

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
20 Mass. Rm. A3042, 425 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20536


Identifying data omitted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

D7

APR 08 2004




FILE: EAC 02 183 52925 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date:

IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]


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

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, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner states that it is a computer software development firm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary temporarily in the United States as a technical consultant. The director denied the petition concluding that the beneficiary is not employed in a position that involves specialized knowledge. Specifically, the director stated that the petitioner had failed to demonstrate that the procedures used by the beneficiary are significantly different from the methods generally used in other computer software development firms, or that the beneficiary's understanding of the petitioning organization's processes constitutes specialized knowledge. The director also stated that the petitioner had not established that the position being offered to the beneficiary requires the services of an individual possessing specialized knowledge. The petitioner subsequently filed an appeal.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that the director improperly applied the relevant statute to the evidence previously submitted in support of the beneficiary's specialized knowledge capacity.

To establish L-1 eligibility, the petitioner must meet the criteria outlined in section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L). Specifically, within three years preceding the beneficiary's application for admission into the United States, a qualifying organization must have employed the beneficiary in a qualifying managerial or executive capacity, or in a specialized knowledge capacity, for one continuous year. In addition, the beneficiary must seek to enter the United States temporarily to continue rendering his or her services to the same employer or a subsidiary or affiliate thereof in a managerial, executive, or specialized knowledge capacity.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(3) further states that an individual petition filed on Form I-129 shall be accompanied by:

- (i) Evidence that the petitioner and the organization which employed or will employ the alien are qualifying organizations as defined in paragraph (l)(1)(ii)(G) of this section.
- (ii) Evidence that the alien will be employed in an executive, managerial, or specialized knowledge capacity, including a detailed description of the services to be performed.
- (iii) Evidence that the alien has at least one continuous year of full time employment abroad with a qualifying organization within the three years preceding the filing of the petition.
- (iv) Evidence that the alien's prior year of employment abroad was in a position that was managerial, executive or involved specialized knowledge and that the alien's prior education, training, and employment qualifies him/her to perform the intended services in the United States; however, the work in the United States need not be the same work which the alien performed abroad.

According to the evidence submitted, the petitioner is a subsidiary of Hexaware Technologies Ltd., located in India. The petitioner was incorporated in 1993 and states that it is a computer software development firm.

The petitioner claims 170 plus employees and \$32,000,000 in gross annual income. The petitioner seeks to employ the beneficiary as a systems analyst for a period of three years, at a yearly salary of \$65,000.00.

The issue in this proceeding is whether the petitioner has established that the beneficiary possesses specialized knowledge, has been employed and will be employed in a specialized knowledge capacity.

Section 214(c)(2)(B) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(c)(2)(B), provides the following:

For purposes of section 101(a)(15)(L), an alien is considered to be serving in a capacity involving specialized knowledge with respect to a company if the alien has a special knowledge of the company product and its application in international markets or has an advanced level of knowledge of processes and procedures of the company.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(1)(ii)(D) defines “specialized knowledge” as:

[S]pecial knowledge possessed by an individual of the petitioning organization’s product, service, research, equipment, techniques, management, or other interests and its application in international markets, or an advanced level of knowledge or expertise in the organization’s processes and procedures.

In a letter, dated April 18, 2002, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary had been employed by the foreign entity since December 1996 as a systems analyst in the E Commerce group. The petitioner also stated that the beneficiary’s primary skills set consists of Visual Basic, ASP, Crystal Reports, CL/400 and RPG/400. The petitioner further stated that the beneficiary has been involved in the study, design, development, and testing of different applications for Equitable Insurance, New York, TAB Inc., and Harley Davidson, UK.

The petitioner also submitted a letter of support, dated April 29, 2002, which discusses a different beneficiary and discusses the alien’s qualifications as an H-1B nonimmigrant. The petitioner stated that systems analysts are hired by the organization to analyze client’s IT requirements and computer hardware design systems. The petitioner then implements the design by customization of the software to the client’s unique requirements. The petitioner further stated that the minimum job requirement of a systems analyst is at least a degree in the Computer Sciences, or related fields, and some experience as a computer professional. The letter does not appear to support the beneficiary’s claim to L-1B status.

