

(b)(6)



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

DATE: **AUG 26 2013**

OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

IN RE:

Petitioner:

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:

INSTRUCTIONS:

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

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

Thank you,


Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The 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 an IT Solutions firm. To employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a business systems analyst position, the petitioner endeavors to classify him 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, finding that (1) the petitioner failed to establish that it would employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position, and (2) the petitioner failed to establish that the submitted Labor Condition Application (LCA) corresponds to the petition. On appeal, counsel asserted that the director's bases for denial were erroneous and contended that the petitioner satisfied all evidentiary requirements.

In her decision, the director stated the following:

Even though the petitioner claims that the beneficiary will be engaged to work on . . . internal projects and does not intend to contract the beneficiary out to . . . third party sites, it is apparent that the petitioner assigns its workers to work on projects based on clients' needs and requirements.

Based on these findings, the director went on to conclude that the "record fails to establish that the position offered to the beneficiary qualifies as a specialty occupation."

As an initial matter and contrary to the director's conclusion, the AAO finds that it is more likely than not that the work offered to the beneficiary will be performed for the petitioner on-site at the petitioner's offices. As will be discussed below, however, while the director erred in her analysis on the specialty occupation issue, the proffered position does not qualify for classification as a specialty occupation for other reasons; therefore, the director's decision to deny the petition on that ground will not be disturbed.

With respect to the LCA issue, the AAO finds that it is more likely than not that the beneficiary will work at the petitioner's offices for the duration of the requested validity period; therefore, the director's finding that the "petitioner did not establish that the LCA corresponds to the petition by encompassing all of the work locations" is withdrawn.

The AAO bases its decision upon its review of the entire record of proceeding, which includes: (1) the petitioner's Form I-129 and the supporting documentation filed with it; (2) the service center's request for additional evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) the Form I-290B and counsel's submissions on appeal.

Having withdrawn the second basis for the denial, the remaining issue before the AAO is whether the petitioner has demonstrated that the proffered position qualifies as 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 regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) states, in pertinent part, the following:

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, a proposed 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 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, and determine whether the position qualifies as a specialty occupation. See generally *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 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.

The LCA submitted to support the visa petition states that the proffered position is a business systems analyst position, and that it corresponds to Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) code and title 15-1121.00, Computer Systems Analysts from the Occupational Information Network (O*NET). The LCA further states that the proffered position is a Level I, entry-level, position.

With the visa petition, counsel submitted evidence that the beneficiary received a bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering from [REDACTED], a master's degree in business

administration from [REDACTED] and a master's degree in management from the [REDACTED]. The record contains no evaluation of the beneficiary's foreign degrees.

Counsel also submitted contracts and other evidence that the petitioner has contracted to provide IT services to other companies, and a letter, dated April 23, 2012, from the petitioner's president. The petitioner's president's letter contains the following description of the duties of the proffered position:

- Build prototypes/proof of concept for different functionalities in [REDACTED] to meet the business requirements gathered by our on-site consultants working at various clients (primarily for our onsite consultants working at [REDACTED]). (10% of daily work).
- Prepare manual test scripts with step by step instructions on executing [REDACTED] software transactions as requested by the on-site consultants at various clients (primarily for our on-site consultants working at [REDACTED]). (20% of daily work).
- Provide assistance as systems analyst in the areas of Finance & Controlling business best practices to other on-site consultants of [the petitioner] who will be working at various client locations (primarily for our on-site consultants working at [REDACTED]) (10% of daily work).
- Perform research on any [REDACTED] software bugs that are discovered by our on-site consultants working at various client locations (primarily bugs discovered by our on-site consultants working at [REDACTED]). Research need to be performed by logging to [REDACTED] online service portal (OSS) and see if there were similar bugs reported to [REDACTED] already and if not work with [REDACTED] in getting the issue resolved (10% of daily work).
- Train new associates/interns of [the petitioner] in building their [REDACTED] functional consulting/systems analysis skills. (20% of daily work).
- Work with Senior Architects of [the petitioner] in building [REDACTED] based software products that will assist in implementation of [REDACTED] software at clients (10% of daily work).
- Assist associates of [the petitioner] in preparing documentation and presentation slides to bid for [REDACTED] project work with different companies in the U.S. that use [REDACTED] software. Respond to any queries addressed by the prospective clients (20% of daily work).

The petitioner's president also stated that the proffered position requires, "[a] Bachelor's degree or equivalent in computer science or engineering (or closely related field of study) . . ."

