Canada Employment Insurance Commission (CEIC)

Commission de l'assurance-emploi du Canada (CAEC)

2014/2015

Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report

Employment Insurance 1940-2015 75 years helping people

Canada

Canada Employment Insurance Commission (CEIC)

Commission de l'assurance-emploi du Canada (CAEC)

March 2016

The Honourable MaryAnn Mihychuk, P.C., M.P.
Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour
140 Promenade du Portage
Gatineau QC K1A 0J9

Dear Minister,

In accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the *Employment Insurance Act*, we are pleased to present the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, to be laid by you before Parliament. This report is the nineteenth in a series of annual reports submitted by the Canada Employment Insurance Commission.

This report, which covers the period from April 1, 2014 to March 31, 2015, analyzes the overall effectiveness of Employment Insurance (EI) income benefits, active measures and service delivery. In particular, the report focuses on the responsiveness of the EI program in a period marked by moderate economic growth and a slight downward trend in the unemployment rate, despite a sharp decline in oil prices, which resulted in a contraction of economic activity in some regions late in the fiscal year.

As in previous years, we relied on key studies and evaluations to complement EI administrative data and to provide a deeper analysis. Information on each of the studies referenced in the report is included in an annex.

In closing, we would like to express our appreciation to Employment and Social Development Canada and Service Canada employees for their support in preparing this report.

We trust you will find the report informative.

The original version was signed by:

Ian Shugart
Chairperson

Judith Andrew
Commissioner for Employers

Mary-Lou Donnelly
Commissioner for Workers

Canada Employment Insurance Commission (CEIC)

Commission de l'assurance-emploi du Canada (CAEC)

2014/2015

Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report

Employment Insurance 1940-2015

75 years helping people

Canada

2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report

This publication is available for download at **canada.ca/publicentre-ESDC**. It is also available upon request in multiple formats (large print, Braille, audio cassette, audio CD, e-text diskette, e-text CD, or DAISY), by contacting 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). By teletypewriter (TTY), call 1-800-926-9105.

© Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada, 2016

For information regarding reproduction rights: **droitdauteur.copyright@hrsdc-rhdcc.gc.ca**

PDF
Cat. No.: Em-13-1E-PDF
ISSN: 1494-7048

ESDC
Cat. No. : CEIC-001-04-16

Table of Contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS 1

HIGHLIGHTS 3

INTRODUCTION 5

PROGRAM OVERVIEW 7

1. Employment Insurance Part I – Employment Insurance Benefits 7

1.1 Historical Background 8

1.2 Employment Insurance Benefits 8

1.3 Waiting and Benefit Periods 13

1.4 Level of Benefits 14

2. Employment Insurance Part II – Employment Benefits and Support Measures 15

2.1 Historical Background 15

2.2 Guidelines 15

2.3 Programming Design and Delivery 16

2.4 Target Population 16

2.5 Employment Benefits and Support Measures 17

3. Relationship Between Employment Insurance Part I and Part II 18

3.1 Targeting Referral and Feedback 18

CHAPTER I - LABOUR MARKET CONTEXT 19

1. Economic Overview 19

1.1 Economic Growth 19

1.2 Key Economic Developments 22

2. Labour Market Overview 23

2.1 Labour Force 23

2.2 Employment 27

2.3 Unemployment 40

CHAPTER II - IMPACTS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS (PART I OF THE *EMPLOMENT INSURANCE ACT*) 49

1. Employment Insurance Benefits 50

1.1 Employment Insurance Claims, Amount Paid and Level of Benefits 51

1.2 Combined Employment Insurance Claims 55

1.3 Family Supplement Provision 57

1.4 Employment Insurance Support for Apprentices 60

1.5 Premium Refund Provision 64

1.6 Impact of Employment Insurance Benefits on Income Redistribution 65

2. Assisting Canadians During Unemployment: Employment Insurance Regular Benefits 67

2.1 Employment Insurance Regular Claims and Amount Paid 68

2.2 Coverage, Eligibility and Access to Employment Insurance Regular Benefits 80

2.3 Level of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits 93

2.4 Maximum and Actual Duration of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits 111

2.5 Exhaustion of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits 122

2.6 Connecting Canadians with Available Jobs Provision 130

2.7 Employment Insurance Regular Benefits and Seasonal Workers 132

2.8 Employment Insurance Regular Benefits and Labour Mobility 138

2.9 Impact of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits on Income Redistribution 142

3. Employment Insurance Fishing Benefits 145

3.1 Employment Insurance Fishing Claims and Amount Paid 145

3.2 Coverage, Eligiility and Access to Employment Insurance Fishing Benefits 148

3.3 Level of Employment Insurance Fishing Benefits 150

3.4 Maximum Duration and Actual Duration of Employment Insurance Fishing Benefits 151

4. Supporting Working Canadians and Their Families: Employment Insurance Special Benefits 152

4.1 Employment Insurance Special Benefits 152

4.2 Employment Insurance Maternity and Parental Benefits 155

4.3 Employment Insurance Sickness Benefits 160

4.4 Employment Insurance Compassionate Care Benefits 166

4.5 Parents of Critically Ill Children Benefits 170

4.6 Employment Insurance Special Benefits for Self-employed Persons 173

5. Employment Insurance Work-Sharing Benefits 175

5.1 Employment Insurance Work-Sharing Claims and Amounts Paid 176

5.2 Level and Duration of Employment Insurance Work-sharing Benefits 178

5.3 Employment Insurance Work-Sharing Agreements 179

5.4 Number of Estimated Layoffs Averted from Work-Sharing Agreements 181

6. Employment Insurance Benefits and Firms 183

6.1 Firms with Employees Receiving Employment Insurance Benefits 183

6.2 Firms and Employment Insurance Regular Benefits 183

6.3 Firms and Employment Insurance Special Benefits 186

6.4 Firms and Temporary Hiring Credit for Small Business 188

7. Employment Insurance Financial Information 189
7.1 Employment Insurance Premium Rate 189
7.2 Recent Trends in Revenues and Expenditures 190

CHAPTER III - IMPACTS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND SUPPORT MEASURES (EBSMS–PART II OF THE *EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT*) 191

1. National Overview 192
1.1 Context 192
1.2 Main Results 193
1.3 Client Profile and Participation 197
1.4 Interventions: Employment Benefits 200
1.5 Interventions: Support Measures 203
1.6 Expenditures 207
1.7 Key Performance Indicators 208
1.8 Early Interventions with EI clients 208
2. Provincial and Territorial EBSM Activities 209
2.1 Context 209
2.2 Newfoundland and Labrador 210
2.3 Prince Edward Island 213
2.4 Nova Scotia 217
2.5 New Brunswick 221
2.6 Quebec 225
2.7 Ontario 229
2.8 Manitoba 232
2.9 Saskatchewan 236
2.10 Alberta 239
2.11 British Columbia 242
2.12 Northwest Territories 246
2.13 Yukon 249
2.14 Nunavut 251
3. National Evaluation of Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSM): Incremental Impacts for the "Long-Tenured Workers" EI Claimant Category and Cost-Benefit Analysis of EBSMs 255
3.1 Incremental Impacts for the "Long-Tenured Workers" EI Claimant Category 255
3.2 Cost-Benefit Analysis for all Active and Former Claimants 260
4. Pan-Canadian Activities and the National Employment Service 263
4.1 Context 263
4.2 Programming for Indigenous People 263
4.3 Enhancing Investments in Workplace Skills 264
4.4 Supporting Agreements with Provinces, Territories and Indigenous Peoples 270
4.5 Labour Market Information 271
4.6 National Employment Service Initiatives 271

CHAPTER IV - PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION **273**

1. Context 273

2. General Information and Enquiries **274**

2.1 On the Internet 274

2.2 By Telephone 277

2.3 In Person 278

3. Claims Processing and Specialized Services **280**

3.1 Claims Processing 280

3.2 Employment Insurance Specialized Call Centres 282

3.3 Employment Insurance Services for Employers 283

3.4 Employment Insurance Requests for Reconsideration 286

4. Quality **293**

4.1 Payment and Processing Accuracy 293

4.2 National Quality and Coaching Program for Call Centres 297

4.3 Insurability of Employment 298

5. Integrity **298**

5.1 Integrity Activities 298

5.2 Integrity Quality Initiatives 299

5.3 Risk Management 300

ANNEX 1 KEY LABOUR MARKET STATISTICS **301**

ANNEX 2 EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS DATA TABLES **313**

ANNEX 3 EBSMS DATA TABLES **351**

ANNEX 4 KEY PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION DATA AND RESULTS **379**

ANNEX 5 EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FINANCIAL INFORMATION **387**

ANNEX 6 KEY STUDIES REFERENCED IN CHAPTERS 2 AND 4 . . . . . **389**

ANNEX 7 RECENT LEGISLATIVE CHANGES TO THE EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM **405**

List of Abbreviations

ACP	Automated Claims Processing
AppliWeb	Application On-line
ASETS	Aboriginal Skills and Employment Traning Strategy
AWE	Average Weekly Earnings
B/C	Benefit-to-Contribution
BEA	Business Expertise Advisors
CBP	Commencement of the Benefit Period
CCAJ	Connecting Canadians to Available Jobs
CCB	Compassionate Care Benefits
CCTB	Canadian Child Tax Benefit
CEGEP	Collège d'enseignement général et professionnel
CEIC	Canada Employment Insurance Commission
CI	Claimant Information
COEP	Canada Out-of-Employment Panel
CPP	Canada Pension Plan
CRA	Canada Revenue Agency
CRF	Consolidated Revenue Fund
CV	Coefficient of Variation
EAS	Employment Assistance Services
EBSM	Employment Benefits and Support Measures
ECC	Employer Contact Centre
EI	Employment Insurance
EIBIS	Employment Insurance Benefit Information System
EICS	Employment Insurance Coverage Survey
EI MAR	Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report
EI PAAR	Employment Insurance Payment Accuracy Review
EI PRAR	Employment Insurance Processing Accuracy Review
EJA	Enhanced Job Alerts
E-ROE	Electronic Record of Employment
ESDC	Employment and Social Development Canada
	Foreign Credential Recognition
G-7	Group of Seven Country
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HCSB	Hiring Credit for Small Business
HRSDC	Human Resources and Social Development Canada
ITIs	Internationally trained individuals
JCP	Job Creation Parnerships
LFS	Labour Force Survey
LMDA	Labour Market Development Agreements
LMI	Labour Market Information
LMP	Labour Market Partnerships
MIE	Maximum Insurable Earnings
MLV	"Most Likely" Value
MOS	Mobile Outreach Services
MSCA	My Service Canada Account
NAICS	North American Industry Classification System
NAAL	National Agent Assist Line
NERE	New-Entrants/Re-Entrant

NES	National Employment Services
NIS	National Investigative Services
NOC	National Occupational Classification
NQAP	National Quality Assurance Program
NQCP	National Quality and Coaching Program
OAG	Office of the Auditor General
OAS	Old Age Security
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OLES	Office of Literacy and Essential Skills
OSFI	Office of the Superintendant of Financial Institutions
PCIC	Parents of Critically Ill Children
PRP	Premium Reduction Program
QPIP	Quebec Parental Insurance Plan
R&I	Research and Innovation
ROE	Records of Employment
ROE SAT	Record of Employment Secure Automated Transfer
ROE Web	Record of Employment on the Web
SCC	Service Canada Centres
SD	Skills Development
SD-A	Skills Development-Apprentices
SD-R	Skills Development-Regular
SE	Self-Employment Benefit
SIP	Sectoral Inititiatives Programs
SEPH	Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours
SLID	Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics Social
SRDC	Research and Demonstration Corporation
SUB	Supplemental Unemployment Benefit
T4E	Tax information slip
TES	Targeted Earnings Supplements
TFWP	Temporary Foreign Worker Program
TRF	Targeting, Referral and and Feedback
SST	Social Security Tribunal
TWS	Targeted Wage Subsidies
UI	Unemployment Insurance
U.S.	United State (of America)
VBW	Variable Best Weeks
VER	Variable Entrance Requirement
WCS	Western Canada Select
WiC	Working in Canada
WTI	West Texas Intermediate
WWC	Working While on Claim
YES	Youth Employment Strategy

Highlights

The 2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report *presents the findings of the analysis of the Employment Insurance (EI) program for the 2014/2015 fiscal year. The highlights presented below relate to the 2014/2015 fiscal year or reflect changes between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.*

Canada's economy and labour market saw moderate growth and the unemployment rate declined slightly.

- Real gross domestic product grew by 2.4% in 2014/2015, the same growth rate as in 2013/2014.
- Employment rose by 103,000 (+0.6%). This represents the fifth consecutive annual increase. Meanwhile, the annual unemployment rate has fallen below 7.0% for the first time since the 2008 recession, dropping from 7.0% to 6.9%.

The number of regular claims and the amount paid increased, while the number of work-sharing claims and benefit payments continued to decline.

- The number of new regular claims established in 2014/2015 increased by 1.3% to 1.34 million. Despite a downward trend since the 2008 recession, the number of claims remained 3.8% higher than the level (1.29 million) observed in 2007/2008. Regular benefit payments, for their part, increased by 2.3% in 2014/2015 to $10.6 billion.
- The number of new work-sharing claims decreased by 31.3% to 8,024 claims, which is below the 14,047 claims established in 2007/2008 before the recession. In 2014/2015, the amount paid in work-sharing benefits was $17.7 million, a decrease of 16.9% from the previous year.

The eligibility rate for regular benefits decreased, but is still above pre-recession levels.

- Among unemployed workers who had contributed EI premiums in the 12 previous months and had a valid job separation, 83.1% were eligible to receive EI regular benefits in 2014. This EI eligibility rate decreased by 2.7 percentage points from 85.8% in 2013 but remains above pre-2008 recession levels (82.3% in 2007 and 82.7% in 2006).
- The decrease was attributable mainly to a shift in the labour market characteristics of unemployed EI contributors with a valid job separation, particularly the former permanent full-time workers and the former temporary non-seasonal workers, who saw their eligibility rate decline.

The number of special claims and fishing claims increased.

- The number of new special claims established increased by 1.8% to 526,100 in 2014/2015. The amount paid in special benefits increased for the fourth consecutive year by 4.1% to $4.9 billion.
- While the number of fishing claims has been declining for several years, the number of new claims established in 2014/2015 increased by 1.5% to 27,587, The amount paid in fishing benefits payments increased by 3.1% to $256 million.

Participation in Employment Benefits and Support Measures declined year over year.

- A total of 689,459 clients (-3.0%) participated in 1,106,750 interventions (-2.8%).
- All three client type counts declined: active claimants (-2.6%); former claimants (-5.6%) and non-insured clients (-2.7%).
- The use of Employment Assistance Services interventions declined by 2.7% to 936,144, while Employment Benefits interventions dropped by 4.8%, reaching 142,389.
- The Skills Development (SD) component, which makes up over 82.5% of all Employment Benefits interventions, declined by 2.3%. SD Regular use dropped by 10.1%, while SD Apprentice increased by 4.1%.
- Provinces and territories focused on developing and delivering skills training to meet current and future skills requirements, and on increasing the skills and participation of underrepresented groups such as immigrants, youth, persons with disabilities, members of visible minorities and Indigenous people.

Service Canada continued to respond to a high volume of Employment Insurance claims.

- Service Canada received 2.80 million EI applications in 2014/2015, which represents an increase from the previous fiscal year (2.78 million applications in 2013/2014).
- Clients made over 4.0 million EI-related in-person service requests while 3.8 million enquiries were answered by the EI Specialized Call Centres and over 556,000 EI-related enquiries were received at 1 800 O-Canada. The Employer Contact Centre (ECC) answered a total of 610,952 calls in 2014/2015.
- With continued investment in technologies to support automated processing of benefits, 67.2% of EI claims were partially or fully automated in 2014/2015. Employers submitted 80.2% of Records of Employment online and 93.4% of clients received their EI benefit payments via direct deposit.
- The payment accuracy rate increased slightly to 95.5% in 2014/2015 from 95.4% in 2013/2014. Errors included overpayments and underpayments attributable to three sources: claimants, employers and Service Canada. For 2014/2015, errors by claimants accounted for 49% of the total Most Likely Value of mispayments, while employer errors and Service Canada errors accounted for 28% and 23% respectively.

Introduction

Monitoring and assessing the Employment Insurance program helps provide a clear understanding of its impact on the Canadian economy and its effectiveness in addressing the needs of Canadian workers, their families and their employers.

1. The Employment Insurance Program

The Employment Insurance (EI) program provides temporary income support to workers who have lost their job for reasons outside their control while they look for new employment or upgrade their skills, and helps unemployed people across the country find employment. The EI program also provides temporary financial assistance to workers who are sick, pregnant, caring for a newborn, newly adopted or critically ill child, or caring for a family member who has a serious medical condition with a significant risk of death.

The Employment Insurance program marked its 75th year in 2015, having been implemented in 1940. The last major reform occurred in 1996. At that time, the program changed its name from "Unemployment Insurance Program" to "Employment Insurance Program" to better reflect its primary objective of promoting employment, and to better emphasize that access to the program is linked to significant work attachment.

2. The Canada Employment Insurance Commission

The Canada Employment Insurance Commission (CEIC) has the legislated mandate to annually monitor and assess the EI program. To do this, the CEIC oversees a research agenda that supports the preparation of its annual *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*. At the end of each fiscal year, the CEIC presents the report to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, who then tables it in Parliament.

The CEIC makes regulations under the authority of the *Employment Insurance Act*, with the approval of the Governor in Council. In addition, the CEIC plays a key role in overseeing the EI program, reviewing and approving policies related to program administration and delivery. EI program operations are carried out, on behalf of the CEIC, by Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC), which also includes Service Canada.

In another key role, the CEIC contributes to the financial transparency of the EI system. Annually, it commissions an EI premium report from the Chief Actuary, prepares a summary report and conveys both reports to the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour and the Minister of Finance, also for tabling in Parliament. The CEIC also sets the annual maximum insurable earnings, according to legislative requirement. Legislation has been passed which will confer rate-setting responsibility on the CEIC, starting with the 2017 EI premium rate.

The CEIC advises which EI appeal decisions will be submitted for judicial review by the Federal Court of Appeal. Additionally, two of the Commissioners—namely the Commissioner for Workers and the Commissioner for Employers—serve in a tri-partite committee with the chair of the Social Security Tribunal. The Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour consults this committee regarding Governor in Council appointments of members to the EI section of that Tribunal.

The CEIC has four members, three of whom are voting members representing the interests of workers, employers, and government. The Commissioner for Workers and the Commissioner for Employers are appointed for terms up to five years by the Governor in Council, and they can be appointed for a new term. They have responsibilities to represent and reflect the views of their respective constituencies, reflecting internally, within ESDC, the concerns and positions of workers and employers on policy development and program delivery related to EI and the labour market. To do this, they establish working relationships and engage in consultations with private sector organizations and individuals interested in and affected by ESDC programs and services, particularly with regard to EI. The Deputy Minister of Employment and Social Development, representing government, acts as the Chairperson of the CEIC, while the Associate Deputy Minister of Employment and Social Development acts as the Vice-chairperson and has voting privileges only when acting on behalf of the Chairperson.

3. Legislated Mandate

Section 3 of the *Employment Insurance Act* gives the CEIC the legislated mandate to produce the *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report* annually:

"3. (1) The Commission shall monitor and assess the impact and effectiveness, for individuals, communities and the economy, of the benefits and other assistance provided under this Act, including:

(a) how the benefits and assistance are utilized by employees and employers, and
(b) the effect of the benefits and assistance on the obligation of claimants to be available for and to seek employment and on the efforts of employers to maintain a stable workforce.

(2) The Commission shall report to the Minister on its assessment annually no later than March 31 following the end of a year. The Commission shall make any additional reports at any other times, as the Minister may request."

4. The Report

The *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report* is produced under the direction and guidance of the CEIC. ESDC officials (including those from Service Canada) support the CEIC in preparing the report. The report relies on multiple sources of information to provide a comprehensive analysis of the EI program, including administrative data, Statistics Canada survey data and peer-reviewed evaluation studies, as well as internal and external reports. The *Report* therefore provides valuable information and evidence with respect to the EI program and the labour market.