The petitioner submitted a copy of an evaluation of the beneficiary’s education, training, and experience from the Zicklin School of Business; a Plan of Merger of Aptech Worldwide Inc. USA into Hexaware Technologies Inc. USA; school transcripts; a Bachelor of Commerce degree from the University of Mumbai, dated December 3, 1996; a Certificate of Participation for completing the UML and Rational Rose and Visual Basic 5.0 courses; certificate of completion from Syspro Software International Services LTD for completing the IBM AS/400 course; and certificates of completion from Aptech Computer Education Center.

In a request for evidence, the director noted that the record did not establish that the beneficiary had been and would be employed in a specialized capacity. The director specifically requested that the petitioner submit evidence establishing that: (1) the beneficiary possessed specialized knowledge above that which is normally possessed by other technical consultants employed by the foreign entity; (2) the beneficiary is currently and will continue to be employed in a specialized knowledge capacity in the United States firm; (3) the beneficiary possessed specialized knowledge above that which is normally possessed by other computer

technical consultants employed by the U.S. entity; and (4) a statement from client(s) commenting on the beneficiary's individual contribution to the project(s) to which he was assigned.

In response, counsel for the petitioner submitted a statement asserting that the beneficiary has an advanced level of knowledge of the petitioning company's processes and procedures relating to software interfaces. Counsel gave a detailed description of the beneficiary's work experience and job duties. Specifically, counsel claimed that the foreign entity has employed the beneficiary as a systems analyst in the company's E-Commerce group since December 1996. Counsel further stated that the beneficiary had been actively involved in the design and development of various applications for Equitable Insurance in New York utilizing his special knowledge. Counsel further stated that in this position, the beneficiary gained special knowledge of the petitioner's interface or Connector technology. Counsel also stated that all the technical consultants who possess knowledge of the connector technology are trained and employed by the foreign entity. Counsel asserted that the beneficiary is distinct among others in the computer field based upon his combination of skill sets and his knowledge of the foreign entity's interface or connector technology products. Counsel also asserted that the beneficiary's knowledge is different from that which is ordinarily encountered in the field.

Counsel continued by asserting that only a small percentage of the organization's technical consultants both in India and the United States possess specialized knowledge of the company's Connector technology and Vitria Business Ware products. Counsel further stated that 13 percent of the consultants (including the beneficiary) in India and 8 percent of the consultants in the United States possess specialized knowledge in this respect. Counsel concludes by contending that many of the ongoing projects have reached a point where the physical presence of technical consultants (including the beneficiary) who possess specialized knowledge of the entity's Connector interface technology and Vitria Business Ware products is now required on site in the United States.

In his decision, the director concluded that the record did not establish that the beneficiary has been or would be employed in a specialized knowledge capacity, as required for classification as an L-1B intracompany transferee. Upon reviewing the detailed description of the beneficiary's job responsibilities, the director determined that the job duties were not significantly different from those of other system analysts in a computer software development firm, and does not "warrant the expertise of someone possessing a truly specialized knowledge." The director noted that the petitioner's explanation of the beneficiary's duties seemed to merely paraphrase the definition of specialized knowledge. The director also concluded that the petitioner had not demonstrated that the company's procedures were significantly different from technology generally used in any computer software development company. The director stated that the petitioner had failed to demonstrate how an understanding of the technology constitutes specialized knowledge. The director further stated that an in-depth knowledge of the functions and systems of the organization does not appear to be unusual for an individual employed as a systems analyst to possess, and is not considered to be indicative of the beneficiary's claimed advanced expertise. The director concluded by stating that the petitioner had failed to document how the beneficiary's knowledge of the processes and procedures, namely familiarity with the connector technology and Vitria Business Ware products, of the petitioning organization are advanced or substantially different from the knowledge possessed by other individuals similarly employed. The director also concluded that the petitioner had failed to sufficiently demonstrate that the knowledge the beneficiary possesses would be difficult to impart to another individual without significant economic inconvenience to the U.S. or foreign entities or that the knowledge is not generally known and is of some complexity. Consequently, the director denied the petition.

