

(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

[Redacted]

DATE: **AUG 26 2013** OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER [Redacted]

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

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:

[Redacted]

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,

for Michael J. Kelly
Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

On the Form I-129 visa petition, the petitioner describes itself as a 35-employee upscale coffee house and business catering company¹ established in 2006. In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as an accountant position,² the petitioner seeks to classify her 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).

The director denied the petition, concluding that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the proffered position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains the following: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the director's letter denying the petition; and (5) the Form I-290B and supporting documentation.

Upon review of the entire record of proceeding, the AAO finds that the petitioner has failed to overcome the director's ground for denying this petition. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will be denied.

As will now be discussed, to meet its burden of proof in this regard, the petitioner must establish that the employment it is offering to the beneficiary meets the following statutory and regulatory requirements.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1) defines the term "specialty occupation" as one 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.

¹ The petitioner provided a North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code of 722211, "Limited-Service Restaurants." U.S. Dep't of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, North American Industry Classification System, 2012 NAICS Definition, "722211 Limited-Service Restaurants," <http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/sssd/naics/naicsrch> (accessed Jul. 31, 2013).

² The Labor Condition Application (LCA) submitted by the petitioner in support of the petition was certified for a job prospect that would fall within the SOC (O*NET/OES) Code 13-2011, the associated Occupational Classification of "Accountants and Auditors," and a Level I (entry-level) prevailing wage rate.

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

An occupation which requires [(1)] 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 [(2)] 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 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 providing supplemental criteria that must be met in accordance with, and not as alternatives to, the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

As such and consonant with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (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. *See Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d 139, 147 (1st Cir. 2007) (describing “a degree requirement in a specific specialty” as “one that relates directly to the duties and responsibilities of a particular 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 occupations. These professions, for which petitioners have regularly been able to establish a minimum entry requirement in the United States of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position, fairly represent the types of specialty occupations 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 rely simply upon a proffered position’s title. The specific duties of the 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 beneficiary, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *See generally Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d at 384. The critical element is not the title of the position nor 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.

In a statement accompanying its April 5, 2012 letter of support, the petitioner claimed that the proffered position would include the following duties:

- Obtaining and maintaining a thorough understanding of the Point of Sales software;
- Financial reporting on a daily basis, including daily cash reports for each store;
- Ensuring that accurate and timely monthly, quarterly, and year-end reports are submitted to the petitioner’s CEO;
- Ensuring that financial information is reported to investors monthly;
- Assisting the operations manager with daily banking requirements;
- Ensuring that account payables are processed timely;
- Ensuring that monthly and quarterly bank compliance activities are performed in an accurate and timely manner;
- Supporting budgeting and forecasting activities;
- Collaborating with store managers to support the company’s overall goals and objectives;

- Monitoring and analyzing each store's profit and loss for the purpose of efficient purchasing and to control the cost of goods sold;
- Responding to inquiries from the owners, investors, and all financial institutions regarding financial results, special reporting questions, and the like;
- Working with the petitioner's certified public accountant to ensure clean and timely year-end financials for tax purposes;
- Assisting in the development and implementation of new procedures and features to enhance the daily bookkeeping workflow of the petitioner's current and future branches;
- Training new and existing staff, as needed;
- Working with the owners to establish yearly financial goals and objectives, and monitoring and advising on progress; and
- Supporting the petitioner's Controller with special projects and workflow process improvements.

In its July 26, 2012 letter submitted in response to the director's RFE, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary would spend thirty percent of her time performing the following tasks:

- Preparing financials reports;
- Analyzing financial information as it relates to assets, liabilities, and available capital;
- Preparing balance sheets, profit and loss statements, and other reports to assist management to understand the company's current financial situation and project the company's future financial position; and
- Communicate and share financial information with banking institutions.

The petitioner stated that the beneficiary would spend twenty percent of her time performing the following tasks:

- Setting accounting procedures and coordinating accounting and bookkeeping services with outside firms; and
- Coordinating the activities of in-house administrative clerical workers.

The petitioner stated that the beneficiary would spend ten percent of her time performing the following tasks:

- Analyzing records in order to identify trends in costs and estimate future revenues.

The petitioner stated that the beneficiary would spend ten percent of her time performing the following tasks:

- Maintaining and monitoring budget systems to control expenditures for food costs, labor costs, marketing, and advertising.

The petitioner stated that the beneficiary would spend ten percent of her time performing the following tasks:

- Advising and assisting the petitioner's management with financial planning, expansions, and capital improvements.

The petitioner stated that the beneficiary would spend ten percent of her time performing the following tasks:

- Performing compliance monitoring in order to avoid assessment of fees and penalties by local and federal agencies.

Finally, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary would spend the remaining ten percent of her time communicating with the petitioner's investors.

