

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy


U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Room 3000
Washington, DC 20529 - 2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

by




FILE: WAC 08 045 51357 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **OCT 29 2008**

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:




PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(iii)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.


Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner is an engineering and civil design services firm that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a trainee for a period of eighteen months. The petitioner, therefore, endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant trainee pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(iii).

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence; (3) the petitioner's response to the director's request; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) the petitioner's Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The director denied the petition on six grounds: (1) that the petitioner had failed to set forth, with specificity, the type of training and supervision to be given, and the structure of the training program; (2) that the petitioner had failed to set forth the proportion of time to be devoted to productive employment; (3) that the petitioner had failed to show the number of hours that will be spent, respectively, in classroom instruction and in on-the-job training; (4) that the petitioner had failed to indicate the source of remuneration received by the trainee and any benefit which will accrue to the petitioner for providing the training; (5) that the petitioner had failed to establish that the proposed training is unavailable in the beneficiary's home country; and (6) that the petitioner had failed to establish that the proposed training will benefit the beneficiary in pursuing a career outside the United States.

On appeal, counsel contends that the director erred in denying the petition.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(iii), provides classification for an alien having a residence in a foreign country, which he or she has no intention of abandoning, who is coming temporarily to the United States as a trainee, other than to receive graduate medical education or training, in a training program that is not designed primarily to provide productive employment.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7) states, in pertinent part, the following:

- (ii) Evidence required for petition involving alien trainee—
 - (A) Conditions. The petitioner is required to demonstrate that:
 - (1) The proposed training is not available in the alien's own country;
 - (2) The beneficiary will not be placed in a position which is in the normal operation of the business and in which citizens and resident workers are regularly employed;
 - (3) The beneficiary will not engage in productive employment unless such employment is incidental and necessary to the training; and

- (H) Is designed to extend the total allowable period of practical training previously authorized a nonimmigrant student.

In its November 26, 2007 letter of support, the petitioner stated the following:

[The petitioner] is a certified and service-oriented engineering company located in the City of Los Angeles. We have a solid experience in civil and structural engineering related to planning, design, management, and construction of educational, commercial, industrial, institutional, transportation, municipal, manufacturing, aerospace, and military facilities. We engage in a wide variety of engineering design involving private and public land development, facility engineering, transportation engineering[,] and topographical engineering. . . .

* * *

Presently, our company's business development plans and initiatives represent an aggressive stance towards expansion into the engineering and construction business in the international market, particularly in the Philippines where we plan to put up an affiliate engineering and consulting office. . . .

With regard to why it is offering the proposed training program, the petitioner stated the following:

The training program's objectives are:

1. To prepare and equip [the] trainee for the future key position as New Business Development Officer at the soon to be established Philippine affiliate.
2. To educate [the] trainee in the management of an engineering and construction business in the United States.
3. To expose [the] trainee to trends and marketing strategies in the engineering and construction industry.

The petitioner explained that the proposed training program would consist of five phases. The first phase, entitled "General Orientation & Industry Familiarization," would last two months. The second phase, entitled "Marketing Training," would last seven months. The third phase, entitled "Construction and Project Management," would last five months. The fourth phase, entitled "Human Resources/Administrative Training," would last two months. The fifth phase, entitled "Business Plan Submission and Final Evaluation and Assessment," would last two months.

Upon review, the AAO agrees with the director's finding that the petitioner's proposed training program does not meet the regulatory requirements to establish eligibility for the nonimmigrant visa.

The director also found that the petitioner had failed to set forth, with specificity, the type of training and supervision to be given, and the structure of the training program. The AAO agrees. The regulation at

8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(B)(1) requires the petitioner to describe the type of training and supervision to be given, and the structure of the training program.

Despite counsel's assertions to the contrary, the information contained in the record of proceeding remains vague in nature, and leaves the AAO with very little idea of what the beneficiary would actually be doing on a day-to-day basis.

For example, the second phase of the proposed training program would last seven months. According to the petitioner, this module would consist of four sessions: (1) marketing foundations; (2) market research and analysis; (3) strategic marketing; and (4) internet & e-commerce solutions. However, the information contained in the record of proceeding remains vague in nature, and leaves the AAO with very little idea of what the beneficiary would actually be doing on a day-to-day basis. Goals and objectives are presented, but lists of goals and objectives are not substitutes for descriptions of how those goals and objectives are to be accomplished; the petitioner has not explained what the beneficiary will actually be doing during this seven-month period of time. The petitioner's description of the rest of its proposed training program suffers similar deficiencies. The petitioner's description of how the beneficiary would spend this period of time consists of summary outlines without specific descriptions of the daily training program.

The petitioner is not required to provide an exhaustive account of how the beneficiary is to spend every minute, or even every single day, of the training program. However, the petitioner has failed to provide a meaningful description, beyond generalities, of what the beneficiary would actually be doing on a daily basis while participating in the proposed training program. It has failed to satisfy 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(B)(1).

The director also found that the petitioner had failed to set forth the proportion of time to be devoted to productive employment. The AAO disagrees. Both counsel and the petitioner have asserted that the proposed training program will not involve productive employment. Given the goals and objectives of the training program as set forth in the record of proceeding, the AAO finds this assertion reasonable. Therefore, the AAO withdraws that portion of the director's decision finding otherwise.

The director also found that the petitioner had failed to show the number of hours that will be spent, respectively, in classroom instruction and in on-the-job training. The AAO disagrees. The petitioner stated that the beneficiary would spend 45% of her time in classroom instruction, 45% of her time in on-the-job training, and 10% of her time in observation. The AAO finds no reason to doubt these figures and, accordingly, withdraws that portion of the director's decision finding otherwise.

