U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals, MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

D1

[redacted]

FILE: WAC 08 150 52198 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: OCT 14 2009

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiary:

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

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

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.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of $585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, 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.

On the Form I-129, Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker, the petitioner states that it engages in software consulting and development, that it was established in 2003, employs 24 persons, and has an estimated gross annual income of $6,070,000. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as an SAP Technical Consultant from October 1, 2008 to September 28, 2011. Accordingly, the petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

On August 13, 2008, the director denied the petition, determining that the petitioner failed to establish that: (1) it meets the regulatory definition of an intending United States employer at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii); (2) it meets the definition of "agent" at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F); (3) it submitted a valid labor condition application (LCA) for all locations; (4) the proffered position is a specialty occupation; or (5) it had complied with the terms and conditions of employment.

On appeal, the petitioner submits a statement and documentation in support of the Form-I-290B, and contends that the director's decision is erroneous.

The record includes: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation filed with United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) on April 14, 2008; (2) the director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the director's RFE; (4) the director's denial decision; and, (5) the Form I-290B and the petitioner's brief and documentation submitted in support of the appeal. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

When filing the Form I-129 petition, the petitioner averred in its April 1, 2008 letter appended to the petition that it "offers services ranging from custom application development, deployment, and integration to corrective maintenance, new releases management, and back-up recovery management." The petitioner also provided an overview of the job duties of an SAP Technical Consultant.

In a second similar letter also dated April 1, 2008, the petitioner emphasized that it is not a job shop or a personnel company and that the "Programmer Analyst [sic]" work for the petitioner and are its direct employees. The petitioner stated that it normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the proffered position and listed its current employees, their job titles, their qualifications, and the petitioner's education requirements. The list identified the educational requirements for the various job titles as "baccalaureate degree." The petitioner provided the typical functions for several positions within the company including that of an SAP Technical Consultant. The petitioner also listed several of its clients and identified different projects for each client, as well as providing copies of its agreements with each of the clients listed.

The director found the initial evidence insufficient to establish eligibility for the benefit sought, and issued an RFE on June 23, 2008. In the request, among other things, the director: asked that the

petitioner submit copies of signed contracts between the petitioner and the beneficiary; requested that the petitioner submit a complete itinerary of services or engagements that specifies the dates of each service or engagement, the names and addresses of the actual employers, and the names and addresses of the establishment, venues, or locations where the services will be performed for the period of time requested; requested that the petitioner submit copies of signed contractual agreements, statements of work, work orders, service agreements, and letters between the petitioner and the authorized officials of the ultimate end-client companies where the work will actually be performed that specifically lists the beneficiary by name on the contracts and provides a detailed description of the duties the beneficiary will perform; and requested copies of the petitioner's state and federal quarterly wage reports. The director noted that the evidence must show specialty occupation work for the beneficiary with the actual end-client company where the work will ultimately be performed.

In a response dated July 29, 2008, the petitioner listed the same or similar information previously submitted.[1] The petitioner again emphasized that it is not a job shop or a personnel company and that the "SAP Technical Consultants" work for the petitioner and are its direct employees. The petitioner asserted that because the position of SAP Technical Consultant is involved in a "software environment [that] is a blend of computer-related technology and sophisticated engineering principles, the duties of this position can only be satisfactorily discharged by an individual having knowledge of the Software industry and the equivalent of a Bachelor's degree in Computer Science, Information Systems, Engineering, Mathematics, or a related analytic or scientific discipline, as well as experience with information systems." The petitioner stated: "[i]n order to properly plan, design and implement software development and programming activities, the SAP Technical Consultant must possess not only a thorough knowledge of the technical requirements of engineering concepts, but also must have analytical and technical expertise to be able to develop software as per the requirements of the customer."

The petitioner also noted that advertisements placed on popular job websites indicated that the minimum requirement for this position is a bachelor's degree. The record before the director did not provide evidence in support of the petitioner's claim.