This year's *Report* focuses on the responsiveness of the EI program during the 2014/2015 fiscal year, a period marked by moderate economic growth and a slight downward trend in the unemployment rate, despite a sharp decline in oil prices, which resulted in a contraction of economic activity in some regions late in the fiscal year. The first chapter discusses the state of the Canadian labour market over that period. The second chapter analyzes the usage, impact and effectiveness of EI benefits provided chiefly under Part I of the *Employment Insurance Act* for the same period. The third chapter assesses the support provided to unemployed workers through active re-employment programs and services, under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act*, known as Employment Benefits and Support Measures. The fourth and final chapter presents information on EI program administration and service delivery. To celebrate the EI program's 75th anniversary, an overview of the program, which among other things showcases some of the program's key historic milestones, has been included in this edition of the *Report*. This overview precedes the first chapter.

Program Overview

The Employment Insurance (EI) program contributes to the economic well-being of workers by providing assistance to individuals who are laid off or are unable to work due to specific life circumstances, and by helping unemployed people across the country find employment.

This chapter provides an overview of EI benefits under Part I and Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act*. The first section outlines accessibility requirements and the way entitlement to financial assistance under EI Part I benefits is determined. The second section summarizes the programming offered under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act*, which helps workers to prepare for, find and maintain employment. The third section briefly discusses the relationship between Part I and Part II of the EI program. This chapter reflects the situation as of March 31, 2015 unless stated otherwise.

1. Employment Insurance Part I[1] – Employment Insurance Benefits

Part I of the EI program provides temporary income support to workers who have lost their job for reasons outside their control while they look for new employment or upgrade their skills. EI Part I also provides temporary financial assistance to workers who are sick, pregnant, caring for a newborn, newly adopted or critically ill child, or caring for a family member who has a serious medical condition with a significant risk of death.

Did you know?

The *Employment Insurance Act* (previously the *Unemployment Insurance Act*) had a predecessor, the *Employment and Social Insurance Act* passed in June 1935. This legislation was found to exceed the federal jurisdictional authority. Therefore, with the consent of all the provinces, the *British North American Act* was amended and the *Unemployment Insurance Act* came into force on August 7, 1940. Collection of premiums began in July 1941, and the first benefits were paid in January 1942.

The Canada Employment Insurance Commission, a tripartite committee, has been overseeing the EI program since its creation as the Unemployment Insurance Commission (UIC) in 1940. In 1977, the UIC integrated into the new Department of Employment and Immigration under the *Employment and Immigration Department and Commission Act* and became the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission. It then became the Canada Employment Insurance Commission under the *Department of Human Resources Development Act* in May 1996.

[1] For the purposes of the *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, EI benefits for self-employed persons (under Part VII.1 of the *Employment Insurance Act*) and EI fishing benefits (under Part VIII) are deemed to be EI Part I benefits.

1.1 Historical Background

The reforms implemented in the *Employment Insurance Act* of 1996 established a new benefit structure. The program moved from a week-based to an hours-based eligibility system and instituted a new premium structure so that individuals pay premiums on all earnings up to an annual maximum. In addition, a number of other changes were implemented, such as the introduction of the family supplement provision, the increase in eligibility requirements for new entrants and re-entrants,[2] and the reduction in the maximum duration of regular benefits from 50 to 45 weeks. While there have been ongoing changes to the program since 1996, these reforms remain the foundation of the current EI program.

Annex 7 provides more detailed information on major changes to the EI program implemented during and after the 1996 EI reform.

1.2 Employment Insurance Benefits

There are a number of types of benefits available under EI Part I: regular, fishing, special (maternity, parental, sickness, compassionate care, and parents of critically ill children), and work-sharing benefits. As access to EI benefits and the maximum duration of benefits vary depending on the benefit being discussed, they are examined by benefit type. However, the calculation of an individual's weekly benefit rate is the same for all benefits and, therefore, will not be discussed separately.

1.2.1 Regular Benefits

EI regular benefits are available to individuals who lose their jobs for reasons outside their control—due, for instance, to a shortage of work or seasonal layoffs, or because they quit with just cause—and who are available for and actively seeking employment.

1.2.1.1 Access Requirements

To qualify for regular benefits, individuals must have been without work and without pay for at least seven consecutive days. In addition, they must have accumulated the required number of hours of insurable employment in the last 52 weeks before their claim or since the start of their last EI claim (known as the qualifying period), whichever is shorter. As shown in Table 1, the required number of hours of insurable employment is based on the unemployment rate in the EI economic region where the individual resides, a feature of the EI program that is known as the Variable Entrance Requirement (VER). Annex 2.24 provides the monthly unemployment rates used for the purposes of the EI program in the 62 EI economic regions.

Did you know?

Employers deducted employees' premiums and submitted payments combined with their premiums to the Canada Employment Insurance Commission. In turn, the Commission would issue unemployment insurance stamps to be inserted into the employee insurance book. This book was the employee's proof of insurable employment. It is the reason that the term "stamps" is still used as an equivalent to insurable employment.

Did you know?

The Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 constituted the first major reform. The revised program extended coverage to almost all workers who were considered employees. It provided relatively easy access to enriched benefits and it required lower contributions. Benefits were geared to an employee's income. In addition, benefits were available not only for loss of employment earnings due to, for example, a lay-off, but also for sickness and pregnancy. A maximum of 15 weeks was payable for both types of benefits.

Table 1

Number of Hours of Insurable Employment Required to Qualify for Benefits

Regional Rate of Unemployment[1]	Required Number of Hours of Insurable Employment in the Last 52 Weeks
6.0% or less	700
6.1% to 7.0%	665
7.1% to 8.0%	630
8.1% to 9.0%	595
9.1% to 10.0%	560
10.1% to 11.0%	525
11.1% to 12.0%	490
12.1% to 13.0%	455
13.1% or more	420

[1] The unemployment rates used for the Employment Insurance program are a moving average of seasonally adjusted monthly rates of unemployment produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

Source: *Employment Insurance Act*, section 7.

[2] New entrant refers to workers who have recently entered the labour market for the first time and re-entrants refer to those who have limited or no work experience in the last two years.

Claimants are required to undertake a reasonable job search for suitable employment in their region, but are not required to move or relocate to where jobs are available in order to remain eligible for EI benefits. The criteria used to define reasonable job search are: job search activities; intensity of job search; type of work being sought; and evidence of job search efforts. The criteria used to define suitable employment are: type of work; wages; commuting time; working conditions; hours of work; and personal circumstances.

In general, most individuals require between 420 and 700 hours of insurable employment to qualify for EI regular benefits. However, individuals who recently entered the workforce for the first time or those who are re-entering the workforce after an absence of two or more years—known as new entrants and re-entrants (NEREs)—require 910 hours of work to qualify, regardless of the unemployment rate in the region where they reside. NEREs are defined as those with fewer than 490 hours of labour force attachment in the pre-qualifying period, which is the 52-week period before the qualifying period (see Chart 1). For the purposes of the NERE provision, labour force attachment comprises hours of work of insurable employment, as well as time spent on EI, workers' compensation, disability benefits, sick leave and approved training. Each week of labour force attachment is considered to be 35 hours, with the exception of insurable employment, which are considered at face value. It should be noted that parents with fewer than 490 hours of labour force attachment in their pre-qualifying period, who received EI maternity or parental benefits in the 208 weeks prior to that pre-qualifying period, are not considered as NEREs and require 420 to 700 hours of insurable employment as per Table 1.

Chart 1

Pre-qualifying Period and Qualifying Period of New Entrants and Re-entrants

1.2.1.2 Maximum Duration of Benefits

As per EI legislation, the maximum duration of regular benefits varies from 14 to 45 weeks, depending on the number of hours of insurable employment used to establish the claim and the unemployment rate in the region where the claimant resides (see Table 2). The higher the regional unemployment rate and number of hours of insurable employment worked by the individual, the higher the entitlement (up to the maximum of 45 weeks).

Table 2

Maximum Number of Weeks of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits

Number of Hours of Insurable Employment	Regional Unemployment Rate[1]											
	6.0% and under	6.1% – 7.0%	7.1% – 8.0%	8.1% – 9.0%	9.1% – – 10.0%	10.1% – 11.0%	11.1% – 12.0%	12.1% – 13.0%	13.1% – 14.0%	14.1% – 15.0%	15.1% – 16.0%	More than 16.0%
420–454	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	28	30	32
455–489	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	26	28	30	32
490–524	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	25	27	29	31	33
525–559	0	0	0	0	0	21	23	25	27	29	31	33
560–594	0	0	0	0	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34
595–629	0	0	0	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34
630–664	0	0	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35
665–699	0	15	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35
700–734	14	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36
735–769	14	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36
770–804	15	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37
805–839	15	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37
840–874	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38
875–909	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38
910–944	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39
945–979	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39
980–1,014	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40
1,015–1,049	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40
1,050–1,084	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41
1,085–1,119	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41
1,120–1,154	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42
1,155–1,189	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42
1,190–1,224	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43
1,225–1,259	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43
1,260–1,294	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44
1,295–1,329	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44
1,330–1,364	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45
1,365–1,399	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45
1,400–1,434	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44	45
1,435–1,469	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45	45
1,470–1,504	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44	45	45
1,505–1,539	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45	45	45
1,540–1,574	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44	45	45	45
1,575–1,609	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45	45	45	45
1,610–1,644	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44	45	45	45	45
1,645–1,679	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45	45	45	45	45
1,680–1,714	32	34	36	38	40	42	44	45	45	45	45	45
1,715–1,749	33	35	37	39	41	43	45	45	45	45	45	45
1,750–1,784	34	36	38	40	42	44	45	45	45	45	45	45
1,785–1,819	35	37	39	41	43	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
1,820 and more	36	38	40	42	44	45	45	45	45	45	45	45

[1] The unemployment rates used for the Employment Insurance program are a moving average of seasonally adjusted monthly rates of unemployment produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

Source: *Employment Insurance Act*, section 12.

1.2.2 Fishing Benefits

EI fishing benefits are paid to self-employed fishers. For the purposes of fishing benefits, a self-employed fisher is a person engaged in fishing, which includes making a catch or doing any work incidental to making or handling a catch (such as loading, unloading, transporting or curing the catch made by the crew of which the person is a member). It also includes those involved in constructing a fishing vessel for their own use or for the use of the crew of which the person is a member in order to make a catch.

1.2.2.1 Access Requirements

To be eligible for fishing benefits, a fisher must be self-employed and unable to qualify for regular benefits. Eligibility for fishing benefits is determined by the claimant's insurable fishing earnings accumulated during the qualifying period, rather than the number of hours worked, as in the case of regular benefits. For fishing benefits, each dollar earned in self-employed fishing is insurable, based on the share arrangement of the crew. As illustrated in Table 3, the minimum amount of earnings fishers need to qualify ranges between $2,500 and $4,200, depending on the regional unemployment rate.

In addition, within the labour force attachment period (the 52 weeks preceding the start date of the fishing benefit qualifying period), a fisher must have done one or more of the following to be eligible for fishing benefits:

- accumulated at least $3,000 from self-employment in fishing; or,
- accumulated at least 490 hours of other labour force attachment related to fishing.[3]

If the individual who is applying for fishing benefits just started working as a self-employed fisher or is returning to fishing after an absence of a year or more preceding the qualifying period, the fisher is considered a NERE. A fisher who is a NERE must have $5,500 or more in insurable earnings from employment as a fisher. However, fishers who received one week or more of maternity or parental benefits in the 208 weeks before the labour force attachment period are not considered NEREs.

Fishing claims have a 31-week maximum qualifying period and there are two separate qualifying periods per year. The earliest start date for the qualifying period for summer benefits is the week of March 1 and the earliest start date for the qualifying period for winter benefits is the week of September 1.

Table 3

Insurable Earnings Entrance Requirement for Fishers

Regional Rate of Unemployment[1]	Insurable Earnings
6% or less	$4,200
6.1% to 7.0%	$4,000
7.1% to 8.0%	$3,800
8.1% to 9.0%	$3,600
9.1% to 10.0%	$3,400
10.1% to 11.0%	$3,200
11.1% to 12.0%	$2,900
12.1% to 13.0%	$2,700
13.1% or more	$2,500

[1] The unemployment rates used for the Employment Insurance program are a moving average of seasonally adjusted monthly rates of unemployment produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

Source: *Employment Insurance (Fishing) Regulations*, section 8.

1.2.2.2 Maximum Duration of Benefits

Fishing claims have a maximum duration of 26 weeks. Note that a self-employed fisher can qualify for two fishing benefit periods within a given calendar year. The benefit period for a summer claim starts in or after the week of October 1 and must end no later than the week of June 15. The benefit period for a winter claim starts in or after the week of April 1 and must end no later than the week of December 15.

1.2.3 Special Benefits

EI special benefits provide temporary financial assistance to employees and insured self-employed persons who are sick, pregnant, caring for a newborn, newly adopted or critically ill child, or caring for a family member who has a serious medical condition with a significant risk of death. These include maternity and parental benefits, sickness benefits, compassionate care benefits, and benefits for parents of critically ill children.

Maternity benefits are payable to the birth mother, while parental benefits can be shared by parents caring for their newborn or newly adopted child. Sickness benefits are available to individuals who are unable to work because of sickness, injury or quarantine. Compassionate care benefits are available to persons who take time off work in order to provide care or support to a family member who has a serious medical condition and face a significant

[3] Examples of labour force attachment related to fishing include receiving EI fishing benefits; participating in authorized training related to fishing; receiving workers' compensation for a fishing injury; or benefiting from employment measures related to fishing.

risk of death. Compassionate care benefits are also available to those who are considered to be like family members by the person who has a serious medical condition, including a close friend or neighbour. Weeks of compassionate care benefits can also be shared with other members of the family that are providing care. Benefits for parents of critically ill children are available to eligible parents who take leave from work to provide care or support their critically ill or injured child (under the age of 18).

Since 2006, the province of Quebec has been responsible for providing maternity, parental and adoption benefits to residents of Quebec through the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP). QPIP also provides paternity benefits, a five-week benefit for new fathers that cannot be shared with the mother.

1.2.3.1 Access Requirements

To be eligible for special benefits, the claimant's normal weekly earnings must be reduced by over 40%. In addition, individuals require 600 hours of insurable employment in their qualifying period which is the shorter of:

- The 52-week period immediately before the start date of the claim or
- The period since the start of a previous EI benefit period, if that benefit period started during the previous 52 weeks.

Self-employed fishers can also qualify for special benefits with fishing earnings of $3,760. In addition, self-employed individuals who opt in for special benefits can qualify if their self-employment earnings meet the minimum self-employment eligibility threshold in the calendar year preceding the claim. This threshold was $6,515 (2013 earnings) for claims established in 2014 and was $6,645 (2014 earnings) for claims established in 2015. Depending on the type of special benefits being requested, additional documents, such as a medical certificate, may be required.

Claimants can apply for maternity benefits before they give birth and can start receiving benefits eight weeks before their due date. Claimants cannot receive maternity benefits beyond 17 weeks after the expected or actual week of childbirth, whichever of the two occurs last. For biological parents, EI parental benefits can be paid starting from the child's date of birth. For adoptive parents, parental benefits can be paid starting from the date the child is placed with them for adoption. In both cases, the parental benefits can be collected during a 52-week period following the week the child was born or adopted. An extension to the eligibility period for parental benefits, up to a maximum of 104 weeks, is available to Canadian Forces members who are prevented from collecting all their parental benefits during the regular 52-week eligibility period because their parental leave has been deferred or interrupted by an imperative military requirement.

To qualify for sickness benefits, individuals must obtain a medical certificate signed by their medical doctor or approved medical practitioner that indicates the period of time they are unable to work due to illness, injury or quarantine. For compassionate care benefits, the claimant must provide a medical certificate signed by the medical doctor or approved medical practitioner of the person who has a serious medical condition that shows that the person needs care or support and is at risk of dying within 26 weeks. This means that the person, or their legal representative, must also complete and sign an authorization to have their medical certificate released. For benefits for parents of critically ill children, the claimant must provide a medical certificate completed and signed by a medical doctor who is licensed to practice medicine in Canada as a specialist. The medical certificate must state that the child is critically ill or injured and requires the care or support of one or more of their parents and set out the period during which the child requires that care or support.

Did you know?

- Fifteen weeks of adoption benefits became available as of January 1, 1984.
- Further to a claimant appeal before the Federal Court of Appeal, paternity and adoption benefits were payable as of March 29, 1987 in the event the mother or the other parent died or became disabled.
- Parental benefits became payable effective November 18, 1990. Ten weeks of parental benefits may be paid, which could be extended to 15 weeks if the child was six months of age or older when the child arrived in the claimant's home and the child suffered from a physical, psychological or emotional condition. They were then payable to either men or women. They could be divided between the parents. These benefits replaced the paternity benefits of 1988 and the adoption benefits of 1984.
- Parental benefits were expanded from 10 to 35 weeks in 2000. Special benefits (maternity, parental and sickness) were made subject to a maximum combination of 50 weeks.

Did you know?

Compassionate care benefits became available as of January 4, 2004. Six weeks of benefits were available to a claimant whose family member has a serious medical condition with a significant risk of death within 26 weeks. Benefits can be shared by eligible family members.

1.2.3.2 Maximum Duration of Benefits

Maternity benefits can be paid for a maximum of 15 weeks and parental benefits, which parents can share, for a maximum of 35 weeks. Maternity and parental benefits can be combined for a maximum of 50 weeks. Sickness benefits can be paid up to a maximum of 15 weeks.

Compassionate care benefits can be paid for a maximum of 6 weeks over a 26-week period, and family members, or persons considered to be like family members by the person who has a serious medical condition, can share them.[4] There may be situations where the person remains in the same condition after the initial 26-week window or later experiences a recurrence of the illness. When this occurs, the claimant(s) could file a new claim for a second block of 6 weeks of compassionate care benefits if they once again meet all of the access requirements. However, a claimant can only receive a maximum of 6 weeks of compassionate care benefits per 26-week window.

Benefits for parents of critically ill children can be paid for a maximum of 35 weeks over a 52-week period. The payments for eligible weeks can be taken in consecutive weeks or divided into periods within the 52-week window. The number of entitled weeks is based on the medical certificate. If the child requires care or support after the period identified in the initial medical certificate, it is possible to receive further benefits, provided another medical certificate is submitted, and the maximum 35 weeks have not already been paid.

1.2.4 Work-sharing Benefits

The Work-sharing program is an adjustment program designed to help employers and employees avoid layoffs when there is a temporary reduction in the normal level of business activity that is beyond the control of the employer. It provides income support in the form of EI work-sharing benefits to eligible workers who work a temporarily reduced work week while their employer recovers. The goal is for all the participating employees to return to normal working hours by the end of the term of the work-sharing agreement.

The program helps employers retain skilled employees and avoid the costly process of recruiting and training new employees when business returns to normal levels. It also helps employees maintain their skills and job by supplementing their wages with work-sharing benefits for the days they are not working.

Work-sharing agreements are approved by the employer, the employees and their representatives and the Canada Employment Insurance Commission. In a unionized workplace, the authorized employee representative(s) will normally be a member of, and a person designated by, the union.

1.2.4.1 Access Requirements

Access requirements for work-sharing benefits are the same as those for regular benefits (see subsection 1.2.1.1 and Table 1).

1.2.4.2 Maximum Duration of Benefits

Participating in a work-sharing agreement does not reduce the number of weeks of regular benefits entitled for workers laid off following participation in the Work-sharing program. According to EI legislation, work-sharing agreements can last from a minimum of 6 consecutive weeks to a maximum of 26 consecutive weeks. The employer may request an extension for a period of up to 12 additional weeks. The maximum duration of a work-sharing agreement, including any extension, is 38 weeks. Employers are subject to a cooling-off period (i.e., number of weeks equal to duration of previous agreement) before entering into new agreements with the same employees.

1.3 Waiting and Benefit Periods

Qualified claimants must serve a two-week waiting period before receiving any type of EI benefits. The waiting period serves a number of purposes. It follows the same practices of other insurance programs and is similar to the deductible portion of private insurance plans. This ensures that EI resources are focused on persons dealing with significant gaps in employment, and allows for the time needed to verify and establish a claim.

In addition, when a claimant qualifies for benefits, a benefit period of 52 weeks is established, which is the window of time within which all available benefits must be paid. This period includes the two-week waiting period. The benefit period ensures that EI benefits are paid within a reasonable timeframe relative to the period when the claimant would have received the earnings that the benefits are designed to replace. However, the initial benefit period can be extended to a maximum of 104 weeks, if, during that initial benefit period:

- no regular benefits were paid to the claimant;

[4] Effective January 3, 2016, the compassionate care benefit was expanded to a maximum of 26 weeks over a 52-week period.

- more than one type of special benefits was paid and at least one of those special benefits was paid for fewer than the applicable maximum number of weeks payable for these special benefits; and,
- the maximum total number of weeks payable for the types of special benefits requested is greater than 50.

