

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

D4




FILE: WAC 07 248 51791 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: **SEP 18 2008**

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



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

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert P. Wiemann".

Robert P. Wiemann, 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.

The petitioner is a headwear manufacturer, importer, and exporter that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a quality assurance trainee for a period of 22 months. The petitioner, therefore, endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant trainee pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(iii).

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

The director denied the petition on six grounds: (1) that the petitioner had failed to adequately describe the career abroad for which the training will prepare the beneficiary; (2) that the petitioner had failed to adequately describe the type of training and supervision to be given, and the structure of the training program; (3) that the petitioner had failed to set forth the proportion of time that will be devoted to productive employment; (4) that the petitioner had failed to show the number of hours that will be spent, respectively, in classroom instruction and in on-the-job training; (5) that the petitioner had failed to indicate the source of remuneration received by the trainee and any benefit which will accrue to the petitioner for providing the training; (6) that the petitioner had failed to establish that the proposed training program does not deal in generalities with no fixed schedule, objectives, or means of evaluation; and (7) that the petitioner had failed to establish that it has the physical plant and sufficiently trained manpower to provide the training specified in the petition.

On appeal, counsel contends that the director erred in denying the petition.

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(iii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(iii), provides classification for an alien having a residence in a foreign country, which he or she has no intention of abandoning, who is coming temporarily to the United States as a trainee, other than to receive graduate medical education or training, in a training program that is not designed primarily to provide productive employment.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7) states, in pertinent part, the following:

- (ii) Evidence required for petition involving alien trainee—
 - (A) Conditions. The petitioner is required to demonstrate that:
 - (1) The proposed training is not available in the alien's own country;
 - (2) The beneficiary will not be placed in a position which is in the normal operation of the business and in which citizens and resident workers are regularly employed;

- (3) The beneficiary will not engage in productive employment unless such employment is incidental and necessary to the training; and
 - (4) The training will benefit the beneficiary in pursuing a career outside the United States.
 - (B) Description of training program. Each petition for a trainee must include a statement which:
 - (1) Describes the type of training and supervision to be given, and the structure of the training program;
 - (2) Sets forth the proportion of time that will be devoted to productive employment;
 - (3) Shows the number of hours that will be spent, respectively, in classroom instruction and in on-the-job training;
 - (4) Describes the career abroad for which the training will prepare the alien;
 - (5) Indicates the reasons why such training cannot be obtained in the alien's country and why it is necessary for the alien to be trained in the United States; and
 - (6) Indicates the source of any remuneration received by the trainee and any benefit which will accrue to the petitioner for providing the training.
- (iii) Restrictions on training program for alien trainee. A training program may not be approved which:
 - (A) Deals in generalities with no fixed schedule, objectives, or means of evaluation;
 - (B) Is incompatible with the nature of the petitioner's business or enterprise;
 - (C) Is on behalf of a beneficiary who already possesses substantial training and expertise in the proposed field of training;
 - (D) Is in a field in which it is unlikely that the knowledge or skill will be used outside the United States;
 - (E) Will result in productive employment beyond that which is incidental and necessary to the training;

- (F) Is designed to recruit and train aliens for the ultimate staffing of domestic operations in the United States;
- (G) Does not establish that the petitioner has the physical plant and sufficiently trained manpower to provide the training specified; or
- (H) Is designed to extend the total allowable period of practical training previously authorized a nonimmigrant student.

In its July 13, 2007 letter of support, the petitioner stated the following:

[The petitioner] was established in 1925 and is a premium manufacturer, importer, and exporter of quality headwear, including hats, caps, and visors . . . The company is especially well known for its line of headwear tailored to the golf market. Headquartered in Los Angeles, California, [the petitioner] is committed to the highest standard in headwear. . .

With regard to why it is offering the training program, the petitioner stated the following:

Utilizing our profits and our connections with our national and international affiliates, we have been seeking to expand our operations outside of the United States and making our name known worldwide. Through research and planning, we have found that starting a business overseas to be cost effective and profitable to our operations, as it will drive down costs.

As a result, we will need . . . representatives to ensure that our goals and objectives are accomplished overseas. We, therefore, wish to place [the beneficiary] as a Quality Assurance Trainee. With the training that [the beneficiary] will receive, he will be fully qualified to become our Quality Assurance Manager to guarantee that the quality of [the petitioner's] products remains the same no matter where they are generated from. . . .