On September 29, 2012, the service center issued an RFE in this matter. The service center requested, *inter alia*, evidence that the petitioner would employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation throughout the entire period of requested employment. The director outlined the specific evidence to be submitted.

In response, counsel submitted additional contracts and other evidence of additional work the petitioner has agreed to perform for other companies.

The director denied the petition on December 27, 2012, finding, as was noted above, that (1) the petitioner had not demonstrated that the proffered position qualifies for classification as a position in a specialty occupation, and (2) the petitioner failed to establish that the submitted LCA corresponds to the petition.

On appeal, counsel asserted that the evidence submitted is sufficient to show that the petitioner would employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation.

As a preliminary matter, the petitioner's claim that a bachelor's degree in "computer science or engineering (or [a] closely related field of study)" is a minimum requirement for entry into the proffered position is inadequate to establish that the proposed position qualifies as a specialty occupation.

The field of engineering is a very broad category that covers numerous and various disciplines, some of which are only related through the basic principles of science and mathematics, e.g., petroleum engineering and aerospace engineering. A petitioner must demonstrate that the proffered position requires a precise and specific course of study that relates directly and closely to the position in question. Since there must be a close correlation between the required specialized studies and the position, the requirement of a degree with a generalized title, such as business administration or engineering, without further specification, does not establish the position as a specialty occupation. *See Matter of Michael Hertz Associates*, 19 I&N Dec. 558 (Comm'r 1988).

Again, to prove that a job requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of specialized knowledge as required by Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, a petitioner must establish that the position requires the attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specialized field of study. As explained above, USCIS interprets the degree requirement at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to require a degree in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proposed position. USCIS has consistently stated that, although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as a degree in business administration, may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify a finding that a particular position qualifies for classification as a specialty occupation. *See Royal Siam Corp. v. Chertoff*, 484 F.3d 139, 147 (1st Cir. 2007).

By asserting that a degree in any branch of engineering would be a sufficient educational qualification for the proffered position, the petitioner has asserted, in effect, that the proffered position does not require a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. The director's decision must therefore be affirmed and the petition denied on this basis alone.

Nevertheless, for the purpose of performing a comprehensive analysis of whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, the AAO turns next to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) and (2): a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position; and a degree requirement in a specific specialty is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or a particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree in a specific specialty. Factors considered by the AAO when determining these criteria include: whether the U.S. Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* on which the AAO routinely relies for the educational requirements of particular occupations, reports the industry requires a degree in a specific specialty; whether the industry's professional association has made a degree in a specific specialty 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 1151, 1165 (D.Minn. 1999) (quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

The AAO will first address the requirement under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1): A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position. The AAO recognizes the *Handbook* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses.¹

The petitioner claims in the LCA that the proffered position corresponds to SOC code and title 15-1121.00, Computer Systems Analysts from O*NET. The AAO reviewed the chapter of the *Handbook* (2012-2013 edition) entitled "Computer Systems Analysts," including the sections regarding the typical duties and requirements for this occupational category. The *Handbook* states the following with regard to the duties of computer systems analysts:

What Computer Systems Analysts Do

Computer systems analysts study an organization's current computer systems and procedures and make recommendations to management to help the organization operate more efficiently and effectively. They bring business and information technology (IT) together by understanding the needs and limitations of both.

Duties

¹ The *Handbook*, which is available in printed form, may also be accessed on the Internet, at <http://www.bls.gov/oco/>. The AAO's references to the *Handbook* are to the 2012 – 2013 edition available online.

Computer systems analysts typically do the following:

- Consult with managers to determine the role of the IT system in an organization
- Research emerging technologies to decide if installing them can increase the organization's efficiency and effectiveness
- Prepare an analysis of costs and benefits so that management can decide if computer upgrades are financially worthwhile
- Devise ways to make existing computer systems meet new needs
- Design and develop new systems by choosing and configuring hardware and software
- Oversee installing and configuring the new system to customize it for the organization
- Do tests to ensure that the systems work as expected
- Train the system's end users and write instruction manuals, when required

Analysts use a variety of techniques to design computer systems such as data-modeling systems, which create rules for the computer to follow when presenting data, thereby allowing analysts to make faster decisions. They also do information engineering, designing and setting up information systems to improve efficiency and communication.

Because analysts work closely with an organization's business leaders, they help the IT team understand how its computer systems can best serve the organization.

