


(b)(6)

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




DATE: **NOV 26 2013**

OFFICE: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

FILE: 

IN RE:

Petitioner: 

Beneficiary:

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

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) in your case.

This is a non-precedent decision. The AAO does not announce new constructions of law nor establish agency policy through non-precedent decisions. If you believe the AAO incorrectly applied current law or policy to your case or if you seek to present new facts for consideration, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen, respectively. Any motion must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) within 33 days of the date of this decision. **Please review the Form I-290B instructions at <http://www.uscis.gov/forms> for the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements.** See also 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file a motion directly with the AAO.**

Thank you,

  
Ron Rosenberg

Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The Director, Nebraska Service Center (the director), denied the immigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner<sup>1</sup> describes itself as an IT services and business solutions firm. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a business systems analyst. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i).<sup>2</sup> The petition is accompanied by an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification (labor certification), certified by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). The priority date of the petition, which is the date the DOL accepted the labor certification for processing, is October 12, 2010. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).

The director's decision denying the petition concludes that the beneficiary did not possess the minimum qualifications as required by the terms of the labor certification. Specifically, the director found that the beneficiary did not possess a four-year bachelor's degree.

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 conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.<sup>3</sup> On appeal, counsel submits a brief and copies of documentation already in the record.

---

<sup>1</sup> The petitioner is a different entity from the employer listed on the labor certification, [REDACTED]. A labor certification is only valid for the particular job opportunity stated on the application form. 20 C.F.R. § 656.30(c). If the petitioner is a different entity than the labor certification employer, then it must establish that it is a successor-in-interest to that entity. *See Matter of Dial Auto Repair Shop, Inc.*, 19 I&N Dec. 481 (Comm'r 1986). The AAO finds that the petitioner is the successor-in-interest to Sierra Atlantic, as the petitioner has described and documented the transaction transferring ownership of all, or a relevant part, of [REDACTED] to a wholly-owned subsidiary of [REDACTED] in December 2010, and later to [REDACTED] effective January 1, 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable 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.

<sup>3</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 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).

At the outset, it is important to discuss the respective roles of the DOL and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) in the employment-based immigrant visa process. As noted above, the labor certification in this matter is certified by the DOL. The DOL's role in this process is set forth at section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act, which provides:

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 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>4</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.

---

<sup>4</sup> Based on revisions to the Act, the current citation is section 212(a)(5)(A).

*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 (9th 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:

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 (9th Cir. 1984).

Therefore, it is the DOL's responsibility to determine whether there are qualified U.S. workers available to perform the offered position, and whether the employment of the beneficiary will adversely affect similarly employed U.S. workers. It is the responsibility of USCIS to determine if

the beneficiary qualifies for the offered position, and whether the offered position and beneficiary are eligible for the requested employment-based immigrant visa classification.

In the instant case, the petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as a skilled worker pursuant to section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Act, which provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable 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. *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(2).

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

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 [labor certification]. The minimum requirements for this classification are at least two years of training or experience.

The beneficiary must meet all of the requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification by the priority date of the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977); *see also Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971).

The determination of whether a petition may be approved for a skilled worker is based on the requirements of the job offered as set forth on the labor certification. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(4). The labor certification must require at least two years of training and/or experience. Relevant post-secondary education may be considered as training. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(2).

Accordingly, a petition for a skilled worker must establish that the job offer portion of the labor certification requires at least two years of training and/or experience, and the beneficiary meets all of the requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification.

In evaluating 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 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 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].” *Id.* at 834 (emphasis added). USCIS cannot and should not reasonably be expected to look beyond the plain language of the labor certification or otherwise attempt to divine the employer’s intentions through some sort of reverse engineering of the labor certification.