The petitioner added a section in the July 29, 2008 letter identified as the beneficiary's itinerary of employment listing a "M2k to SAP conversion – GAP Analysis" project for Thales Avionics, a third party company with which the petitioner had entered into a contract on December 7, 2007. The petitioner provided a brief description of the M2k to SAP Conversion project and indicated that the project would commence on November 3, 2008 with final deployment planned in September 2009 and that the beneficiary would "be working on this requirement for the client, Thales" primarily at the petitioner's offices but would travel to the client site when needed. The petitioner added that the beneficiary's job responsibilities for this project would include:

---

[1] The petitioner's July 29, 2008 response to the director's RFE is the same letter as the second letter submitted in support of the petition, except that it adds paragraphs that appear to relate more specifically to the beneficiary.

- Responsible for the successful delivery of SAP technology/process deliverables.
- Assists in the selection, implementation and support of SAP solutions.
- Involve in improving operational metrics, SAP/business case development and performance measurements.
- Provide techno functional and business process experience while working on SAP implementation projects.
- Responsible for planning and actively participating in SAP/design, configuration and implementation.
- SAP technical knowledge of ABAP/4 and one or more of the following skills SAP R/3. Reports, FRICE (RICE).ALV Functionalities[.]
- Involve in developing SAP project deliverables using a formal, structured methodology[.]
- Involve to apply [sic] SAP knowledge to resolve configuration and technical issues. Involve in SAP Process definition, analysis, design, and implementation; script development; conduct business requirements definition sessions; Apply required configuration changes.

As noted above, the director denied the petition on August 13, 2008. The director noted the number of contracts the petitioner had provided including the Thales Avionics contract and observed that none of the contracts requested the services of the beneficiary and the petitioner had not provided evidence that the contracts had not expired. The director found that the petitioner subcontracts workers with a variety of computer skills to other companies that need computer programming services. The director concluded that, without complete valid contracts relating to the beneficiary, the petitioner had not established that it had control of the beneficiary's actual work and the record did not contain sufficient information regarding the nature and scope of the beneficiary's services. The director found that the petitioner had not established that it is the beneficiary's employer and that it met the definition of United States employer or agent. Moreover, the director determined that without an itinerary or documentation establishing the validity of the submitted contracts, the director could not determine the beneficiary's actual work location; thus, the submitted LCA could not be determined valid. The director further determined that it was impossible to determine that the beneficiary would be employed in a specialty occupation based on the lack of valid unexpired contracts detailing the beneficiary's ultimate duties. Finally, the director found that the record raised questions regarding the petitioner's compliance with the terms and conditions of employment in other petitions and thus USCIS could not expect that the petitioner would comply with the terms and conditions of employment in this petition.

The AAO finds that the paramount issue in this matter is whether the petitioner has established that it is offering a specialty occupation position to the beneficiary. While the AAO affirms the director's decision on the issues of whether an employer-employee relationship exists, the validity of the LCA, and whether the petitioner has complied with the terms and conditions of employment, we will not discuss these issues as the petition is not approvable on the crucial issue of failure to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. The AAO also observes that the crux of the failure to establish eligibility for this benefit is not whether the petitioner has established that it has an ongoing business with numerous clients, but whether the proffered position has been

sufficiently described by the company that is utilizing the beneficiary's services to establish the position as a specialty occupation. In that regard, the AAO will examine the various descriptions of the proffered employment in an effort to ascertain the beneficiary's actual duties and whether those duties comprise the duties of a specialty occupation.

The AAO observes that the petitioner again includes an "itinerary" in its September 10, 2008 statement submitted on appeal. In the section identified as the beneficiary's itinerary, the petitioner identifies the M2k to SAP conversion – GAP Analysis project and states that the beneficiary "has been designated to be working on the development" of this project. The petitioner notes that the project will commence in January 2009, with the final deployment planned in January 2010 and that "[t]hereafter, further enhancements have been planned for these two applications, which is likely to extend until September 2010." The petitioner also indicates that the beneficiary will work on this requirement in its offices and will travel to Thales Avionics offices in Irvine, California when needed. The petitioner further includes an August 25, 2008 letter from Thales Avionics stating: "[the petitioner] is currently involved in Information Technology projects in the areas of fault reporting and component maintenance. In addition, [the petitioner] has been contracted to provide on-going production support and application software enhancements as needed." The petitioner also provides a statement of work outlining the goals and objectives of the M2k to SAP conversion – GAP Analysis. The statement of work indicates that an SAP Project Manager will be located onsite at Irvine, California.