On appeal, counsel for the petitioner submits a brief in which he asserts that the director reached an erroneous conclusion based upon an improper reading of the relevant section of the Act. Counsel also contends that the director reached an erroneous conclusion in that he mistakenly concludes that the beneficiary does not qualify for L-1B status in a specialized knowledge capacity because of the lack of evidence to establish that the beneficiary's knowledge of the processes and procedure of the U.S. and foreign entities are substantially different from, or advanced in relation to, any individual similarly employed. Counsel further reiterates a description of the beneficiary's knowledge, training, and expertise in the computer software applications field. Counsel asserts that the beneficiary received his specialty training from the foreign entity and that within the company only a handful of consultants possess this specialized knowledge. Counsel further asserts that the beneficiary's combined knowledge of the company's proprietary products, Constellar Interfaces and the software applications of Equitable Insurance and TAB, Inc., qualifies as "specialized knowledge." Counsel resubmits on appeal a copy of the Constellar Corporation Software License and Services Interface Developer Agreement and petitioner's letters of support.

On review of the record, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary possesses specialized knowledge or that he will be employed in a specialized knowledge capacity as required in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(l)(3)(ii). Counsel contends that the beneficiary possesses specialized knowledge of the organizations products, processes, and procedures. Counsel asserts that the beneficiary acquired the specialized knowledge through the training programs offered to the beneficiary by the foreign entity at its training and production facilities in India. Although the petitioner submitted certificates of computer education and training received from the Aptech Computer Education Center, not the petitioner or the claimed parent company, there has been no evidence presented to show the length of the course or how the course contributes to the beneficiary's claimed specialized knowledge of the petitioner's processes. The petitioner has not presented any evidence to substantiate the claim that the courses offered by the apparently unrelated foreign entity equip the beneficiary with specialized knowledge of the petitioner's product. There has been no evidence submitted such as degrees, certification, course transcripts, or certificates of completion to establish that the beneficiary received specialty training regarding Constellar Interfaces, Vitria Business Ware product, and the software applications of Equitable Insurance and TAB, Inc. from the foreign entity. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

Furthermore, contrary to counsel's contentions, mere familiarity with an organization's product, process, or service, such as knowledge of its Connector technology, Constellar Interface, and Vitria Business Ware products, does not constitute special knowledge under section 214 (c)(2)(B) of the Act. While the petitioner claims that the beneficiary's experience with the organization includes intimate familiarity with the foreign entity's offshore operations and proprietary products, including "connector technology," and intimate familiarity with client's software development projects gained while working on the projects during the offshore phase, this statement alone is not indicative of specialized knowledge capacity. In addition, although the petitioner contends that the beneficiary will be integral as an onsite staff member, and will continue to utilize the offshore project artifacts, tools, and methodologies for providing the remaining project tasks, this claim is insufficient to establish that the beneficiary possesses specialized knowledge or will be performing tasks that require specialized knowledge. The record does not demonstrate that the tasks described are not common to all systems analysts in the computer software application and development field. The described duties do not require advanced expertise or establish that the beneficiary possesses a special knowledge of the organizations functions and software application systems. Further, the petitioner states that the onsite tasks will consist of business requirement analysis, technical architecture requirements analysis, high-level design, and post delivery implementation and support services. There has been no evidence

submitted to establish that the tasks are so intricate that they require the services of one who possesses specialized knowledge in the field. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California, supra*. It appears that the description given is common to all computer firms in the software development business and does not differentiate the beneficiary from that of any other person employed as a systems analyst. Cf. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2004-05 edition, "Computer Systems Analysts, Database Administrators, and Computer Scientists" (online at <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos042.htm>).

