




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



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



DATE: **MAY 20 2013** OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE: 

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

If you believe the AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg  
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

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

On the Form I-129 visa petition, the petitioner describes itself as a merchant services company established in 2005. In order to employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a management analyst position, the petitioner seeks 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 the petitioner failed to establish that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation in accordance with the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions. On appeal, counsel for the petitioner asserts that the director's basis for denial of the petition was erroneous and contends that the petitioner satisfied all evidentiary requirements.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) the Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for evidence (RFE); (3) the petitioner's response to the RFE; (4) the notice of decision; and (5) the Form I-290B and supporting materials. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

For the reasons that will be discussed below, the AAO agrees with the director that the petitioner has not established eligibility for the benefit sought. Accordingly, the director's decision will not be disturbed. The appeal will be dismissed, and the petition will be denied.

The primary issue for consideration is whether the petitioner's proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation. To meet its burden of proof in this regard, the petitioner must establish that the employment it is offering to the beneficiary meets the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

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.

In the petition signed on November 24, 2011, the petitioner indicates that it is seeking the beneficiary's services as a management analyst on a full-time basis at the rate of pay of \$54,725 per year. In the November 23, 2011 letter of support, the petitioner states the following regarding the duties of the proffered position:

[The beneficiary] will be employed as a Management Analyst with total responsibility for coordinating all financial and business operations management in [the petitioning] company. Within the scope of this professional position, he will also be responsible for directing various components of an existing market plan. In order to make sure all efforts are working toward the proper goal, a management analyst will help to keep each area of responsibility functioning at optimum efficiency.

Specific duties [the beneficiary] will perform are as follows:

- Coordinate daily business operations including marketing strategies;
- Conduct budget analysis of the current and past budgets and plan and maintain annual and monthly expense budget performing risk management;
- Analyze accounting records to determine financial resources to implement various operations programs;
- Keep track of monetary exchange rates between Japanese yen and US dollars;
- Negotiate and administer contracts with clients;
- Coordinate with management to evaluate the productivity of the company's marketing strategies;
- Maintain and review order status and report to clients on daily basis;
- Measure the effectiveness of advertising and communications programs and strategies;
- Present information and promotional methods to clients and management;
- Examine and analyze statistical data to forecast future marketing trends;

- Forecast and track marketing and design trend research;
- Monitor industry statistics and follow trends in trade literature;
- Research and provide information to help new business development and report to the president;
- Create research database to keep current of new regulations that may effect [the petitioner's] industry; [and]
- Maintain close communications with [the petitioner's] sister companies in the US and conducting meetings with potential clients[.]

In addition, the petitioner states that "[the petitioner's] need for this specialty occupation is a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration or related field." Further, the petitioner states that the position "requires specialized knowledge of the Japanese language and understanding of the Japanese industry in this field." In addition, the petitioner reports that the management analyst must be bilingual in Japanese and English, including "business and technical language ability in Japanese and English."

With the initial petition, the petitioner submitted a copy of the beneficiary's foreign degree and transcripts, as well as a credential evaluation from Global Education Group, Inc. The evaluation states that the beneficiary's foreign education is equivalent to a U.S. Bachelor of Business Administration degree with a concentration in international business and economics.

The petitioner also submitted a Labor Condition Application (LCA) in support of the instant H-1B petition. The AAO notes that the LCA designation for the proffered position corresponds to the occupational classification of "Management Analysts" - SOC (ONET/OES Code) 13-1111, at a Level I (entry level) wage.

The director found the evidence insufficient to establish eligibility for the benefit sought, and issued an RFE on March 13, 2012. The petitioner was asked to submit documentation to establish that a specialty occupation position exists for the beneficiary. The director outlined the specific evidence to be submitted. The AAO notes that the director specifically requested the petitioner submit a more detailed description of the proffered position, to include the approximate percentage of time for each duty the beneficiary will perform, level of responsibility, etc.

On May 22, 2012, counsel responded by submitting further information regarding the proffered position and additional evidence. In response to the director's RFE, counsel submitted a letter dated May 6, 2012, which included a revised description of the duties of the proffered position, along with the percentage of time that the beneficiary will spend performing each duty. Specifically, the petitioner stated that the beneficiary will perform the following duties ("with the level of responsibility ranked as A, B, C . . . indicating the priority"):

- Analyze accounting records to determine financial resources to implement various operations programs. Recommend new systems, procedures, or organizational changes. Develop long-range objectives and specify the strategies and actions to achieve them. Measure the effectiveness of advertising and communications programs and strategies.  
-25%, A
- Coordinate daily business operations including marketing strategies. Coordinate with the owner to evaluate the productivity of the company's marketing strategies. Conduct on-site observations to determine the methods that will be needed for conducting daily business.  
-20%, A
- Maintain close communications with sister companies and confer with the owner to ensure that the changes are working. Communicate with coworkers to obtain information from all relevant sources. Provide guidance and expert advice to staffs from sister companies on technical, systems-, or process-related topics.  
-25%, A
- Conduct budget analysis of current and past budgets, plan and maintain annual and monthly expense budget. Analyze financial and other data including revenue, expenditure, sales records, performance report, etc.  
-15%, A
- Present information and promotional methods to management. Examine and analyze statistical data to forecast future marketing trends. Forecast and track marketing and design trend research. Monitor industry statistics and follow trends in trade literature. Research and provide information to help new business development and report to management.  
-10%, B
- Keep track of monetary exchange rates between Japanese Yen and U.S. Dollars. Create research database to keep current of new regulations that may affect the credit-card processing industry.  
-5%, C

