

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090  
Washington, DC 20529-2090



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



B6

DATE: **APR 18 2011**

Office: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER

FILE:


SRC-08-007-54379

IN RE:           Petitioner:  
                  Beneficiary:



PETITION:     Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to  
                  Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew  
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition, which is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be sustained and the petition will be approved.

The petitioner is an information processing, manufacturer, sales and services company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an advisory engineer. As required by statute, a Form ETA 750,<sup>1</sup> Application for Alien Employment Certification (Form ETA 750), approved by the Department of Labor (the DOL), accompanied the petition. Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary satisfied the minimum level of education stated on the labor certification.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The record shows that the appeal is properly filed, timely and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. The procedural history in this case is documented by the record and incorporated into the decision. Further elaboration of the procedural history will be made only as necessary. The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.<sup>2</sup>

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least two years training or experience), not of a temporary nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii), also provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions.

To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's priority date. *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). The priority date of the petition is March 22, 2005, which is the date the labor certification was accepted for processing by the DOL. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).<sup>3</sup> The Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Form I-140) was filed on August 14, 2007.

---

<sup>1</sup> After March 28, 2005, the correct form to apply for labor certification is the Form ETA 9089. *See* 69 Fed. Reg. 77325, 77326 (Dec. 27, 2004).

<sup>2</sup> The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1). The record in the instant case provides no reason to preclude consideration of any of the documents newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

<sup>3</sup> If the petition is approved, the priority date is also used in conjunction with the Visa Bulletin issued by the Department of State to determine when a beneficiary can apply for adjustment of status or for an immigrant visa abroad. Thus, the importance of reviewing the *bona fides* of a job opportunity as of the priority date is clear.

The job qualifications for the certified position of advisory engineer are found on Form ETA 750 Part A. Item 13 describes the job duties to be performed as follows:

Interface with independent software vendors on MCAD (mechanical computer aided design) aided engineering. Plan, engineer, enable and test professional applications and solutions on systems and workstations. Ensure performance optimization, certification availability and competitive quality. Establish relationship with vendors. Provide architecture and plan to vendors. Provide technical support to customers. Utilize MCAD, OpenGL, Linux, X Windows and C/C++.

The minimum education, training, experience and skills required to perform the duties of the offered position are set forth at Part A of the labor certification and reflects the following requirements:

Block 14:

Education (number of years)

Grade school	X
High school	X
College	X
College Degree Required	U.S. or foreign equivalent Bachelor's Degree
Major Field of Study	Computer Science or Engineering*

Experience:

Job Offered (or) Related Occupation	2 years 2 years in IT Engineer, Technical Lead or Systems Analyst
---	--

Block 15:

Other Special Requirements \*Employer will accept a Bachelor's Degree plus two (2) years of experience in Information Technology field as meeting the degree requirement.

As set forth above, the proffered position requires a U.S. or foreign equivalent Bachelor's degree in computer science or engineering and two years of experience in the job offered or related occupations such as IT engineer, technical lead or systems analyst. The employer would accept a combination of a bachelor's degree and two years of experience in information technology filed in lieu of the U.S. or foreign equivalent bachelor's degree in computer science or engineering.

On Part B of the labor certification, signed by the beneficiary, the beneficiary listed his prior education as: he attended Tokyo Metropolitan University in Japan from April 1989 to March 1993 and received a bachelor's degree in political science. The Form ETA 750B also reflects the beneficiary's experience as follows: he worked for IBM Japan Ltd. as a systems engineer from April 1993 to April 2000, and as a technical lead from April 2000 to April 2001; and he has been working for the petitioner in the proffered position since May 2001.

In support of the beneficiary's educational qualifications, the record contains a copy of the beneficiary's diploma from Tokyo Metropolitan University. It indicates that the beneficiary was awarded a Bachelor of Arts in Politics on March 25, 1993. The record also contains a copy of a credentials evaluation, dated April 28, 2005, from The Trustforte Corporation. The evaluation describes the beneficiary's diploma from Tokyo Metropolitan University as a Bachelor of Arts degree in political science and concludes that it is equivalent to a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Political Science from an accredited US college or university.

The director denied the petition on September 30, 2008. The director determined that the beneficiary's bachelor of arts degree in political science did not meet the certified Form ETA 750's requirement of a bachelor's degree in computer science or engineering.

On appeal, with regard to the beneficiary's qualifying academic credentials, counsel submitted copies of the beneficiary's educational documents and the evaluation and claims that the item 15 of the Form ETA 750 clearly indicates that the employer will accept a bachelor's degree plus two years of experience in the IT area. Counsel asserts that the beneficiary qualifies for the proffered position under the skilled worker category.