Also on appeal, the petitioner reiterates its belief that the position of an SAP Technical Consultant requires a theoretical and practical application of highly specialized knowledge and asserts that a degree is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations. The petitioner provides copies of three Internet advertisements to establish that a bachelor's degree is the minimum requirement for the proffered position. The three advertisements are for: (1) an SAP SRM Technical Consultant for an undefined company that lists a bachelor's degree or higher in Computer Science, Electrical Engineering, Information Technology, and/or Business Management; (2) an SAP CRM ISA Technical Consultant advertised by a technical recruiter that indicates the candidate should have experience in several different programs and computer languages; and (3) an SAP CRM Senior Technical Consultant for an information technology company that lists a BS/BTech/MS (Full-Time) in the education field of the advertisement. The petitioner also informs that it normally requires a bachelor's degree in a field related to the field of work and provides a list of its employees indicating that a bachelor's degree is the educational requirement for all of its listed positions including, operations manager, lead programmer analyst, programmer analyst, systems administrator, network administrator, president, SAP business process analyst, technical consultant, director of projects and recruiter.

The petitioner asserts that a specialty occupation exists for the beneficiary and that the proffered position satisfies the requirement for a specialty occupation.

Preliminarily, the AAO finds that despite the director's RFE requesting contracts and statements of work from the ultimate end user of the beneficiary's services, the petitioner failed to fully comply with the request and submits for the first time on appeal, an August 25, 2008 letter from Thales

Avionics with statements of work attached. Where, as here, a petitioner has been put on notice of a deficiency in the evidence and has been given an opportunity to respond to that deficiency, the AAO is reluctant to accept evidence offered for the first time on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988); *see also Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533 (BIA 1988). In this matter, however, even if considering the outline of the beneficiary's duties and assuming the outline of duties relates to the M2k to SAP conversion – GAP Analysis project, the AAO does not find the description sufficiently comprehensive to establish that the actual position is a specialty occupation.

For purposes of the H-1B adjudication, the issue of *bona fide* employment is viewed within the context of whether the petitioner has offered the beneficiary a position that is determined to be a specialty occupation. Therefore, the AAO will specifically review whether the petitioner has provided sufficient evidence to establish that the services to be performed by the beneficiary are those of a specialty occupation.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), defines the term "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires:

(A) theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and

(B) attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

The term "specialty occupation" is further defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as:

> An occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields of human endeavor including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which requires the attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Thus, it is clear that Congress intended this visa classification only for aliens who are to be employed in an occupation that requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge that is conveyed by at least a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty.

Consistent with section 214(i)(1) of the Act, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) states that a specialty occupation means an occupation "which [1] requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields of human endeavor including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which [2] requires the attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States."

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, the position must also meet one of the following criteria:

(1) A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position;

(2) The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or, in the alternative, an employer may show that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree;

(3) The employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position; or

(4) The nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

As a threshold issue, it is noted that 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must logically be read together with section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). In other words, this regulatory language must be construed in harmony with the thrust of the related provisions and with the statute as a whole. *See K Mart Corp. v. Cartier Inc.*, 486 U.S. 281, 291 (1988) (holding that construction of language which takes into account the design of the statute as a whole is preferred); *see also COIT Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp.*, 489 U.S. 561 (1989); *Matter of W-F-*, 21 I&N Dec. 503 (BIA 1996). As such, the criteria stated in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) should logically be read as being necessary but not necessarily sufficient to meet the statutory and regulatory definition of specialty occupation. To otherwise interpret this section as stating the necessary *and* sufficient conditions for meeting the definition of specialty occupation would result in particular positions meeting a condition under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) but not the statutory or regulatory definition. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d 384, 387 (5th Cir. 2000). To avoid this illogical and absurd result, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must therefore be read as stating additional requirements that a position must meet, supplementing the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