Analysts determine requirements for how much memory and speed the computer system needs, as well as other necessary features. They prepare flowcharts or diagrams for programmers or engineers to use when building the system. Analysts also work with these people to solve problems that arise after the initial system is set up.

Most systems analysts specialize in certain types of computer systems that are specific to the organization they work with. For example, an analyst might work predominantly with financial computer systems or engineering systems.

In some cases, analysts who supervise the initial installation or upgrade of IT systems from start to finish may be called IT project managers. They monitor a project's progress to ensure that deadlines, standards, and cost targets are met. IT project managers who plan and direct an organization's IT department or IT policies are included in the profile on computer and information systems managers. For more information, see the profile on computer and information systems managers.

The following are examples of types of computer system analysts.

Systems analysts specialize in developing new systems or fine-tuning existing ones to meet an organization's needs.

Systems designers or systems architects specialize in helping organizations choose a specific type of hardware and software system. They develop long-term goals for the computer systems and a plan to reach those goals. They work with management to ensure that systems are set up to best serve the organization's mission.

Software quality assurance (QA) analysts do in-depth testing of the systems they design. They run tests and diagnose problems to make sure that certain requirements are met. QA analysts write reports to management recommending ways to improve the system.

Programmer analysts design and update their system's software and create applications tailored to their organization's needs. They do more coding and debugging the code than other types of analysts, although they still work extensively with management to determine what business needs the applications are meant to address. Other occupations that do programming are computer programmers and software developers. For more information, see the profiles on computer programmers and software developers.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2012-13 ed., "Computer Systems Analysts," <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/computer-and-information-technology/computer-systems-analysts.htm> (last visited August 20, 2013).

Most of the duties the petitioner's president attributed to the proffered position are consistent with the duties of computer systems analysts as described in the *Handbook*. On the balance, the AAO finds that the proffered position is a computer systems analyst position as described in the *Handbook*.

The *Handbook* states the following about the educational requirements of computer systems analyst positions:

How to Become a Computer Systems Analyst

A bachelor's degree in a computer or information science field is common, although not always a requirement. Some firms hire analysts with business or liberal arts degrees who know how to write computer programs.

Education

Most computer systems analysts have a bachelor's degree in a computer-related field. Because computer systems analysts are also heavily involved in the business side of a

company, it may be helpful to take business courses or major in management information systems (MIS).

Some employers prefer applicants who have a Master of Business Administration (MBA) with a concentration in information systems. For more technically complex jobs, a master's degree in computer science may be more appropriate.

Although many analysts have technical degrees, such a degree is not always a requirement. Many systems analysts have liberal arts degrees and have gained programming or technical expertise elsewhere.

Some analysts have an associate's degree and experience in a related occupation.

Many systems analysts continue to take classes throughout their careers so that they can learn about new and innovative technologies and keep their skills competitive. Technological advances come so rapidly in the computer field that continual study is necessary to remain competitive.

Systems analysts must also understand the business field they are working in. For example, a hospital may want an analyst with a background or coursework in health management. An analyst working for a bank may need to understand finance.

Advancement

With experience, systems analysts can advance to project manager and lead a team of analysts. Some can eventually become information technology (IT) directors or chief technology officers. For more information, see the profile on computer and information systems managers.

Important Qualities

Analytical skills. Analysts must interpret complex information from various sources and be able to decide the best way to move forward on a project. They must also be able to predict how changes may affect the project.

Communication skills. Analysts work as a go-between with management and the IT department and must be able to explain complex issues in a way that both will understand.

Creativity. Because analysts are tasked with finding innovative solutions to computer problems, an ability to "think outside the box" is important.

Teamwork. The projects that computer systems analysts work on usually require them to collaborate and coordinate with others.

Id. at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/Computer-and-Information-Technology/Computer-systems-analysts.htm#tab-4> (last visited August 20, 2013).

Although the *Handbook* indicates that most computer systems analysts have a bachelor's degree in a field related to computers, it also indicates that some systems analyst positions are available to people with a degree in business or liberal arts who know how to write computer programs. Clearly, computer systems analyst positions do not, as a category, require a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent.

Further, the petitioner has designated the proffered position as a Level I position on the submitted LCA, indicating that it is an entry-level position for an employee who has only basic understanding of the occupation. See U.S. Dep't of Labor, Emp't & Training Admin., *Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance*, Nonagric. Immigration Programs (rev. Nov. 2009), available at http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf. The classification of the proffered position as a Level I position does not support the assertion that it is a position that cannot be performed without a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent, especially as the *Handbook* suggests that some computer systems analyst positions do not require such a degree.