Upon completion of the training program, [the beneficiary] will play a vital role in the potential success of our operations abroad, since [the petitioner's] success is achieved through its reputation for quality products. Therefore, the training program is essential in ensuring our policies and goals are maintained to that end.

In the training program outline submitted at the time the petition was filed, the petitioner explained that its proposed training program would consist of four phases. The first phase would consist of two sessions: (1) the first session, entitled "General Orientation: Company Structure, Personnel & Policy," would last one month, and (2) the second session, entitled "Management Level Exposure," would last three months. The second phase would consist of five sessions: (1) the first session, entitled "Product Development," would last two months; (2) the second session, entitled "Quality Costs," would last three months; (3) the third session, entitled "Quality Management," would last two months; (4) the fourth session, entitled "Inventory Management," would last three months; and (5) the fifth session, entitled "Product Purchasing," would last three months. The third phase would consist of four sessions: (1) the first session, entitled "Company's Computer Architecture," would last one month; (2) the second session, entitled "Company Software & Machine Equipment," would last one month; (3) the third session, entitled "Computer Structure Analysis," would last one month; and (4) the fourth

session, entitled "Technical Documentation," would last one month. Finally, the fourth phase would consist of a one-month review.

Upon review, the AAO agrees with the director's determination that the petitioner's proposed training program does not meet the regulatory requirements to establish eligibility for the nonimmigrant visa.

The director found that the petitioner failed to adequately describe the career abroad for which the training will prepare the beneficiary. The AAO agrees. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(A)(4) requires the petitioner to demonstrate that the proposed training will benefit the beneficiary in pursuing a career outside the United States, and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(B)(4) requires the petitioner to describe the career abroad for which the training will prepare the alien.

In her March 26, 2008 denial, the director stated the following:

[T]he petitioner has not adequately described the career abroad for which this training program will prepare the alien. The petitioner indicates that the beneficiary will be sent back to his home country to initially help establish their company structure, coordinate with business partners and perform quality assurance and managerial duties as necessary upon completion of the training program. However, at this time there is no branch office in the trainee's home country. The petitioner states that their branch office in the Philippines is currently being researched. This is supported by the lack of evidence in the record pertaining to an existing or currently pending Philippine affiliate. Although, the record does contain a job offer letter, dated July 9, 2007, the letter indicates that branch is up coming. . . .

In his May 27, 2008 appellate brief, counsel states the following:

The Petitioner seeks to establish an Asian branch office by using its profits and by using its network of vendors and multinational clients in the United States, Canada, Europe, Africa, Australia, and the Pacific Rim . . . The Petitioner currently outsources production operations to China . . . However, due to their Chinese partners' rising costs of production, the Petitioner seeks to establish a branch office in the Philippines to allow for greater control over production costs, product consistency, and distribution methods. For this reason, the Petitioner is offering a quality assurance training program to train a quality assurance manager for its upcoming branch office abroad. The Petitioning employer has consistently provided the reasons why it wants to establish an overseas branch office and why it needs a quality assurance manager for the branch office.

The AAO agrees with the director's analysis. Again, the reason for creation of the training program at issue here is to train the beneficiary on the petitioner's own business practices. Having made such a demonstration, however, the petitioner is compelled to further demonstrate that there is a setting in which the beneficiary will be able to use his newfound knowledge. Since his newfound knowledge will be specific to the petitioner, an operation run by the petitioner would be the only setting in which he would be able to use the knowledge.

The petitioner's intentions are not the issue; the issue is whether there existed, at the time the petition was filed, a career abroad in which the beneficiary would utilize the training he obtains through the proposed

training program. The petitioner has not demonstrated that such a position existed at the time the petition was filed. It has not demonstrated that such a position actually exists at the present time.

There is no evidence in the record of proceeding to indicate that the petitioner had any concrete plans for such expansion at the time the petition was filed.¹ A petitioner must establish eligibility at the time of filing the nonimmigrant visa petition. A visa petition may not be approved based on speculation of future eligibility or after the petitioner or beneficiary becomes eligible under a new set of facts. *Matter of Michelin Tire Corp.*, 17 I&N Dec. 248 (Reg. Comm. 1978).

Accordingly, the petitioner has not established that the proposed training would prepare the beneficiary in pursuing a career abroad. The petitioner has failed to satisfy 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(A)(4) and 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(B)(4).