The occupational classification of the offered position is not one of the occupations statutorily defined as a profession at section 101(a)(32) of the Act, which states: "The term 'profession' shall include but not be limited to architects, engineers, lawyers, physicians, surgeons, and teachers in elementary or secondary schools, colleges, academies, or seminaries." The proffered position is not listed in section 101(a)(32).

Part A of the ETA 750 indicates that the DOL assigned the occupational code of 15-1032 and title "Computer Software Engineer, Systems Software" to the proffered position. The DOL's occupational codes are assigned based on normalized occupational standards. The occupational classification of the offered position is determined by the DOL (or applicable State Workforce Agency) during the labor certification process, and the applicable occupational classification code is noted on the labor certification form. O\*NET is the current occupational classification system used by the DOL. Located online at <http://online.onetcenter.org>, O\*NET is described as "the nation's primary source of occupational information, providing comprehensive information on key attributes and characteristics of workers and occupations." O\*NET incorporates the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system, which is designed to cover all occupations in the United States.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>See <http://www.bls.gov/soc/socguide.htm>.

In the instant case, the DOL categorized the offered position under the SOC code 15--1032.00. The O\*NET online database states that this occupation falls within Job Zone Four.<sup>5</sup>

According to the DOL, two to four years of work-related skill, knowledge, or experience are needed for Job Zone 4 occupations. The DOL assigns a standard vocational preparation (SVP) of 7 to Job Zone 4 occupations, which means “[m]ost of these occupations require a four-year bachelor’s degree, but some do not.” See <http://online.onetcenter.org/link/summary/15-1032.00> (accessed March 22, 2011). Additionally, the DOL states the following concerning the training and overall experience required for these occupations:

A considerable amount of work-related skill, knowledge, or experience is needed for these occupations. For example, an accountant must complete four years of college and work for several years in accounting to be considered qualified. Employees in these occupations usually need several years of work-related experience, on-the-job training, and/or vocational training.

*See id.* Because of the requirements of the proffered position and the DOL’s standard occupational requirements, the proffered position is for a professional, but might also be considered under the skilled worker category. The instant petition was filed checking box e in Part 2 of the Form I-140 which includes both professional category and skilled worker category. In response to the director’s notice of intent to deny (NOID) dated August 7, 2008, counsel claimed that in the alternative, the beneficiary also qualifies for the proffered position pursuant to the skilled worker category, EB31.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) states the following:

If the petition is for a professional, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien holds a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree and by evidence that the alien is a member of the professions. Evidence of a baccalaureate degree shall be in the form of an official college or university record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study. To show that the alien is a member of the professions, the petitioner must submit evidence that the minimum of a baccalaureate degree is required for entry into the occupation.

The above regulation uses a singular description of foreign equivalent degree. Thus, the plain meaning of the regulatory language concerning the professional classification sets forth the requirement that a beneficiary must produce one degree that is determined to be the foreign

---

<sup>5</sup>According to O\*NET, most of the occupations in Job Zone Four require a four-year bachelor's degree. <http://online.onetcenter.org/help/online/zones> (accessed March 22, 2011).

equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate degree in order to be qualified as a professional for third preference visa category purposes.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. 204(5)(1)(3)(ii)(B) states the following:

If the petition is for a skilled worker, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien meets the educational, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification, meets the requirements for Schedule A designation, or meets the requirements for the Labor Market Information Pilot Program occupation designation. The minimum requirements for this classification are at least two years of training or experience.

The above regulation requires that the alien meet the requirements of the labor certification.

Because the petition's proffered position qualifies for consideration under both the professional and skilled worker categories, the AAO will apply the regulatory requirements from both provisions to the facts of the case at hand, beginning with the professional category.

Initially, however, we will provide an explanation of the general process of procuring an employment-based immigrant visa and the roles and respective authority of both agencies involved.

As noted above, the Form ETA 750 in this matter is certified by the DOL. Thus, at the outset, it is useful to discuss the DOL's role in this process. Section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act provides:

In general.-Any alien who seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor is inadmissible, unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General that-

(I) there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified (or equally qualified in the case of an alien described in clause (ii)) and available at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place where the alien is to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, and

(II) the employment of such alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed.

It is significant that none of the above inquiries assigned to the DOL, or the remaining regulations implementing these duties under 20 C.F.R. § 656, involve a determination as to whether the position and the alien are qualified for a specific immigrant classification. This fact has not gone unnoticed by Federal Circuit Courts.