1.4 Level of Benefits

The level of EI benefits is tied to the amount of insurable earnings an individual has accumulated during the qualifying period (generally 52 weeks) before establishing the claim, up to the annual maximum, expressed weekly. Under the *Employment Insurance Act*, maximum insurable earnings (MIE) increase in line with the average industrial wage. The MIE was $48,600 in 2014 and $49,500 in 2015. The weekly benefit rate is 55% of the portion of average weekly insurable earnings that does not exceed the MIE limit. The maximum weekly benefit rate was therefore $514 in 2014 and $524 in 2015.

Table 4

Divisor Used to Calculate Weekly Benefit Rate Based on the Regional Rate of Unemployment

Regional Rate of Unemployment[1]	Number of Weeks for Regular and Special Benefits / Divisor for Fishing Benefits
6% or less	22
6.1% to 7.0%	21
7.1% to 8.0%	20
8.1% to 9.0%	19
9.1% to 10.0%	18
10.1% to 11.0%	17
11.1% to 12.0%	16
12.1% to 13.0%	15
13.1% or more	14

[1] The unemployment rates used for the Employment Insurance program are a moving average of seasonally adjusted monthly rates of unemployment produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

Source: *Employment Insurance Act*, section 14, and *Employment Insurance (Fishing) Regulations*, section 8.

For regular and special benefits, the weekly benefit rate is calculated using the highest weeks of earnings over the qualifying period (generally 52 weeks). The number of weeks used ranges from 14 to 22 depending on the regional rate of unemployment (see Table 4). The total insurable earnings during those weeks is then divided by the number of required weeks and multiplied by 55% to determine the weekly benefit rate, without exceeding the maximum weekly benefit.

For fishing benefits, the weekly benefit rate is calculated by dividing the total fishing insurable earnings obtained during the qualifying period (generally 31 weeks prior to the claim) by the divisor associated with the claimant's regional unemployment rate (see Table 4), and then multiplying the result by the basic rate of 55%, without exceeding the allowed maximum weekly benefit.

1.4.1 Family Supplement

The family supplement provision gives low-income families with children (under the age of 18) a benefit rate of up to 80% of their average weekly insurable earnings. However, under the family supplement provision, the weekly benefit rate cannot be higher than 55% of the MIE limit weekly equivalent ($524 in 2015). The family supplement rate is based on the family net income up to a maximum of $25,921 per year, as well as the number of children in the family and their ages. If the family net income level rises, the family supplement gradually decreases, so that if the income exceeds $25,921, no supplement is payable.

1.4.2 Working While on Claim

The Working While on Claim (WWC) provision is applied to adjust EI benefits when a claimant has employment earnings while on claim and its objective is to encourage work attachment by allowing claimants to accept available work while receiving EI benefits. It applies to the following benefits: regular, fishing, parental, compassionate care and parents of critically ill children.

A national WWC pilot project (Pilot Project No. 18) was introduced on August 5, 2012. Under this WWC pilot project, a claimant's weekly benefits are reduced by 50% of his or her earnings while on claim, starting with the first dollar earned, until the claimant's earnings reach 90% of the average weekly earnings used to establish his or her benefit rate. At that point, the claimant's weekly benefits are reduced dollar for dollar until they reach zero, to ensure claimants do not receive more in earnings and benefits than they would have earned working full time. This pilot concluded on August 1, 2015. A new one-year WWC pilot project (Pilot Project No. 19) took effect on August 2, 2015 and has the same parameters as Pilot Project No. 18. This pilot is scheduled to conclude on August 6, 2016.

In the EI legislation, the provision allows claimants receiving EI benefits (except maternity and sickness benefits)[5] to earn up to $50 per week or 25% of their weekly EI benefit rate (whichever is higher) before dollar-for-dollar deductions begin. From 2005 to 2012, a series of pilots raised the allowance to $75 or 40% without a reduction to their weekly EI benefits to encourage EI claimants to accept more work, which were followed by the Pilot Project No. 18.

More information on Part I of the EI program is available on the Service Canada web site at: http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/sc/ei/index.shtml.

Did you know?

EI pilot projects allow the Government of Canada to test and assess the labour market impacts of new approaches designed to assist the unemployed, for a defined period of up to 3 years and in designated EI economic regions, before considering permanent changes to the EI program.

There have been 24 pilot projects since their inception under the Unemployment Insurance legislation in 1994 (19 since the 1996 reform and 5 between 1994 and 1996). One of the first pilot projects allowed claimants to use the telephone to file their report cards. Now, the vast majority of claimants use the internet.

2. Employment Insurance Part II – Employment Benefits and Support Measures

The purpose of Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* is "to help maintain a sustainable Employment Insurance (EI) system through the establishment of employment benefits for insured participants and the maintenance of a national employment service."[6] The programs delivered under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* are called Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSMs). EBSMs are labour market programs and services established to help unemployed Canadians return to work and to develop a labour force that meets current and emerging needs of employers. The programs are delivered mostly by provinces and territories, through Labour Market Development Agreements (LMDAs). EI Part II programming results for 2014/2015 are presented in Chapter III of this publication.

2.1 Historical Background

In the mid-1990s, there was a growing consensus that temporary income support provided under the *Unemployment Insurance Act* was not sufficient to meet labour market challenges. Existing training and work experience programs under Unemployment Insurance Development Uses (UIDU) had achieved significant results. However, investment in active employment programs was insufficient to equip the unemployed with the skills they needed to overcome structural barriers and get back to work. Additional investment in active programming, such as work experience and training, was required to help individuals overcome structural barriers and quickly re-enter the labour market. Therefore, Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* introduced in 1996 proposed a redesign of existing UIDU training and work experience programs to do the following:

- improve access for the unemployed population (support to the non-insured population);
- increase flexibility and streamline services at the local level;
- equip individuals directly with the tools to develop a personalized transition strategy;
- clarify the federal government's role in vocational training; and,
- improve national and local labour market information.

In May 1996, the Proposal to Provinces and Territories for a New Partnership in the Labour Market offered provinces and territories two delivery options for the active employment programming delivered under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act*: provincial/territorial delivery of EI-funded employment programs (option 1); or federal delivery of programs coupled with a federal offer to collaborate with the province or territory in their design, delivery and evaluation (option 2).

During the first phase of the implementation of the LMDAs, from 1996 to 2000, seven provinces and territories chose to accept full responsibility for designing and delivering employment programs (option 1). Between 2005 and 2010, the federal government completed the full devolution of the EBSMs, with the exception of pan-Canadian programming.

2.2 Guidelines

EBSMs are established under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* in accordance with the following guidelines:

- harmonization with provincial/territorial employment initiatives to ensure there is no unnecessary overlap or duplication;

[5] Claimants with employment earnings while on maternity or sickness claim has their benefits reduced dollar for dollar.

[6] Part II, section 56 of the *Employment Insurance Act*.

- reduction of dependency on unemployment benefits by helping individuals obtain or keep employment;
- cooperation and partnership with other governments, employers, community-based organizations and other interested organizations;
- flexibility to allow significant decisions about implementation to be made at a local level; and,
- availability of EBSM assistance in either official language, where there is a significant demand for that assistance in that language.

2.3 Programming Design and Delivery

EBSMs are flexible by design, allowing provincial and territorial jurisdictions to develop and deliver programs that respond to local and regional labour market needs. All provinces and territories are now fully responsible for designing and delivering programs similar to the EBSMs established under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act*. The LMDAs provide the framework within which EBSM delivery takes place.

In support of these activities, Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC) transfers LMDA funding to the provinces and territories, and focuses on accountability, evaluation and ongoing policy development. ESDC delivers pan-Canadian programming and maintains, in partnership with the provinces and territories, specific projects and activities in the national interest under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act*. More information on the LMDAs is available online at: http://www.esdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/training_agreements/lmda/index.shtml.

For more information on the different EI Part II programs delivered across Canada, please consult provincial and territorial services:

Newfoundland and Labrador	http://www.hrle.gov.nl.ca/hrle/
Prince Edward Island	http://www.skillspei.com
Nova Scotia	http://www.novascotia.ca/employmentnovascotia
New Brunswick	http://www2.gnb.ca/content/gnb/en/gateways/employment.html
Quebec	http://emploiquebec.net/anglais/index.htm
Ontario	http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/
Manitoba	http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/aet/ets2/jobs_careers.html
Saskatchewan	http://www.economy.gov.sk.ca/LabourMarketPrograms
Alberta	http://employment.alberta.ca
British Columbia	http://www.workbc.ca/
Yukon	http://www.education.gov.yk.ca/training.html
Northwest Territories	https://www.ece.gov.nt.ca/advanced-education/career-employment/programs-services
Nunavut	http://www.gov.nu.ca/family-services/information/career-development

2.4 Target Population

EI-insured clients and non-insured clients are both eligible to participate in EBSMs; however, the type of assistance available differs for the two groups.

2.4.1 Employment Insurance-Insured Clients: Activation of Employment Insurance Regular Claimants

The EI-insured client group is composed of two client types, “active” and “former” claimants, who are eligible for all types of EBSM interventions. *Active claimants* are claimants who have established a regular EI claim, and who tend to have strong and recent labour market attachment. Therefore, they tend to be able to return to work faster than those with a weaker labour attachment.

Former claimants are individuals who established an EI regular claim in the previous 36 months, or who received maternity or parental benefits during a benefit period established in the previous 60 months. Former claimants do not receive income support under Part I of the *Employment Insurance Act* while they complete an EBSM intervention; however, they may receive Part II support while completing their return-to-work action plan.

2.4.2 Non-insured Clients

Non-insured clients are those who have no substantive or recent labour force attachment, and include new labour force participants and individuals who were formerly self-employed. For example, Aboriginals, the disabled and immigrants have lower labour force attachment and labour market participation rates for which Part II programming is

available. While these clients are not eligible for Employment Benefits, they can access Employment Assistance Services delivered under the Support Measures.

2.5 Employment Benefits and Support Measures

2.5.1 Employment Benefits

Section 59 of the *Employment Insurance Act* specifies that the Canada Employment Insurance Commission (CEIC) may establish employment benefits to help insured participants obtain employment. Employment Benefits are accessible by EI-insured clients only. These benefits enable EI-insured clients to gain work skills and experience through a combination of specific employment interventions. Employment Benefits include the following types of benefits.

Skills Development helps insured participants obtain skills for employment by providing direct financial assistance that enables them to select, arrange and pay for their own training.

Targeted Wage Subsidies help insured participants obtain on-the-job work experience by providing employers with financial assistance to pay the wages of insured participants whom they hire. This benefit encourages employers to hire unemployed individuals whom they would not normally hire in the absence of a subsidy.

Self-Employment provides financial assistance and business planning advice to EI-eligible participants to help them start their own business. This financial assistance is intended to cover personal living expenses and business-related expenses during the initial stages of the business.

Job Creation Partnerships projects provide insured participants with opportunities to gain work experience that will help them secure permanent employment. Projects under this initiative help develop the community and the local economy.

Targeted Earnings Supplements encourage unemployed persons to accept employment by offering them financial incentives. Quebec offers a similar measure—Return to Work Supplement—to help with expenses related to returning to work (for example, new tools, office materials or clothing).

2.5.2 Support Measures

Support Measures are authorized under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* to assist unemployed persons or persons at risk of becoming unemployed in finding employment. Support measures include programming similar to Employment Assistance Services (EAS), Labour Market Partnerships (LMPs), and Research and Innovation (R&I). While EAS are delivered by provincial and territorial governments, LMPs and R&I initiatives may be delivered at the federal, provincial and territorial levels.

Employment Assistance Services offer funding to organizations to enable them to provide employment assistance to unemployed persons. The services may include counselling, action planning, job search skills, job finding clubs, job placement services, and the provision of labour market information, case management and follow-up. The provinces and territories may employ third parties to provide these services.

Labour Market Partnerships provide funding to help employers, employee or employer associations, community groups and communities improve their capacity to deal with human resource requirements and implement labour force adjustments. These partnerships involve developing plans, strategies and implementing adjustment measures.

Research and Innovation supports activities that identify better ways of helping people to prepare for or keep employment and to be productive participants in the labour force. Funds are provided to eligible recipients to enable them to carry out demonstration projects and research for this purpose.

2.5.3 Pan-Canadian Programming

The objective of pan-Canadian programming is to enhance the Canadian economic union by promoting an efficient and integrated national labour market and ensuring enough skilled workers are available in the Canadian workforce. These activities are designed to address national labour market challenges and promote equality of opportunity for all Canadians, with a focus on helping underrepresented groups reach their full potential in the Canadian labour market.

Pan-Canadian programming includes initiatives such as responding to national emergencies, supporting interprovincial labour mobility, promoting and supporting national sectoral councils, and providing national labour market information and national labour exchange systems. Also included among the national initiatives are literacy and essential skills initiatives, youth employment initiatives, labour market programs for Aboriginal people, and national research and innovation projects designed to find better ways of helping people obtain and keep employment as productive members of the labour force.

2.5.4 National Employment Service

Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* specifies that the CEIC shall maintain a National Employment Service (NES) to facilitate the labour market exchange function for the country. The NES provides information on employment opportunities across Canada to help workers find suitable employment and help employers obtain appropriate workers. Previously, these were delivered through the Job Bank and Working in Canada web sites, which were merged in March 2014 into a single source of jobs and labour market information. The Job Bank is designed to improve the way information about jobs and the labour market is disseminated by reducing duplication, improving the quality of information, and making online information more accessible and easier to use.

3. Relationship Between Employment Insurance Part I and Part II

In summary, while Employment Insurance (EI) Part I benefits can be viewed as a "passive support" program, EI Part II constitutes an "active support" component. Part I subsidizes job search and career development by providing temporary income support to eligible unemployed individuals. Part II helps unemployed individuals by providing them with the skills, experience and knowledge necessary to find new and suitable employment and reduce future dependency on EI Part I. Together, Part I and Part II improve the matching function between available positions and workers in the Canadian labour market.

EI Part I benefits are delivered by Employment and Social Development Canada (through Service Canada) directly to EI claimants, while most of Part II is delivered by the provinces and territories via Labour Market Development Agreements funded by the Government of Canada. Eligible clients receiving temporary income support delivered under EI Part I can also access Employment Benefits and Support Measures available under EI Part II.

Upon completion of the online EI Part I application, clients are invited to visit the corresponding provincial/territorial web site for additional information about employment supports available in their jurisdiction. Each province and territory provides online employment services, which include the contact information for local services (see section 2.3 above for more information about provincial and territorial active labour market programming).

The EI-insured claimant can make an appointment to create a customized return-to-work action plan. This action plan may include Employment Assistance Services (EAS) and the necessary Employment Benefits to build the skills and experience necessary to find employment.

Although, non-insured clients may only access EAS under EI Part II, they can access additional employment programming under other federal-provincial/territorial agreements, such as the Canada Job Fund Agreements (http://www.esdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/training_agreements/cjf/index.shtml) established with each province and territory.

When clients visit a Service Canada Centre for active employment programming, they are directed to the closest provincial or territorial employment centres and online services.

3.1 Targeting Referral and Feedback

Employment and Social Development Canada has developed a "Targeting, Referral and Feedback" (TRF) tool to help provinces and territories identify EI applicants, according to local labour market needs and available EI Part II employment programming.

TRF enables the provinces and territories to actively offer active labour market programming to address known shortages in the labour market, and to engage underrepresented groups or those who would benefit the most from early Part II interventions. Quebec implemented the initial model in 1999 and an automated process in 2006 with the advent of the On-line EI Application (AppliWeb). British Columbia implemented the now nationally available tool in the fall of 2015. Other provinces and territories have expressed an interest in implementing TRF.

Did you know?

- E-enabling the program: Since 2002, the EI program has made significant strides in moving from a paper based model to an electronic / paperless model that facilitates more timely processing of benefits. Today, 98.5% of all applications are received electronically (through AppliWeb) and 100% of eligible claimants submit their bi-weekly reports electronically (either through the Internet Reporting Service or the Telephone Reporting Service).
- ROE Web: Did you know that Record of Employment on the Web (ROE Web) was first introduced in September 2000 as a pilot project to allow employers to submit ROEs in an electronic format instead of paper? In 2004, ROE Web was made available to all employers. Since then a series of enhancements have been implemented to improve the solution. To date, more than 45 million ROEs have been submitted by employers in an electronic format. The electronic submission of ROEs ensures the highest level of data completion and accuracy, and allows Service Canada to pay citizens in a more timely manner.

Chapter I

Labour Market Context

This chapter outlines key labour market developments and the economic situation that prevailed in Canada during the 2014/2015 fiscal year, the period for which this Report assesses the Employment Insurance program.[1] Section 1 provides a general overview and historical context of the economic situation for 2014/2015, while Section 2 summarizes key labour market developments.[2,3] More comprehensive information on elements discussed in this chapter is available under Annex 1.

1. Economic Overview

1.1 Economic Growth

The Canadian economy experienced real Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth for the fifth consecutive year in 2014/2015.[4] Canada saw real GDP growth at a rate of 2.4% in 2014/2015, and its level was estimated at $1.98 trillion in nominal terms, or $1.76 trillion in real terms (chained $2007). Real GDP growth in 2014/2015 was the same as 2013/2014, but was higher than growth rates observed in 2012/2013 and lower than 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 (see Chart 1).

After recording the largest quarterly percentage decline in real GDP since 1981 in the first quarter of 2009, the Canadian economy recovered in subsequent quarters, reporting positive growth rates in every quarter until a contraction of the economy began in the first quarter of 2015.[5] Canada's GDP growth has been moderate since the first quarter of 2012 when compared with rates observed just after the 2008 recession with quarterly GDP growth of 0.5% or less in eight of the last thirteen quarters (see Chart 2).

---

1 The reporting period analyzed consists of the fiscal year of the Government of Canada, which began on April 1, 2014 and ended on March 31, 2015. Data are provided on the basis of calendar years in some sections where data on the basis of fiscal years were not available.

2 Data points provided in this chapter are generally sourced from Statistics Canada, more specifically from the Labour Force Survey (LFS), the Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours (SEPH), and the Canadian System of Macroeconomic Accounts. Annual data are averages of seasonally unadjusted monthly data (except when only seasonally adjusted data are available), while quarterly and monthly data are seasonally adjusted unless otherwise noted. Totals may not always add up due to rounding.

3 Due to revisions made to data by Statistics Canada, figures for previous years published in previous *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Reports* have been restated accordingly.

4 GDP is defined as the estimated total value of all income earned or expenditures made that are observed in an economy over a given period, usually one year. Real GDP measures this output on an expenditure basis only and reflects the difference in total production, not value, of output within an economy.

5 1981 is the earliest year for which historically comparable real GDP data are available from Statistics Canada.

Chart 1

Real Gross Domestic Product, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian System of Macroeconomic Accounts, CANSIM Table 380-0064.

Chart 2

Real Gross Domestic Product Growth, by Quarter, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian System of Macroeconomic Accounts, CANSIM Table 380-0064

When compared to other Group of Seven (G7) countries, Canada reported the second highest rate of real GDP growth in 2014, below the United Kingdom and equal to the United States (see Chart 3). Another way to compare Canada's performance internationally using GDP is through the use of measures comparing GDP per-capita. The use of GDP per-capita allows for an assessment of how a country's economic output compares to others when adjusted for each country's population, providing a comparison of overall living standards within the economies assessed. Based on the most recent data available from the World Bank, in 2014 Canada's GDP per-capita declined compared to results observed in 2013, which is mainly attributable to a combination of gradual declines in the value of global commodity prices over the time period assessed (also seen through the declines in per-capita GDP of countries with growth heavily reliant on commodity price fluctuations including the Russian Federation, Norway,

Australia, Kuwait, and Ghana among others), and the rise in Canada's total population relative to increases observed in labour force participation. With a level of $50,235, Canada ranked 14th globally in GDP-per-capita in 2014 and was 2nd amongst G7 members behind the United States.[6] Among G7 nations in 2014 the United Kingdom (+9.5%), the United States (+3.1%), Germany (+3.0%), and France (+0.2%) reported increases in GDP per-capita while Italy (-1.4%), Canada (-4.0%) and Japan (-6.3%) reported declines (see Chart 3).