In the instant case, the labor certification states that the offered position has the following minimum requirements:

- H.4. Education: Master’s degree in Accounting.
- H.5. Training: None required.
- H.6. Experience in the job offered: None required.
- H.7. Alternate field of study: Information Systems, Science or Engineering.
- H.8. Alternate combination of education and experience: Bachelor’s degree plus 5 years of related, post-Bachelor’s, progressive experience.
- H.9. Foreign educational equivalent: Accepted.
- H.10. Experience in an alternate occupation: 60 months as a consultant, engineer or analyst. 60 months of related, post-bachelor’s, progressive related experience.
- H.14. Specific skills or other requirements: None. Note: any suitable combination of education, training or experience is acceptable.

In the instant case, the labor certification states that the beneficiary possesses a Bachelor’s degree in accounting from the [redacted] completed in 1997.

The record contains a copy of the beneficiary’s bachelor of commerce diploma and transcripts from [redacted] India, completed in 1993. The record contains a copy of the beneficiary’s certificate of membership from [redacted] indicating that the beneficiary was admitted as an Associate of [redacted] on April 1, 1997. Transcripts indicate that the beneficiary completed the [redacted] final exam in November 1996.

The record contains an evaluation of the beneficiary’s educational credentials prepared by [redacted] for [redacted] on May 18, 2010. The evaluation states that the beneficiary’s bachelor of commerce represents the academic equivalent of three years of undergraduate study in business administration at a regionally accredited institution in the United States and that her certificate of membership in [redacted] represents the academic equivalent of a Bachelor’s degree in accounting from a regionally accredited institution in the United States.

The record also contains an evaluation of the beneficiary’s educational credentials prepared by [redacted] for [redacted] on October 27, 2011. The evaluation states that the beneficiary’s bachelor of commerce and membership in [redacted] represent the equivalent of a Bachelor of Arts degree in accounting from an accredited institution of higher education in the United States.

USCIS may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinions statements submitted as expert testimony. *See Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791, 795 (Commr. 1988). However, USCIS is ultimately responsible for making the final determination regarding an alien's eligibility for the benefit sought. *Id.* The submission of letters from experts supporting the petition is not presumptive evidence of eligibility. USCIS may evaluate the content of the letters as to whether they support the alien's eligibility. *See id.* at 795. USCIS may give less weight to an opinion that is not corroborated, in accord with other information or is in any way questionable. *Id.* at 795. *See also Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Commr. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Commr. 1972)); *Matter of D-R-*, 25 I&N Dec. 445 (BIA 2011) (expert witness testimony may be given different weight depending on the extent of the expert's qualifications or the relevance, reliability, and probative value of the testimony).

The petitioner relies on the beneficiary's three-year bachelor's degree combined with her membership in ICAI as being equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree. A three-year bachelor's degree will generally not be considered to be a "foreign equivalent degree" to a U.S. baccalaureate. *See Matter of Shah*, 17 I&N Dec. 244 (Reg. Comm. 1977). Where the analysis of the beneficiary's credentials relies on a combination of lesser degrees and/or work experience, the result is the "equivalent" of a bachelor's degree rather than a full U.S. baccalaureate or foreign equivalent degree required for classification as a professional.

The AAO has reviewed the Electronic Database for Global Education (EDGE) created by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). According to its website, AACRAO is "a nonprofit, voluntary, professional association of more than 11,000 higher education admissions and registration professionals who represent more than 2,600 institutions and agencies in the United States and in over 40 countries around the world." *See* <http://www.aacrao.org/About-AACRAO.aspx>. Its mission "is to serve and advance higher education by providing leadership in academic and enrollment services." *Id.* EDGE is "a web-based resource for the evaluation of foreign educational credentials." *See* <http://edge.aacrao.org/info.php>. Authors for EDGE must work with a publication consultant and a Council Liaison with AACRAO's National Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Educational Credentials.<sup>5</sup> If placement recommendations are included, the Council Liaison works with the author to give feedback and the publication is subject to final review by the entire Council. *Id.* USCIS considers EDGE to be a reliable, peer-reviewed source of information about foreign credentials equivalencies.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> *See An Author's Guide to Creating AACRAO International Publications* available at [http://www.aacrao.org/Libraries/Publications\\_Documents/GUIDE\\_TO\\_CREATING\\_INTERNATIONAL\\_PUBLICATIONS\\_1.sflb.ashx](http://www.aacrao.org/Libraries/Publications_Documents/GUIDE_TO_CREATING_INTERNATIONAL_PUBLICATIONS_1.sflb.ashx).