In addition, the response to the RFE included an organizational chart and Internet printouts. Notably, several of the printouts are in a foreign language, and they are not accompanied by an English translation.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Any document submitted containing a foreign language must be accompanied by a full English language translation that has been certified by the translator as complete and accurate, and that the translator is competent to translate from the foreign language into English. See 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3). Because the petitioner failed to comply with the regulations by submitting a certified translation of the documents, the AAO cannot determine whether the evidence supports the petitioner's claims. *Id.* Accordingly, the evidence

The director reviewed the information provided in response to the RFE to determine whether the petitioner had established eligibility for the benefit sought. Although the petitioner claimed that the beneficiary would serve in a specialty occupation, the director determined that the petitioner failed to establish how the beneficiary's immediate duties would necessitate 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 a specific specialty. The director denied the petition on August 15, 2012. Counsel for the petitioner submitted an appeal of the denial of the H-1B petition.

The issue before the AAO is whether the petitioner has provided sufficient evidence to establish that it would employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. The AAO will first make some preliminary findings that are material to this decision's application of the H-1B statutory and regulatory framework to the proffered position as described in the record of proceeding.

When determining whether a position is a specialty occupation, it is important to consider the nature of the business offering the employment and the description of the specific duties of the position as it relates to the particular employer. To ascertain the intent of a petitioner, USCIS looks to the Form I-129 and the documents filed in support of the petition. It is only in this manner that the agency can determine the exact position offered, the location of employment, the proffered wage, et cetera. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(9)(i), the director has the responsibility to consider all of the evidence submitted by a petitioner and such other evidence that he or she may independently require to assist his or her adjudication. Further, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv) provides that "[a]n H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation shall be accompanied by [d]ocumentation . . . or any other required evidence sufficient to establish . . . that the services the beneficiary is to perform are in a specialty occupation."

For H-1B approval, the petitioner must demonstrate a legitimate need for an employee exists and to substantiate that it has H-1B caliber work for the beneficiary for the period of employment requested in the petition. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to demonstrate it has sufficient work to require the services of a person with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, to perform duties at a level that 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 for the period specified in the petition.

The AAO notes that it is reasonable to assume that the size of an employer's business has or could have an impact on the duties of a particular position. *See EG Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a/ Mexican Wholesale Grocery v Department of Homeland Security*, 467 F. Supp. 2d 728 (E.D. Mich. 2006). Thus, the size of a petitioner may be considered as a component of the nature of the petitioner's business, as the size impacts upon the duties of a particular position. In matters where a petitioner's business is relatively small, the AAO reviews the record for evidence that its operations, are, nevertheless, of sufficient complexity to indicate that it would employ the beneficiary in position requiring the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge that may be obtained only through a baccalaureate degree or higher in or its equivalent in a specific

---

that is in a foreign language is not probative and will not be accorded any weight in this proceeding. The AAO will not attempt to decipher or "guess" the meaning of documents that are not accompanied by a full, certified English language translation.

specialty. Additionally, when a petitioner employs relatively few people, it may be necessary for the petitioner to establish how the beneficiary will be relieved from performing non-qualifying duties.

As previously noted, in the Form I-129, the petitioner describes itself as a merchant services company. In the letter of support dated November 23, 2011, the petitioner claims that it is a "growing consumer services company specializing in credit card services along with phone and retail sales." The petitioner states that its services include "24 hour technical support, free estimates, PC software, wireless terminals, mobile credit card processing, DSL terminals, check guarantee services, gift card services, multi-currency programs, and prepaid debit card program." The petitioner continues by stating that its "principle business activity involves sales of consumer products to hundreds of different retailers and private customers and to distributors around the country."

The petitioner indicated that it has two employees. Based upon an organizational chart submitted in response to the RFE, it appears that the petitioner's two employees are the owner (who also operates two other companies) and an administrative coordinator. Counsel states that the administrative coordinator "is in charge of clerical work in the company" and claims that the beneficiary will be relieved from performing non-qualifying duties. Neither the petitioner nor counsel provides further information regarding the roles and responsibilities of the petitioner's two employees. Counsel makes a general conclusory statement but fails to provide any further information or support for his statement. Without documentary evidence to support the claim, the assertions of counsel will not satisfy the petitioner's burden of proof. The unsupported assertions of counsel do not constitute evidence. *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

For an H-1B petition to be granted, the petitioner must provide sufficient evidence to establish that it will employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. 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'r 1998). USCIS regulations affirmatively require a petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking at the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1).

Furthermore, the AAO notes that the petitioner referenced the beneficiary performing duties in connection with "sister companies," and provided an organizational chart indicating that the owner of the petitioning company also owns two other business entities. Notably, the petitioning company is the only relevant employer to the instant Form I-129 petition. If the beneficiary were scheduled to perform work for any other company, that company would need to submit a separate Form I-129 petition for the portion of the beneficiary's time to be spent performing duties for that employer.