At this point, the AAO makes a critical finding that decisively impacts against the petitioner's case on appeal, namely, that while the duties as described above and elsewhere in the proceeding indicate that the beneficiary would apply and accordingly need to be conversant with some accounting concepts and applications, neither the duties nor any other evidence within the record of proceeding establish a particular educational level of accounting knowledge that the beneficiary would have to apply, let alone, that the beneficiary would have to theoretically and practically apply at least a bachelor's degree level of highly specialized knowledge in accounting or a closely related field, as would be necessary for the proffered position to qualify as a specialty occupation under the statutory and regulatory framework controlling the H-1B specialty occupation program.

In reaching this conclusion, the AAO fully considered the totality of the evidence in the record of proceeding, including the information presented about the particular nature of the petitioner's business operations and including the fact that it appears that the petitioner has been and apparently would continue to employ a particular Certified Public Accountant (CPA) for guidance and advice.

The AAO will next address the two general opinion letters submitted by the petitioner as evidence that the proffered position is a specialty occupation.

In his July 1, 2012 letter, [REDACTED] the petitioner's CPA, stated that he has observed the petitioner's recent growth, and recommends the hiring of a full-time accountant. [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] opined in his July 10, 2012 letter that "[a]s [the petitioner's] business

grows, it seems like a reasonable next step is to hire a full-time accountant.” However, neither of these letters constitutes probative evidence of the proffered position satisfying any criterion described at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

At the outset, the AAO notes that neither of these opinions is accompanied by, or expressly states the full content of, whatever documentation and/or oral transmissions upon which they are based. Accordingly, the AAO finds that, on this ground alone and independent of the other material deficiencies to be noted below, these opinions are not probative evidence of the proffered position satisfying any criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). In short, neither author provides a substantive factual foundation for the opinion that he offers.

The AAO notes further that neither of these individuals discusses the fact that the petitioner submitted an LCA certified for a wage-level that is only appropriate for a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within its occupation, which signifies that the beneficiary is only expected to possess a basic understanding of the occupation.³ These authors’ omission of such an important factor severely diminishes the evidentiary value of their assertions.

However, even if these deficiencies were not present, these letters would still not satisfy any of the criteria described at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

With regard to the letter from [REDACTED] it is noted that he stated only that he recommends that the petitioner hire a full-time accountant. However, that recommendation is not probative evidence towards satisfying any of the criteria described at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Aside from the

³ The *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* (available at http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf (last accessed Jul. 31, 2013)) issued by DOL states the following with regard to Level I wage rates:

Level I (entry) wage rates are assigned to job offers for beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation. These employees perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment. The tasks provide experience and familiarization with the employer’s methods, practices, and programs. The employees may perform higher level work for training and developmental purposes. These employees work under close supervision and receive specific instructions on required tasks and results expected. Their work is closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy. Statements that the job offer is for a research fellow, a worker in training, or an internship are indicators that a Level I wage should be considered [emphasis in original].

The proposed duties’ level of complexity, uniqueness, and specialization, as well as the level of independent judgment and occupational understanding required to perform them, are questionable, as the petitioner submitted an LCA certified for a Level I, entry-level position. The LCA’s wage-level indicates that the proffered position is actually a low-level, entry position relative to others within the occupation. In accordance with the relevant DOL explanatory information on wage levels, this wage rate indicates that the beneficiary is only required to possess a basic understanding of the occupation; that she will be expected to perform routine tasks requiring limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that she will be closely supervised and his work closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that she will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results.

foundational defect already mentioned, this recommendation neither cites a necessity for the position that it recommends nor does it state or even recommend any minimal education requirement for the recommended hiring.

In similar fashion, [REDACTED] assertion that the hiring of a full-time accountant “seems like a reasonable next step,” unaccompanied as it is by supportive evidence explaining and substantiating his opinion, is a conclusory statement that carries no probative weight towards satisfying any of the criteria described at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), either.

The AAO may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinion statements submitted as expert testimony. However, where an opinion is not in accord with other information or is in any way questionable, the AAO is not required to accept or may give less weight to that evidence. *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791 (Comm’r 1988).

For all of these reasons, the AAO finds that the letters from [REDACTED] are not probative evidence that the petitioner has satisfied any criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

Having made these initial findings, the AAO will now discuss the application of each supplemental, alternative criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to the evidence in this record of proceeding.

The AAO will now discuss the application of each supplemental, alternative criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to the evidence in this record of proceeding.

The AAO will first discuss the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(I), which is satisfied by establishing that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position that is the subject of the petition.

The AAO recognizes the U.S. Department of Labor’s (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations it addresses.⁴ Two portions of the *Handbook* are directly relevant to this proceeding: (1) the *Handbook*’s discussion of the “Bookkeeping, Accounting, and Auditing Clerks” occupational classification; and (2) its discussion of the “Accountants and Auditors” occupational classification.