<sup>6</sup> In *Confluence Intern., Inc. v. Holder*, 2009 WL 825793 (D.Minn. March 27, 2009), the court determined that the AAO provided a rational explanation for its reliance on information provided by AACRAO to support its decision. In *Tisco Group, Inc. v. Napolitano*, 2010 WL 3464314 (E.D.Mich. August 30, 2010), the court found that USCIS had properly weighed the evaluations submitted and the information obtained from EDGE to conclude that the alien's three-year foreign "baccalaureate" and foreign "Master's" degree were only comparable to a U.S. bachelor's degree.

According to EDGE, a three-year Bachelor of Commerce degree from India is comparable to “three years of university study in the United States.”

EDGE confirms that [REDACTED] associate membership upon passing the [REDACTED] final examination represents attainment of a level of education comparable to a bachelor’s degree in the United States.

In response to a request for evidence (RFE) issued by the AAO on September 13, 2013, the petitioner submitted an evaluation of the beneficiary’s educational credentials prepared by AACRAO confirming that the beneficiary’s [REDACTED] associate membership is comparable to a bachelor’s degree in the United States. Counsel contends that the beneficiary’s associate membership in [REDACTED] is equivalent to a bachelor’s degree and provides copies of AAO cases; however, the AAO cases submitted by counsel are non-precedent decisions.

Although AACRAO and EDGE confirm that the [REDACTED] final examination is comparable to a U.S. bachelor’s degree, [REDACTED] is not an academic institution that can confer an actual degree with an official college or university record. *See Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, 2006 WL 3491005 11 (D. Ore. Nov. 30, 2006) (finding USCIS was justified in concluding that [REDACTED] membership was not a college or university “degree” for purposes of classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree). While no degree is required for the skilled worker classification, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(B) provides that a petition for an alien in this classification must be accompanied by evidence that the beneficiary “meets the education, training or experience, and any other requirements of the individual labor certification.” Thus, the singular degree requirement is not applicable to skilled workers and the regulation governing skilled workers only requires that the beneficiary meet the requirements of the labor certification. As noted previously, the certified ETA Form 9089 requires a bachelor’s degree in Accounting, Information Systems, Science or Engineering. The record contains documentary evidence showing the beneficiary in the instant petition passed the [REDACTED] final exam and was awarded a certificate of membership as an associate of the [REDACTED]. However, the AAO finds that the petitioner did not state in the labor certification that it would accept membership in [REDACTED] as a foreign educational equivalent to a U.S. bachelor’s degree in Accounting, Information Systems, Science or Engineering.

---

In *Sunshine Rehab Services, Inc.* 2010 WL 3325442 (E.D.Mich. August 20, 2010), the court upheld a USCIS determination that the alien’s three-year bachelor’s degree was not a foreign equivalent degree to a U.S. bachelor’s degree. Specifically, the court concluded that USCIS was entitled to prefer the information in EDGE and did not abuse its discretion in reaching its conclusion. The court also noted that the labor certification itself required a degree and did not allow for the combination of education and experience.

The labor certification does not permit a lesser degree, a combination of lesser degrees, and/or associate membership in [REDACTED], such as that possessed by the beneficiary.<sup>7</sup> Nonetheless, the AAO RFE permitted the petitioner to submit any evidence that it intended the labor certification to require an alternative to a U.S. bachelor's degree or a single foreign equivalent degree, as that intent was explicitly and specifically expressed during the labor certification process to the DOL and to potentially qualified U.S. workers.<sup>8</sup> Specifically, the AAO requested that the petitioner provide a copy of the signed recruitment report required by 20 C.F.R. § 656, together with copies of the prevailing wage determination, all recruitment conducted for the position, the posted notice of the filing of the labor certification, and all resumes received in response to the recruitment efforts.