In the instant case the petitioner has demonstrated that the beneficiary is skilled and familiar with connector technologies, procedures, and applications that are undoubtedly beneficial to the organization's processes. However, the plain meaning of the term "special" knowledge is knowledge or expertise beyond the ordinary in a particular field, process, or function. See section 214(c)(2)(B) of the Act. The petitioner has not submitted evidence sufficient to demonstrate that the beneficiary's duties involve knowledge or expertise beyond what is commonly held in his field. In addition, the petitioner notes that a training division has been built in India to accommodate training personnel to effectively assist clients, and that it maintains a regular rotational program to assure that all key personnel are in touch with the most current techniques and procedures of all of the various aspects of the organizations procedures and services. The petitioner also stated that 13 percent of the consultants in India and 8 percent of the consultants in the United States possess specialized knowledge acquired through training and experience at the foreign entity. However, the evidence does not establish the total number of consultants employed by the organization in relation to the percentage of employees trained, nor does the record reflect who among the employees and consultants are considered "key personnel."

In addition, the record does not establish that the beneficiary has advanced or special knowledge of the petitioning organization's product, procedures, or its application in U.S. and international markets. Counsel contends that the beneficiary's combined knowledge of the organization's proprietary products, namely Constellar Interfaces and Vitria Business Ware products is significant and qualifies as "specialized knowledge." Contrary to counsel's contention, a mere knowledge of an organization's proprietary products does not connote "special" knowledge where the individual is one of many employees privy to such information. Furthermore, any systems analyst would necessarily have knowledge of its company's proprietary products in order to function efficiently in the field. There has been no evidence, such as training certificates or official class rosters, submitted to demonstrate that the beneficiary received the claimed training from the foreign entity in the use of Constellar Interfaces or Vitria Business Ware products. Contrary to counsel's assertions, the beneficiary's knowledge of the company product, or of the processes and procedures of the foreign company, has not been shown to be substantially different from, or advanced in relation to that of any systems analyst of any software development firm. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Treasure Craft of California, supra*. Without supporting documentation, the assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaighena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

In accordance with the statutory definition of specialized knowledge, a beneficiary must possess "special" knowledge of the petitioner's product and its application in international markets, or an "advanced level" of knowledge of the petitioner's processes and procedures. See section 214(c)(2)(B) of the Act. Here, the evidence demonstrates that the beneficiary possesses the skill required to work as a systems analyst dealing with various software interface applications, not a special knowledge of the petitioner's processes and

procedures. In addition, computer software application training appears to be readily available within the organization. There has been no independent documentary evidence submitted to establish that any computer technician within the United States cannot be trained to perform tasks performed by the beneficiary within a reasonable period of time so as not to negatively effect the overall operations of the U.S. and foreign entities.

Furthermore, the petitioner's description of the beneficiary's job duties fails to establish that an individual who possesses specialized knowledge is necessary for the proposed systems analyst position in the United States. Additionally, the qualifications necessary for the beneficiary to successfully perform his job as a systems analyst appear to be standard for the industry. Cf. *Occupational Outlook Handbook, supra*. The petitioner asserted that the maintenance and production support of the technological applications require a high degree of skill, expertise, knowledge and relevant experience, and that the organization has set up training facilities to accommodate these requirements. It is thereby reasonable to conclude that the beneficiary's educational background and claimed in-house training is equivalent to that of others within the field, and not, per se, uncommon or unique. Accordingly, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary would be employed in a specialized knowledge position or that the position requires an individual with specialized knowledge.