Consonant with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), USCIS consistently interprets the term "degree" in the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position. Applying this standard, USCIS regularly approves H-1B petitions for qualified aliens who are to be employed as engineers, computer scientists, certified public accountants, college professors, and other such professions. These occupations all require a baccalaureate degree in the specific specialty as a minimum for entry into the occupation and fairly represent the types of professions that Congress contemplated when it created the H-1B visa category. To determine whether a particular job qualifies as a specialty occupation, USCIS does not simply rely on a position's title. The specific duties of the proffered position, combined with the nature of the petitioning entity's business operations, are factors to be considered. USCIS must examine the

ultimate employment of the alien, to determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv) provides that "[a]n H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation shall be accompanied by [d]ocumentation . . . or any other required evidence sufficient to establish . . . that the services the beneficiary is to perform are in a specialty occupation." Moreover, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv)(A)*(1)* specifically lists contracts as one of the types of evidence that may be required to establish that the services to be performed by the beneficiary will be in a specialty occupation.

The petitioner's initial evidence submitted in support of the petition provided an overview of the typical functions of an "SAP Technical Consultant." In response to the director's RFE, the petitioner provided the same overview and indicated its belief that the proffered position of an SAP Technical Consultant required the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in computer science, information systems, engineering, mathematics, or a related analytic or scientific discipline, as well as experience with information systems. The petitioner also briefly described a project for a third party company and indicated that the beneficiary would perform the generally described duties for the project.

On appeal, the petitioner again identifies the M2k project and provides a statement of work for the project; however, the statement of work does not identify an SAP Functional Consultant or any position other than a SAP Project Manager, a position that would be located at the client's offices. As noted above, the petitioner also includes an August 25, 2008 letter from Thales Avionics stating: "[the petitioner] is currently involved in Information Technology projects in the areas of fault reporting and component maintenance." The letter does not identify the beneficiary as the individual that will be working as the SAP Project Manager or in any position. Thus, the record on appeal also fails to include the detailed information necessary to establish that the SAP Technical Consultant working on the referenced project for Thales Avionics will perform duties that comprise the duties of a specialty occupation.

The AAO acknowledges the petitioner's assertion that the proffered position requires a theoretical and practical application of highly specialized knowledge. However, an assertion without the underlying description of actual duties and evidence from the actual user of the beneficiary's services of the proposed duties is insufficient. General statements and vague descriptions of an occupation do not establish that a specific proffered position is a specialty occupation. 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 only information in the record regarding the beneficiary's actual duties is the outline provided in response to the director's RFE and again on appeal. This outline is insufficient to establish that the beneficiary's actual duties as they relate to the proposed projects comprise the duties of a specialty occupation. The description is broadly stated and vague regarding details of the level of support and actual actions that the beneficiary will be expected to perform. The petitioner has not provided

sufficient evidence to establish that the general outline of duties set out in its description would require a degree beyond that of a general degree and/or an SAP certification.

The AAO also acknowledges the three job advertisements the petitioner submitted that relate to the position of an SAP Technical Consultant and the petitioner's assertion that the job advertisements require the successful applicant to have a bachelor's degree. Upon review of the three job announcements, the AAO does not find that the advertisements indicate that a bachelor's degree in a specific discipline is necessarily required. Two of the three advertisements list a bachelor's degree but do not indicate if the degree is preferred or required. Moreover, these two advertisements appear to find a range of degrees/disciplines acceptable for the advertised positions. The third advertisement does not indicate that the successful candidate would have a bachelor's degree but appears to accept knowledge and experience in various computer programs and languages as sufficient. Upon review of the advertisements, the AAO finds that these advertisements do not establish an industry standard for an SAP Technical Consultant in a parallel position in organizations similar to the petitioner. The AAO observes first that the petitioner has not established that the organizations listed in the advertisements are similar to the petitioner, as the job announcements do not provide sufficient information to enable the AAO to conclude that the businesses advertising the positions are similar to the petitioner in size, number of employees, level of revenue, or nature of business. Second, the broadly stated descriptions for the petitioner's position and those in the advertisements are insufficient to establish that the actual duties of the positions are indeed parallel. Finally, the AAO finds that the information in the advertisements underscores the fact that a broadly-defined SAP Technical Consultant is not a specialty occupation.

