



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

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

In Re: 21106367

Date: JUN. 16, 2022

Appeal of Texas Service Center Decision

Form I-140, Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Advanced Degree, Exceptional Ability, National Interest Waiver)

The Petitioner, a legal analyst, seeks second preference 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 EB-2 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 the Petitioner qualified for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, but that she had not established that a waiver of the required job offer, and thus of the labor certification, would be in the national interest. On appeal, the Petitioner submits additional documentation and a brief asserting that she is eligible for a national interest waiver.

In these proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. 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. 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.

Section 203(b) of the Act sets out this sequential framework:

(2) Aliens who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or aliens of exceptional ability. –

(A) In general. – Visas shall be made available . . . to qualified immigrants who are members of the professions holding advanced degrees or their equivalent or who because of their exceptional ability in the sciences, arts, or business, will

substantially benefit prospectively the national economy, cultural or educational interests, or welfare of the United States, and whose services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business are sought by an employer in the United States.

(B) Waiver of job offer –

(i) National interest waiver. . . . [T]he Attorney General may, when the Attorney General deems it to be in the national interest, waive the requirements of subparagraph (A) that an alien’s services in the sciences, arts, professions, or business be sought by an employer in the United States.

While neither the statute nor the pertinent regulations define the term “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).¹ *Dhanasar* states that after a petitioner has established eligibility for EB-2 classification, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) may, as matter of discretion², grant a national interest waiver if the petitioner demonstrates: (1) that the foreign national’s proposed endeavor has both substantial merit and national importance; (2) that the foreign national is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor; and (3) 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.

The first prong, substantial merit and national importance, focuses on the specific endeavor that the foreign national 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 foreign national. To determine whether he or she 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; any progress towards achieving the proposed endeavor; and the interest of potential customers, users, investors, or other relevant entities or individuals.

The third prong requires the petitioner to demonstrate 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. In performing this analysis, USCIS may evaluate factors such as: whether, in light of the nature of the foreign national’s qualifications or the proposed endeavor, it would be impractical either for the foreign national 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 foreign national’s contributions; and whether the national interest in the foreign national’s contributions is sufficiently urgent to warrant forgoing the labor certification process. In each case, the factor(s)

¹ In announcing this new framework, we vacated our prior precedent decision, *Matter of New York State Department of Transportation*, 22 I&N Dec. 215 (Act. Assoc. Comm’r 1998) (*NYSDOT*).

² See also *Poursina v. USCIS*, No. 17-16579, 2019 WL 4051593 (Aug. 28, 2019) (finding USCIS’ decision to grant or deny a national interest waiver to be discretionary in nature).

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.³

II. ANALYSIS

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 agree with the Director that the Petitioner has not sufficiently demonstrated the national importance of her proposed endeavor under the first prong of the *Dhanasar* analytical framework.

Regarding her claim of eligibility under *Dhanasar*'s first prong, the Petitioner indicated that her proposed endeavor in the United States is to work as a legal analyst and "work on nationally significant projects and contribute to cross-border activities through my extensive experience, knowledge, and contacts." The Petitioner also stated she intends to "pursue positions within U.S. companies and firms that will benefit from my outstanding abilities and in-depth understanding of the many features regarding the United States, Brazil, and Latin America's taxation and legal system." The Petitioner claims her endeavor serves the national interest by attracting foreign investors to the United States and encouraging cross-border transactions.

The record includes articles indicating the U.S. is the largest recipient of cross-border investment in the world while Brazil is the second largest economy in the Western Hemisphere and the United States' second largest trading partner. In addition, the Petitioner provided reports and articles indicating Brazil has a complex tax and commercial system as compared to other nations throughout the world. The record therefore supports the Director's determination that the Petitioner's proposed work as a legal analyst has substantial merit.

In determining national importance, the relevant question is not the importance of the field or profession in which the individual will work; instead we focus on the "the specific endeavor that the foreign national proposes to undertake."⁴ 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.

In her appellate brief, the Petitioner points to her background, education, work experience, and specialized training in her field. The Petitioner's knowledge, skills, and experience in her field relate to the second prong of the *Dhanasar* framework, which "shifts the focus from the proposed endeavor to the

³ See *Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 888-91, for elaboration on these three prongs.

⁴ The issue here is not the value of the legal industry or the impact of consulting on our country's economy, but rather whether the Petitioner's specific proposed endeavor as a legal analyst and consultant rises to the level of national importance.

foreign national.” *Id.* at 890.⁵ The issue here is whether the specific endeavor that she proposes to undertake has national importance under *Dhanasar*’s first prong. 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.

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. Although the Petitioner’s Professional Plan and Statement reflect her intention to work for U.S. companies and eventually create her own law firm, she has not offered sufficient information and evidence to demonstrate that the prospective impact of her proposed endeavor rises to the level of national importance. 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 record does not show that the Petitioner’s proposed endeavor stands to sufficiently extend beyond her employer and clientele to impact her field or the industry more broadly at a level commensurate with national importance.

Furthermore, the Petitioner has not demonstrated that the specific endeavor she proposes to undertake has significant potential to employ U.S. workers or otherwise offers substantial positive economic effects for our nation. Specifically, she has not shown that her legal analyst activities stand to provide substantial economic benefits in the United States.⁶ While the Petitioner submitted articles and industry reports showing the U.S. legal services industry generated \$400 billion in 2018, and employed 1,100,000 U.S. citizens in 2017, she has not submitted documentary evidence that would demonstrate that benefits to the regional or national economy resulting from the Petitioner’s undertakings would reach the level of “substantial positive economic effects” contemplated by *Dhanasar*. *Id.* at 890. In addition, the Petitioner has not demonstrated that any increases in employment or income attributable to her legal analyst activities stand to substantially affect economic activity or tax revenue nationally. Accordingly, the Petitioner’s proposed work does not meet the first prong of the *Dhanasar* framework.

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.

III. CONCLUSION

As the Petitioner has not met the requisite first prong of the *Dhanasar* analytical framework, we conclude that she has not established she is eligible for or otherwise merits a national interest waiver as a matter

⁵ To establish that it would be in the national interest to waive the job offer requirement, a petitioner must go beyond showing her expertise in a particular field. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2) defines “exceptional ability” as “a degree of expertise significantly above that ordinarily encountered” in a given area of endeavor. By statute, individuals of exceptional ability are generally subject to the job offer/labor certification requirement; they are not exempt by virtue of their exceptional ability. Therefore, whether a given petitioner seeks classification as an individual of exceptional ability, or as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, that individual cannot qualify for a waiver just by demonstrating a degree of expertise significantly above that ordinarily encountered in her field of expertise. *See Dhanasar*, 26 I&N Dec. at 886 n.3.

⁶ The Petitioner did not note, at the time of filing, any specific state or region of the United States where she intended to provide consulting services.

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.