On appeal, counsel also referred to a 1988 INS memorandum as a guide for interpreting the statutory definition of specialized knowledge. See Memo, Norton, Assoc. Comm., Examinations (Oct. 27, 1988), reprinted in *65 Interpreter Releases 1194 (Nov. 7, 1988)*. In the memorandum, the Commissioner noted four characteristics of employees with "specialized knowledge," which counsel uses to emphasize that the beneficiary's training and experience in the software development and maintenance processes establishes that the beneficiary's knowledge differs from that generally found in the computer software application and development industry. The beneficiary's ability to execute software development and maintenance processes does not by itself establish that the beneficiary's knowledge is different from that generally found in the industry. In *Matter of Penner*, the Commissioner emphasized that the specialized knowledge worker classification was not intended for "all employees with any level of specialized knowledge." 18 I&N Dec. 49 (Comm. 1982). According to *Matter of Penner*, "[s]uch a conclusion would permit extremely large numbers of persons to qualify for the 'L-1' visa" rather than just the "key" personnel that Congress specifically intended. With regard to counsel's reliance on the 1988 Associate Commissioner's memorandum, the memorandum was intended as a guide for employees and will not supercede the plain language of the statute or the regulations. Therefore, by itself, counsel's assertion that the beneficiary's qualifications are analogous to the examples outlined in the memorandum is insufficient to establish the beneficiary's qualification for classification as a specialized knowledge professional. As discussed, the petitioner has not submitted probative evidence to establish that the beneficiary's knowledge is uncommon, noteworthy, or distinguished by some unusual quality and not generally known in the alien's field of endeavor.

While the AAO acknowledges that the specialized knowledge classification is not solely for those "relatively rare employees with unusual knowledge," the legislative history for the term "specialized knowledge" provides ample support for a restrictive interpretation of the term. In *1756, Inc. v. Attorney General*, 745 F. Supp. 9 (D.D.C. 1990), the court upheld the denial of an L-1 petition for a chef, where the petitioner claimed that the chef possessed specialized knowledge. The court noted that the legislative history demonstrated a concern that the L-1 category would become too large: "The class of persons eligible for such nonimmigrant visas is narrowly drawn and will be carefully regulated and monitored by the Immigration and Naturalization Service." *Id.* at 16 (citing H.R. REP. No. 91-851, 1970 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2750, 2754, 1970 WL 5815). The court stated, "[I]n light of Congress' intent that the L-1 category should be limited, it was reasonable for the INS to conclude that specialized knowledge capacity should not extend to all employees with specialized knowledge.

On this score, the legislative history provides some guidance: Congress referred to ‘key personnel’ and executives.” *1756, Inc.*, 745 F. Supp. at 16.

Similarly, in *Matter of Penner*, the Commissioner emphasized that the specialized knowledge worker classification was not intended for “all employees with any level of specialized knowledge.” 18 I&N Dec. 49 (Comm. 1982). According to *Matter of Penner*, “[s]uch a conclusion would permit extremely large numbers of persons to qualify for the ‘L-1’ visa” rather than the “key personnel” that Congress specifically intended. *Id.* at 53. In accordance with the statute and the legislative history, it would be inappropriate to expand the visa category to allow the entry of any personnel who already had knowledge of a petitioner’s operations.¹

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. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed

¹ The precedent decision *Matter of Penner* pre-dates the 1990 amendment to the definition of “specialized knowledge.” Other than deleting the former requirement that specialized knowledge had to be “proprietary,” however, the 1990 amendment did not greatly alter the definition of the term. In particular, the 1990 Committee Report does not even support the claim that Congress “rejected” the INS interpretation of “specialized knowledge.” The 1990 Committee Report does not criticize, and does not even refer to, any specific INS regulation or precedent decision interpreting the term. The Committee Report simply states that the Committee was recommending a statutory definition because of “[v]arying,” [*i.e.*, not specifically incorrect], “interpretations by INS,” H. Rep. No. 101-723(I), *supra*, at 69, 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. at 6749. Beyond that, the Committee Report simply restates the tautology that became § 214(c)(2)(B) of the Act. *Id.* The AAO concludes, therefore, that *Matter of Penner* remains useful guidance concerning the intended scope of the “specialized knowledge” L-1B classification.