In 2014/2015, the goods and services sectors both recorded positive GDP growth in Canada. Service-producing industries (+2.4%) slightly outpaced growth rates for goods-producing industries (+1.9%). Despite challenges from the onset of oil price declines starting in the second half of 2014, the Mining, Quarrying, Oil and Gas Extraction industry posted average annual growth of 4.7% between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015. Despite the positive annual growth seen in this industry, movements in monthly data show this sector began to experience a period of contraction starting in November 2014 which persisted through the end of 2014/2015. The industry subsector which faced the largest impacts from the drop in oil prices in 2014/2015 were not businesses directly involved in oil and gas extraction activities, but those defined as businesses providing support activities and services for mining, oil and gas extraction.

The two North American Industry Classification System industries[7] that reported the highest rates of real GDP growth for 2014/2015 were the Wholesale Trade industry (+5.2%) and the Mining, Quarrying, Oil and Gas Extraction industry (+4.7%). The two industry sectors that reported the lowest rates of economic growth were the Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting industry (-8.6%) and the Management of Companies. and Enterprises industry (-0.8%).[8]

Chart 3

Gross Domestic Product, Changes in Real and per Capita Growth, G7 Countries, 2013 to 2014

Source: World Bank, World Development Indicators, National Accounts Data, December 2015 (for data on GDP per capita), and International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook Database, October 2015 (for data on change in real GDP at market prices).

[6] Note that Canada's global ranking is partly influenced by comparisons to much smaller, more urbanized global markets such as Luxembourg, Qatar, Macao, and Singapore, all of which rank ahead of Canada on a GDP per-capita basis. The other countries which reported a higher GDP per-capita than Canada in 2014 were Luxembourg ($116,664), Norway ($97,307), Qatar($96,732), Macao SAR ($96,038), Switzerland ($85,594), Australia ($61,925), Denmark ($60,707), Sweden ($58,938), Singapore ($56,285), the United States ($54,630), Ireland ($54,374), the Netherlands ($54,195), Iceland ($52,172), and Austria ($52,004). Source: World Bank. World Development Indicators – National Accounts Data. December 2015.

[7] Note that all industries listed in this Chapter refer to two digit level industry coding for the North American Industry Classification System, based on industry classifications introduced in 2012.

[8] Statistics Canada. Gross Domestic Product at Basic Prices, by North American Industry Classification System. CANSIM Table 379-0031.

1.2 Key Economic Developments

The labour productivity of Canadian businesses grew by 2.6% in 2014/2015, following an increase of 1.8% in 2013/2014 and a decline of 0.7% in 2012/2013.9 The labour productivity growth rate observed for Canada in 2014/2015 is the highest growth rate reported in almost a decade (see Chart 4).

Chart 4

Labour Productivity, Canada, 2004/2005 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Indexes of Labour Productivity, CANSIM Table 383-0008.

In 2014, Canada's labour productivity level ranked fourth among the G7 countries, in comparison to a fifth place in 2013. Labour productivity in Canada was 11% below the G7 average for 2014, and was 5% above the average of all Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) member countries (see Chart 5).

Chart 5

Labour Productivity, G7 Countries and OECD Average, 2014

Note: Totals listed have been rounded to the nearest dollar from amounts reported by the OECD.
Source: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD Productivity Database, June 2015.

One of the most significant economic events for Canada and worldwide during 2014/2015 was the decline in oil prices, which declined significantly starting in July 2014. The average spot price of West Texas Intermediate (WTI) oil, a global benchmark for world energy prices, fell from $US 105.79/barrel at the beginning of June 2014 to $US 47.22/barrel at the beginning of January 2015, a decline of 55% over that period.[9] The decline in the commodity price resulted in large reductions in employment in the Forestry, Fishing, Oil and Gas Extraction industry of Alberta's economy over a six-month period, with the total number of employed falling from 185,500 in September 2014 to 161,500 in March 2015.[10] Between November 2014 and April 2015, price declines were also observed for natural gas (-38.6%), lumber (-22.4%), base metals (-14.9%), and agricultural products (-9.7%), though declines for these commodities were not as severe as the drop in oil prices in the second half of 2014/2015.[11]

2. Labour Market Overview

2.1 Labour Force

The total size of Canada's labour force[12] grew by 0.4% (72,300) to 19.14 million in 2014/2015, less than half the rate of growth observed in 2013/2014 (+1.0%). Growth in the labour force was most prominent in Alberta (+56,000) and Ontario (+19,800), while all the Atlantic provinces and British Columbia saw declines in 2014/2015.

Growth of the Canadian working age population (i.e. population aged 15 and over) has outpaced or been equal to growth in the number of labour force participants in Canada for every year since 2008/2009 (see Chart 6).

Chart 6

Population and Labour Force, Canada, 1977/1978 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0001.

[9] Government of Alberta. *"Energy Prices"*. Economic Dashboard. Based on Rates Reported by U.S. Energy Information Administration (West Texas Intermediate - WTI) and Alberta Energy (Western Canada Select - WCS) http://economicdashboard.albertacanada.com/EnergyPrice

[10] Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0007.

[11] Department of Finance. "Budget 2015." 21 April 2015. p.42

[12] The labour force is defined as the civilian non-institutional population 15 years of age or older who are employed or unemployed. A more comprehensive definition is provided under Annex 1.1.

The number of working age individuals not in the labour force has been rising at a faster rate than the number of people participating in the labour force, and as a result Canada has seen its labour force participation rate[13] decline year-over-year since 2008/2009, despite a growing number of Canadians participating in the labour force. Following a decline of 0.2 percentage point to 66.4% in 2013/2014, Canada's participation rate fell again by half a percentage point in 2014/2015 to reach 65.9% (see Chart 7).

Over the last 10 fiscal years, the labour force participation rate has fluctuated from a high of 67.5% in 2007/2008 to a low of 65.9% in 2014/2015, and has remained at a higher level, on average, than rates observed in previous decades (see Chart 7). In comparison, the percentage of working-age Americans (defined by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics as those aged 16 years and over) who participated in the U.S. labour force reached a 35-year low in 2014/2015, falling 0.3 percentage point from the previous year to 62.8%.

Chart 7

Labour Force Participation Rate, Canada and United States, 1976/1977 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0001 (for Canadian data), United States Department of Labour (Bureau of Labor Statistics), Current Population Survey (for U.S. data).

All provinces and territories have also reported marginal declines in labour force participation rates since 2012/2013 (see Chart 8).

By gender, the participation rate for men in Canada continues to be higher than the rate for women. While the gap in participation rates has narrowed considerably over time, the participation rate of women in the labour force has stabilized since 2002/2003. The gap in participation rates between men and women in 2014/2015 was 9.1 percentage points. The narrowing of the gap in participation rates between men and women since 1990/1991 is due to both an increasing participation rate by women and declines in the participation rate of men observed during that time (see Chart 9).

[13] Statistics Canada defines the labour force participation rate as the labour force expressed as a percentage of the population aged 15 years and older. A more comprehensive definition is provided under Annex 1.1.

Chart 8

Labour Force Participation Rate, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2012/2013 to 2014/2015

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0001 (for provincial data), and special tabulations (for territorial data).

Chart 9

Labour Force Participation Rate, Canada and United States, 1976/1977 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0001.

By age, the participation rate for core-aged individuals (25 to 54 years) has remained relatively stable over time before a drop of 0.4 percentage point between 2013/2014 (86.6%) and 2014/2015 (86.2%). A significant shift that has occurred in Canada's labour market is the large increase in participation rates observed among those aged 55 and over, increasing from 25.6% in 2000/2001 to 37.1% in 2014/2015, despite a decrease of 0.2 percentage point from 2013/2014 to 2014/2015, the first decline for this group in 19 years. In contrast, the youth cohort (15 to 24 years) reported increases on average in participation rates from 2000/2001 to 2008/2009 and declines since then. This trend may be starting to reverse as participation rates for the youth cohort increased year over year between 2012/2013 (63.7%) to 2014/2015 (64.3%) as economic conditions improved (see Chart 10).

Chart 10

Labour Force Participation Rate, by Age Group, Canada, 1976/1977 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0001.

The shifts occurring in labour force participation rates across age groups are much clearer if non-core aged cohorts (i.e. those aged 15-24 and 55 and over) are divided into five-year increments. Between 2000/2001 and 2014/2015, the two largest shifts observed among these age groups in terms of participation rates have occurred in the 60 to 64 (+16.8 percentage points between 2000/2001 and 2014/2015) and the 55 to 59 age group (+11.2 percentage points). An opposite trend of declining participation rates has occurred among youth, with participation dropping marginally among 20 to 24 years old (-1.5 percentage point between 2008/2009 and 2014/2015) and significantly among workers aged 15 to 19 years old (-6.0 percentage points) (see Chart 11). Based on these results, the Canadian economy has become increasingly reliant on older workers, and the eventual retirement or departure of many of these workers in future years may raise challenges in meeting demands for labour.

Chart 11

Labour Force Participation Rate, by Age Group, Canada, 1976/1977 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0001.

2.2 Employment

Canada saw a moderate increase in employment in 2014/2015, with a net gain of 103,000 positions (+0.6%) from 2013/2014 to 2014/2015, to reach an annual average of 17.83 million persons employed. This was the fifth consecutive year of employment growth in Canada since the decline in employment observed in 2009/2010 following the impacts of the 2008 recession.[14]

When compared to other advanced economies, on a calendar year basis Canada (+0.6%) ranked fifth in the level of employment growth among the G7 countries during 2014 in percentage (e.g. the rate of increase) and numerical (e.g. total count of new employment positions created) terms, behind the United Kingdom (+2.3%), the United States (+1.6%), Germany (+0.9%) and marginally behind Japan (+0.6%), while remaining ahead of Italy (+0.4%) and France (+0.2%).[15]

Despite increases in employment in 2014/2015, the national employment rate for 2014/2015 (61.4%) declined for the second consecutive year by 0.3 percentage point compared to the rate observed in 2013/2014 (61.7%).[16] The national employment rate has held relatively constant since the 2008 recession, similar to the years just after the initial recovery period after the recession of the early 1990s and in contrast to steady increases observed in the economic recovery period following the recessionary period of the early 1980s (see Chart 12).

Chart 12

Employment Rate, Canada, 1976/1977 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0001.

[14] See Annex 1.3 for a detailed summary of the estimated employment within the Canadian economy.

[15] International Monetary Fund. World Economic Outlook Database. October 2015.

[16] The employment rate is defined as the number of persons employed expressed as a percentage of the population 15 years of age and over. A more comprehensive definition is available under Annex 1.1.

2.2.1 Employment, by Province and Territory, Gender and Age

Employment gains within the Canadian economy varied from jurisdiction to jurisdiction in 2014/2015. Alberta (+2.1%), the Yukon (+2.1%), Saskatchewan (+1.0%) and Manitoba (+1.0%) saw the largest percentage increases in employment from 2013/2014 to 2014/2015, while the Northwest Territories (-4.8%), Nunavut (-2.4%), Newfoundland and Labrador (-1.9%) and New Brunswick (-0.8%) reported the largest percentage declines over that same period.

Chart 13

Employment, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2014/2015

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0001 (for provincial data), and special tabulations (for territorial data).

Ontario (6.89 million people employed) and Quebec (4.07 million people employed) accounted for more than 60% of overall employment in Canada for 2014/2015. Alberta (2.29 million jobs) moved into third place for the total number of persons employed, marginally surpassing British Columbia (2.28 million jobs) (see Table 1).

Table 1

Average Annual Count of Employed Persons (Thousands), by Province, 2014/2015

	2014/2015	% of Total Employed - Canada
Province		
Newfoundland and Labrador	237.1	1.3%
Prince Edward Island	73.9	0.4%
Nova Scotia	447.9	2.5%
New Brunswick	352.9	2.0%
Quebec	4,065.5	22.8%
Ontario	6,886.0	38.6%
Manitoba	630.0	3.5%
Saskatchewan	571.4	3.2%
Alberta	2,286.0	12.8%
British Columbia	2,279.0	12.8%
Canada	**17,829.6**	**100.0%**

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0087.

Consistent with historical trends, there was significant variability observed in employment rates across jurisdictions, with a gap of 17.9 percentage points between the jurisdiction reporting the highest (the Yukon) and lowest (Nunavut) employment rates. The Yukon (71.0%), Alberta (69.2%), the Northwest Territories (68.1%), Saskatchewan (66.8%) and Manitoba (64.3%) all reported employment rates above the national average of 61.4% (see Chart 14).

Chart 14

Employment Rate, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2009/2010 to 2014/2015

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0001 (for provincial data), and special tabulations (for territorial data).

2.2.1.1 Share of Employment, by Gender and Age

In terms of employment by gender, similar to labour force participation rates in recent years (see Chart 9), there has been a narrowing of the male and female shares of employed Canadians. In 2014/2015, men represented 52.4% of all employed Canadians while women represented 47.6%. The gap in the share of employment narrowed considerably over time until the year 2009/2010 (when 52.0% of all those employed were men and 48.0% were women), and has widened slightly since then (see Chart 15).

On the basis of gender, in 2014/2015 men occupied 56.9% of all full-time jobs while women occupied 43.1% of full-time positions. A much larger gender gap in the percentage shares of employment is observed for persons working in part-time positions, with women occupying 66.5% and men occupying 33.5% of part-time jobs in Canada during 2014/2015. The shares of men and women occupying full-time and part-time positions have remained relatively constant in the years since the 2008 recession.

Canada's aging demographics also contributed to significant changes to the composition of the workforce over the past decade and a half, with the number of older workers (55 and older) more than doubling from 1.5 million in 2000/2001 to 3.5 million in 2014/2015. During the same time period, the number of core-aged workers (25 to 54 years) increased only slightly from 11.0 million in 2000/2001 to 11.8 million in 2014/2015. The population of younger workers (15 to 24 years) stayed relatively constant, increasing from 2.3 million in 2000/2001 to 2.5 million in 2014/2015. The majority of job increases reported in recent years have therefore been found among demographic groups outside of the traditional "core ages" of the labour force, with Canadians 55 years and older obtaining the largest share of employment increases (see also Chart 15).

Chart 15

Employment, by Gender and Age Group, Canada, 1976/1977 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour force survey, CANSIM Table 282-0001.

2.2.2 Employment, by Educational Attainment, Industry and Sector

As technology and demands from industry for more specialized skills evolve, Canadians require increasing rates of enrollment and completion of secondary and post-secondary education to improve their chances of obtaining employment. This can be seen through an examination of employment rates on the basis of educational attainment, where employment rates tend to increase for every additional level of education completed by those in the labour force, while the differences in employment rates between those with less educational attainment and the national average have risen over time (see Table 2).

Table 2

Employment Rate, by Educational Attainment, Canada, 2004/2005 to 2014/2015

	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
0 to 8 Years	21.5%	21.5%	21.1%	20.4%	20.1%	19.3%	19.9%	20.2%	19.6%	18.9%
Some High School	44.7%	45.0%	45.4%	44.6%	40.8%	40.3%	40.1%	39.5%	39.3%	39.0%
High School Graduate	65.4%	65.1%	65.5%	63.8%	61.6%	61.6%	61.6%	61.0%	60.5%	59.6%
Some Postsecondary	63.2%	64.0%	64.3%	63.8%	60.7%	60.8%	60.2%	60.6%	59.7%	58.5%
Postsecondary Certificate or Diploma	72.7%	72.5%	72.8%	72.4%	70.8%	71.0%	70.7%	70.5%	70.6%	70.1%
Bachelor's Degree	76.3%	76.9%	76.7%	76.0%	75.5%	75%	74.3%	74.6%	74.4%	74.0%
Above Bachelor's Degree	77.3%	77.0%	76.5%	76.2%	75.8%	75.0%	75.2%	75.2%	74.5%	74.1%
Canada	**62.6%**	**63.0%**	**63.5%**	**63.0%**	**61.4%**	**61.6%**	**61.6%**	**61.8%**	**61.7%**	**61.4%**

Source: Statistics Canada. Labour Force Survey. CANSIM Table 282-0003.

The 0.6% increase in employment in 2014/2015 came entirely from the services-producing industries (+127,900 employed persons, or +0.9%), particularly the Health Care and Social Assistance industry (+42,400, or 1.9%), Accommodation and Food Services industry (+35,500, or 3.0%), the Wholesale Trade industry (+31,400, or 5.2%) and the Education Services industry (+30,200, or 2.5%). These increases were partially offset by decreases in the Retail Trade industry (employment decline of 21,100, or -1.0%). Combined, the goods-producing industries experienced a reduction of 25,000 (-0.6%) in the

number of employed persons. Despite the sharp decline in the oil price, the Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction industry (-1,700 employment, or -0.6%) witnessed a percentage variation in 2014/2015 similar to averages reported for the other goods-producing industries.

In 2014/2015, total employment of private sector employees grew by 0.7%, compared to 0.4% for public sector employees, while the number of workers defined as self-employed persons also increased by 0.4%. In total, for 2014/2015 private sector employees accounted for 64.7% of overall employment (11.5 million), followed by the public sector employees at 20.0% of employment (3.6 million) and self-employed workers at 15.4% (2.7 million), with this breakdown remaining relatively constant over recent years.

2.2.3 Employment, by Employment Type, and Union Coverage

Full-time employment grew by 0.4%, with three times that rate of growth in part-time employment (1.2%) in 2014/2015. Full-time employment accounted for 80.8% (14.4 million jobs) of all employment in Canada in 2014/2015. The remaining 19.2% (3.4 million jobs) was associated with part-time employment.[17] Canadian workers also tended, on average, to report very high average weighting of the number of hours worked at their main jobs compared to all other jobs they occupied, meaning that if a person was employed in more than one job at once they would allocate a very high share of their total actual hours worked in a given week towards the main job they occupy compared to all other jobs they worked (98.8% of actual hours worked for full-time employees were at their main job, compared to 93.5% of actual hours worked for part-time employees at their main job).[18]

Two trends of note that occurred in the Canadian economy over the last decade were small and consistent annual incremental increases in the share of part-time workers in the economy (from 18.5% of employment in 2004/2005 to 19.2% in 2014/2015) and the consistent year-over-year share of all workers in the economy who are defined as self-employed (an average of 15.5% of employed Canadians who are defined as self-employed per year).[19] Given the current composition of the Canadian labour market and the eligibility criteria for EI regular benefits, one in every six workers in the Canadian economy would not be covered by EI regular benefits given the way insurable employment is defined for the purposes of the EI program. Self-employed workers are not normally considered eligible for EI regular benefits given the nature of their employment, but are eligible to claim EI special benefits provided they opt in to paying EI premiums for 52 weeks prior to making a claim for special benefits and meet other eligibility requirements.

A notable change in 2014/2015 was the decline in the total number of employees who worked in jobs that received union coverage[20], whose total share of employees declined by 0.9% (42,600 jobs) compared to 2013/2014 (see Chart 16). This is significant in relation to the EI program given that firms with collective agreements in place tend to provide negotiated leave and benefits that often replace or complement EI special benefits. The decline in the number of unionized positions in 2014/2015 was largely driven by declines in unionized private sector jobs (-2.2%, or 43,500 jobs). This may indicate that some unionized private sector jobs that previously provided coverage for supplementary benefits through negotiated collective agreements are now covered less frequently by collective agreement provisions similar in nature to what is offered by EI special benefits. This could mean demands for special benefit coverage through the EI program could increase in future years as the number of jobs covered by negotiated supplemental benefits in collective agreements declines within the Canadian economy.

---

[17] Part-time employment consists of persons who usually work less than 30 hours per week at their main or only job.

[18] In 2014/2015, full-time employees in the Canadian economy, on average, worked 39.9 actual hours per week at all the jobs they occupied versus 39.4 hours at their main job, a difference of half an hour per week. This compares to a difference of 1.2 actual hours worked per week for part-time employees at their main jobs (17.2 hours) versus all jobs (18.4) in which they worked during the reference week. Source: Statistics Canada. Labour Force Survey. CANSIM Table 282-0027.

[19] Statistics Canada. Labour Force Survey. CANSIM Table 282-0089.

[20] Based on definitions used by Statistics Canada, this grouping refers to employees who are members of a union and employees who are not union members but who are covered by a collective agreement or a union contract.

Chart 16

Employment, by Employment Type, Sector, Union Coverage and Job Permanency, 2012/2013 to 2014/2015

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0001 (for data on employment), 282-0077 (for data on union coverage), 282-0079 (for data on job permanency), and 282-0089 (for data on employment type).

2.2.4. Hours Worked

In 2014/2015, average hours worked per week including overtime for all employees in the Canadian economy remained unchanged at 30.4 hours compared to 2013/2014. Prior to 2013/2014, average hours worked had increased in each of the previous three years after the national average dropped to 30.0 hours per week following impacts of the 2008 recession. Hours worked matters for the administration of the EI program because EI eligibility is based in part on the number of hours of insurable employment worked in the previous year.