The director also found that the petitioner had failed to indicate the source of remuneration received by the trainee and any benefit which will accrue to the petitioner for providing the training. The AAO disagrees. The petitioner indicates that the beneficiary will receive an allowance of \$350 per week. The petitioner has also described its plans for the beneficiary after she returns to the Philippines. While those plans may not have satisfied other regulatory criteria at issue in this case, they do satisfy C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(B)(6), and the AAO withdraws that portion of the director's decision finding otherwise.

The director also found that the petitioner had failed to establish that the proposed training could not be obtained in the Philippines, the beneficiary's home country. The AAO disagrees. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(A)(1) requires the petitioner to demonstrate that the proposed training is not available in the alien's own country, and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(B)(5) requires a statement from the

petitioner indicating the reasons why the proposed training cannot be obtained in the alien's home country and why it is necessary for the alien to be trained in the United States.

The question to be addressed when attempting to satisfy 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(A)(1) and 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(B)(5) is not whether the petitioner offers this training in the alien's home country. Whether the petitioner itself offers similar training in the beneficiary's home country is not the issue; the question is whether the training is unavailable anywhere in the beneficiary's home country, irrespective of whether it would be provided by the petitioner or another entity.

In the present case, however, the reason for creation of the training program is to train the beneficiary on the petitioner's own business practices. Moreover, the petitioner in this particular case has demonstrated that its business practices are sufficiently unique that such knowledge could not be obtained at another facility. The AAO finds that, in this particular case, the petitioner has established that the proposed training is not available in the Philippines, and finds that the petitioner has satisfied 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(A)(1) and 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(B)(5). The AAO, therefore, withdraws that portion of the director's decision finding otherwise.

The director also found that the petitioner had failed to adequately describe the career abroad for which the training would prepare the beneficiary. The AAO agrees. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(A)(4) requires the petitioner to demonstrate that the proposed training will benefit the beneficiary in pursuing a career outside the United States, and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(B)(4) requires the petitioner to describe the career abroad for which the training will prepare the alien.

In her March 12, 2008 denial, the director stated the following:

[T]he petitioner has not given any concrete dates or timelines of when the petitioner will expand into the Philippine market . . . How will the training benefit the beneficiary in pursuing a career abroad outside the U.S. when the petitioner has not provided evidence of this future expansion other than stating so in their support letter?

The AAO agrees with the director. As noted above, the AAO has found the petitioner in compliance with 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(A)(1) and 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(B)(5). Again, the question to be addressed when attempting to satisfy these two criteria is not whether the petitioner offers this training in the alien's home country. Whether the petitioner itself offers similar training in the beneficiary's home country is not the issue; the question is whether the training is unavailable anywhere in the beneficiary's home country, irrespective of whether it would be provided by the petitioner or another entity.

However, in the present case, and as noted above, the reason for creation of the training program is to train the beneficiary on the petitioner's own business practices.

Having made such a demonstration, however, the petitioner is compelled to further demonstrate that there is a setting in which the beneficiary will be able to use her newfound knowledge. Since her newfound knowledge (the knowledge that cannot be obtained in the Philippines) will be specific to the petitioner, an operation run by the petitioner would be the only setting in which she would be able to use the knowledge (again, if the knowledge can be used at employment other than for the petitioner, it is therefore not wholly specific to the petitioner's business, and therefore can be obtained in the Philippines).

The petitioner has failed to establish that there is in fact exists a career abroad in which the beneficiary can utilize the training to be imparted via the proposed training program. As the purpose of the proposed training program is to train the beneficiary on the petitioner's unique business practices, the only setting in which the beneficiary would be able to utilize her newfound knowledge would be for the petitioner.

As the petitioner has not yet established its affiliate office in the Philippines, there exists no setting in which she would be able to utilize her newfound knowledge. A petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. A visa petition may not be approved based on speculation of future eligibility or after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978). In this particular case, since the proposed training is specific to the petitioner, and the setting in which the beneficiary would utilize her skills would be for the petitioner in the Philippines, the petitioner must document that, at the time the petition was filed, it actually had plans to commence operations in the Philippines upon completion of the training. The record, as presently constituted, contains no documentary evidence of the petitioner's expansion plans at the time the petition was filed, beyond training the beneficiary. Nor has the petitioner submitted any documentary evidence, beyond its own assertions, to demonstrate that it is in the process of setting up operations in the Philippines. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)). The petitioner has not satisfied 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(2)(A)(4).

Pursuant to the above discussion, the AAO agrees with the director's decision that the proposed training program does not meet the regulatory requirements for approval of the nonimmigrant visa.

Beyond the decision of the director, the AAO finds that the petition may not be approved for an additional reason.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(iii)(G) precludes approval of a petition in which the petitioner has not established that it has the physical plant and sufficiently trained manpower to provide the training specified in the petition. In its letter of support, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary would be under the supervision of the petitioner's principal. However, there is no indication in the record of how this individual's normal job duties would be accomplished while he is supervising the beneficiary. Without a description of which duties would be delegated, and the persons to whom the various duties would be delegated, the AAO cannot, in this particular case, find that the petitioner has established that it has the personnel to provide the training specified in the petition. For this additional reason, the petition may not be approved.

For all of these reasons, the petition may not be approved. An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. See *Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*. 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); see also *Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989)(noting that the AAO reviews appeals on a de novo basis).

The petition will be denied and the appeal dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for the decision. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.