U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Non-Precedent Decision of the Administrative Appeals Office

In Re: 31111861

Date: MAY 29, 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.

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. The Petitioner intends

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v. Garland*, 72 F.4th 85, 88 (5th Cir. 2023) (joining the Ninth, Eleventh, and D.C. Circuit Courts (and Third in an unpublished decision) in concluding that USCIS' decision to grant or deny a national interest waiver to be discretionary in nature).

to continue her work as a fitness director and provide fitness-related services through her business located in [redacted] Florida.

As it relates to substantial merit, the endeavor's merit may be shown in a range of areas such as business, entrepreneurialism, science, technology, culture, health, or education. *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 889. The Director determined the Petitioner established the substantial merit, but not the national importance, of her proposed endeavor. On appeal, the Petitioner argues that her submissions of a personal statement, "Probative Research," and an expert opinion letter demonstrated the national importance aspect of the first prong.

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. Although the Petitioner contends that her personal statement discussed the importance of various national and government initiatives, such as "Active People, Healthy Nation," "Step It Up," and "Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans," the matter here is not whether these initiatives, as well as the topics of physical trainers, fitness, or similarly related subjects, are nationally important. Rather, the Petitioner must demonstrate the national importance of her specific, proposed endeavor of providing her services as a fitness director through her company in the [redacted] Florida area. Likewise, her submission of "Probative Research" covers a wide range of topics, such as physical inactivity and obesity, rather than establishing the national importance of her particular professional services or business.[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.

Further, as indicated above, the Petitioner presented a letter from A-R- who found the Petitioner's proposed endeavor has national importance. The letter emphasizes the Petitioner's "track record of success" and "unique[] qualifi[cation]." However, the Petitioner's knowledge, skills, and abilities relate to the second prong of the *Dhanasar* framework, which "shifts the focus from the proposed endeavor to the foreign national." *Id.* at 890. The issue here is whether the specific endeavor that she proposes to undertake has national importance under *Dhanasar's* first prong. Moreover, the letter repeatedly references the impact that the Petitioner will have on her clients rather than the required broader impact. 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. *Id.* at 889. Here, the Petitioner did not demonstrate how her services or business would largely influence the field and rise to the level of national importance. 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 endeavor sufficiently extends beyond her prospective clients, to impact the field or the U.S. economy more broadly at a level commensurate with national importance.

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

Finally, the Petitioner did not establish how her fitness company has significant potential to employ U.S. workers or otherwise offer substantial positive economic effects for our nation. Again, the expert opinion letter discusses the "sector" forecast and "fitness club industry" without showing the projected U.S. economic impact or job creation attributable to the Petitioner's particular services or company. Here, the record does not show any benefits to the U.S. regional or national economy resulting from her specific services or business would reach the level of "substantial positive economic effects" contemplated by *Dhanasar*. *Id.* at 890.

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, as well as a review of the Director's favorable determination of the Petitioner's eligibility as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree.[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).