Moreover, upon review of the petitioner's description of the duties of the proffered position, the AAO finds that the petitioner describes the proposed duties in terms of generalized and generic functions that fail to convey sufficient substantive information to establish the relative complexity, uniqueness and/or specialization of the proffered position or its duties. The abstract level of information provided about the proffered position and its constituent duties is exemplified by the

petitioner's assertion that the beneficiary will "communicate with coworkers to obtain information from relevant sources." The statement fails to provide any insight into the beneficiary's actual duties, nor does it include any information regarding the specific tasks that the beneficiary will perform. Moreover, the AAO observes that the petitioning company consists of just two employees. The petitioner also claims that the beneficiary will "[c]onduct on-site observations to determine the methods that will be needed for conducting daily business." Notably, the petitioner does not provide any information as to the specific knowledge required to "[c]onduct on-site observations" or the resources/tools to be used.

Additionally, the petitioner claims that the beneficiary will "measure the effectiveness of advertising and communications programs and strategies." However, the petitioner fails to provide sufficient information to establish the actual work involved in "measur[ing]" these programs and strategies for the petitioner's business operations. Additionally, the petitioner fails to demonstrate how the performance of this duty, as described in the record, would require the attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. According to the petitioner, the beneficiary will "[k]eep track of monetary exchange rates between Japanese Yen and U.S. Dollars." The description of this task fails to convey any information regarding the knowledge and/or level of understanding required to perform duty.

The petitioner further states that the beneficiary will "coordinate daily business operations including marketing strategies" as well as "maintain close communication with sister companies and confer with the owner to ensure that the changes are working." The petitioner did not provide any further information to establish how the performance of these tasks involves the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. Furthermore, the petitioner fails to convey how a baccalaureate level of education (or higher) in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, would be required to perform these tasks. The overall responsibilities for the proffered position contain generalized functions without providing sufficient information regarding the particular work, and associated educational requirements, into which the duties would manifest themselves in their day-to-day performance within the petitioner's business operations.

Such generalized information does not in itself establish a necessary correlation between any dimension of the proffered position and a need for a particular level of education, or educational equivalency, in a body of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty. The AAO also observes, therefore, that it is not evident that the proposed duties as described in the petitioner's job descriptions, and the position that they comprise, merit recognition of the proffered position as a specialty occupation. To the extent that they are described by the petitioner, the AAO finds, the proposed duties do not provide a sufficient factual basis for conveying the substantive matters that would engage the beneficiary in the actual performance of the proffered position for the entire period requested, so as to persuasively support the claim that the position's actual work would require the theoretical and practical application of any particular educational level of highly specialized knowledge in a specific specialty directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the proffered position. Notably, the petitioner did not provide documentation to substantiate the job duties and responsibilities of the proffered position.

Furthermore, upon review of the record of proceeding, the AAO notes that the petitioner's claimed

entry requirement of at least a bachelor's degree in "Business Administration or related field" for the proffered position, without more, is inadequate to establish that the proposed position qualifies as a specialty occupation. 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, without further specification, does not establish the position as a specialty occupation. *Cf. Matter of Michael Hertz Associates*, 19 I&N Dec. 558 (Comm'r 1988).

To demonstrate that a job requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly 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 or its equivalent. As discussed *supra*, 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. 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 at 147<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, based upon a review of the record of proceeding, the AAO finds that there are additional discrepancies and inconsistencies with regard to the proffered position that preclude the approval of the petition. For instance, there are discrepancies between what the petitioner claims about the occupational classification and level of responsibility inherent in the proffered position set against the contrary occupational classification and level of responsibility conveyed by the wage level indicated on the LCA submitted in support of the petition.

As previously discussed, the petitioner submitted an LCA in support of the petition that designated the proffered position to the corresponding occupational category of "Management Analysts" - SOC (ONET/OES) code 13-1111. The wage level for the proffered position in the LCA corresponds to a Level I (entry) position. The prevailing wage source is listed in the LCA as the OES (Occupational Employment Statistics) OFLC (Office of Foreign Labor Certification) Online Data Center.<sup>3</sup> The

---

<sup>2</sup> Specifically, the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit explained in *Royal Siam* that:

[t]he courts and the agency consistently have stated that, although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as a business administration degree, may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify the granting of a petition for an H-1B specialty occupation visa. *See, e.g., Tapis Int'l v. INS*, 94 F.Supp.2d 172, 175-76 (D.Mass.2000); *Shanti*, 36 F. Supp.2d at 1164-66; *cf. Matter of Michael Hertz Assocs.*, 19 I & N Dec. 558, 560 ([Comm'r] 1988) (providing frequently cited analysis in connection with a conceptually similar provision). This is as it should be: otherwise, an employer could ensure the granting of a specialty occupation visa petition by the simple expedient of creating a generic (and essentially artificial) degree requirement.

*Id.*

<sup>3</sup> The Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) program produces employment and wage estimates for

LCA was certified on November 22, 2011. The petitioner signed the LCA on November 23, 2011. The AAO notes that by completing and submitting the LCA, and by signing the LCA, the petitioner attested that the information contained in the LCA was true and accurate.