There is no doubt that the authority to make preference classification decisions rests with INS. The language of section 204 cannot be read otherwise. See *Castaneda-Gonzalez v. INS*, 564 F.2d 417, 429 (D.C. Cir. 1977). In turn, DOL

has the authority to make the two determinations listed in section 212(a)(14).<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 423. The necessary result of these two grants of authority is that section 212(a)(14) determinations are not subject to review by INS absent fraud or willful misrepresentation, but all matters relating to preference classification eligibility not expressly delegated to DOL remain within INS' authority.

\* \* \*

Given the language of the Act, the totality of the legislative history, and the agencies' own interpretations of their duties under the Act, we must conclude that Congress did not intend DOL to have primary authority to make any determinations other than the two stated in section 212(a)(14). If DOL is to analyze alien qualifications, it is for the purpose of "matching" them with those of corresponding United States workers so that it will then be "in a position to meet the requirement of the law," namely the section 212(a)(14) determinations.

*Madany v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008, 1012-1013 (D.C. Cir. 1983).

Relying in part on *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008, the Ninth circuit stated:

[I]t appears that the DOL is responsible only for determining the availability of suitable American workers for a job and the impact of alien employment upon the domestic labor market. It does not appear that the DOL's role extends to determining if the alien is qualified for the job for which he seeks sixth preference status. That determination appears to be delegated to the INS under section 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b), as one of the determinations incident to the INS's decision whether the alien is entitled to sixth preference status.

*K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983). The court relied on an amicus brief from the DOL that stated the following:

The labor certification made by the Secretary of Labor ... pursuant to section 212(a)(14) of the ... [Act] ... is binding as to the findings of whether there are able, willing, qualified, and available United States workers for the job offered to the alien, and whether employment of the alien under the terms set by the employer would adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed United States workers. *The labor certification in no way indicates that the alien offered the certified job opportunity is qualified (or not qualified) to perform the duties of that job.*

(Emphasis added.) *Id.* at 1009. The Ninth Circuit, citing *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006, revisited this issue, stating:

---

<sup>6</sup> Based on revisions to the Act, the current citation is section 212(a)(5)(A) as set forth above.

The Department of Labor ("DOL") must certify that insufficient domestic workers are available to perform the job and that the alien's performance of the job will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed domestic workers. *Id.* § 212(a)(14), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(14). The INS then makes its own determination of the alien's entitlement to sixth preference status. *Id.* § 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b). *See generally K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 9th Cir.1983).

The INS, therefore, may make a *de novo* determination of whether the alien is in fact qualified to fill the certified job offer.

*Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman*, 736 F. 2d 1305, 1309 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984).

Therefore, it is the DOL's responsibility to certify the terms of the labor certification, but it is the responsibility of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to determine if the petition and the alien beneficiary are eligible for the classification sought. For classification as a member of the professions, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) requires that the alien had a U.S. baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree and be a member of the professions. Additionally, the regulation requires the submission of "an official *college or university* record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study." (Emphasis added.)

In 1991, when the final rule for 8 C.F.R. § 204.5 was published in the Federal Register, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (the Service), responded to criticism that the regulation required an alien to have a bachelor's degree as a minimum and that the regulation did not allow for the substitution of experience for education. After reviewing section 121 of the Immigration Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-649 (1990), and the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference, the Service specifically noted that both the Act and the legislative history indicate that an alien must have at least a bachelor's degree: "[B]oth the Act and its legislative history make clear that, in order to qualify as a professional under the third classification or to have experience equating to an advanced degree under the second, *an alien must have at least a bachelor's degree.*" 56 Fed. Reg. 60897, 60900 (November 29, 1991)(emphasis added).

Moreover, it is significant that both the statute, section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, and relevant regulations use the word "degree" in relation to professionals. A statute should be construed under the assumption that Congress intended it to have purpose and meaningful effect. *Mountain States Tel. & Tel. v. Pueblo of Santa Ana*, 472 U.S. 237, 249 (1985); *Sutton v. United States*, 819 F.2d. 1289m 1295 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987). It can be presumed that Congress' narrow requirement in of a "degree" for members of the professions is deliberate. Significantly, in another context, Congress has broadly referenced "the possession of a degree, diploma, certificate, or similar award from a college, university, school, or other institution of learning." Section 203(b)(2)(C) (relating to aliens of exceptional ability). Thus, the requirement at section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) that an eligible alien both have a baccalaureate "degree" and be a member of the professions reveals that a member of the professions must have a *degree* and that a diploma or certificate from an institution of learning other than a college or university is a potentially similar

but distinct type of credential. Thus, even if we did not require “a” degree that is the foreign equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate degree, we would not consider education earned at an institution other than a college or university.

The petitioner in this matter relies on the beneficiary’s combined education and work experience to reach the “equivalent” of a degree in computer science or engineering, which is not a bachelor’s degree based on a single degree in the required field listed on the certified labor certification.