The AAO finds that the *Handbook*’s entries for the “Bookkeeping, Accounting, and Auditing Clerks” and “Accountants and Auditors” occupational classifications both contain aspects of the proposed duties, and that both occupations require some understanding and application of accounting principles. However, the question to be addressed in this proceeding is not whether the proffered position requires some knowledge of accounting principles, but whether it is one that normally requires the level of knowledge of a body of highly specialized knowledge in accounting

⁴ The *Handbook*, which is available in printed form, may also be accessed online at <http://www.stats.bls.gov/oco/>. The AAO’s references to the *Handbook* are from the 2012-13 edition available online.

that is signified by at least a bachelor's degree, or its equivalent, in accounting or a closely-related specialty.

As discussed in the *Handbook*, bookkeeping, auditing, and auditing clerks do not comprise an occupational category that normally requires at least a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty. The *Handbook* states the following with regard to this occupational classification:

Bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks produce financial records for organizations. They record financial transactions, update statements, and check financial records for accuracy.

Duties

Bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks typically do the following:

- Use bookkeeping software as well as online spreadsheets and databases
- Enter (post) financial transactions into the appropriate computer software
- Receive and record cash, checks, and vouchers
- Put costs (debits) as well as income (credits) into the software, assigning each to an appropriate account
- Produce reports, such as balance sheets (costs compared to income), income statements, and totals by account
- Check figures, postings, and reports for accuracy
- Reconcile or note and report any differences they find in the records

The records that bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks work with include expenditures (money spent), receipts (money that comes in), accounts payable (bills to be paid), accounts receivable (invoices, or what other people owe the organization), and profit and loss (a report that shows the organization's financial health).

Workers in this occupation have a wide range of tasks. Some in this occupation are full-charge bookkeeping clerks who maintain an entire organization's books. Others are accounting clerks who handle specific tasks.

These clerks use basic mathematics (adding, subtracting) throughout the day.

As organizations continue to computerize their financial records, many bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks use specialized accounting software, spreadsheets, and databases. Most clerks now enter information from receipts or bills into computers, and the information is then stored electronically. They must be comfortable using computers to record and calculate data.

The widespread use of computers also has enabled bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks to take on additional responsibilities, such as payroll, billing, purchasing (buying), and keeping track of overdue bills. Many of these functions require clerks to communicate with clients.

Bookkeeping clerks, also known as **bookkeepers**, often are responsible for some or all of an organization's accounts, known as the general ledger. They record all transactions and post debits (costs) and credits (income).

They also produce financial statements and other reports for supervisors and managers. Bookkeepers prepare bank deposits by compiling data from cashiers, verifying receipts, and sending cash, checks, or other forms of payment to the bank.

In addition, they may handle payroll, make purchases, prepare invoices, and keep track of overdue accounts.

Accounting clerks typically work for larger companies and have more specialized tasks. Their titles, such as accounts payable clerk or accounts receivable clerk, often reflect the type of accounting they do.

Often, their responsibilities vary by level of experience. Entry-level accounting clerks may enter (post) details of transactions (including date, type, and amount), add up accounts, and determine interest charges. They also may monitor loans and accounts to ensure that payments are up to date.

More advanced accounting clerks may add up and balance billing vouchers, ensure that account data is complete and accurate, and code documents according to an organization's procedures.

Auditing clerks check figures, postings, and documents to ensure that they are mathematically accurate and properly coded. They also correct or note errors for accountants or other workers to fix.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2012-13 ed., "Bookkeeping, Accounting, and Auditing Clerks," <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/office-and-administrative-support/bookkeeping-accounting-and-auditing-clerks.htm#tab-2> (accessed Jul. 31, 2013).

As noted above, the petitioner stated in its July 26, 2012 letter that the beneficiary would spend thirty percent of her time – nearly one-third – performing such tasks as preparing financial reports; preparing balance sheets; preparing profits and loss statements; and sharing financial information with banking institutions. The AAO finds that, to the extent that the content of these functions are presented within the context of the petitioner's business operations - including the use of an outside CPA for what appears to be the more technical accounting and financial issues than met in the day-to-day running of the business - the petitioner has not established that such duties would in practice exceed the scope or competency of bookkeeping and accounting clerks. In this regard, the AAO notes that the *Handbook* states, in pertinent part, the following about the educational requirements necessary for entrance into that occupational category:

Most bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks need a high school diploma. However, some employers prefer candidates who have some postsecondary education, particularly coursework in accounting. In 2009, 25 percent of these workers had an associate's or higher degree.

Id. at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/office-and-administrative-support/bookkeeping-accounting-and-auditing-clerks.htm#tab-4> (accessed Jul. 31, 2013).