Wage levels should be determined only after selecting the most relevant Occupational Information Network (O\*NET) occupational code classification. Then, a prevailing wage determination is made by selecting one of four wage levels for an occupation based on a comparison of the employer's job requirements to the occupational requirements, including tasks, knowledge, skills, and specific vocational preparation (education, training and experience) generally required for acceptable performance in that occupation.<sup>4</sup>

Prevailing wage determinations start with a Level I (entry) and progress to a wage that is commensurate with that of a Level II (qualified), Level III (experienced), or Level IV (fully competent) position after considering the job requirements, experience, education, special skills/other requirements and supervisory duties. Factors to be considered when determining the prevailing wage level for a position include the complexity of the job duties, the level of judgment, the amount and level of supervision, and the level of understanding required to perform the job duties.<sup>5</sup> The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) emphasizes that these guidelines should not be implemented in a mechanical fashion and that the wage level should be commensurate with the complexity of the tasks, independent judgment required, and amount of close supervision received.

The wage levels are defined in DOL's "Prevailing Wage Determination Policy Guidance." A Level I wage rate is described as follows:

**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

---

over 800 occupations. See Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, on the Internet at <http://www.bls.gov/oes/>. The OES All Industries Database is available at the Foreign Labor Certification Data Center, which includes the Online Wage Library for prevailing wage determinations and the disclosure databases for the temporary and permanent programs. The Online Wage Library is accessible at <http://www.flcdatacenter.com/>.

<sup>4</sup> For additional information regarding prevailing wage determinations, 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](http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> A point system is used to assess the complexity of the job and assign the wage level. Step 1 requires a "1" to represent the job's requirements. Step 2 addresses experience and must contain a "0" (for at or below the level of experience and SVP range), a "1" (low end of experience and SVP), a "2" (high end), or "3" (greater than range). Step 3 considers education required to perform the job duties, a "1" (more than the usual education by one category) or "2" (more than the usual education by more than one category). Step 4 accounts for Special Skills requirements that indicate a higher level of complexity or decision-making with a "1" or a "2" entered as appropriate. Finally, Step 5 addresses Supervisory Duties, with a "1" entered unless supervision is generally required by the occupation.

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.

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](http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf).

In the November 23, 2011 letter of support, the petitioner states that it "requires that its Management Analyst exercise autonomous judgment with respect to his promotional and daily decision making and strategy." Notably, the petitioner also states that "this particular position requires specialized knowledge of the Japanese language and understanding of Japanese industry in this field." According to the petitioner, the beneficiary will "handle increasingly diverse and sophisticated needs of [the petitioner's] clients as well as customer relations activities." The petitioner claims that the beneficiary must "create and implement an intelligent financial plan." Further, the petitioner asserts that it will rely on the beneficiary to "maximize revenue for the company" and "create a strong project stream for [the petitioner]." In addition, the petitioner indicates that the management analyst will have "total responsibility for coordinating all financial and business operations management in [the petitioning] company." The petitioner states that the beneficiary will "be responsible for directing various components of an existing market plan." The petitioner continues by claiming that the position of management analyst with [the petitioner] is so complex and unique which requires multiple professional job duties." Furthermore, the petitioner claims that the proffered position "is a professional position by virtue of the responsibilities and breadth of knowledge required for its proper accomplishment and the complex nature of the duties to be performed, involving the application of theoretical and practical knowledge in the highly sophisticated disciplines of business operations."

In the May 6, 2012 letter, submitted in response to the RFE, counsel claims that the management analyst position is "critical within the company" and that in addition to a degree, the position requires "outstanding coordinating ability." Counsel continues by asserting that the "position has complex responsibilities" and "[t]he duties to be performed are of an intellectually sophisticated and technical nature." According to counsel, the position requires "diversified skills to successfully and efficiently manage the complex and technical duties." Counsel emphasizes that the duties of the position are "complex"

In the appeal, counsel asserts that "[a]ccounting for the entire job description and supporting evidence, the complex job duties and specialized business knowledge required of the position of management analysts for a company like [the petitioner] would normally require a bachelor's degree in a business related specialty." Counsel emphasizes the complexity of the duties of the proffered position.

The AAO notes that this characterization of the position and the claimed duties, responsibilities and requirements conflict with the wage-rate element of the LCA, which, as reflected in the discussion above, is indicative of a comparatively low, entry-level 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 have a basic understanding of the occupation and carries expectations that the beneficiary perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that he would be closely supervised; that his work would be closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that he would receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results. As noted above, a job offer for a research fellow, a worker in training, or an internship is an indication that a Level I wage should be considered.

Furthermore, the petitioner claims that knowledge of the Japanese language is required for the position. A language requirement other than English in a petitioner's job offer generally is considered a special skill for all occupations, with the exception of Foreign Language Teachers and Instructors, Interpreters, and Caption Writers. In the instant case, the petitioner has not established that the foreign language requirement has been reflected in the wage-level for the proffered position.

Under the H-1B program, a petitioner must offer a beneficiary wages that are at least the actual wage level paid by the petitioner to all other individuals with similar experience and qualifications for the specific employment in question, or the prevailing wage level for the occupational classification in the area of employment, whichever is greater, based on the best information available as of the time of filing the application. See section 212(n)(1)(A) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(n)(1)(A).

The AAO notes that the prevailing wage of \$54,725 per year on the LCA corresponds to a Level I for the occupational category of "Management Analysts" for Los Angeles County (Alhambra, California).<sup>6</sup> The petitioner stated in the Form I-129 petition and LCA that the offered salary for the proffered position was \$54,725 per year. Notably, if the proffered position were designated as a higher level position, the prevailing wage at that time would have been \$72,238 per year for a Level II position, \$89,752 per year for a Level III position, and \$107,266 per year for a Level IV position.