The distribution of hours worked by Canadian employees at all jobs they occupy had increases in the share of all workers who are working less than 35 hours per week, and declines in the share of employees working more than 35 hours per week, between 2012/2013 and 2014/2015. While the majority (56.2%) of Canadian workers continue to report working a total of 35 hours or more per week, there has been a decline of 4.7 percentage points between 2012/2013 and 2014/2015 in the share of employees with total number of hours in full-time equivalent positions. The only full-time equivalent hours category which saw increases in its share of all employees (by 2.9 percentage points between 2012/2013 and 2014/2015) were those working between 30 and 34 hours per week. The number of employees working zero hours but still defined as employed also increased by 0.3 percentage point over that time. Overall, the Canadian economy has experienced a reduction in the total number of hours worked on average in recent years with an increasing share of Canadian employees working hours very close to the cut-off between full-time and part-time hours (see Chart 17).

The distribution of hours worked varies significantly by gender and age. By gender, women were the majority of workers for each category of hours worked up to 35 to 39 hours, while men made up the majority of all workers who worked 40 hours or more per week. By age, two trends observed were that workers aged 15 to 24 years made up the largest share (40.5% in 2014/2015) of those working between 1 to 14 hours in each reference week, and that members of the core-age groupings of the labour force (25 to 54 years) made up the largest share of workers (67.9% in 2014/2015) working zero hours on average in a given reference week. The distribution of hours worked by age group has remained relatively consistent for the Canadian economy since 2012/2013.

Employees in the Northwest Territories (33.3), Alberta (32.7), Newfoundland and Labrador (32.5) and New Brunswick (31.5) worked the most hours per week on average. In 2014/2015, employees in the Yukon (29.1), British Columbia (29.4), Nova Scotia (29.9), Prince Edward Island (30.0) and Manitoba (30.0) worked the fewest number of hours on average. There was a variance of 4.2 hours worked between the provinces and territories with the highest and lowest reported average hours worked per week (see Chart 18).

Chart 17

Distribution of Total Hours Worked, All Jobs, Canada, 2012/2013 to 2014/2015

Note: Distribution reflects the actual number of hours worked in the reference week of the Labour Force Survey at all jobs occupied by Canadian employees.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0017.

Chart 18

Average Hours Worked Per Week (Including Overtime), by Province and Territory, Canada, 2013/2014 to 2014/2015

Source: Statistics Canada, Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours, CANSIM Table 281-0032.

Significant changes to provincial and territorial rankings for hours worked per week have occurred between 2004/2005 and 2014/2015, with the average number of hours worked increasing significantly in Alberta, Newfoundland and Labrador, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia while declines were reported in Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia. The Northwest Territories also reported a significant average increase in hours worked since the 2008 recession, with levels returning to pre-recession levels.

Employees in goods-producing industries continued to report working 37.4 hours per week on average in 2014/2015, the same level as reported in 2013/2014. Employees in services-producing industries, meanwhile, worked 28.5 hours per week on average in 2014/2015, also the same result as in 2013/2014 (see Chart 19).

Chart 19

Average Hours Worked Per Week (Including Overtime), by Industry, Canada, 2013/2014 to 2014/2015

Source: Statistics Canada, Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours, CANSIM Table 281-0032.

2.2.5 Wages

Including payments received by employees for overtime, Canada's average weekly nominal earnings grew by 2.7% to $942 in 2014/2015, compared with $917 in 2013/2014.[21] Wage payments determine the EI premiums paid by employers and employees, as well as the level of benefits that claimants can receive, calculated as a proportion of a claimant's wage payments received up to the maximum insurable earnings amount.

In 2014/2015, similar to previous years, Alberta reported the highest average weekly earnings for a province at $1,157 per week followed by Newfoundland and Labrador ($1,001), Saskatchewan ($982) and Ontario ($945). Average earnings in the six other provinces continued to fall below the national average ($942). The jurisdiction with the highest average weekly earnings was the Northwest Territories at $1,409. Every Canadian territory reported higher average nominal earnings than all provinces in Canada except Alberta (see Chart 20).

[21] Note that wage figures are not consistent with results reported in the 2013/2014 *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report* as totals in that version did not include wages for overtime hours worked. The average weekly nominal earnings for all industries in Canada, excluding overtime, were $916 in 2014/2015, compared with $889 in 2013/2014.

Chart 20

Average Weekly Nominal Earnings, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2013/2014 to 2014/2015

Source: Statistics Canada, Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours, CANSIM 281-0026.

Six provinces (Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta) exceeded the national average wage increase of 2.7%, while Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia experienced the lowest wage growth (2.1%, 2.2% and 2.3% respectively). Chart 21 compares the increase of nominal earnings by province and territory to the inflation rate for that jurisdiction, measured by the Consumer Price Index. Ontario was, marginally, the only province that experienced earnings growth that was lower than the growth in its Consumer Price Index from 2013/2014 to 2014/2015.

Chart 21

Average Increases in Weekly Nominal Earnings and Consumer Price Index, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2013/2014 to 2014/2015

Sources: Statistics Canada, Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours, CANSIM Table 281-0026 (for data on nominal earnings), and Statistics Canada, Consumer Price Index Measures, CANSIM Table 326-0020 (for data on CPI).

For 2014/2015, employees in the goods-producing sectors continued to report higher average nominal weekly earnings ($1,223) than employees in the services sector ($878). Employees in the Mining, Quarrying, Oil and Gas Extraction industry had the highest average weekly earnings ($2,064) followed by workers in Utilities ($1,805). The Accommodation and Food Services industry, meanwhile, had the lowest average nominal weekly earnings for the second consecutive year ($372), followed by workers in Retail Trade ($544). In 2014/2015, growth in nominal weekly earnings varied considerably across industries from a low of -0.1% (Education Services industry) to a high of 7.7% (Mining, Quarrying and Oil and Gas Extraction industry) (see Chart 22).

When looking at the change in wage rates in Canada for 2014/2015 on the basis of gender, men earned an average hourly wage of $26.44 while women earned an average hourly wage of $22.78, a difference of $3.66 per hour that is equivalent to 16.1% of the average hourly wage of women.

When examining median hourly wages[22], men earned a median hourly rate of $23.34 (a difference of $3.10 less than the reported average hourly wage rate for men) while women earned a median wage rate of $19.82 (a difference of $2.96 less than reported average hourly wage rate for women). While hourly wages have increased at a similar rate for both men and women over the last fifteen years, the gap in hourly wages between men and women has persisted (see Chart 23).

Chart 22

Average Weekly Nominal Earnings, by Industry, Canada, 2014/2015

Source: Statistics Canada, Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours, CANSIM Table 281-0026.

[22] The median is the midrange value of all results, showing the estimated value at which half the population would earn more, while the other half would earn less than that specified amount.

Chart 23

Average and Median Nominal Wage Rates, by Gender, Canada, 1997/1998 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour force survey, CANSIM Table 282-0073.

The decline in the number of unionized private sector jobs in 2014/2015 (see Chart 16) may lead to future declines in the rate of growth in reported average wages for Canadian workers, as unionized jobs have historically paid higher wages to employees on both an average and median basis. Should the number of unionized private sector jobs within the economy decline at equivalent rates to what was observed in 2014/2015 in future years, it could have an effect on the reported levels of average and median wage growth within the Canadian economy, which would incrementally decline on an average and median basis. The average hourly wage of a unionized employee was $28.27 in 2014/2015, compared with average hourly wages for employees with no union coverage worth $23.03, a difference of $5.24 per hour. A larger wage gap was observed when measuring median hourly wages, with unionized employees earning $26.12 in 2014/2015 compared to median wages of non-unionized employees at $19.05, a gap of $7.07 per hour (see Chart 24).

The results above are significant for the EI program since wage payments determine both the EI premiums paid by employers and employees, as well as the level of benefits that claimants can receive, calculated as a proportion of a claimant's wage payments received up to the maximum insurable earnings amount. As earnings change, the level of associated average and median earnings received by employees could also grow at a slower rate on average. This finding, if the trend observed in 2014/2015 continues, could influence the amount of EI premiums paid on average by both employees and employers into the EI operating account as wage growth moderates, and result in slower growth in the rate of maximum insurable earning increases for EI claimants. More demand for EI claims and lower average claim amounts could also occur as the rising share of all employees working in non-unionized positions could create the potential for reduced job permanency.

Chart 24

Average and Median Nominal Wage Rates, by Union Coverage, Canada, 2014/2015

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0073.

2.2.5.1 *Workers Earning Minimum Wage*

The share of employees earning minimum wage varies across Canada given the specific characteristics of each jurisdiction's labour market and specific policies of provincial governments, which are responsible for setting minimum wage rates. The frequency of minimum wages increases over time has been inconsistent, with provinces choosing to adopt increases at different times based on economic and labour market considerations specific to their jurisdiction, which can change over time. Minimum wages across Canada varied between $10.20 and $11.00 per hour in 2014 (see Table 3), and some provinces have chosen to implement additional increases since that time.

Table 3

Minimum Wage Rates and Share of Total Persons Employed Earning Minimum Wage, by Province, Canada, 2014

	Hourly Minimum Wage Rate[1]	Hourly Minimum Wage Rate as a Share (%) of Average Hourly Wage, by Province[2]	Share (%) of Employees in Each Province Paid at Minimum Wage[3]
Province			
Newfoundland and Labrador	$10.25	46.4%	5.4%
Prince Edward Island	$10.35	46.8%	6.1%
Nova Scotia	$10.40	47.1%	6.7%
New Brunswick	$10.30	46.6%	5.7%
Quebec	$10.35	44.9%	6.0%
Ontario	$11.00	44.3%	10.9%
Manitoba	$10.70	47.9%	5.1%
Saskatchewan	$10.20	40.3%	3.5%
Alberta	$10.20	36.3%	1.7%
British Columbia	$10.25	42.2%	5.9%
Canada[4]	**Not Applicable**	**Not Applicable**	**7.2%**

1 Wage rates listed in this row are based on a customized search of the ESDC Labour Program's database of historical minimum wages for adult workers in Canada for the year 2014, reflecting the latest change in minimum wage rates reported for all provinces during 2014.

2 Data is not available on a provincial basis for average hourly wages in Canada's Atlantic provinces for the CANSIM Table cited. The share of minimum wage for each Atlantic province listed in this column is based on minimum wage rates for each province as a share of the average hourly wage for the Atlantic region for 2014 ($22.10). Data provided on hourly wages excludes calculations for Canada's territories.

Source: Statistics Canada. Labour Force Survey. CANSIM Table 282-0233.

3 Statistics Canada. "Minimum Wage in Canada Since 1975." The Daily – Canadian Megatrends. January 2016.

4 Currently, the Government of Canada has no defined minimum wage rate for federally regulated employees, choosing instead to entrench the applicable general adult minimum wage rate for workers covered by Part III of the Canada Labour Code for any federally regulated work undertaken in that province or territory. As a result, a minimum wage rate for Canada is not provided. The percentage listed reflects aggregated totals of all provincial data on minimum wage earners.

Source: ESDC. "Customized Search for General Minimum Wage Rates in Canada." Labour Program. 2015.

The national average for the share of all employees earning minimum wage is heavily influenced by results reported for Ontario, the only jurisdiction to report a share of employees earning minimum wages that was above the national average, at 10.9%. In contrast, for 2014 the provinces that reported the lowest shares of total employment positions earning minimum wages were in Alberta (1.7%), Saskatchewan (3.5%) and Manitoba (5.1%). The high average for Canada in comparison to averages for most provinces is explained in part by Ontario's relative labour market size. Ontario has also introduced gradual increases to its minimum wage rate in recent years. As minimum wage rates increase, the proportion of employees paid at minimum wage also tends to increase because some employees who were earning wages marginally above the minimum wage rate before increases are introduced then join the population of those earning minimum wages, if their wages are not increased proportionately.[23]

According to the OECD, minimum wage rates are a key policy tool to assist in preventing workers and their families from falling into poverty, and the success of minimum wage rates depends on the level of the wage paid and amount of net earnings received. Canada's minimum wage rates are currently set at a level, on average, worth 44.1% of reported median wage rates for the Canadian economy, higher than the level reported for the United States (37.3%). Workers in Canada also tend to receive net wages very close to the wage rates paid by employers, meaning few additional opportunities are available to address potential income shortfalls through tax benefits and subsidies.[24] After adjusting for inflation, the average value of minimum wage in Canada for 2014 was $10.39 per hour, a level comparable to the real value of minimum wage earned in the late 1970s.[25]

A significant recent trend in the distribution of minimum wage earners is the large increase in the share of employees between the ages of 15 and 19 earning minimum wage, and those over the age of 65 between 2013 and 2014. Significant declines in the share of workers earning minimum wage were reported for members of the core-age demographics of the labour force over the same time period.

Chart 25

Share of Employees Earning Minimum Wage, by Age Group, Canada, 2013 and 2014

Source: Galarneau, D. and E. Fecteau. 2014. "The Ups and Downs of Minimum Wage," Insights on Canadian Society, Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

[23] Statistics Canada. "Minimum Wage in Canada Since 1975." The Daily – Canadian Megatrends. January 2016.

[24] Keese, Mark and Shruti Singh. 'How Does Canada Compare? Employment Outlook 2015.' Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. July 2015. http://www.oecd.org/canada/Employment-Outlook-Canada-EN.pdf

[25] Statistics Canada. "Minimum Wage in Canada Since 1975." The Daily – Canadian Megatrends. January 2016. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-630-x/11-630-x2015006-eng.htm>

2.3 Unemployment

For the fifth year in a row, the unemployment rate[26] in Canada declined, falling below 7.0% for the first time since the end of the 2008 recession. The unemployment rate was 6.9% in 2014/2015, a decline of 0.1 percentage point from 2013/2014. In 2014/2015, there were 1.31 million people unemployed[27] on average compared to 1.34 million in 2013/2014, representing a 2.3% decrease. The national annual unemployment rate remains 0.9 percentage point above the rate of 6.0% reported in 2007/2008 prior to the start of the 2008 recession, which was the lowest annual unemployment rate observed since 1976/1977.

The duration of unemployment periods fluctuates for various reasons, including changes in labour supply and demand, changing demands for skills in the labour market, and the seasonality of various occupations.

In 2014/2015, the average duration of unemployment[28] in Canada decreased slightly to 20.6 weeks from the level of 21.1 weeks observed in 2013/2014. The average duration of unemployment reported for 2014/2015 was the same as the rate observed in 2012/2013. Duration of unemployment tends to be correlated with movements in the unemployment rate and sharp spikes in average unemployment duration tend to follow recessionary periods. However the unemployment duration reported annually has remained relatively constant since 2010/2011 and has not followed historical trends observed in previous economic recoveries where the average duration of unemployment fell over the recovery period (see Chart 26).

Chart 26

Unemployment Rate and Duration of Unemployment, Canada, 1976/1977 to 2014/2015

Note: Totals listed in the text and other charts in Chapter 1 for average unemployment duration reflect average unemployment durations listed under the No Top-code category. See Footnote 26 for more information.
Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Tables 282-0047 (for data on duration of unemployment), and 282-0001 (for data on unemployment rate).

[26] The unemployment rate is the number of unemployed persons expressed as a percentage of the labour force. A more comprehensive definition is provided under Annex 1.1.

[27] Unemployed persons are defined as those who are without work, have looked for work in the past four weeks and are available for work; are on temporary layoff with an expectation of being recalled and who are available for work; or have a job to start within four weeks and are available to work. A more comprehensive definition is available under Annex 1.1.

[28] Duration of unemployment is the number of continuous weeks during which a person has been unemployed. Statistics Canada reports average unemployment duration using two measures: one using a 99 week cut off, and one which provides an average duration where all observations are measured fully, which increases the average duration of unemployment measured for the Canadian labour force. Given the 99 week cap measure tends to underestimate the average length of unemployment periods in Canada, the *Monitoring and Assessment Report* will report average unemployment duration in future years using data without the 99 week cap.

2.3.1 Unemployment Rate and Duration, by Province and Territory, Gender and Age

Similar to 2013/2014, unemployment rates in Western Canada remained below the national average due to the region's strong economic performance in recent years. For the sixth consecutive year, the province of Saskatchewan recorded the lowest unemployment rate (4.0%) in 2014/2015 followed by Alberta (4.9%), Manitoba (5.4%) and British Columbia (6.0%) (see Chart 27).

Chart 27

Unemployment Rate, by Province and Territory, 2012/2013 to 2014/2015

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0087

Quebec residents experienced the longest average duration of unemployment at 23.5 weeks in 2014/2015, followed by Ontario residents at 21.6 weeks. All other provinces were below the national average of 20.6 weeks, while the shortest duration was observed in Saskatchewan at 13.3 weeks, followed by Alberta at 14.1 weeks. Compared to 2013/2014, Newfoundland and Labrador registered the largest increase in average duration of unemployment (+0.4 week), followed by Prince Edward Island (+0.3 week) and New Brunswick (+0.2 week). All other provinces reported decreases in the average duration of unemployment, led by Manitoba (-1.0 week), Saskatchewan (-1.0 week) and British Columbia (-0.9 week) (see Chart 28).

Chart 28

Duration of Unemployment by Province, Canada, 2012/2013 to 2014/2015

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0047.

Men (7.4%) experienced a higher unemployment rate than that for women (6.3%) in 2014/2015. The unemployment rate for men declined for the fifth consecutive year while the unemployment rate for women declined for the fourth consecutive year. The unemployment rate fell by 0.1 percentage point for men and by 0.2 percentage point for women in 2014/2015 when compared to 2013/2014.

As shown in Chart 29, the gender unemployment rate gap reversed itself in 1990/1991. Since that time, unemployment rates for women have remained consistently lower than unemployment rates for men by 0.9 percentage point per year, on average. The unemployment rate for men versus women in 2009/2010 reached a gap of 2.5 percentage points, the largest gap recorded since comparable data have been collected, but has since declined as economic conditions improved. Men have also historically experienced longer average durations of unemployment than women.

In 2014/2015, the unemployment rate for individuals between the ages of 25 and 54 decreased by 0.1 percentage point to reach 5.7%, while the rate for individuals 55 years and older fell by 0.3 percentage point to also reach 5.7%. Individuals aged 15 to 24 saw their unemployment rate decrease by 0.3 percentage point to 13.3% in 2014/2015.

The youth unemployment rate still remains more than double the unemployment rates reported for core-aged and older workers. However the gap in the unemployment rates between youth and core-aged workers declined from 7.8 percentage points in 2013/2014 to 7.6 percentage points in 2014/2015, the narrowest gap observed between these age cohorts since 2008/2009. Although young Canadians continued to face higher unemployment rates than older cohorts in 2014/2015, the average duration of unemployment for younger workers was significantly lower, at 12.1 weeks, than the durations reported for core-aged and older workers, at 22.6 and 29.9 weeks respectively (see Chart 30). In other words, unemployment periods generally last longer for people in older age cohorts, although they are less likely to be unemployed than their younger counterparts.

Chart 29

Unemployment Rate and Duration of Unemployment, by Gender, Canada, 1976/1977 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Tables 282-0047 (for data on duration of unemployment), and 282-0001 (for data on unemployment rate).

Chart 30

Unemployment Rate and Duration of Unemployment, by Age Group, Canada, 1976/1977 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Tables 282-0047 (for data on duration of unemployment), and 282-0001 (for data on unemployment rate).

2.3.2 Unemployment, by Educational Attainment, and Reason

In 2014/2015, the unemployment rate among individuals with a university degree[29] was 4.8%, compared with 5.4% for those with a post-secondary certificate or diploma[30], while the unemployment rate was 8.2% for those who completed high-school (including those with at least partially completed post-secondary education) and 13.6% for those who have partial high school education or less.[31]

Unemployment can result from a number of factors and the reasons for a person's unemployment are a key factor in determining eligibility for EI benefits.[32] Generally, benefits are only available to individuals who have lost their job for reasons outside their control or who left their job with just cause. In 2014/2015, persons who became unemployed because they lost their job (job losers) accounted for the largest share of the unemployed population in Canada (43.5%); however, this share declined slightly from totals reported in 2013/2014 (43.8%). Individuals who were unemployed because they left their job (job leavers) accounted for the smallest share of the unemployed population (18.6%) although their share of the total unemployed population increased the most (+0.7 percentage point) between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

The share of unemployed persons classified as 'job leavers' is sometimes referred to by policy makers as a potential indicator of improving economic conditions.[33] An increasing rate of workers leaving their jobs voluntarily can indicate that conditions within the labour market have improved and workers are able to find employment positions which they believe would better meet their needs or offer improved working conditions.[34]

The share of job leavers who form part of the unemployed population has remained more constant year over year since the end of the 2008 recession. This observation is not consistent with trends in the share of unemployed workers defined as 'job leavers' during previous economic recoveries for Canada, which saw the share of 'job leavers' steadily increase in years after the recession of the early 1980s, and slow but steady increases during the economic recovery of the early 1990s (see Chart 31).