These statements do not support a conclusion that a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally required for employment as a bookkeeping, accounting, or auditing clerk. Given that nearly one-third of the beneficiary's proposed duties fall within those described in the *Handbook* as normally performed by bookkeeping and accounting clerks, an occupational category which does not normally require a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, the *Handbook* does not support a finding that the proffered position satisfies the first criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The AAO finds that the remaining duties proposed for the beneficiary are generally similar to those described in the *Handbook* as being normally performed by accountants. However, it should be stressed that, as will soon be addressed, a position's inclusion within the Accountants occupational category is not in itself sufficient to establish that that particular position is one for which the minimum educational requirement would be at least a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty.

In pertinent part, the *Handbook* states the following with regard to this occupational classification:

Accountants and auditors prepare and examine financial records. They ensure that financial records are accurate and that taxes are paid properly and on time. Accountants and auditors assess financial operations and work to help ensure that organizations run efficiently. . . .

Accountants and auditors typically do the following:

- Examine financial statements to be sure that they are accurate and comply with laws and regulations

- Compute taxes owed, prepare tax returns, and ensure that taxes are paid properly and on time
- Inspect account books and accounting systems for efficiency and use of accepted accounting procedures
- Organize and maintain financial records
- Assess financial operations and make best-practices recommendations to management
- Suggest ways to reduce costs, enhance revenues, and improve profits

In addition to examining and preparing financial documentation, accountants and auditors must explain their findings. This includes face-to-face meetings with organization managers and individual clients, and preparing written reports.

Many accountants and auditors specialize, depending on the particular organization that they work for. Some organizations specialize in assurance services (improving the quality or context of information for decision makers) or risk management (determining the probability of a misstatement on financial documentation). Other organizations specialize in specific industries, such as healthcare.

* * *

Public accountants do a broad range of accounting, auditing, tax, and consulting tasks. Their clients include corporations, governments, and individuals.

They work with financial documents that clients are required by law to disclose. These include tax forms and balance sheet statements that corporations must provide potential investors. For example, some public accountants concentrate on tax matters, advising corporations about the tax advantages of certain business decisions or preparing individual income tax returns.

External auditors review clients' financial statements and inform investors and authorities that the statements have been correctly prepared and reported.

Public accountants, many of whom are Certified Public Accountants (CPAs), generally have their own businesses or work for public accounting firms.

Some public accountants specialize in forensic accounting, investigating financial crimes, such as securities fraud and embezzlement, bankruptcies and contract disputes, and other complex and possibly criminal financial transactions. Forensic

accountants combine their knowledge of accounting and finance with law and investigative techniques to determine if an activity is illegal. Many forensic accountants work closely with law enforcement personnel and lawyers during investigations and often appear as expert witnesses during trials.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2012-13 ed., "Accountants and Auditors," <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/Business-and-Financial/Accountants-and-auditors.htm#tab-2> (accessed Jul. 31, 2013).

With regard to the educational requirements necessary for entry into this occupational classification, the *Handbook* states that "[m]ost accountants and auditors need at least a bachelor's degree in accounting or a related field." *Handbook* at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/Business-and-Financial/Accountants-and-auditors.htm#tab-4>. However, "most" does not indicate that an accountant position normally requires at least a bachelor's degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty. The first definition of "most" in *Webster's New Collegiate College Dictionary* 731 (Third Edition, Hough Mifflin Harcourt 2008) is "[g]reatest in number, quantity, size, or degree." As such, if merely 51% of accountant positions require at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, it could be said that "most" accountant positions require such a degree. It cannot be found, therefore, that a particular degree requirement for "most" positions in a given occupation equates to a normal minimum entry requirement for that occupation, much less for the particular position proffered by the petitioner. Instead, a normal minimum entry requirement is one that denotes a standard entry requirement but recognizes that certain, limited exceptions to that standard may exist. To interpret this provision otherwise would run directly contrary to the plain language of the Act, which requires in part "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." Section 214(i)(1) of the Act.

Furthermore, the *Handbook* includes the following statement:

In some cases, graduates of community colleges, as well as bookkeepers and accounting clerks who meet the education and experience requirements set by their employers, get junior accounting positions and advance to accountant positions by showing their accounting skills on the job.

Id. Thus, the *Handbook* does not indicate that a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally required for this occupational category. Instead, this category accommodates a wide spectrum of educational credentials, and that spectrum includes credentials that fall short of a bachelor's degree.

As clear from the statements from the *Handbook* excerpted above, the fact that a person may be employed in a position designated as that of an accountant and may apply accounting principles in the course of his or her job is not in itself sufficient to establish the position as one that qualifies as a specialty occupation. Thus, it is incumbent on the petitioner to provide sufficient evidence to establish that the particular position being proffered would involve accounting services at a level requiring the theoretical and practical application of at least a bachelor's-degree level of a body of

highly specialized knowledge in accounting. To make this determination, the AAO turns to the record for information regarding the duties and nature of the petitioner's business operations.