The petitioner was required to provide, at the time of filing the H-1B petition, an LCA certified for the correct wage level in order for it to be found to correspond to the petition. To permit otherwise would result in a petitioner paying a wage lower than that required by section 212(n)(1)(A) of the Act, by allowing that petitioner to simply submit an LCA for a different wage level at a lower prevailing wage than the one that it claims it is offering to the beneficiary. As such, the petitioner has failed to establish that it would pay the required wage for the beneficiary's work, as mandated under the Act if the petition were granted. Thus, even if it were determined that the petitioner overcame the director's ground for denying the petition (which it has not), for this reason also the

---

<sup>6</sup> For additional information regarding the prevailing wage for management analysts in Los Angeles County, see the All Industries Database for 7/2011 - 6/2012 for Management Analysts at the Foreign Labor Certification Data Center, Online Wage Library on the Internet at <http://www.flcdatacenter.com/OesQuickResults.aspx?code=13-1111&area=31084&year=12&source=1> (last visited May 15, 2013).

H-1B petition cannot be approved. It is considered an independent and alternative basis for denial.

Moreover, the AAO notes that this aspect of the LCA undermines the credibility of the petition, and, in particular, the credibility of the petitioner's assertions regarding the demands, level of responsibilities and requirements of the proffered position. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence. Any attempt to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies will not suffice unless the petitioner submits competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth lies. *Matter of Ho*, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 591-92 (BIA 1988).

As noted below, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(i)(B)(2) specifies that certification of an LCA does not constitute a determination that an occupation is a specialty occupation:

Certification by the Department of Labor of a labor condition application in an occupational classification does not constitute a determination by that agency that the occupation in question is a specialty occupation. The director shall determine if the application involves a specialty occupation as defined in section 214(i)(1) of the Act. The director shall also determine whether the particular alien for whom H-1B classification is sought qualifies to perform services in the specialty occupation as prescribed in section 214(i)(2) of the Act.

While DOL is the agency that certifies LCA applications before they are submitted to USCIS, DOL regulations note that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (i.e., its immigration benefits branch, USCIS) is the department responsible for determining whether an LCA filed for a particular Form I-129 actually supports that petition. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b), which states, in pertinent part (emphasis added):

For H-1B visas . . . DHS accepts the employer's petition (DHS Form I-129) with the DOL certified LCA attached. *In doing so, the DHS determines whether the petition is supported by an LCA which corresponds with the petition*, whether the occupation named in the [LCA] is a specialty occupation . . . and whether the qualifications of the nonimmigrant meet the statutory requirements of H-1B visa classification.

The regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 655.705(b) requires that USCIS ensure that an LCA actually supports the H-1B petition filed on behalf of the beneficiary. Here, the petitioner has failed to submit a valid LCA that corresponds to the claimed duties and requirements of the proffered position, that is, specifically, that corresponds to the level of work, responsibilities and requirements that the petitioner ascribed to the proffered position and to the wage-level corresponding to such a level of work, responsibilities and requirements in accordance with the pertinent LCA regulations.

The statements regarding the claimed level of complexity, independent judgment and knowledge required for the proffered position, along with the petitioner's claimed requirements, are materially inconsistent with the certification of the LCA for a Level I entry-level position. This conflict undermines the overall credibility of the petition. The AAO finds that, fully considered in the context of the entire record of proceedings, the petitioner failed to establish the nature of the

proffered position and in what capacity the beneficiary will actually be employed.

For the foregoing reasons, a review of the enclosed LCA indicates that the information provided does not correspond to the level of work and requirements that the petitioner ascribed to the proffered position and to the wage-level corresponding to such a level of work and requirements in accordance with the pertinent LCA regulations. As a result, even if it were determined that the petitioner overcame the other independent reason for the director's denial, the petition could still not be approved for this reason.

The AAO will now address the director's basis for denial of the petition, namely that the petitioner failed to establish that it would employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. Based upon a complete review of the record of proceeding, the AAO agrees with the director and finds that the evidence fails to establish that the position as described constitutes a specialty occupation. For efficiency's sake, the AAO hereby incorporates the above discussion and analysis into the record of proceeding regarding the beneficiary's proposed employment.

For an H-1B petition to be granted, the petitioner must provide sufficient evidence to establish that it will employ the beneficiary in a specialty occupation position. To make its determination whether the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation, the AAO first turns 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 DOL's *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (hereinafter the *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 recognizes the *Handbook* as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses.<sup>7</sup> As previously mentioned, the petitioner asserts in the LCA that the proffered position falls under the occupational category "Management Analysts."

The AAO reiterates that the job duties of the proffered position, as provided by the petitioner, do not convey the substantive nature of the actual work that the beneficiary would perform within the petitioner's business operations. Rather, the job description conveys, at best, only generalized

---

<sup>7</sup> The *Handbook*, which is available in printed form, may also be accessed on the Internet, at <http://www.stats.bls.gov/oco/>. The AAO's references to the *Handbook* are to the 2012 – 2013 edition available online.

functions at a generic level. Upon review of the record of proceeding, the petitioner has not established that the duties of the proffered position fall under the occupational category "Management Analysts." Nevertheless, the AAO reviewed the chapter of the *Handbook* (2012-2013 edition) entitled "Management Analysts" including the sections regarding the typical duties and requirements for this occupational category.<sup>8</sup> However, the *Handbook* does not indicate that "Management Analysts" comprise an occupational group for which at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry.