Counsel asserts that the language in Section H.14 of the ETA Form 9089 (Note: any suitable combination of education, training or experience is acceptable) demonstrates the petitioner's intent to accept less than a four-year bachelor's degree for the offered position. Specifically, counsel asserts that a DOL Board of Alien Labor Certification Appeals (BALCA) case is applicable to the instant petition (*Francis Kellogg*, 94-INA-465 (BALCA 1998)). Counsel does not state how DOL precedent is binding in these proceedings. While 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that precedent decisions of USCIS are binding on all its employees in the administration of the Act, BALCA decisions are not

---

<sup>7</sup> The DOL has provided the following field guidance: "When an equivalent degree or alternative work experience is acceptable, the employer must specifically state on the [labor certification] as well as throughout all phases of recruitment exactly what will be considered equivalent or alternative in order to qualify for the job." See Memo. from Anna C. Hall, Acting Regl. Adminstr., U.S. Dep't. of Labor's Empl. & Training Administration, to SESA and JTPA Adminstrs., U.S. Dep't. of Labor's Empl. & Training Administration, Interpretation of "Equivalent Degree," 2 (June 13, 1994). The DOL's certification of job requirements stating that "a certain amount and kind of experience is the equivalent of a college degree does in no way bind [USCIS] to accept the employer's definition." See Ltr. From Paul R. Nelson, Certifying Officer, U.S. Dept. of Labor's Empl. & Training Administration, to Lynda Won-Chung, Esq., Jackson & Hertogs (March 9, 1993). The DOL has also stated that "[w]hen the term equivalent is used in conjunction with a degree, we understand to mean the employer is willing to accept an equivalent foreign degree." See Ltr. From Paul R. Nelson, Certifying Officer, U.S. Dept. of Labor's Empl. & Training Administration, to Joseph Thomas, INS (October 27, 1992). To our knowledge, these field guidance memoranda have not been rescinded.

<sup>8</sup> In limited circumstances, USCIS may consider a petitioner's intent to determine the meaning of an unclear or ambiguous term in the labor certification. However, an employer's subjective intent may not be dispositive of the meaning of the actual minimum requirements of the offered position. See *Maramjaya v. USCIS*, Civ. Act No. 06-2158 (D.D.C. Mar. 26, 2008). The best evidence of the petitioner's intent concerning the actual minimum educational requirements of the offered 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 ensures that the stated requirements of the offered position as set forth on the labor certification are not incorrectly expanded in an effort to fit the beneficiary's credentials. Such a result would undermine Congress' intent to limit the issuance of immigrant visas in the professional and skilled worker classifications to when there are no qualified U.S. workers available to perform the offered position. See *Id.* at 14.

similarly binding. Precedent decisions must be designated and published in bound volumes or as interim decisions. 8 C.F.R. § 103.9(a). Further, the language cited by counsel is required by the DOL regulations at 20 CFR § 656.17(h)(4)(ii):

If the alien beneficiary already is employed by the employer, and the alien does not meet the primary job requirements and only potentially qualifies for the job by virtue of the employer's alternative requirements, certification will be denied unless the application states that any suitable combination of education, training or experience is acceptable.

Counsel's assertion that the alternative requirements for the proffered position are specified in Items H-14 and H-8B are without merit. The fact that the petitioner chose to include this required language on the ETA Form 9089 in these sections does not assist the AAO in identifying how the petitioner defined the alternative requirements.

Given the history of the *Kellogg* language requirement at 20 C.F.R. § 656.17(h)(4)(ii), the AAO does not generally interpret this phrase when included as a response to Part H, Question 14, to mean that the employer would accept lesser qualifications than the stated primary and alternative requirements on the labor certification. To do so would make the actual minimum requirements of the offered position impossible to discern, it would render largely meaningless the stated primary and alternative requirements of the offered position on the labor certification, and it would potentially make any labor certification with alternative requirements ineligible for classification as an advanced degree professional. In other words, the AAO does not consider the presence of *Kellogg* language in a labor certification to have any material effect on the interpretation of the minimum requirements of the job.