In the instant matter, the AAO finds that those job duties listed by the petitioner which do generally fall within those described in the *Handbook* as normally performed by accountants (as opposed to the duties which align with those of bookkeeping and accounting clerks) are generalized descriptions of functions generic to accounting positions. They lack specific and substantial information showing what their actual performance within the petitioner's particular business would involve in terms of substantive accounting issues, theoretical and practical applications of accounting knowledge that would be involved in addressing those issues, and the associated educational level of accounting knowledge that would be required. As such, they do not establish that their performance requires the theoretical and practical application of at least a bachelor's-degree level of a body of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty.

The AAO's determination that the accounting duties proposed for the beneficiary would not involve accounting services at a level requiring the theoretical and practical application of at least a bachelor's-degree level of a body of highly specialized knowledge in accounting is bolstered by the fact that the petitioner submitted an LCA certified for a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within its occupation, which signifies that the beneficiary is only expected to possess a basic understanding of the occupation.

Next, the AAO finds that the materials from DOL's Occupational Information Network (O*NET OnLine) do not establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation under the first criterion described at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), either. O*NET OnLine is not particularly useful in determining whether a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is a requirement for a given position, as O*NET OnLine's Job Zone designations make no mention of the specific field of study from which a degree must come. As was noted previously, the AAO 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 proposed position. The Specialized Vocational Preparation (SVP) rating is meant to indicate only the total number of years of vocational preparation required for a particular position. It does not describe how those years are to be divided among training, formal education, and experience and it does not specify the particular type of degree, if any, that a position would require. For all of these reasons, the O*NET OnLine excerpt submitted by counsel is of little evidentiary value to the issue presented on appeal.

Nor is the AAO persuaded by counsel's citation to the DOL's *Dictionary of Occupational Titles* (the *DOT*), and his implicit argument regarding the value of an SVP rating of 8. The *DOT* does not support the assertion that assignment of SVP ratings of 8 is indicative of a specialty occupation, which is obvious upon reading Section II of the *DOT's* Appendix C, Components of the Definition Trailer, which addresses the Specialized Vocational Preparation (SVP) rating system,⁵ and which states, in pertinent part, the following:

⁵ U.S. Dep't of Labor, Office of Administrative Law Judges, OALJ Law Library, *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*, <http://www.oalj.dol.gov/PUBLIC/DOT/REFERENCES/DOTAPPC.HTM> (accessed Jul. 31, 2013).

II. SPECIFIC VOCATIONAL PREPARATION (SVP)

Specific Vocational Preparation is defined as the amount of lapsed time required by a typical worker to learn the techniques, acquire the information, and develop the facility needed for average performance in a specific job-worker situation.

This training may be acquired in a school, work, military, institutional, or vocational environment. It does not include the orientation time required of a fully qualified worker to become accustomed to the special conditions of any new job. Specific vocational training includes: vocational education, apprenticeship training, in-plant training, on-the-job training, and essential experience in other jobs.

Specific vocational training includes training given in any of the following circumstances:

- a. Vocational education (high school; commercial or shop training; technical school; art school; and that part of college training which is organized around a specific vocational objective);
- b. Apprenticeship training (for apprenticeable jobs only);
- c. In-plant training (organized classroom study provided by an employer);
- d. On-the-job training (serving as learner or trainee on the job under the instruction of a qualified worker);
- e. Essential experience in other jobs (serving in less responsible jobs which lead to the higher grade job or serving in other jobs which qualify).

The following is an explanation of the various levels of specific vocational preparation:

Level	Time
1	Short demonstration only

As noted at section A.1.1 in DOL's Employment and Training Administration's Clearance Package Supporting Statement to the Office of Management and Budget, which is accessible on the Internet at http://www.onetcenter.org/dl_files/omb2011/Supporting_StatementA.pdf, "The O*NET data supersede the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL's) *Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT)*," and the *DOT* "is no longer updated or maintained by DOL." It should also be noted that the *DOT* was last updated more than 20 years ago, in 1991. See <http://www.oalj.dol.gov/libdot.htm>, the homepage of DOL's Office of Administrative Law Judges (OALJ), online edition of the *DOT's* Fourth Edition, Revised in 1991.

- 2 Anything beyond short demonstration up to and including 1 month
- 3 Over 1 month up to and including 3 months
- 4 Over 3 months up to and including 6 months
- 5 Over 6 months up to and including 1 year
- 6 Over 1 year up to and including 2 years
- 7 Over 2 years up to and including 4 years
- 8 Over 4 years up to and including 10 years
- 9 Over 10 years

Note: **The levels of this scale are mutually exclusive and do not overlap.**

Thus, an SVP rating of 8 does not indicate that at least a four-year bachelor's degree is required to perform the duties of the proffered position or, more importantly, that such a degree must be in a specific specialty closely related to the requirements of that occupation. Therefore, the information from the *DOT* is not probative of the proffered position satisfying this criterion.