An inverse relationship is seen between the unemployed population defined as 'job leavers' and those defined as having not worked in the last year or never worked, in that when the share of 'job leavers' increases, the share of those who have not worked in the last year or never worked tends to decline. This could potentially indicate that the share of job leavers in the Canadian economy tends to increase as competition for positions within the labour market is less intensive, and when people tend to be unemployed for longer time periods. This relationship could indicate that in recent years employed workers were less likely to leave their jobs to pursue other potential job opportunities as they were not as confident of being able to find new work arrangements to meet their needs.

Individuals who have not worked in the last year or never worked accounted for 37.9% of the unemployed in 2014/2015. As shown in Chart 31, totals for each grouping of the unemployed, by reason, were similar to figures reported in the last four years. However, these figures differ significantly from pre-recession figures reported in 2007/2008. The most notable change since the 2008 recession is in the share of unemployed who have not worked in the last year or never worked, which increased by 7.7 percentage points between 2007/2008 and 2014/2015. The share of 'job leavers' between 2007/2008 and 2014/2015 declined by 5.6 percentage points, while the share of 'job losers' declined by 2.2 percentage points during that time.

---

29 Statistics Canada defines this group as any person having obtained at least a bachelor's degree.

30 Defined by Statistics Canada as having completed a certificate (including a trade certificate) or diploma from an educational institution beyond the secondary school level, including certificates from vocational schools, apprenticeship training, community college, Collège d'Enseignement Général et Professionnel (CEGEP) and school of nursing. Also included are certificates below a Bachelor's degree obtained at a university.

31 Statistics Canada. Labour Force Survey. CANSIM Table 282-0003.

32 Service Canada determines whether a claimant`s reason for job interruption is valid in terms of EI eligibility, in accordance with the *Employment Insurance Act and the Employment Insurance Regulations*.

33 'Job Openings and Labor Turnover Summary – June 2015.' *Economic News Release*. Bureau of Labor Statistics. United States Department of Labor. August 2015. Accessed 14 August 2015. http://www.bls.gov/news.release/jolts.nr0.htm

34 Yellen, Janet. 'Challenges Confronting Monetary Policy.' Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Speech to the 2013 National Association for Business Economics Policy Conference, Washington, D.C. 4 March 2013. Accessed 14 August 2015. http://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/yellen20130302a.htm

Chart 31

Share of Unemployed Population, by Reason of Unemployment, Canada, 1976/1977 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0216.

2.3.3 The Long-term Unemployed

In 2014/2015, a large majority of unemployed people (76.4%) were unemployed for 26 weeks or less, with approximately one third (33.8%) of the unemployed population being without work for 4 weeks or less. Those unemployed for 52 weeks or more, defined as the long-term unemployed, represented 12.1% of the unemployed population in 2014/2015 and would therefore be considered ineligible for EI regular benefits (see Chart 32). Eligibility for EI regular benefits is based on the amount of hours of insurable employment that an individual has accumulated in the previous 52 weeks which, by definition, would exclude the long-term unemployed from being eligible for benefits.

Chart 32

Long-term Unemployment as a Share of Total Unemployed, Canada 1976/1977 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0047.

The share of the long-term unemployed population has almost doubled since the beginning of the 2008 recession. This share, however, did not increase to levels seen following the recession of the early 1990s when it peaked at 17.5% in 1994/1995. The rate of decline in the share of long-term unemployed has also been slower following the 2008 recession than in previous recovery periods for which data are available. A majority of unemployed Canadians (60.9%) in 2014/2015 found employment within three months of beginning their search (see Chart 33).

According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Canada's long-term unemployed population accounted for 12.9% of the total unemployed population in 2014 (see Chart 34).[35] This was well below the proportion of long-term unemployed reported in all other G7 countries and also well below average for OECD member states.

Finally, another indicator of the state of the labour market is the total number of workers who are considered to be underemployed, meaning those who are obliged to work part-time hours involuntarily or are employed in full-time equivalent positions but only work part-time hours due to a lack of full-time work. When using this definition of underemployment, if the total number of underemployed workers were defined as included in the definition for Canada's official unemployment rate for the labour force, they would represent an increase in the average rate of unemployment in Canada of 2.4 percentage points, in 2014/2015 (increasing the level from an official unemployment rate of 6.9% to a rate of unemployment and underemployment of 9.3%). The level of underemployment in 2014/2015 was slightly lower than the additional 2.5 percentage point gap for the unemployment/underemployment rate when compared to the official unemployment rate that was observed during the last year of the most recent recessionary period in 2009/2010.[36]

Chart 33

Share of Total Unemployment, by Search Duration, Canada, 1976/1977 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0047.

[35] Note that the OECD figures listed here are reported on a calendar year basis, not by fiscal year.

[36] Statistics Canada. Labour Force Survey. CANSIM Table 282-0085.

Chart 34

Share of All Unemployed Persons Classified as Long-Term Unemployed, G7 Countries and OECD Average, 2014

Source: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development ,Employment and Labour Market Statistics, Long-Term Unemployment Rate. (Paris: OECD, 2016)

Bibliography[37]

"About Gross Domestic Product." Statistics Canada. 10 April 2015. http://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/nea/about/gdp

"GDP per Hour Worked, USD Constant Prices." Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Productivity Database. 2015.

"Guide to the Labour Force Survey." Statistics Canada (Labour Statistics Division). Ottawa. 2015. http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/71-543-g/71-543-g2015001-eng.htm

"Job Openings and Labor Turnover Summary – June 2015." *Economic News Release*. Bureau of Labor Statistics. United States Department of Labor. August 2015. Accessed 14 August 2015. http://www.bls.gov/news.release/jolts.nr0.htm

"Long-term Unemployment Rate (Indicator)." Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. OECD Employment and Labour Market Statistical Extracts. https://data.oecd.org/unemp/long-term-unemployment-rate.htm

Department of Finance. "Budget 2015." Ottawa. 21 April 2015. <http://actionplan.gc.ca/en/blog/economic-action-plan-2015>

ESDC. "Customized Search for General Minimum Wage Rates in Canada." Labour Program. 2015.

Government of Alberta. "*Energy Prices*". Economic Dashboard. Based on Rates Reported by U.S. Energy Information Administration (West Texas Intermediate - WTI) and Alberta Energy (Western Canada Select - WCS) http://economicdashboard.albertacanada.com/EnergyPrice

International Monetary Fund. World Economic Outlook Database. October 2015. https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2015/02/weodata/index.aspx

Poloz, Stephen, Carolyn Wilkins et al. "Monetary Policy Report – July 2015." Bank of Canada. 15 July 2015. <http://www.bankofcanada.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/mpr-2015-07-15.pdf>

Statistics Canada. "Minimum Wage in Canada Since 1975." The Daily – Canadian Megatrends. January 2016. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-630-x/11-630-x2015006-eng.htm>

Yellen, Janet. "Challenges Confronting Monetary Policy." Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Speech to the 2013 National Association for Business Economics Policy Conference. Washington, D.C. 4 March 2013. http://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/yellen20130302a.htm

[37] Includes all references cited in this chapter with the exception of citations using Statistics Canada surveys referenced in graphs and charts throughout this chapter.

Chapter II

Impacts and Effectiveness of Employment Insurance Benefits (Part I of the *Employment Insurance Act*)

This chapter examines the usage, impact and effectiveness of Employment Insurance benefits that were paid under Part I of the Employment Insurance Act *during the 2014/2015 fiscal year.*[1]

Section 1 analyzes total Employment Insurance (EI) benefits, which are composed of all benefit types as a whole, namely regular benefits, fishing benefits, special benefits (maternity, parental, sickness, compassionate care and parents of critically ill children benefits, which include those paid to self-employed persons) and work-sharing benefits. Section 2 examines income support provided by regular benefits to unemployed individuals who lost their job for reasons beyond their control. Section 3 discusses fishing benefits paid to self-employed fishers. Section 4 examines the role EI plays in helping Canadian workers balance work commitments with family responsibilities and personal illnesses by providing special benefits. Section 5 discusses work-sharing benefits, which help employers and employees avoid temporary layoffs when business activity declines below normal levels. Section 6 profiles firms and their employees' usage of EI benefits. Finally, section 7 provides general information on EI program finances.

This chapter assesses the income support provided by EI Part I benefits by reporting on various indicators, including the number of new claims established, amount paid, level of benefits, maximum duration and actual duration of benefits, exhaustion of benefits, and the impact of benefits on income redistribution. The number of new claims established[2] and amount paid indicate the way in which Canadians use the program and the amount of transfer payments they receive. The level of benefits is essentially an indicator of the generosity of benefits, usually expressed as the weekly benefit rate. Maximum duration of benefits corresponds to the maximum number of weeks during which benefits may be paid, which varies depending on the benefit type, while actual duration is the number of weeks during which a claimant actually receives benefits.[3] Exhaustion occurs for two reasons–all of a claimant's entitled weeks of benefits have been paid, or the final week of the claimant's benefit period (generally a 52-week period) is reached before all payable benefit weeks have been paid. Finally, income redistribution transfers income from high earners to low earners and from provinces and regions of low unemployment to provinces and regions of high unemployment.

In addition, throughout the chapter, key EI program provisions and pilot projects are discussed. EI program provisions (permanent features of the EI program) are a part of either legislation or regulations, while pilot projects are temporary regulatory measures that modify or replace some of the program's provisions. EI pilot projects are used to test and assess the labour market impacts of new approaches before considering a permanent change

---

1 For the purposes of the *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, Employment Insurance (EI) benefits for self-employed persons (available under Part VII.1 of the *Employment Insurance Act*) and EI fishing benefits (available under Part VIII) are deemed to be EI Part I benefits.

2 For this chapter, established claims refer to new claims established for which at least one dollar of EI benefits was paid.

3 Some of the key concepts presented therein are defined more specifically in Annex 2.1 of the report.

to the EI program. More specifically, EI pilot projects are used to determine which possible amendments to the *Employment Insurance Act* or its regulations would make them more consistent with current industry employment practices, trends or patterns or would improve service to the public.

Lastly, this chapter discusses recent changes to the EI program and their impact. The changes include: the Variable Best Weeks approach to calculating the rate of weekly EI benefits; the Working While on Claim pilot project; changes to EI economic regions, which led to the creation of new regions in Prince Edward Island and the territories, and changes to the methodology to determine the regional unemployment rate in the territories; the Connecting Canadians to Available Jobs initiative, which clarified EI claimants' responsibilities to undertake a reasonable job search; new benefits for parents of critically ill children, which have been available since June 9, 2013; and greater flexibility for people receiving parental benefits, compassionate care benefits or benefits for parents of critically ill children to receive sickness benefits (since March 24, 2013, in the case of parental benefits, and since October 12, 2014, in the case of compassionate care or parents of critically ill children benefits).

This chapter relies on several sources of information to provide a comprehensive analysis of the EI program. EI administrative data are the main source of data used. Numerical figures, tables and charts in this chapter are generally based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data. However, due to the relatively limited number of fishing claims, compassionate care claims, claims for parents of critically ill children and work-sharing claims, and to ensure the quality of data, elements of analysis related to these four types of benefits are sometimes based on the total (100%) of EI administrative data, with the exception of amount paid, which is based on a 10% sample. Furthermore, when results regarding firms (i.e. employers) are presented, data are generally based on all EI administrative data. Throughout the chapter, data for 2014/2015 are compared with data from previous years and, in some instances, long-term trends are discussed.[4]

For some analyses, tax data from the Canada Revenue Agency were used; normally, this is based on a 10% sample of T4 slips with employment income or T1 returns. The main source used to examine the coverage of the EI program, as well as the eligibility for and accessibility of unemployed people to EI benefits is Statistics Canada's Employment Insurance Coverage Survey. In addition, data from the Labour Force Survey, also carried out by Statistics Canada, are used to explore the employed population's eligibility to EI benefits or to highlight the unemployment rate's impact on EI economic regions and in Canada.

Annex 2 of the report presents additional statistical information on benefits analyzed in this chapter, while Annex 7 provides a detailed overview of major changes to the EI program implemented between April 1996 and December 2015. Lastly, Section 1 of the Program Overview (which precedes Chapter I) contains more information on key EI provisions with regard to access requirements, maximum duration of benefits and level of benefits.

1. Employment Insurance Benefits

The Employment Insurance (EI) program provides temporary income support to workers who have lost their job for reasons outside their control while they look for new employment or upgrade their skills. The program also provides temporary financial assistance to workers who are sick, pregnant, caring for a newborn, newly adopted or critically ill child, or caring for a family member who has a serious medical condition with a significant risk of death.

In this chapter, EI benefits include regular benefits (created in 1940), fishing benefits (created in 1956), special benefits—namely maternity benefits (created in 1971), parental benefits (created in 1990), sickness benefits (created in 1971), compassionate care benefits (created in 2004) and benefits for parents of critically ill children (created in 2013)—and work-sharing benefits (created in 1977).

The amount paid in EI benefits is driven by three key indicators: the number of claims, the average weekly benefit rate (i.e. the level of benefits) and the duration of benefits. In general, an increase in one of these indicators will have a positive impact on the amount paid. The number of claims, amount paid and benefit levels are discussed in the next section (Section 1.1), and the duration of benefits is dealt with later, in the sections on the various types of benefits (sections 2, 3, 4 and 5). Section 1.2 discusses combined EI claims, which are a new analysis element in this report. Section 1.3 provides

[4] In this chapter, administrative data provide a snapshot of claims, as they appear in EI administrative records, as of the month of August following the end of the fiscal year. Unless otherwise stated, these data are not revised over time. Due to regular changes to the administrative data, a snapshot of the fiscal years taken later, would provide slightly different figures without qualitatively changing the conclusions.

an analysis of the family supplement provision, and Section 1.4 deals with support for apprentices under the EI program. Lastly, Section 1.5 provides an analysis of the premium refund provision, and Section 1.6 discusses the impact of EI benefits on income redistribution.

In this part, EI claim refers to a claim for which at least one dollar of Employment Insurance benefits was paid.

1.1 Employment Insurance Claims, Amount Paid and Level of Benefits

In 2014/2015, the total number of new EI claims edged up 1.0% to 1.81 million. This was the first increase after two consecutive years of decline.

As shown in Chart 1, the number of new claims established in 2014/2015 is below the peak of 2.17 million in 2009/2010, which was the culmination of the effects of the 2008 recession, and below the annual levels in the following years, until 2012/2013.

The main reason for the increase in 2014/2015 was an increase in special claims (+1.8%)—especially sickness claims (+2.5%)—and regular claims (+1.3%) [see Table 1]. This increase was entirely the result of an increase of 16.4% in the number of claims from Alberta, which had experienced an economic slowdown during the year.

In 2014/2015, an average of 755,550 claimants were receiving EI benefits each month, down 0.8% compared with the average of 761,820 claimants in 2013/2014, according to Statistics Canada.[5] This number is the number of EI claimants who received at least one dollar in EI benefits during the reference period within the given month (usually the week of the 15th day of the month). The number is affected by the inflow of new EI claimants and the outflow of EI claimants no longer receiving benefits, mainly because they have exhausted the number of weeks of benefits to which they were entitled or because they have returned to work.

Chart 1

Employment Insurance Claims[1] and Amount Paid, Canada, 2002/2003 to 2014/2015

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

[5] Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Statistics, CANSIM Table 276-0020.

Table 1

Employment Insurance Claims[1], by Type of Benefits, Canada, 2013/2014 to 2014/2015

Type of Employment Insurance Benefits	New Claims Established[1]	
	2013/2014	2014/2015
Regular Benefits	**1,325,810**	**1,342,610**
Fishing Benefits	**26,700**	**26,250**
Special Benefits[2]	**516,820**	**526,100**
Maternity Benefits	169,640	169,080
Parental Benefits (Biological Parents)	189,480	189,740
Parental Benefits (Adoptive Parents)	1,640	1,580
Sickness Benefits	336,800	345,070
Compassionate Care Benefits	6,150	6,120
Benefits for Parents of Critically Ill Children	1,470	2,560
Work-sharing Benefits	**11,830**	**8,260**
Canada[3]	**1,793,420**	**1,811,360**

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits was paid.

2 The numbers for Employment Insurance (EI) special benefits do not add up to the total presented because EI claimants can receive multiple types of EI benefits in one claim.

3 The numbers in this table do not add up to the total presented because Employment Insurance (EI) claimants can receive multiple types of EI benefits in one claim.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Usually, EI claims and the number of claimants tend to change in the same direction, except when there is a change in the duration of benefits or a large, sudden jump or decrease in the number of claims. During an economic shock, the number of claims increases faster than the number of claimants because there is a lag between the time that the new claims are received and the time that the benefit period is established and benefits are payable. Conversely, if the number of claims decreases, the number of claimants will remain high for a time, because of earlier claims for which benefits continue to be paid, until the benefits are exhausted or the claimants find work.

Like the number of EI claims, the amount paid in benefits also increased in 2014/2015 to $15.8 billion, up 2.8% compared with 2013/2014 (see Chart 1).

The increase in benefits paid is mainly the result of a 2.3% increase in the amount paid in regular benefits and a 4.1% increase in amount paid in special benefits. This is the second consecutive year in which the total benefits paid has increased following the decrease in 2012/2013. This increase in benefits paid is also the result of an increase in average weekly benefits and the number of claims established in 2014/2015.

In 2014/2015, of the $15.8 billion paid in EI benefits, regular benefits accounted for 67.0% of the total, while special benefits accounted for 31.3% (see Chart 2).

The other types of benefits, such as fishing benefits and work-sharing benefits, accounted for 1.7% of the total EI benefits paid in 2014/2015.

Economic cycles and labour market conditions tend to have a greater effect on the number of regular claims and the amount paid in regular benefits than on the number of special claims. For example, the unemployment rate fell 0.1 percentage point, from 7.0% in 2013/2014 to 6.9% in 2014/2015. This modest decline is consistent with the slight increases of 1.3% in the number of regular claims and 2.3% in the amount paid, which are smaller than the increases for special benefits: the number of special claims rose 1.8% and the amount paid climbed 4.1%. These data suggest that the number of special claims and the associated amounts are in general more greatly affected by demographic changes and changes in the characteristics of the labour force.

In 2014/2015, the average weekly benefit rate was $431, up 3.4% compared with the 2013/2014 level ($417).

Chart 2

Amount Paid in Employment Insurance Benefits[1], by Benefit Type, Canada, 2014/2015

[1] Amounts are expressed in millions of dollars.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

1.1.1 Employment Insurance Claims, Amount Paid and Level of Benefits, by Province and Territory

Provincial and territorial labour markets vary in their demographic and sectorial composition. Therefore, the provincial and territorial distribution of EI claims and amount paid in benefits do not necessarily align with the geographic distribution of employment, as shown in Table 2.

Comparing the distribution of EI claims to the distribution of employment reveals that the Atlantic provinces and Quebec were overrepresented in terms of the number of claims relative to their share of employment. Conversely, Ontario and the western provinces were underrepresented. For example, the Atlantic provinces accounted for 14.8% of all new EI claims established in 2014/2015, but they accounted for 6.2% of jobs across Canada.

Conversely, Ontario accounted for 31.0% of all EI claims established in 2014/2015, but it accounted for 38.6% of jobs across Canada.

Except for Quebec, the distribution is similar for amount paid in EI benefits. In 2014/2015, the Atlantic provinces received 16.7% of the amount paid in benefits (but accounted for 6.2% of jobs), while Ontario and the western provinces received 60.8% of the amount paid (but accounted for 71.0% of jobs).

In 2014/2015, Alberta was the jurisdiction with the greatest increase in EI claims, up 23,790 claims (+16.4%). Saskatchewan (up 3,460 claims or +7.8%) and British Columbia (up 3,190 claims or +1.6%) had more modest increases, while Ontario had a decrease of 11,360 claims (-2.0%). The number of new claims did not change significantly in the other provinces and territories.