The director also found that the petitioner had failed to adequately describe the type of training and supervision to be given, and the structure of the training program. The AAO agrees. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(B)(1) requires the petitioner to describe the type of training and supervision to be given, and the structure of the training program.

The director stated the following in her denial:

The petitioner, however, has not shown that it has a structured training program. The training program does not include the number of hours that will be spent in each individual session or list the instructors for each individual session, lecture hours, equipment usage, anticipated student learning outcomes, textbook(s), method of instruction or materials needed . . . The record does indicate that the President, who is to oversee the training and supervision at all times, will have time to conduct training 40 hours a week by allocating his work to subordinates. The timelines here would need to be broken down into significantly more discrete segments, with more information about how the time would be utilized, to meet the terms of the regulations. . .

On appeal, counsel submits additional information to rebut the director's findings. However, the AAO finds that the petitioner's description of its proposed training program remains deficient. The evidence of record remains vague in nature and leaves the AAO with very little idea of what the beneficiary would actually be doing on a day-to-day basis. While the petitioner is not required to account for every minute of the beneficiary's time, it must provide detailed information as to how the beneficiary would actually be spending the bulk of his time. Summary descriptions of how the beneficiary would spend months of time are insufficient. Nor is the training manual sufficient: the record does not support a finding that the petitioner would be able to spread this 106-page booklet across 22 months of training.

The petitioner has failed to provide a meaningful description of what the beneficiary would actually be doing, on a day-to-day basis, while he participates in the proposed training program. The petitioner has failed to satisfy 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(B)(1).

¹ Although some of the internet printouts and office space inquiries submitted by counsel on appeal were printed before the petition was filed, the AAO notes nonetheless that none of these documents bind the petitioner to pursuing any course of action and do not constitute documentary evidence that a career abroad exists, even at this time. There is no indication that there existed, for the beneficiary, a position abroad at the time the petition was filed.

The director also found that the petitioner had failed to set forth the proportion of time to be devoted to productive employment; that the petitioner had failed to show the number of hours that will be spent, respectively, in classroom instruction and in on-the-job training; and that the petitioner had failed to indicate the source of remuneration received by the trainee and any benefit which will accrue to the petitioner for providing the training, as required by 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.2(h)(7)(ii)(B)(2), (3), and (6). The AAO disagrees. The petitioner provided this information in its July 13, 2007 letter of support and supporting documentation. Accordingly, the AAO finds that the petitioner has overcome the concerns of the director in this regard, and it withdraws that portion of the director's decision finding otherwise.

The director also found that the petitioner had failed to establish that the proposed training program does not deal in generalities with no fixed schedule, objectives, or means of evaluation, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(iii)(A). The AAO agrees.

The AAO incorporates here its previous discussion regarding the vague and generalized nature of the petitioner's description of what the beneficiary would actually be doing while participating in the proposed training program. Again, the evidence of record remains vague in nature and leaves the AAO with very little idea of what the beneficiary would actually be doing on a day-to-day basis. Providing a list of vague goals to be accomplished or skills to be imparted does not substitute for a description of what the beneficiary would actually be doing. While the petitioner is not required to account for every minute of the beneficiary's time, it must provide information as to how the beneficiary would actually be spending the bulk of his time. The petitioner has failed to provide a meaningful description of what the beneficiary would actually be doing, on a day-to-day basis, while he participates in the proposed training program.

For all of these reasons, approval of the petition is precluded by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(iii)(A). The AAO finds that the record fails to demonstrate the existence of a training program that does not deal in generalities with no fixed schedule, objectives, or means of evaluation.

The director also found that the petitioner had failed to establish that it has the physical plant and sufficiently trained manpower to provide the training specified in the petition, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(iii)(G). The AAO disagrees.

The director stated the following in her denial:

The petition shows that the petitioner currently has ninety-eight employees. The record indicates that President of the Company will both supervise and instruct the trainee 40 hours per week; no other instructors are mentioned.

On appeal, the petitioner provides the names and information regarding the qualifications of the individuals who will provide the training, as well as those who will perform the duties of the president of the company when he is involved in the training program. This information was not before the director at the time she issued her decision. The AAO finds that the petitioner has overcome the concerns of the director regarding this issue. The petitioner has satisfied 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(7)(iii)(G), and the AAO withdraws that portion of the director's decision finding otherwise.

For the reasons set forth in the preceding discussion, the AAO will not disturb the director's denial of the petition.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

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