There is no provision in the statute or the regulations that would allow a beneficiary to qualify under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act with anything less than a full baccalaureate degree. More specifically, a three-year bachelor’s degree will not be considered to be the “foreign equivalent degree” to a United States baccalaureate degree. A United States baccalaureate degree is generally found to require four years of education. *Matter of Shah*, 17 I&N Dec. 244 (Reg. Comm. 1977). Where the analysis of the beneficiary’s credentials relies on work experience alone or a combination of multiple lesser degrees, the result is the “equivalent” of a bachelor’s degree rather than a single-source “foreign equivalent degree.” In order to have experience and education equating to a bachelor’s degree in the required field under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, the beneficiary must have a single degree that is the “foreign equivalent degree” to a United States baccalaureate degree in the required field.

The beneficiary’s bachelor of arts degree in political science from Tokyo Metropolitan University alone is not a foreign equivalent degree in the required field. Because the beneficiary does not have a “United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree,” from a college or university in the required field of study listed on the certified labor certification, the beneficiary does not qualify for preference visa classification under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act as he does not have the minimum level of education required for the equivalent of a bachelor’s degree in the required field. Therefore, the director’s decision denying the instant petition under the professional category must be affirmed.

However, to determine whether a beneficiary is eligible for a preference immigrant visa under the skilled worker category, USCIS must ascertain whether the alien is, in fact, qualified for the certified job. USCIS will not accept a degree equivalency or an unrelated degree when a labor certification plainly and expressly requires a candidate with a specific degree. In evaluating the beneficiary’s qualifications, USCIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. USCIS may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. *See Matter of Silver Dragon Chinese Restaurant*, 19 I&N Dec. 401, 406 (Comm. 1986). *See also, Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008; *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006; *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981).

Where the job requirements in a labor certification are not otherwise unambiguously prescribed, e.g., by professional regulation, USCIS must examine “the language of the labor certification job requirements” in order to determine what the petitioner must demonstrate about the beneficiary’s qualifications. *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1015. The only rational manner by which USCIS can be

expected to interpret the meaning of terms used to describe the requirements of a job in a labor certification is to “examine the certified job offer *exactly* as it is completed by the prospective employer.” *Rosedale Linden Park Company v. Smith*, 595 F. Supp. 829, 833 (D.D.C. 1984)(emphasis added). USCIS’s interpretation of the job’s requirements, as stated on the labor certification must involve “reading and applying *the plain language* of the [labor certification application form].” *Id.* at 834 (emphasis added). USCIS cannot and should not reasonably be expected to look beyond the plain language of the labor certification that the DOL has formally issued or otherwise attempt to divine the employer’s intentions through some sort of reverse engineering of the labor certification.

Further, the employer’s subjective intent may not be dispositive of the meaning of the actual minimum requirements of the proffered position. *Maramjaya v. USCIS*, Civ. Act. No. 06-2158, 14 n. 7. Thus, USCIS agrees that the best evidence of the petitioner’s intent concerning the actual minimum educational requirements of the proffered position is evidence of how it expressed those requirements to the DOL during the labor certification process and not afterwards to USCIS. The timing of such evidence is needed to ensure inflation of those requirements is not occurring in an effort to fit the beneficiary’s credentials into requirements that do not seem on their face to include what the beneficiary has.

In the instant matter, the Form ETA 750 clearly provides that the minimum academic requirements of a bachelor’s degree in computer science or engineering might be met through a combination of a bachelor’s degree and two years of experience in the IT industry. The plain meaning of the language indicates that the employer would accept two years of experience in the IT industry lieu of the computer science or engineering major.

The beneficiary has a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree in political science and more than two years of experience as an IT engineer, technical lead or systems analyst, which meets the bachelor’s degree in computer science or engineering requirements under the Item 15 of the labor certification. The record contains a letter dated October 28, 2008, from the petitioner to verify the beneficiary’s employment with the petitioner and its affiliate company in Japan as a systems engineer/analyst, technical lead and advisory engineer for more than 10 years from April 1993 to the priority date. The letter is from the beneficiary’s current and former employer and includes the name, address, and title of the writer, and a specific description of the duties performed by the beneficiary, and thus, meets the requirements set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(1) and (l)(3)(ii)(A).

Therefore, the AAO finds that with the evidence submitted on appeal, the petitioner has established that the beneficiary possessed a bachelor’s degree, two years of experience in information technology field and two years of experience in the job offered or related occupation as an IT engineer, technical lead or systems analyst, and thus, qualifies for preference visa classification under section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act as a skilled worker. The petition will be approved under the skilled category.

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 met that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is sustained. The petition is approved.