The subchapter of the *Handbook* entitled "How to Become a Management Analyst" states, in part, the following about this occupation:

**Education**

A bachelor's degree is the typical entry-level requirement for management analysts. However, some employers prefer to hire candidates who have a master's degree in business administration (MBA). In 2010, 28 percent of management analysts had a master's degree.

Few colleges and universities offer formal programs in management consulting. However, many fields of study provide a suitable education because of the range of areas that management analysts address. Common fields of study include business, management, accounting, marketing, economics, statistics, computer and information science, and engineering.

Analysts also routinely attend conferences to stay up to date on current developments in their field.

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2012-13 ed.*, Management Analysts, <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/business-and-financial/management-analysts.htm#tab-4> (last visited May 15, 2013).

When reviewing the *Handbook*, the AAO must note again that the petitioner designated the wage level of the proffered position as a Level I position on the LCA. As previously discussed, this designation is indicative of a comparatively low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupation and signifies that the beneficiary is only expected to possess a basic understanding of the occupation and carries expectations that the beneficiary perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of judgment; that he would be closely supervised; that his work would be closely monitored and reviewed for accuracy; and that he would receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results.

The *Handbook* does not support the assertion that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into this occupation. Rather, the

---

<sup>8</sup> For additional information regarding the occupational category "Management Analysts," see U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2012-13 ed.*, Management Analysts, on the Internet at <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/business-and-financial/management-analysts.htm#tab-1> (last visited May 15, 2013).

*Handbook* states that many fields of study provide a suitable education for management analysts. The *Handbook's* narrative indicates that common fields of study include business, management, accounting, marketing, economics, statistics, computer and information science, and engineering. According to the *Handbook*, a range of programs can help people prepare for jobs in this occupation. However, the *Handbook* does not conclude that normally the minimum requirement for entry into these positions is at least a bachelor's degree in a *specific specialty*, or its equivalent.

In general, provided the specialties are closely related, e.g., chemistry and biochemistry, a minimum of a bachelor's or higher degree in more than one specialty is recognized as satisfying the "degree in the specific specialty" requirement of section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act. In such a case, the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" would essentially be the same. Since there must be a close correlation between the required "body of highly specialized knowledge" and the position, however, a minimum entry requirement of a degree in disparate fields (such as business, management, accounting, marketing, economics, statistics, computer and information science and engineering) would not meet the statutory requirement that the degree be "in *the* specific specialty," unless the petitioner establishes how each field is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position such that the required body of highly specialized knowledge is essentially an amalgamation of these different specialties.<sup>9</sup> Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act (emphasis added).

Here, although the *Handbook* indicates that a bachelor's is the typical entry-level requirement, it also indicates that baccalaureate degrees in various fields are acceptable for entry into the occupation. In addition to recognizing degrees in disparate fields (i.e., business, management, accounting, marketing, economics, statistics, computer and information science and engineering), the *Handbook* also states that a degree in business is acceptable. As noted above, although a general-purpose bachelor's degree, such as a degree in business, 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 at 147. Therefore, the *Handbook's* recognition that a general, non-specialty degree in business is sufficient for entry into the occupation strongly suggests that a bachelor's degree *in a specific specialty* is not normally the minimum requirement for entry into this occupation. Furthermore, the narrative of the *Handbook* indicates that a degree in engineering is also acceptable for management analyst positions. The issue here is that the field of engineering is a broad category that covers numerous and various specialties, some of which are only related through the basic principles of science and mathematics, e.g., nuclear engineering and aerospace engineering. Therefore, it is not readily apparent that a degree in any and all engineering specialties is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of a management analyst. 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. Accordingly, as the *Handbook* indicates that working in these positions does not normally require at least a bachelor's degree in a

---

<sup>9</sup> Whether read with the statutory "the" or the regulatory "a," both readings denote a singular "specialty." Section 214(i)(1)(B) of the Act; 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). Still, the AAO does not so narrowly interpret these provisions to exclude positions from qualifying as specialty occupations if they permit, as a minimum entry requirement, degrees in more than one closely related specialty. As just stated, this also includes even seemingly disparate specialties provided the evidence of record establishes how each acceptable, specific field of study is directly related to the duties and responsibilities of the particular position.

specific specialty, or its equivalent, for entry into the occupation, it does not support the proffered position as being a specialty occupation.

The AAO notes that in response to the director's RFE, counsel claims that USCIS has previously approved H-1B cases on behalf of different employers for the proffered position of management analyst. In support of the assertion, counsel submitted notices issued by USCIS to these other employers. Notably, the petitioner did not submit copies of the petitions and supporting documents. If a petitioner wishes to have unpublished service center or AAO decisions considered by USCIS in its adjudication of a petition, the petitioner is permitted to submit copies of such evidence that it either obtained itself and/or received in response to a Freedom of Information Act request filed in accordance with 6 C.F.R. Part 5. Otherwise, "[t]he non-existence or other unavailability of required evidence creates a presumption of ineligibility." 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(2)(i).