Nor does the record of proceeding contain any persuasive documentary evidence from any other relevant authoritative source establishing that the proffered position's inclusion in this occupational category would be sufficient in and of itself to establish the proffered position as, in the words of this criterion, a "particular position" for which "[a] baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry."

As the evidence in the record of proceeding does not establish that a baccalaureate degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position that is the subject of this petition, the petitioner has not established the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1).

Next, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not satisfied the first of the two alternative prongs of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2). This prong alternatively calls for a petitioner to establish that a requirement of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common to the petitioner's industry in positions that are both: (1) parallel to the proffered position; and (2) located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner.

In determining whether there is such a common degree requirement, factors often considered by USCIS include: whether the *Handbook* reports that the industry requires a degree; whether the industry's professional association has made a degree a minimum entry requirement; and whether letters or affidavits from firms or individuals in the industry attest that such firms "routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals." See *Shanti, Inc. v. Reno*, 36 F. Supp. 2d at 1165 (D.Minn. 1999) (quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

Here and as already discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook* reports an industry-wide requirement for at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent.

As evidence of eligibility under this criterion, the petitioner submits letters from [REDACTED]

In her July 9, 2012 letter, [REDACTED] Commerce, stated that “[a]s a \$1.7 million annual operation a full time accountant is necessary,” and that “[i]n speaking with comparable businesses in our area, they too have brought on full time accountants as tax and business regulation [and] reporting has become more and more rigorous.”

In her July 5, 2012 letter, [REDACTED] who owns a bakery in Iran, stated that “a caring, knowledgeable and diverse accountant is a must for growing businesses. . . .”

In his July 11, 2012 letter, [REDACTED] stated the following:

In the 28 years of being a wholesale vendor for many firms nationally we have found the firms that have succeeded usually have the following. A strong banking relationship, a solid attorney to provide advice and an accounting firm for tax purposes [sic].

We have also found an in house bookkeeper (accountant) who can handle many valuable factors for the owner to be a necessary part of the management team. A good book keeper can advise the CEO on not only the many changes in taxes that are occurring, but be the Human Resource expert, manage Payroll, monitor Payables, and provide a Quality Control aspect.

Finally, [REDACTED] stated the following in her November 14, 2012 letter:

[REDACTED] is a coffee roasting company and café with two corporate branches. . . .

[G]iven [the petitioner’s] current size and anticipated growth with the opening of two new coffee houses in [REDACTED] it is our strong recommendation that [the petitioner] obtain a corporate accountant. . . .

However, these four letters do not satisfy the first of the two alternative prongs of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2) which, again, requires the petitioner to establish that a requirement of a bachelor’s or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common to the petitioner’s industry in positions that are both: (1) parallel to the proffered position; and (2) located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner.

The record contains no documentary evidence to support [REDACTED] statement that “[i]n speaking with comparable businesses in our area, they too have brought on full time accountants as tax and business regulation [and] reporting has become more and more rigorous.” Simply 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)).

Nor does the record contain any documentary evidence establishing that the companies for whom [REDACTED] are “similar” to the petitioner in size, scope, and scale of operations, business efforts, expenditures, or other fundamental dimensions. Nor does the record contain any documentary information establishing that any of those companies actually employ a full-time accountant and that any such accountants possess at least a bachelor’s degree in accounting or a closely related specialty. Again, simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Id.* Furthermore, and with specific regard to [REDACTED] statements regarding the benefits of employing an in-house bookkeeper, it is noted again that DOL states in the *Handbook* that bookkeeping positions do not normally require a bachelor’s degree in a specific specialty, or the equivalent. See U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2012-13 ed., “Bookkeeping, Accounting, and Auditing Clerks,” <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/office-and-administrative-support/bookkeeping-accounting-and-auditing-clerks.htm#tab-4> (accessed Jul. 31, 2013).

Nor is it clear that [REDACTED] are discussing the accounting positions that are “parallel” to the one proposed by the petitioner. None of these authors, for instance, discussed the fact that the petitioner submitted an LCA certified for a wage-level that is only appropriate for a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within its occupation, which signifies that the beneficiary is only expected to possess a basic understanding of the occupation.

For all of these reasons, these letters do not satisfy the first alternative prong described at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

Nor does the petitioner submit any other evidence to establish that a requirement of a bachelor’s or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is common to the petitioner’s industry in positions that are both: (1) parallel to the proffered position; and (2) located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner.

Therefore, the petitioner has not satisfied the first of the two alternative prongs described at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2), as the evidence of record does not establish a requirement for at least a bachelor’s degree in a specific specialty as common to the petitioner’s industry in positions that are both (1) parallel to the proffered position and (2) located in organizations that are similar to the petitioner.

