aesthetician from September 29, 2014 to February 17, 2019, which is only four years and five months. Therefore, the record does not establish that the Petitioner possessed at least five years of progressive post-baccalaureate experience in the specialty.

[1] If these types of evidence do not readily apply to the individual's occupation, a petitioner may submit comparable evidence to establish their eligibility. 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(3)(iii).

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

In addition, while the Petitioner initially claimed she qualifies for EB-2 classification as an individual of exceptional ability, SCOPS did not address this issue. Since the evidence in the record does not establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the Petitioner is eligible for, or otherwise merits, a national interest waiver as a matter of discretion, we will reserve the issue of whether she qualifies for EB-2 classification as an individual of exceptional ability for future consideration should the need arise. *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 alternate issues on appeal where an applicant is otherwise ineligible).

B. National Interest Waiver

The Petitioner proposes to establish an aesthetic clinic in [redacted] California that specializes in "non-surgical treatments, contributing significantly to the health, well-being, and beauty of the community." She intends to "offer innovative, non-invasive treatments and to foster the development of professionals in this field."

Turning to the first *Dhanasar* prong, SCOPS determined that, although the Petitioner's proposed endeavor has substantial merit, she did not establish her endeavor is of national importance. In determining whether the proposed endeavor has national importance, we consider its potential prospective impact. *Matter of Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 889. 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.

On appeal, the Petitioner contends her proposed endeavor "carries significant national importance by contributing to the evolution of the U.S. aesthetic industry, addressing critical market gaps, and enhancing the broader economic and social fabric of our nation" and "will stimulate economic growth in the regions" it will operate. The Petitioner, however, has not provided evidence demonstrating that her proposed endeavor would operate on such a scale as to rise to a level of national importance. It is insufficient to claim an endeavor has national importance or would create a broad impact without providing evidence to substantiate such claims. Furthermore, while any basic economic activity has the potential to positively affect the economy to some degree, the Petitioner has not demonstrated how the asserted potential prospective impact of her proposed endeavor stands to offer broader implications in her industry or to generate substantial positive economic effects. 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, we conclude the Petitioner has not shown that her proposed endeavor stands to sufficiently extend beyond her future clients to impact the field of aesthetics, the economy, or U.S. societal welfare more broadly at a level commensurate with national importance.

The Petitioner also asserts her endeavor will address the "significant talent shortage" in the aesthetics industry. She states she will address "this shortage head-on by creating a pipeline of will-trained, highly skilled professionals who are ready to meet the needs of the market." However, the national

shortage of aesthetic professionals is not, in and of itself, sufficient to establish the national importance of the Petitioner's endeavor. Further, the Department of Labor directly addresses U.S. worker shortages through the labor certification process.

Moreover, the Petitioner also highlights that her proposed endeavor aligns with national initiatives, including the Small Business Act and several executive orders. However, merely working in an important field or profession is insufficient to establish the national importance of the proposed endeavor. *Id.* at 889. Instead, when determining whether the proposed endeavor has national importance, the relevant question is not the importance of the field, industry, or profession in which the individual will work; instead, we focus on the "the specific endeavor that the foreign national proposes to undertake." *Id.* Thus, while we acknowledge that the aesthetics industry is important, this fact is insufficient to establish the national importance of her proposed endeavor.

Because the Petitioner has not established eligibility under the first prong of the *Dhanasar* test, we need not address her eligibility under the remaining prongs, and we hereby reserve them. *See INS v. Bagamasbad,* 429 U.S. at 25; *see also Matter of L-A-C-*, 26 I&N Dec. at 526 n.7. The burden of proof is on the Petitioner to establish that she meets each eligibility requirement of the benefit sought by a preponderance of the evidence. *Matter of Chawathe*, 25 I&N Dec. at 375-376. The Petitioner has not done so here and, therefore, we conclude that she has not established eligibility for a national interest waiver as a matter of discretion.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.