Table 2

Employment Insurance Claims[1], Amount Paid and Employment, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2014/2015

Province and Territory	New Claims Established[1] (Share)	Amount Paid (Share)	Employment (Share)
Newfoundland and Labrador	4.5%	5.5%	1.3%
Prince Edward Island	1.2%	1.3%	0.4%
Nova Scotia	4.4%	4.7%	2.5%
New Brunswick	4.7%	5.2%	2.0%
Quebec[2]	27.2%	22.2%	22.8%
Ontario	31.0%	33.4%	38.6%
Manitoba	3.2%	3.2%	3.5%
Saskatchewan	2.6%	2.8%	3.2%
Alberta	9.4%	9.5%	12.8%
British Columbia	11.5%	11.8%	12.8%
Yukon[3]	0.1%	0.2%	Not applicable
Northwest Territories[3]	0.1%	0.2%	Not applicable
Nunavut[3]	0.1%	0.1%	Not applicable
Canada	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits was paid.

2 Quebec data does not include maternity and parental benefits, as the province has its own program—the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP)—to administer such benefits.

3 Due to operational difficulties inherent to remote locations, Statistics Canada uses an alternate methodology in the administration of the Labour Force Survey in the territories. To ensure data consistency, the territories are therefore excluded from analysis for employment.

Sources: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data (for data on claims and amount paid); and Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0001 (for data on employment). ESDC data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

The increase in EI claims in Alberta is mainly the result of a 25.9% increase in new regular claims in response to the province's economic decline toward the end of 2014/2015.

Between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015, the amount paid in EI benefits rose in all jurisdictions except New Brunswick and the three territories. The greatest percentage increases were in Alberta (+9.0%), Saskatchewan (+5.7%) and Prince Edward Island (+5.7%). Two factors are behind the increases: a greater number of new claims and a rise in average weekly benefit rates. Although the average weekly benefit rate went up in each province and territory, the greatest percentage increases were in Saskatchewan (+4.6%) and Alberta (+4.2%). The average weekly benefit rate varied from a minimum of $412 in New Brunswick to a maximum of $495 in the Northwest Territories, with the three territories and Alberta posting the highest rates.

1.1.2 Employment Insurance Claims, Amount Paid and Level of Benefits, by Gender and Age

After two consecutive years of decline, the number of EI claims established for both men and women rose in 2014/2015. The greatest increase was among men (1.8% or 17,470 claims). By contrast, the increase among women was very small (+0.1%), or 470 claims more than in the previous year. In 2014/2015, women were responsible for 45% of EI claims established, and men, 55%.

The amount paid in EI benefits increased in similar proportions among men (+2.8%) and women (+2.9%) in 2014/2015. Women received 49% of the amount paid in 2014/2015, compared with 51% for men.

In 2014/2015, the average weekly benefit rate for men was $457, significantly higher than the rate for women ($398). This gap has existed for numerous years.

The age group distribution of claimants who EI claims established in 2014/2015 shows that those aged 25 to 44 years had the most claims, namely 48%. They were followed by claimants aged 45 to 54 years (22%), those aged 55 years or older (20%) and those aged 24 years or younger (10%). It was found that the number of claims went up for two age groups when the number decreased for the other two groups. Specifically, claims by those aged 25 to 44 years and those aged 55 years or older climbed 1.4% (or 12,020 claims) and 4.0% (or 14,120 claims), respectively, compared with 2013/2014, while claims by those aged 24 years or younger and those aged 45 to 54 years fell 0.2% (or 360 claims) and 2.0% (or 7,840 claims), respectively. Note that the number of new claims has increased each year since 2010/2011 for claimants aged 55 years or older, while it has decreased each year for claimants aged 24 years or younger over the same period.

Population aging in Canada has led to a considerable increase in the number of older workers in the labour force, which may be the cause of the increase in EI claims by this age group. Since 2010/2011, the number of workers aged 55 years or older has increased 18.3% (+543,330). Over the same period, the number of workers aged 25 to 44 years has increased only 4.4% (+320,720), and the number of workers aged 15 to 24 years, only 1.7% (+42,620). As for the number of workers aged 45 to 54 years, it has decreased 2.7% (-116,890).

Similar to previous years, the average weekly benefit rate for youth ($394) was lower than the rate for claimants aged 55 years and older ($417), 45 to 54 years ($434) and 25 to 44 years ($442).

1.1.3 Employment Insurance Claims, Amount Paid and Level of Benefits, by Employment Insurance Claimant Category[6]

The breakdown of data on new claims by claimant category shows that, in 2014/2015, occasional claimants represented the majority of claimants (59%), while long-tenured workers and frequent claimants represented 23% and 18% of claimants, respectively. An analysis of the number of claimants shows that the increase in the number of benefits in 2014/2015 (+1.0%) is the result of an increase in the number of occasional claimants (+7.3%), because the number of new claims established for long-tenured workers and frequent claimants decreased 10.6% and 1.8%, respectively.

The average weekly benefit rate in 2014/2015 was higher for long-tenured workers ($468) than for frequent claimants ($439) and for occasional claimants ($414). However, the increase in the average weekly benefit rate was greater for occasional claimants (+4.3%) than for long-tenured workers (+3.3%) and for frequent claimants (+2.6%).

As for amount paid, 55% went to occasional claimants, while long-tenured workers and frequent claimants received 25% and 20%, respectively. As a result, occasional claimants received a smaller proportion of the amount paid relative to their proportion of number of new claims (55% versus 59%). This difference is mainly the result of their average weekly benefit rate being lower than that of claimants in the other two categories. Comparing 2013/2014 with 2014/2015, it can be seen that the amount paid to long-tenured workers fell 11.4%, while amount paid to occasional claimants climbed 11.6% and amount paid to frequent claimants remained relatively stable (+0.6%).

1.2 Combined Employment Insurance Claims

The EI program allows a claimant to receive more than one type of benefits in a single benefit period. Under certain provisions, all types of benefits can be combined in the same claim, with the exception of regular and fishing which cannot be combined. Table 3 provides the distribution of pure and combined claims for the 2014/2015 fiscal year. Pure claims are those claims in which an EI claimant receives only one benefit type during his or her benefit period, while claims where the claimant is in receipt of more than one benefit type during his or her benefit period are referred to as combined or mixed claims.

[6] The three EI claimant categories are the following: long-tenured workers, occasional claimants and frequent claimants. Long-tenured workers are EI claimants who have paid at least 30% of the maximum annual EI premiums in 7 of the past 10 years and who, over the last five years, have collected EI regular or fishing benefits for 35 weeks or less. Frequent claimants are EI claimants who have had three or more EI regular or fishing claims and have collected benefits for a total of more than 60 weeks in the past five years. Occasional claimants are EI claimants who do not meet the requirements for either long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

Table 3

Pure and Combined Employment Insurance Claims[1], by Type of Benefits, Canada, 2014/2015

Benefit Type[2]	Pure Claims (One Benefit Type)	Combined Claims						Total
		Claims With One Additional Benefit Type (Two Benefit Types)			Claims With Two or More Additional Benefit Types (Three Benefit Types or More)			
		Total	Major Groupings	All Other	Total	Major Groupings	All Other	
Regular	90%	9%	Sickness: 9%	0%	0%	None	0%	100%
Fishing	90%	10%	Sickness: 10%	0%	0%	None	0%	100%
Maternity	2%	84%	Parental: 82% Sickness: 2%	1%	14%	Parental + Sickness: 12% Regular + Sickness: 1%	0%	100%
Parental[3]	14%	73%	Maternity: 72% Regular: 1%	0%	12%	Maternity + Sickness: 11% Maternity + Regular: 1%	0%	100%
Sickness	56%	37%	Regular: 35%	2%	6%	Maternity + Parental: 6%	0%	100%
Compassionate Care	62%	32%	Sickness: 16% Regular: 16%	0%	6%	Sickness + Regular: 5%	0%	100%
Work-sharing	79%	20%	Regular:16% Sickness: 3%	0%	1%	None	0%	100%
All Claims	**83%**	**15%**			**1%**			**100%**

Note: Total may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits was paid.

2 Excludes benefits for parents of critically ill children.

3 Parental benefits for biological parents and parental benefits for adoptive parents are grouped together.

As can be seen from Table 3, in 2014/2015 pure claims accounted for 83% of all claims. Pure claims represented the highest proportion of claims for most benefit types, with the exception of maternity and parental benefits, for which claims were pure in only 2% and 14% of cases, respectively. Those claims which contained two benefit types accounted for 15% of total claims, while claims with three or more benefit types accounted for just 1%.

Maternity claims had the highest proportion of two benefit type claims, which represented 84% of all maternity claims. The maternity and parental grouping accounted for 82% of all maternity claims, reflecting the similar circumstances under which the benefits are taken, and 72% of all parental claims, demonstrating the fact that most parental benefits are taken by women.

When considering claims with two additional benefit types, a combination of maternity, parental and sickness benefits was the largest grouping at 12% of total maternity claims (or 11% and 6% of parental and sickness claims respectively). According to a 2013 internal study,[7] 98% of females living outside of Quebec[8] who received maternity or parental with sickness benefits took sickness benefits first. This may suggest that the common grouping of maternity and sickness claims could be attributed to difficult pregnancies, as maternity benefits are available only eight weeks prior to the child's expected date of birth.

Sickness claims accounted for the third largest proportion of claims with two or more benefit types, with approximately 44% of claims being mixed. Sickness benefits were most frequently combined with regular benefits, accounting for 35% of all sickness claims, or 9% of all regular claims. Claims including both fishing and sickness benefits accounted for 10% of all fishing claims.

7 ESDC, Use of EI Regular and Special Benefits by Maternity or Parental Claimants (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2013).

8 For the study *Use of EI Regular and Special Benefits by Maternity and Parental Claimants*, data for Quebec and Canada outside of Quebec were examined separately due to differences in legislation. In 2006, the Province of Quebec implemented the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP). Residents of Quebec receive maternity and parental benefits through the QPIP while remaining eligible for other federal EI special and regular benefits.

When combined, compassionate care benefits (CCB) were most frequently claimed with regular or sickness benefits. According to a 2014 internal study, the rate of pure compassionate care benefits has been increasing since they became available in 2003/2004, at which time only 41% of CCB claims were pure.[9] The study also found that, of the compassionate care claims grouped with regular benefits, 41% of claimants received compassionate care benefits first, while of those combined with sickness benefits, 72% of claimants began with the CCB. The study proposed that the high rate of CCB preceding sickness benefits may be caused by the stress of caring for a family member with a serious medical condition. In 5% of compassionate care claims, the benefit is combined with both sickness and regular.

Finally, although work-sharing claims were generally pure (79%), when mixed the benefits were most often combined with regular benefits, with the work-sharing and regular grouping making up 16% of total work-sharing claims. This is primarily driven by the similar circumstances under which the two benefit types are taken; specifically, work-sharing benefits are provided to those at risk of lay-off while regular benefits are provided for those who have already been laid off. In addition, to receive work-sharing benefits a claimant must have accumulated a sufficient number of hours of insurable employment to qualify for regular benefits, and as such would be automatically eligible for regular benefits in the event they are laid off.

1.3 Family Supplement Provision

Targeting low-income families, the family supplement provides additional benefits to EI claimants with one or more children (under the age of 18) who receive the Canada child tax benefit (CCTB),[10] and who have an annual family net income of less than or equal to $25,921.[11] For eligible claimants, the family supplement can increase the benefit rate, from 55% of weekly insurable earnings to a maximum of 80% of their weekly insurable earnings, and is available for all benefit types.[12] Claimants are eligible to receive the full family supplement if their family net income is less than $20,921. After $20,921, the family supplement is reduced gradually until the family net income reaches $25,921, after which the supplement is equal to zero.

The amount of the family supplement takes also into account the number and ages of the children for whom the claimant receives the CCTB. Table 4 shows how the amount of the family supplement is calculated for selected family income ranges, on the condition that it cannot exceed 25% (i.e., 80% minus 55%) of the claimant's weekly insurable earnings.

Table 4

Amount of Family Supplement for Selected Family Income Ranges, by Number and Age of Children, Canada, 2014/2015

Number and Age of Children	Selected Family Income Range			
	Less than $20,921	$21,751 to $22,000	$23,751 to $24,000	$25,751 to $25,921
Number of Children				
One	$31.30	$24.45	$10.70	$0.70
Two	$58.70	$46.25	$20.70	$1.40
Three	$86.10	$68.20	$31.05	$2.10
Top-up for Each Additional Child	$27.45	$22.85	$11.90	$0.95
Age of Children				
Age Supplement for Each Child Under 7 Years Old	$4.15	$3.45	$1.80	$0.15

Source: *Employment Insurance Regulations*, section 34.

[9] ESDC, *Compassionate Care Benefits: Update* (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2015).

[10] For more information on the CCTB, please visit http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/goc/cctb.shtml.

[11] EI claimants are also eligible for the family supplement if their spouse or common-low partner receives the CCTB.

[12] As is the case for other claimants, those receiving the family supplement are subject to the maximum weekly benefit rate ($514 in 2014 and $524 in 2015); this means that if claimants are already receiving the maximum weekly benefit, they will not receive any additional top-up through the family supplement.

A total of 80,910 new claims qualified for the family supplement in 2014/2015, a decrease of 5.9% from the previous year. As Chart 3 indicates, the number of EI claimants receiving the family supplement has now decreased for 13 consecutive years, falling from 187,320 in 2001/2002 to 80,910 in 2014/2015, representing a 56.8% decrease. As a proportion of total EI claims, claims established with family supplement have consistently dropped since 2006/2007 (from 7.7% in 2006/2007 to 4.5% in 2014/2015). Over the same time period, the share of amount paid in family supplement to total EI benefits paid has decreased from 1.2% to 0.6%. The overall decline in these claims can be partially attributed to the fact that the family income threshold has been held constant at $25,921 since 1997, while family incomes have continued to rise resulting in fewer EI claimants eligible. From 2001 to 2013, the median family income increased by 43.1%, from $53,500 to $76,550.[13]

Almost 70% of claims with family supplement were established in Ontario (with 35%), Quebec (with 22%) and British Columbia (with 12%). The number of claims declined in all provinces except Manitoba, the largest percentage decreases occurring in Newfoundland and Labrador (-14%) and Prince Edward Island (-12%).

Women accounted for 79% of new claims receiving the family supplement in 2014/2015. For their part, claimants aged 25 to 44 made up the majority of claims with family supplement (70%), while those aged 45 to 54 years, under 25 years old, and 55 years and older were responsible for 15%, 13% and 2% of them, respectively. Both women and men, as well as all age groups witnessed a decrease in their number of claims with family supplement in 2014/2015, compared to 2013/2014.

In 2014/2015, low-income families received $90.0 million in additional benefits through the family supplement, a decrease of 5.5% from the previous year. The amount paid for the family supplement in 2014/2015 decreased by 8.4% for men and by 4.8% for women. Women accounted for 82% of family supplement benefits, while men accounted for 18%.

Chart 3

Employment Insurance Claims with Family Supplement[1], Canada, 2001/2002 to 2014/2015

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits with family supplement was paid.
Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

[13] Source: Statistics Canada, T1 Family File, CANSIM Table 111-0009.

1.3.1 Family Supplement Rate

As previously mentioned, the family supplement can increase the replacement rate of a claimant's weekly insurable earnings by a maximum of 25 percentage points (from 55% to 80%). In 2014/2015, the average weekly top-up for the family supplement was $41 compared to $43 in 2013/2014. In fact, because of the family supplement provision, the average weekly benefit rate of claimants receiving the supplement increased by 14%, from $295 to $336.

As shown in Chart 4, the distribution of claims with family supplement by replacement rate of earnings slightly shifted between 2007/2008 and 2014/2015, with a higher percentage of claims having a lower replacement rate in 2014/2015 compared to 2007/2008. Conversely, in 2014/2015, the proportion of claims with a higher replacement rate was lower than what was experienced in 2007/2008. In 2014/2015, 3.0% of claims with family supplement received a benefit rate that was equal to 80% of the claimant's weekly insurable earnings, which was 4.3 percentage points lower than what was witnessed in 2007/2008 (7.3%).

These results are mainly driven by the fact that the parameters of the family supplement provision has been held constant for many years, resulting in an average top-up that has remained relatively unchanged over time (roughly $42). A constant family top-up combined with an increasing average benefit rate has caused the share of claims with family supplement leading to higher benefit rates to decrease from 2007/2008 to 2014/2015.

Chart 4

Employment Insurance Claims with Family Supplement[1], by Replacement Rate of Earnings, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits with family supplement was paid.
Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

1.4 Employment Insurance Support for Apprentices

Apprenticeship is a key means by which individuals gain the skills and experience they need to be certified in the skilled trades. The skilled trades are a key part of the Canadian labour market, and a large number of employed Canadians work in skilled trades that are designated for apprenticeship training.

In Canada, the apprenticeship system is an industry-driven learning system that combines on-the-job training and technical training. On-the-job training (during which the apprentice is an employee and earns a wage) is under the direction of a qualified person. Technical training is the theoretical instruction, at a college or other training institution, to support what is learned in the workplace.

In most jurisdictions, to enter an apprenticeship program, a prospective apprentice must be at least 16 years old and have successfully completed Grade 12, or have an equivalent amount of work experience or related education. In addition, the potential apprentice must find a job with an employer who will sponsor and train him or her under the mentorship of a qualified person.

Each province or territory is responsible for apprenticeship training within its jurisdiction. As a result, apprenticeship programs in Canada, including the duration and delivery method of technical training, vary across trades and across provinces and territories. In Quebec, for example, apprentices complete all of their technical training at a college or training institution before beginning on-the job-training. In the rest of Canada, apprentices start with on-the-job training which is followed by technical training through a variety of approaches, including in-class learning, self-learning, distance learning, night classes or day release programs.

To help Canadians continue their apprenticeship and become certified journeypersons, the Employment Insurance program offers temporary income support to those who stop working for the sole purpose of attending full-time technical training (sometimes referred to as block-release training) provided that their respective province or territory refers them under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* and that they meet the other EI eligibility requirements (e.g., have sufficient hours of insurable employment during their qualifying period).

Under the EI program, apprentices are required to serve only one two-week waiting period for the full duration of their apprenticeship, even if it involves multiple blocks of full-time technical training. In addition, they can take advantage of applying for EI benefits up to seven days before the end of work and can elect to be exempt from bi-weekly reporting requirements while receiving EI benefits during full-time technical training. Apprentices attending full-time technical training also receive a special reference code issued by their province or territory or their training institution that facilitates faster processing of their EI claims. This reference code is issued for each block of full-time technical training.

Furthermore, employers may choose to offer Supplemental Unemployment Benefit (SUB) plans to increase the weekly earnings of their apprentices during their periods of technical training, up to 95% of the apprentice's normal weekly earnings.[14]

Outside of periods of full-time technical training, apprentices who lose their job due, for instance, to seasonal unemployment or termination of employment may also be eligible for EI regular benefits. Eligibility for EI in these cases would require that apprentices have a valid job separation and have accumulated enough hours of insurable employment during their qualifying period (usually the 52-week period prior to making a claim). In addition, apprentices who are sick, pregnant, caring for a newborn, newly adopted or critically ill child, or caring for a family member who has a serious medical condition with a significant risk of death may also apply for EI special benefits.

Furthermore, apprentices may be entitled to receive financial support under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act*, which is delivered by the provinces and territories under the Labour Market Development Agreements, to help cover accommodation, child care, transportation and other costs while attending technical training. Other financial support from the Government of Canada is also available through programs such as the Canada Apprentice Loan and various apprenticeship grants.

The amount paid to apprentices in EI benefits is driven by three key indicators: the number of claims from apprentices, the average weekly benefit rate (i.e. the level of benefits) and the duration of benefits. In general, an increase in one of these indicators will have a positive impact on the amount paid. In Section 1.4.1, the number of claims and amount paid are

[14] The purpose of a SUB plan is to provide supplemental payments to Employment Insurance benefits during a period of unemployment due to temporary stoppage of work, training, illness, injury or quarantine. Employers must register their SUB plans with the Canada Employment Insurance Commission which must approve them so that payments made under such plans are not considered as earnings and do not reduce EI benefits.

discussed, while the level and duration of benefits are discussed in Section 1.4.2. In these sections, EI claims from apprentices refer to claims from apprentices referred under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits was paid.

1.4.1 Employment Insurance Claims from Apprentices and Amount Paid

In 2014/2015, the number of new EI claims from apprentices increased by 2.4% compared to 2013/2014, from 52,730 claims to 54,010 claims. As a result, the amount paid in EI benefits reached $290.3 million in 2014/2015, representing an increase of 2.5% from the previous year when the amount paid was $283.1 million.