Next, the AAO finds that the petitioner did not satisfy the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2), which provides that “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.”

In this particular case, the petitioner has failed to credibly demonstrate that the duties the beneficiary will perform on a day-to-day basis constitute a position so complex or unique that it can

only be performed by a person with at least a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty.

The record of proceeding does not contain evidence establishing relative complexity or uniqueness as aspects of the proffered position, let alone that the position is so complex or unique as to require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge such that a person with a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is required to perform that position. Rather, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not distinguished either the proposed duties, or the position that they comprise, from generic bookkeeping or accounting work, neither of which, the *Handbook* indicates, necessarily require a person with at least a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty.

The petitioner therefore failed to establish how the beneficiary's responsibilities and day-to-day duties comprise a position so complex or unique that the position can be performed only by an individual with a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty.

Additionally, the AAO incorporates here by reference and reiterates its earlier discussion regarding the LCA and its indication that the petitioner would be paying a wage-rate that is only appropriate for a low-level, entry position relative to others within the occupation, as this factor is inconsistent with the relative complexity and uniqueness required to satisfy this criterion. Based upon the wage rate, the beneficiary is only required to have a basic understanding of the occupation. Moreover, that wage rate indicates that the beneficiary will perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of independent judgment; that the beneficiary's work will be closely supervised and monitored; that she will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results; and that her work will be reviewed for accuracy.

Consequently, as it has not been shown that the particular position for which this petition was filed is so complex or unique that it can only be performed by a person with at least a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty, the petitioner has not satisfied the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The AAO turns next to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3), which entails an employer demonstrating that it normally requires a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty for the position.

The AAO's review of the record of proceeding under this criterion necessarily includes whatever evidence the petitioner has submitted with regard to its past recruiting and hiring practices and employees who previously held the position in question.

To satisfy this criterion, the record must contain documentary evidence demonstrating that the petitioner has a history of requiring the degree or degree equivalency, in a specific specialty, in its prior recruiting and hiring for the position. The record must establish that a petitioner's imposition of a degree requirement is not merely a matter of preference for high-caliber candidates but is necessitated

by the performance requirements of the proffered position.⁶ In the instant case, the record does not establish a prior history of recruiting and hiring for the proposed position only persons with at least a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty.

Were USCIS limited solely to reviewing a petitioner's claimed self-imposed requirements, then any individual with a bachelor's degree could be brought to the United States to perform any occupation as long as the employer artificially created a token degree requirement, whereby all individuals employed in a particular position possessed a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specific specialty or its equivalent. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d at 387. In other words, if a petitioner's assertion of a particular degree requirement is not necessitated by the actual performance requirements of the proffered position, the position would not meet the statutory or regulatory definition of a specialty occupation. *See* § 214(i)(1) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) (defining the term "specialty occupation").

To satisfy this criterion, the evidence of record must show that the specific performance requirements of the position generated the recruiting and hiring history. A petitioner's perfunctory declaration of a particular educational requirement will not mask the fact that the position is not a specialty occupation. USCIS must examine the actual employment requirements, and, on the basis of that examination, determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. *See generally Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d at 387. In this pursuit, the critical element is not the title of the position, or the fact that an employer has routinely insisted on certain educational standards, but whether performance of 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 a 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 constrained to recognize a specialty occupation merely because the petitioner has an established practice of demanding certain educational requirements for the proposed position - and without consideration of how a beneficiary is to be specifically employed - then any alien with a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty could be brought into the United States to perform non-specialty occupations, so long as the employer required all such employees to have baccalaureate or higher degrees. *See id.* at 388.

The record indicates that the petitioner has never hired an accountant. Although the fact that a proffered position is a newly-created one is not in itself generally a basis for precluding a position from recognition as a specialty occupation, certainly an employer that has never recruited and hired for the position cannot satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3), which requires a demonstration that it normally requires a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty for the position.

Furthermore, even if the record contained such evidence, the AAO would still find that the petitioner failed to satisfy 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3) because the record does not, as indicated

⁶ Any such assertion would be undermined in this particular case by the fact that the petitioner indicated in the LCA that its proffered position is a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within its occupation.

above, establish that its degree requirement is not merely a matter of preference for high-caliber candidates but is necessitated by the performance requirements of the proffered position, a determination which is strengthened by the petitioner's indication in the LCA that its proffered position is a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within its occupation.

As the petitioner has failed to demonstrate a history of recruiting and hiring only individuals with a bachelor's degree, or the equivalent, in a specific specialty for the proffered position, it has failed to satisfy 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3).

Next, the AAO finds that the petitioner has not satisfied the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4), which requires the petitioner to establish that the nature of the proffered position's duties is so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty.