As the record of proceeding does not contain copies of the petitions, there were no underlying facts to be analyzed and, therefore, no prior, substantive determinations could have been made to determine what facts, if any, were analogous to those in this proceeding. While 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(c) provides that AAO precedent decisions are binding on all USCIS employees in the administration of the Act, unpublished decisions are not similarly binding.

When any person makes an application for a "visa or any other document required for entry, or makes an application for admission [ . . . ] the burden of proof shall be upon such person to establish that he is eligible" for such relief. 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972). Furthermore, any suggestion that USCIS must review unpublished decisions and possibly request and review each case file relevant to those decisions, while being impractical and inefficient, would also be tantamount to a shift in the evidentiary burden in this proceeding from the petitioner to USCIS, which would be contrary to section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Accordingly, the AAO was not required to request and/or obtain a copy of the petitions cited by counsel.

Nevertheless, if the previous nonimmigrant petitions were approved based on the same unsupported and contradictory assertions that are contained in the current record, the approvals would constitute material and gross error on the part of the director. The AAO is not required to approve applications or petitions where eligibility has not been demonstrated, merely because of prior approvals that may have been erroneous. *See, e.g. Matter of Church Scientology International*, 19 I&N Dec. 593, 597 (Comm'r 1988). It would be absurd to suggest that USCIS or any agency must treat acknowledged errors as binding precedent. *Sussex Engg. Ltd. v. Montgomery*, 825 F.2d 1084, 1090 (6th Cir. 1987), cert. denied, 485 U.S. 1008 (1988).

Furthermore, the AAO's authority over the service centers is comparable to the relationship between a court of appeals and a district court. Even if a service center director had approved the nonimmigrant petition, the AAO would not be bound to follow the contradictory decision of a service center. *Louisiana Philharmonic Orchestra v. INS*, 2000 WL 282785 (E.D. La.), *aff'd*, 248 F.3d 1139 (5th Cir. 2001), cert. denied, 122 S.Ct. 51 (2001).

It is incumbent upon the petitioner to provide persuasive evidence that the proffered position

qualifies as a specialty occupation under this criterion, notwithstanding the absence of the *Handbook's* support on the issue. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iv) provides that "[a]n H-1B petition involving a specialty occupation shall be accompanied by [d]ocumentation . . . or any other required evidence sufficient to establish . . . that the services the beneficiary is to perform are in a specialty occupation." As previously mentioned, going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

The petitioner has not established that the proffered position falls under an occupational category for which the *Handbook*, or other authoritative source, indicates that at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the occupation. Furthermore, the duties and requirements of the proffered position as described in the record of proceeding do not indicate that the position is one for which a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, is normally the minimum requirement for entry. Thus, the petitioner failed to satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1).

Next, the AAO reviews the record regarding 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.

As stated earlier, 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 (quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. at 1102).

Here and as already discussed, the petitioner has not established that its proffered position is one for which the *Handbook*, or other authoritative source, reports a standard industry-wide requirement of at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or its equivalent. Thus, the AAO incorporates by reference the previous discussion on the matter. Also, there are no submissions from the industry's professional association and/or letters or affidavits from firms or individuals in the petitioner's industry. The record of proceeding is devoid of evidence to support a conclusion that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation under this criterion of the regulations.

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. For the reasons discussed above, the petitioner has not satisfied the first alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The AAO will next consider the second alternative prong of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2),

which is satisfied if the petitioner shows that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

The AAO acknowledges that the petitioner claims that the proffered position involves complex and/or unique duties. In the instant case, the record of proceeding contains documentation regarding the petitioner's business operations, including an organizational chart for the petitioning company and its "sister companies," along with printouts from [www.corporationwiki.com](http://www.corporationwiki.com) regarding the companies and an Internet printout for one of the "sister companies."<sup>10</sup> However, upon review of the record of proceeding, the AAO finds that the petitioner has failed to sufficiently develop relative complexity or uniqueness as an aspect of the proffered position of management analyst. That is, the AAO reviewed the record in its entirety and finds that the petitioner has not provided sufficient documentation to support a claim that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can only be performed by an individual with a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Further, the AAO hereby incorporates into this analysis the earlier comments and findings regarding the information and evidence provided with regard to the proposed duties and requirements and the position that they are said to comprise. As reflected in those earlier comments and findings, the petitioner has not developed or established complexity or uniqueness as attributes of the proffered position that would require the services of a person with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

In the instant case, the petitioner failed to sufficiently develop relative complexity or uniqueness as an aspect of the proffered position of management analyst. Specifically, the petitioner failed to demonstrate how the management analyst 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 related courses may be beneficial, or even required, in performing certain duties of a management analyst 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 proffered.

This is further evidenced by the LCA submitted by the petitioner in support of the instant petition. Again, the AAO incorporates by reference and reiterates its earlier discussion that the LCA indicates that the position is a low-level, entry position relative to others within the occupation. Based upon the wage rate, the beneficiary is only required to have a basic understanding of the occupation. Moreover, the wage rate indicates that the beneficiary will perform routine tasks that require limited, if any, exercise of independent judgment; his work will be closely supervised and monitored; he will receive specific instructions on required tasks and expected results; and his work will be reviewed for accuracy.