Similarly, the petitioner's indication that it only hires individuals with bachelor's degrees to perform a myriad number of positions from president to programmer analyst is insufficient to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. The AAO observes that the petitioner has not established that it has previously employed an SAP Technical Consultant to perform the generally stated duties the petitioner indicates will be performed for the Thales Avionics project or that it requires a degree in a specific discipline for the proffered position, or that any of its generally described positions require bachelor's degrees in specific disciplines. The AAO notes that the education of specific individuals does not establish that the duties of their positions comprise the duties of a specialty occupation; rather it is the actual detailed job description that must be analyzed to determine whether a position is a specialty occupation. In this regard, the critical element is not the title of the position or an employer's self-imposed standards, but whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act. To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to absurd results. If USCIS were limited to reviewing a petitioner's self-imposed employment requirements, then any alien with a bachelor's degree could be brought into the United States to perform a non-professional or non-specialty occupation, so long as the employer required all such employees to have baccalaureate degrees or higher degrees. As the record does not include a detailed description of the beneficiary's actual duties for the petitioner or its client, the petitioner has not established the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

The record is without the underlying evidence of the actual work to be performed or other evidence to support the petitioner's claim that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. As the record in this matter does not include a comprehensive description of the beneficiary's actual duties and the specific duties that the beneficiary will perform as they relate to the listed project(s) the beneficiary will work on for the duration of the requested employment period, the petition must be denied. To establish that a specific position in the computer field is a specialty occupation, the petitioner must provide evidence of the nature of the employing organization, the particular projects planned, a comprehensive description of the beneficiary's duties from the ultimate user of the beneficiary's services, and evidence that the duties described require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge attained through a baccalaureate program in a specific discipline. In this matter, the petitioner has failed to provide such evidence. Without evidence of work orders or statements of work describing the specific duties the petitioner and/or the end use company requires the beneficiary to perform, USCIS is unable to discern the nature of the position and whether the position indeed requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge attained through a baccalaureate program. Again, going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for the purpose of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici,* 22 I&N Dec. at 165. Without a meaningful job description, the petitioner may not establish any of the alternate criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

In support of this analysis, USCIS routinely cites *Defensor v. Meissner,* 201 F.3d 384 (5th Cir. 2000), in which an examination of the ultimate employment of the beneficiary was deemed necessary to determine whether the position constitutes a specialty occupation. The petitioner in *Defensor*, Vintage Health Resources (Vintage), was a medical contract service agency that brought foreign nurses into the United States and located jobs for them at hospitals as registered nurses. The court in *Defensor* found that Vintage had "token degree requirements," to "mask the fact that nursing in general is not a specialty occupation." *Id.* at 387.

The court in *Defensor* held that for the purpose of determining whether a proffered position is a specialty occupation, the petitioner acting as an employment contractor is merely a "token employer," while the entity for which the services are to be performed is the "more relevant employer." *Id* at 388. The *Defensor* court recognized that evidence of the client companies' job requirements is critical where the work is to be performed for entities other than the petitioner. The *Defensor* court held that the legacy Immigration and Naturalization Service had reasonably interpreted the statute and regulations as requiring the petitioner to produce evidence that a proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation on the basis of the requirements imposed by the entities using the beneficiary's services. *Id.*

In this matter, the petitioner provides generic descriptions of computer-related positions such as operations manager, programmer analyst, SAP technical consultant, systems administrator, and network administrator in its letter in support of the petition. Without the underlying statements of work that comprehensively describe the work to which the beneficiary will be assigned and describe the beneficiary's actual duties as those duties relate to specific project, the AAO is unable to analyze whether the beneficiary's duties require at least a baccalaureate degree or the equivalent in a specific specialty, as required for classification as a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the petitioner has not

established that the position meets any of the requirements for a specialty occupation set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) or that the beneficiary would be coming temporarily to the United States to perform the duties of a specialty occupation pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(1)(B)*(1)*.

The petition will be denied and the appeal dismissed for the above stated reason. 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.

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