Both on its own terms and also in comparison with the three higher wage-levels that can be designated in an LCA, the petitioner's designation of an LCA wage-level I is indicative of duties of relatively low complexity.

As earlier noted, the *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* issued by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) states the following with regard to Level I wage rates:

Level I (entry) wage rates are assigned to job offers for beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation. These employees perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment. The tasks provide experience and familiarization with the employer's methods, practices, and programs. The employees may perform higher level work for training and developmental purposes. These employees work under close supervision and receive specific instructions on required tasks and results expected. Their work is closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy. Statements that the job offer is for a research fellow, a worker in training, or an internship are indicators that a Level I wage should be considered [emphasis in original].

The pertinent guidance from the Department of Labor, at page 7 of its *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* describes the next higher wage-level as follows:

Level II (qualified) wage rates are assigned to job offers for qualified employees who have attained, either through education or experience, a good understanding of the occupation. They perform moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment. An indicator that the job request warrants a wage determination at Level II would be a requirement for years of education and/or experience that are generally required as described in the O*NET Job Zones.

The above descriptive summary indicates that even this higher-than-designated wage level is appropriate for only "moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment." The fact that this higher-than-here-assigned, Level II wage-rate itself indicates performance of only "moderately

complex tasks that require limited judgment,” is very telling with regard to the relatively low level of complexity imputed to the proffered position by virtue of its Level I wage-rate designation.

Further, the AAO notes the relatively low level of complexity that even this Level II wage-level reflects when compared with the two still-higher LCA wage levels, neither of which was designated on the LCA submitted to support this petition.

The aforementioned *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* describes the Level III wage designation as follows:

Level III (experienced) wage rates are assigned to job offers for experienced employees who have a sound understanding of the occupation and have attained, either through education or experience, special skills or knowledge. They perform tasks that require exercising judgment and may coordinate the activities of other staff. They may have supervisory authority over those staff. A requirement for years of experience or educational degrees that are at the higher ranges indicated in the O*NET Job Zones would be indicators that a Level III wage should be considered.

Frequently, key words in the job title can be used as indicators that an employer’s job offer is for an experienced worker. . . .

The *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance* describes the Level IV wage designation as follows:

Level IV (fully competent) wage rates are assigned to job offers for competent employees who have sufficient experience in the occupation to plan and conduct work requiring judgment and the independent evaluation, selection, modification, and application of standard procedures and techniques. Such employees use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems. These employees receive only technical guidance and their work is reviewed only for application of sound judgment and effectiveness in meeting the establishment’s procedures and expectations. They generally have management and/or supervisory responsibilities.

Here the AAO again incorporates its earlier discussion and analysis regarding the implications of the petitioner’s submission of an LCA certified for the lowest assignable wage-level. By virtue of this submission the petitioner effectively attested that the proffered position is a low-level, entry position relative to others within the occupation, and that, as clear by comparison with DOL’s instructive comments about the next higher level (Level II), the proffered position did not even involve “moderately complex tasks that require limited judgment” (the level of complexity noted for the next higher wage-level, Level II). The AAO also finds that, separate and apart from the petitioner’s submission of an LCA with a wage-level I designation, the petitioner has also failed to provide sufficiently detailed documentary evidence to establish that the nature of the specific duties that would be performed if this petition were approved is so specialized and complex that the

knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty.

For all of these reasons, the evidence in the record of proceeding fails to establish that the proposed duties meet the specialization and complexity threshold at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

Finally, it is noted that in her July 31, 2012 letter counsel cited *Matter of Arjani*, 12 I&N Dec. 649 (Reg. Comm'r. 1966) in support of her argument that “[i]t is well established that an accountant is a ‘professional’ within the meaning of the H-1B regulations.” However, that case does not stand for the proposition cited by counsel, as *Matter of Arjani* did not involve an H-1B visa petition. *Matter of Arjani* pertained to an immigrant visa petition, and the issue was whether the beneficiary of that petition was a member of the professions as defined in section 101(a)(32) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(32), and as interpreted at those times. The issue before the AAO is whether the petitioner’s proffered position qualifies as a nonimmigrant H-1B specialty occupation – not whether it is a profession. *Matter of Arjani*, therefore, is irrelevant.⁷

As the petitioner has not satisfied at least one of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), it cannot be found that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed and the petition will be denied on this basis.

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. The petition is denied.

⁷ The AAO notes that the current, primary, and fundamental difference between qualifying as a profession and qualifying as a specialty occupation is that specialty occupations require the U.S. bachelor’s or higher degree, or equivalent, to be in a specific specialty. A position qualifying as a profession as that term is defined in section 101(a)(32) of the Act would not necessarily qualify as a specialty occupation unless it met the definition of that term at section 214(i)(1) of the Act.