Further still, the AAO finds that, to the extent that they are described in the record of proceeding, the numerous duties that the petitioner ascribes to the proffered position indicate a need for a range of technical knowledge in the computer/IT field, but do not establish any particular level of formal, postsecondary education leading to a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty as minimally necessary to attain such knowledge.

As the evidence of record does not establish that the particular position here proffered is one for which the normal minimum entry requirement is a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent, the petitioner has not satisfied 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 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 (quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. at 1102).

In the instant case, the petitioner has not established that the proffered position falls under an occupational category for which the *Handbook*, or other reliable and authoritative source, indicates that there is a standard, minimum entry requirement of at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent.

Also, there are no submissions from professional associations, individuals, or similar firms in the petitioner's industry attesting that individuals employed in positions parallel to the proffered position are routinely required to have a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for entry into those positions.

Thus, based upon a complete review of the record, the petitioner has not established 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 petitioner has not, therefore, satisfied the first alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The petitioner also has not satisfied 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." A review of the record indicates that the petitioner has failed to credibly demonstrate that the duties the beneficiary will be responsible for or perform on a day-to-day basis entail such complexity or uniqueness that the proffered position can be performed only by a person with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty.

Specifically, the petitioner failed to demonstrate how the duties described require the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge such that a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required to perform them. For instance, the petitioner did not submit information relevant to a detailed course of study leading to a specialty degree and did not establish how such a curriculum is necessary to perform the duties of the proffered position. While a few related courses may be beneficial, or even required, in performing certain duties of the proffered position, the petitioner has failed to demonstrate how an established curriculum of such courses leading to a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is required to perform the duties of the particular position here.

Therefore, the evidence of record does not establish that this position is significantly different from other positions in the occupation such that it refutes the *Handbook's* information to the effect that there is a spectrum of preferred degrees acceptable for such positions, including degrees not in a specific specialty. In other words, the record lacks sufficiently detailed information to distinguish the proffered position as unique from or more complex than positions that can be performed by persons without at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

Further, as was also noted above, the LCA submitted in support of the visa petition is approved for a Level I computer systems analyst, an indication that the proffered position is an entry-level position for an employee who has only a basic understanding of computer systems analysis. This does not

support the proposition that the proffered position is so complex or unique that it can only be performed by a person with a specific bachelor's degree, especially as the *Handbook* indicates that some computer systems analyst positions do not require such a degree.

As the petitioner fails to demonstrate how the proffered position is so complex or unique relative to other positions within the same occupational category that do not require at least a baccalaureate degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for entry into the occupation in the United States, it cannot be concluded that the petitioner has satisfied the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The AAO will next address the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3), which may be satisfied if the petitioner demonstrates that it normally requires a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for the proffered position.²

The record contains no evidence pertinent to anyone that the petitioner has previously hired to fill the proffered position. Further, the statement of the petitioner's president, that the educational requirement of the proffered position may be satisfied by a degree in any branch of engineering, makes clear that the petitioner does not require a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent for the proffered position. For both reasons, the petitioner has not satisfied the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3).

Finally, the AAO will address the alternative criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4), which is satisfied if the petitioner establishes that the nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform them is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent.

Again, relative specialization and complexity have not been sufficiently developed by the petitioner as an aspect of the proffered position.

The duties of the proffered position include building prototypes/proof of concept for different functionalities in [REDACTED], preparing manual test scripts with step by step instructions, analyzing bugs and debugging programs, training new employees in [REDACTED], assisting in building [REDACTED]-based software

² While a petitioner may believe or otherwise assert that a proffered position requires a degree, that opinion alone without corroborating evidence cannot establish the position as a specialty occupation. 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 a specific specialty or its equivalent. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d at 387. In other words, if a petitioner's degree requirement is only symbolic and the proffered position does not in fact require such a specialty degree or its equivalent to perform its duties, the occupation 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").

products, assisting in preparing presentations to sell the petitioner's computer services, and responding to inquiries from prospective clients. Those duties contain no indication of a nature so specialized and complex that they require knowledge usually associated with a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent, especially as the *Handbook* indicates that some systems analyst positions require no such specialized degree, and the petitioner has asserted that the proffered position is a Level I, entry-level, position.

For the reasons discussed above, the petitioner has not satisfied the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

The petitioner has failed to establish that it has satisfied any of the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) and, therefore, it cannot be found that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. The appeal will be dismissed and the petition denied for this 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.