---

<sup>10</sup> As previously mentioned, the documentation includes information in a foreign language and it is not accompanied by a certified English translation. For the reasons already discussed the information that is in a foreign language is not probative evidence in establishing the proffered position as qualifying as a specialty occupation. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3).

Without further evidence, it is simply not credible that in the instant case the petitioner's proffered position is complex or unique as such a position would likely be classified at a higher-level, such as a Level IV (fully competent) position, requiring a significantly higher prevailing wage. A Level IV (fully competent) position is designated by DOL for employees who "use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems."<sup>11</sup>

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

The AAO observes that the petitioner has indicated that the beneficiary's academic background and experience in the industry will assist him in carrying out the duties of the proffered position. However, the test to establish a position as a specialty occupation is not the skill set or education of a proposed beneficiary, but whether the position itself requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge obtained by at least baccalaureate-level knowledge in a specialized area. The petitioner does not explain or clarify at any time in the record which of the duties, if any, of the proffered position would be so complex or unique as to be distinguishable from those of similar but non-degreed or non-specialty degreed employment. Consequently, as the petitioner fails to demonstrate that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, 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 third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) entails an employer demonstrating that it normally requires a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for the position. The AAO usually reviews the petitioner's past recruiting and hiring practices, as well as information regarding employees who previously held the position.

To merit approval of the petition under this criterion, the record must contain documentary evidence demonstrating that the petitioner has a history of requiring the degree or degree equivalency in its prior recruiting and hiring for the position. Further, it should be noted that 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 performance requirements of the position. In the instant case, the record does not establish a prior history of recruiting and hiring for the proffered position only persons with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or the equivalent.

While a petitioner may believe or otherwise assert that a proffered position requires a specific 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

---

<sup>11</sup> For additional information on Level IV wage levels, 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](http://www.foreignlaborcert.doleta.gov/pdf/NPWHC_Guidance_Revised_11_2009.pdf).

requirements, then any individual with a bachelor's degree could be brought to the United States to perform any occupation as long as the petitioner 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 388. In other words, if a petitioner's stated degree requirement is only designed to artificially meet the standards for an H-1B visa and/or to underemploy an individual in a position for which he or she is overqualified and if 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").

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 384. 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 the specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act. To interpret the regulations any other way would lead to absurd results: if USCIS were constrained to recognize a specialty occupation merely because the petitioner has an established practice of demanding certain educational requirements for the proffered 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.

In the November 23, 2011 letter of support, the petitioner states that the proffered position is a new position. Accordingly, the petitioner did not submit any documentation regarding employees who have previously held the position. In addition, the petitioner did not submit any documentation regarding its hiring practices. The record is devoid of information to satisfy this criterion of the regulations.

The AAO reviewed the record of proceeding but finds that the petitioner has not provided evidence to establish that it normally requires at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, for the proffered position. Thus, the petitioner has not satisfied the third criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A).

The fourth criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) requires a petitioner to establish that the nature of the specific 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 a specific specialty, or its equivalent.

The AAO acknowledges that the petitioner may believe that the proffered position involves

specialized and complex duties. As previously mentioned, the petitioner provided documentation regarding its business operations, including an organizational chart and printouts from the Internet. However, the petitioner has not provided sufficient evidence to satisfy this criterion of the regulations. The AAO notes that relative specialization and complexity have not been sufficiently developed by the petitioner as an aspect of the proffered position. That is, the proposed duties have not been described with sufficient specificity to establish that they are more specialized and complex than positions that are not usually associated with at least a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. The petitioner has not provided sufficient probative evidence to support its claim. Further, the AAO incorporates its earlier discussion and analysis regarding the duties of the proffered position, and the designation of the proffered position in the LCA as a low, entry-level position relative to others within the occupational category of "Management Analysts." The petitioner designated the position as a Level I position (the lowest of four assignable wage-levels), which DOL indicates is appropriate for "beginning level employees who have only a basic understanding of the occupation."

Without further evidence, it is simply not credible that the petitioner's proffered position is one with specialized and complex duties as such a position would likely be classified at a higher-level, such as a Level IV (fully competent) position, requiring a substantially higher prevailing wage. As previously discussed, a Level IV (fully competent) position is designated by DOL for employees who "use advanced skills and diversified knowledge to solve unusual and complex problems" and requires a significantly higher wage.

The petitioner has submitted inadequate probative evidence to satisfy this criterion of the regulations. Thus, the petitioner has not established that the duties of the position are so specialized and complex that the knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. The AAO, therefore, concludes that the petitioner failed to satisfy the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

For the reasons related in the preceding discussion, 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.

A beneficiary's credentials to perform a particular job are relevant only when the job is found to be a specialty occupation. As discussed in this decision, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position requires a baccalaureate or higher degree in a specific specialty, or its equivalent. Therefore, the AAO need not and will not address the beneficiary's qualifications further.

An application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the service center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1043, *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683; *see also Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 145 (noting that the AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis).

Moreover, when the AAO denies a petition on multiple alternative grounds, a plaintiff can succeed on a challenge only if it shows that the AAO abused its discretion with respect to all of the AAO's enumerated grounds. *See Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d at 1043, *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683.

The petition will be denied and the appeal dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternative basis for the decision. In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act. Here, that burden has not been met.

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