Counsel provided copies of the notice(s) of Internet and newspaper advertisements and recruitment, however, they all fail to advise the DOL or otherwise qualified U.S. workers that the educational requirements for the job may be met through a quantitatively lesser degree or defined equivalency. Specifically, the newspaper advertisements advertise numerous jobs available with the petitioner. The advertisements do not include the minimum requirements and provide only brief descriptions of the proffered position's duties. In addition, the posting notice submitted by the petitioner does not advise that the educational requirements for the job may be met through a combination of lesser degrees or other defined equivalency; in fact, it provides none of the requirements stated on the labor certification. Counsel states that a resume received by the petitioner during recruitment "clearly lacked any suitable combination . . ." of education or experience. However, counsel fails to explain how the "suitable combination" was analyzed and determined by the petitioner. The assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaighbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980). Thus, the alien does not qualify as a skilled worker as she does not meet the terms of the labor certification as explicitly expressed or as extrapolated from the evidence of the petitioner's intent about those requirements during the labor certification process.

The petitioner must establish that the beneficiary possessed all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the priority date. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). See *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Acting Reg. Comm. 1977); see also *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971). 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 v. Smith*, 696 F.2d 1008 (D.C. Cir. 1983); *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006 (9th Cir. 1983); *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1981).


The labor certification states that the beneficiary qualifies for the offered position based on experience as an account executive with [REDACTED] India from September 1, 1997 to February 28, 2000; a consultant with [REDACTED] India from November 5, 2002 to November 15, 2004; an Oracle applications consultant with [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] California from November 15, 2004 to March 1, 2007; and a principal consultant with [REDACTED] California from November 2, 2009 until March 15, 2011, the date on which the labor certification was signed by the beneficiary. No other experience is listed. The beneficiary signed the labor certification under a declaration that the contents are true and correct under penalty of perjury.

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

Any requirements of training or experience for skilled workers, professionals, or other workers must be supported by letters from trainers or employers giving the name, address, and title of the trainer or employer, and a description of the training received or the experience of the alien.

The record contains an experience letter from [REDACTED] manager human resources, on [REDACTED] letterhead stating that the company employed the beneficiary as a consultant from November 5, 2002 to November 15, 2004. In response to the AAO's RFE the petitioner submitted evidence that [REDACTED] has a separate Federal Employment Identification Number (FEIN) and is not controlled by [REDACTED] in the United States. The letter accounts for 24 months of relevant experience.

The record contains an experience letter from [REDACTED] human resources administrator, on [REDACTED] letterhead stating that the company employed the beneficiary as an Oracle applications consultant (senior consultant) from November 15, 2004 to March 1, 2007. The record also contains an experience letter from [REDACTED] director human resources, on [REDACTED] letterhead stating that the company employed the beneficiary as a principal consultant from November 4, 2009 until October 2, 2010, the date on which the letter was signed. In response to the AAO's RFE the petitioner provided a letter dated October 24, 2013, which provides a list of the beneficiary's various duties and percentage of time spent on those duties during his employment as an [REDACTED] applications consultant and principal consultant with [REDACTED]. This letter establishes



that the beneficiary's experience in the alternate occupation of consultant is not substantially comparable to the job duties of the proffered position and may be utilized to qualify the beneficiary for the proffered position.<sup>9</sup> As such, the petitioner has established that the beneficiary more likely than not meets the minimum required experience as stated on the labor certification.

In visa petition 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; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.

---

<sup>9</sup> A definition of "substantially comparable" is found at 20 C.F.R. § 656.17:

5) For purposes of this paragraph (i):

- ...
- (ii) A "substantially comparable" job or position means a job or position requiring performance of the same job duties more than 50 percent of the time. This requirement can be documented by furnishing position descriptions, the percentage of time spent on the various duties, organization charts, and payroll records.