As mentioned in Section 1.4, outside of periods of full-time training and during the benefit period of a claim still open, an apprentice may lose her or his job due to reasons such as lack of work or may need to take time off work to, for instance, care for a newborn child. If he or she meets the eligibility requirements, he or she may therefore receive EI regular or special benefits. Of the 54,010 claims established for apprentices in 2014/2015, 37% (or 20,100 claims) contained at least one week of regular benefits, and 3% (or 1,550 claims) included at least one week of special benefits.

The amount paid to apprentices in regular benefits was $76.9 million (representing 26% of the total amount of $290.3 million), whereas the amount paid in special benefits was $5.6 million (representing 2% of the total amount paid). Nearly the entire difference, specifically $207.3 million (or 71% of the total amount paid), represents the amount paid to apprentices while attending full-time technical training.

1.4.1.1 Employment Insurance Claims from Apprentices and Amount Paid, by Province and Territory

As Table 5 shows, in 2014/2015, 76% of EI claims from apprentices were established in Alberta (with a share of 38%), Ontario (with 23%), and British Columbia (with 15%). Alberta led all provinces and territories not only for the level of new claims established, but also for annual growth, with an increase of 1,840 new claims in 2014/2015. In Ontario, the jurisdiction with second-largest number of claims from apprentices, the number of new claims established decreased by 370 claims.

In 2014/2015, total benefits paid to apprentices significantly increased in Alberta ($12.2 million) and decreased in Ontario (-$6.2 million), while there was little variation in the other provinces and territories. Of $290.3 million paid to apprentices in benefits, Alberta (with a share of 37%), Ontario (with 22%), and British Columbia (with 15%) altogether received 74% of benefits paid.

1.4.1.2 Employment Insurance Claims from Apprentices and Amount Paid, by Gender and Age

In 2014/2015, there were more male than female apprentices who received EI benefits while participating in apprenticeship programs and attending full-time technical training. Indeed, men made 96% of claims from apprentices, while women were responsible for only 4% of them, which is similar to data from previous years. The low number of claims for women is consistent with the low number of women who register in apprenticeship programs.[15] Out of $290.3 million paid to apprentices in 2014/2015, men received 95% of total benefits, while women accounted for 5% of benefits (see Table 6).

Also similar to previous years, claimants aged 25 to 44 years and those aged 25 and under tended to participate much more than older claimants (45 years and older) in apprenticeship programs and full-time technical training for which they received EI benefits. Table 6 shows that claimants aged 25 to 44 years were responsible for the highest percentage of claims from apprentices with 51%, followed by those under 25 years with 46%. Individuals aged 45 years and more were responsible for only 3% of new claims established for apprentices. In terms of benefits, claimants aged 25 to 44 years received 54% of benefits, while those aged less than 25 years and those aged 45 years and older received, respectively, 42% and 4% of amount paid in benefits.

According to a research paper, the low participation of older claimants (45 years and older) may be explained, among other things, by the fact that older employees may be choosing to forgo training for personal reasons. For example, being close to retirement may cause them to be less interested in training related to career advancement.[16] Another study,[17] which found that the incidence of training declines with age, corroborates this finding.

---

[15] Statistics Canada, Registered Apprenticeship Information System, CANSIM Table 477-0053.

[16] Cathy Underhill, *Training through the Ages* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, Science, Innovation and Electronic Information Division, 2006).

[17] Jungwee Park, *Job-related Training of Older Workers* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, Labour Statistics Division, 2012).

Table 5

Employment Insurance Claims from Apprentices[1] and Amount Paid, by Province and Territory[2], Canada, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

	New Claims Established for Apprentices[1]			Amount Paid		
			(Share)	($ Million)		(Share)
	2013/2014	2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2014/2015	2014/2015
Province and Territory						
Newfoundland and Labrador	2,150	1,880	3%	15.7	15.4	5%
Prince Edward Island	50	280	1%	0.3	1.6	1%
Nova Scotia	1,560	1,360	3%	9.9	8.2	3%
New Brunswick	1,770	1,630	3%	10.7	10.7	4%
Ontario	12,920	12,550	23%	70.7	64.5	22%
Manitoba	2,910	3,040	6%	15.0	15.6	5%
Saskatchewan	4,310	4,390	8%	19.7	21.7	7%
Alberta	18,480	20,320	38%	95.2	107.4	37%
British Columbia	8,320	8,300	15%	44.6	43.3	15%
Territories	260	260	0%	1.2	1.9	1%
Canada	**52,730**	**54,010**	**100%**	**283.1**	**290.3**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Includes claims from apprentices referred under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits was paid.

[2] No value are included for Quebec, which reflects its unique program design in which apprentices complete all of the technical training prior to beginning on-the-job training.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Table 6

Employment Insurance Claims from Apprentices[1] and Amount Paid, by Gender and Age Group, Canada, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

	New Claims Established for Apprentices[1]			Amount Paid		
			(Share)	($ Million)		(Share)
Gender and Age Group	2013/2014	2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2014/2015	2014/2015
Gender						
Men	50,680	51,610	96%	269.9	276.3	95%
Women	2,050	2,400	4%	13.2	14.0	5%
Age						
24 Years and Under	24,610	24,940	46%	119.8	123.2	42%
25 to 44 Years	26,470	27,310	51%	151.8	155.4	54%
45 Years and Older	1,650	1,760	3%	11.5	11.7	4%
Canada	**52,730**	**54,010**	**100%**	**283.1**	**290.3**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Includes claims from apprentices referred under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

1.4.1.3 Employment Insurance Claims from Apprentices and Amount Paid, by Industry and Occupation

Similar to the past four years, apprentice claimants from the Construction industry, Manufacturing industry, and the Other Services (excluding Public Administration) industry received more EI benefits than claimants working in other industries.

As Table 7 shows, apprentices from the Construction industry were responsible for the largest number of new claims established in 2014/2015, with 56% of all claims for apprentices. Apprentices from the Manufacturing industry were next with 9% of all claims in 2014/2015. Apprentices from the Other Services (excluding Public Administration) industry had the third-highest portion of EI claims from apprentices with 7% of all claims. In terms of amount paid in benefits, claimants employed in the Construction (59%), Manufacturing (9%) and Other Services excluding Public Administration (7%) industries received 75% of total benefits paid to apprentices in 2014/2015.

An examination of the distribution of new claims by occupation of apprentices confirms the trend observed for the industrial distribution of EI claims from apprentices. Indeed, 90% of these new claims in 2014/2015 came from apprentices in the Trades and Skilled Transport and Equipment Operators occupation group, whose occupation subgroups are chiefly related to the Construction industry.[18] Claimants from this occupational group received, in 2014/2015, 90% of total benefits paid to apprentices compared to 10% for claimants working in other occupations.

Table 7

Employment Insurance Claims from Apprentices[1] and Amount Paid, by Industry and Occupation, Canada 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

Industry and Occupation	New Claims Established for Apprentices[1]			Amount Paid		
			(Share)	($ Million)		(Share)
	2013/2014	2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2014/2015	2014/2015
Industry						
Construction	30,850	30,480	56%	173.3	171.7	59%
Manufacturing	4,950	4,670	9%	26.9	26.2	9%
Other Services (excluding Public Administration)	3,800	4,010	7%	16.2	19.4	7%
Other Industries	13,130	14,850	27%	66.7	73.0	25%
Occupation						
Trades and Skilled Transport and Equipment Operators	47,580	48,710	90%	255.6	262.0	90%
Other Occupations	5,150	5,300	10%	27.5	28.3	10%
Canada	**52,730**	**54,010**	**100%**	**283.1**	**290.3**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Includes claims from apprentices referred under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

[18] The major group Trades and Skilled Transport and Equipment Operators is comprised of the following occupation subgroups: Contractors and Supervisors, Trades and Related Workers; Supervisors, Railway and Motor Transportation Occupations; Machinists and Related Occupations; Electrical Trades and Telecommunication Occupations; Plumbers, Pipefitters and Gas Fitters; Metal Forming, Shaping and Erecting Trades; Carpenters and Cabinetmakers; Masonry and Plastering Trades; Other Construction Trades.

1.4.2 Level and Actual Duration of Employment Insurance Benefits for Apprentices

In 2014/2015, the average weekly benefit rate payable to apprentices increased by 3.8 % from $453 in 2013/2014 to $470. Consistent with previous years, the average weekly benefit rate for apprentices was higher than that of regular benefits for the EI program overall ($470 compared to $434).

In 2014/2015, claimants from Alberta received the highest average weekly benefit rate (with $494) while those from Prince Edward Island had the lowest level of benefit (with $415). Furthermore, on average, the level of benefit received by men ($472) was 5.8% higher than what women ($446) received in 2014/2015. In addition, among all different age groups, claimants aged 25 years and older had, on average, the highest average weekly benefit rate ($480) while claimants under 25 years had the lowest ($458).

In 2014/2015, on average, the actual duration of all types of EI benefits that apprentices received was 11.4 weeks compared to 11.8 weeks in 2013/2014. Of these 11.4 weeks, 8.1 weeks of benefits were paid for training purposes during periods of full-time technical training and the remainder were for regular or special benefits outside of these periods.

The average actual duration of benefits received by apprentices for periods of full-time technical training was the highest in the territories (9.3 weeks), followed by Manitoba (8.4 weeks) and Ontario (8.4 weeks). In contrast, the lowest average actual durations were recorded in Prince Edward Island (6.5 weeks) and Nova Scotia (6.7 weeks).

There were no difference by gender; the duration of benefits was 8.0 weeks for men and 8.1 weeks for women, on average, in 2014/2015. By age group, little variation was observed as well: older apprentices (45 years and older) had a duration of 7.9 weeks, while apprentices aged 25 to 44 and those aged under 25 received 8.0 and 8.1 weeks of benefits.

Finally, apprentices who only received EI benefits while attending full-time technical training received an average of 7.8 weeks of benefits in 2014/2015. On the other hand, apprentices who, during their benefit period, received benefits while attending technical training *and* regular (or special) benefits outside of their block of full-time training received an average of 17.2 weeks of benefits.

1.5 Premium Refund Provision[19]

The EI program has specific provisions for contributors who are unlikely to qualify for benefits. Employees with insurable earnings of $2,000 or less are eligible for a full refund of their EI premiums when they file an income tax return.[20]

According to Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) data on T4 slips from employers, 947,000 individuals were eligible for the full EI premium refund as they had insurable earnings in 2013 of $2,000 or less. These cases represented 5.5% of those with insurable earnings.

From this group, 621,000 individual tax filers with insurable earnings of $2,000 or less in 2013 paid EI premiums and received a full EI premium refund, according to the CRA T1 individual tax filer data.[21] In total, $10.7 million in full EI premiums were refunded in 2013, a 35.9% decline since 2001 ($16.7 million). The average refund in 2013, among those who received the full refund, was $17.29. This represents an increase from 2009 when it was $16.15, but remains below the 2001 average refund of $22.33. Overall, the premium refund has declined by 22.6% (-$5.04) since 2001, which has been driven primarily by a decrease in the EI premium rate from 2.25% in 2001 to 1.88% in 2013.[22]

Chart 5 provides a historical breakdown of individuals who were eligible for and received the full EI premium refund. In 2013, 947,000 individuals were eligible for the full EI premium refund, a decrease of 15.6% (-176,000) since 2001. Similarly, 621,000 individuals actually received the full premium refund in 2013, representing a decline of 17.3% (-130,000) over the same period. These declines can mainly be attributed to the fact that the income threshold for full refund

---

[19] As the premium refund is administered through the tax system, the most recent data available for this section are for the 2013 taxation year.

[20] The analysis in this section excludes partial refunds, which impact a relatively small number of individuals. In 2013, employees with insurable earnings between $2,000 and $2,039 were eligible for a partial refund of their EI premiums.

[21] While CRA T4 data are based on the population of individuals receiving a T4 tax slip, CRA data on T1 tax returns include individual taxpayers who received a T4 tax slip and who filed an income tax return.

[22] These premium rates apply to regions outside of the province of Quebec after 2006. In Quebec, the premium rate is lower—at 1.52% in 2013—because the province administers its own maternity, parental and paternity benefits under the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan.

has been fixed at $2,000 since it was introduced in 1997, while the average hourly wage has increased by 39.8% over the same time period (from $17.22 in 2001 to $24.07 in 2013).[23] Over time, the combination of a fixed income threshold for premium refund and a steady increase in hourly wages has led to gradual declines in the number of people who are eligible for and receiving the full EI premium refund.

In 2013, 66% of all individuals eligible for the full EI premium refund filed an income tax return and received a refund of their premiums. This implies that a substantial proportion (34%) of those eligible for the full EI premium refund did not file an income tax return. From 2001 to 2013, between 64% and 70% of all individuals eligible for the full EI premium refund filed an income tax return and received a refund.

1.6 Impact of Employment Insurance Benefits on Income Redistribution[24]

The EI program is considered by many to be a mechanism for income redistribution in Canada, as EI benefits are transferred towards individuals in the lower part of the income distribution. A 2012 evaluation study[25] showed that the benefit and contribution sides of the program are redistributive and that the impact of the program on the redistribution of earnings increased substantially during the 2008 recession.

In this report, to measure the extent of income redistribution of total EI benefits, the amount of EI benefits paid to each province and territory, selected demographic group (sex and age group) or industry is

Chart 5

Employees Who Were Eligible for and Received the full Employment Insurance Premium Refund, Canada, 2001 to 2013

Source: Canada Revenue Agency (CRA), T4 tax slip data with insurable employment income (for data on employees eligible for a full premium refund); and CRA, T1 tax return data (for data on employees who received a full premium refund). CRA data are based on a 10% sample of T4 slips with insurable employment income and T1 tax returns with employment income.

[23] Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0069.

[24] This section examines the impact of total EI benefits on income redistribution. Section 2.9 of Chapter II provides a similar analysis for the impact of EI regular benefits.

[25] Ross Finnie and Ian Irvine, *The Redistributional Impact of Employment Insurance 2007-2009* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2012).

divided by the total amount of EI premiums collected. This provides a set of total benefits-to-contributions (B/C) ratios. These ratios are then normalized, with the ratio for Canada set at 1.0.[26] The resulting ratios–the adjusted total benefits-to-contributions ratios–for each sub-population indicate whether the province or territory, demographic group or industry receives more in EI benefits than it contributes to the program, relative to Canada as a whole. For this section, the amount of EI premiums collected is based on the latest available Canada Revenue Agency tax data, which are for 2013. EI benefit data used for this analysis of B/C ratios are therefore for 2013 as well.

The B/C ratio calculation is based on employee and employer contributions paid at source, which means that premium reductions due to the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP)[27] and the Premium Reduction Program (PRP)[28], both administered at source, have been taken into account.

A province or territory, demographic group or industry with an adjusted ratio higher than 1.0 means that the underlying sub-population is a net beneficiary of the EI program, while those with an adjusted ratio lower than 1.0 are net contributors to the program relative to Canada as a whole. Annex 2.23 provides a detailed account of EI premiums collected and benefits paid across different provinces and territories, demographic groups (sex and age group) and industries. The following sections summarize the key findings.

1.6.1 Adjusted Total Benefits-to-contributions Ratios, by Province and Territory[29]

The Atlantic provinces, Quebec and Yukon continued to be net beneficiaries of total EI benefits in 2013, as they were in previous years, with adjusted ratios greater than 1.0, while Ontario, the Western provinces and Nunavut remained net contributors, with adjusted ratios below 1.0. Northwest Territories was the only jurisdiction with an adjusted ratio equal to 1.0. Generally, provinces with higher adjusted total benefits-to-contributions ratios also have higher unemployment rates. In 2013, the four Atlantic provinces were the four largest net beneficiaries of total EI benefits, and they also had the highest unemployment rates of all provinces (see Chart 6).

1.6.2 Adjusted Total Benefits-to-contributions Ratios, by Gender, Age Group and Income

In 2013, women were net beneficiaries from the EI program, with an adjusted total benefits-to-contributions ratio of 1.1, while men were net contributors with an adjusted ratio of 0.9. The reason for this difference can be primarily attributed to the fact that women have historically received higher proportions of special benefits (maternity, parental, sickness and compassionate care benefits) than men, even though they have historically had a lower unemployment rate (0.9 percentage point lower for women in 2013). For example, in 2014/2015, women received $4.1 billion in special benefits compared with $0.8 billion for men, representing close to a 5:1 ratio, which is consistent with previous years.

Among different age groups, claimants aged 15 to 24 (youth) and claimants aged 25 to 44 had adjusted total benefits-to-contributions ratios of 1.1 and 1.2 respectively, as they made up the majority of maternity and parental benefit recipients. Claimants aged 45 to 54 years and claimants aged 55 and older were net contributors, with adjusted ratios of 0.8 and 0.9 respectively.

A study on the financial impact of receiving EI benefits[30] concluded that the EI program has a considerable positive income redistribution effect, with lower income families having a higher adjusted total benefits-to-contributions ratio than higher income families. In fact, families with after-tax incomes below the median received 34% of total EI benefits and paid 18% of all premiums, representing an adjusted total benefits-to-contributions ratio of close to 2.0.

---

[26] For ease of analysis, the benefits-to-contributions ratios have been adjusted so that the national figure equals 1.0. Provincial and territorial, demographic and industry figures have been normalized to enable a standardized base for comparative purposes. As a result, actual premium contributions divided by benefits paid will not equate to adjusted benefits-to-contributions ratios.

[27] Since 2006, Quebec has paid parental, adoption, maternity and paternity benefits under the QPIP, and they replace the same type of special benefits provided by the EI program. For this reason, the premium rate is lower in Quebec for employees and employers than elsewhere in Canada because the province itself collects the premiums to finance its plan.

[28] The PRP reduces EI premiums of employers when their employees are covered by a short-term disability plan that meets or exceeds certain requirements established by the Canada Employment Insurance Commission.

[29] Provincial and territorial benefits-to-contributions (B/C) ratios are determined by the location of employers for premiums and by the residence of claimants for benefits. As a result, it is possible that some provincial and territorial B/C ratios may be under- or overstated if contributions are being accredited to a province or territory, while the employment is actually situated in another province or territory.

[30] Constantine Kapsalis, *Financial Impacts of Receiving Employment Insurance* (Ottawa: Data Probe Economic Consulting Inc., 2010).

Chart 6

Adjusted Total Benefits-to-contributions Ratio and Unemployment Rate, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2013

Note: The unemployment rates for Yukon, Northwest Territories and Nunavut are not available.
Source: Canada Revenue Agency [CRA], T4 slips with employment income (for data on contributions); ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data (for data on benefits); and Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0087 (for data on unemployment rates). CRA data are based on a 10% sample of T4 slips with employment income, and ESDC data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

1.6.3 Adjusted Total Benefits-to-contributions Ratios, by Industry

In 2013, the goods-producing industries were collectively a net beneficiary of EI benefits, with an adjusted benefits-to-contributions ratio of 1.5, while the services-producing industries were, as a whole, net contributors, with an adjusted ratio of 0.9 (see Chart 7). These results are also in line with the higher unemployment rate in the goods-producing industries (6.3% in 2013) than in the services-producing industries (4.0%). Within the goods sector, the Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting industry and the Construction industry had the highest adjusted total benefits-to-contributions ratios (3.5 and 2.2, respectively).

2. Assisting Canadians During Unemployment: Employment Insurance Regular Benefits

Employment Insurance (EI) regular benefits provide temporary financial assistance to workers who have lost their job for reasons outside their control, while they look for work or upgrade their skills,[31] provided that, in the previous 52 weeks, or since the start of their last claim (whichever is shorter), they paid EI premiums and have accumulated the required number of hours of insurable employment. In most cases, to qualify for regular benefits, individuals require between 420 and 700 hours of insurable employment, depending on the unemployment rate of the EI economic region in which they reside at the time of making their claim. This feature of the EI program is referred to as the Variable Entrance Requirement (VER).

[31] Activities delivered under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* help unemployed individuals in Canada prepare for, find and maintain suitable employment. Under the umbrella of Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSMs), these activities include programs delivered by provinces and territories under Labour Market Development Agreements (LMDAs), as well as the Government of Canada's pan-Canadian programming and functions of the National Employment Service (NES).

Chart 7

Adjusted Total Benefits-to-contributions Ratio, by Industry, Canada, 2013

Source: Canada Revenue Agency [CRA], T4 slips with employment income (for data on contributions); and ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data (for data on benefits). CRA data are based on a 10% sample of T4 slips with employment income, and ESDC data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

However, workers who have recently entered the labour market for the first time (new entrants) and those who have limited or no work experience in the last two years (re-entrants) require 910 hours of insurable employment regardless of where they reside. These two groups are collectively known as new-entrants/re-entrants (NEREs).

The amount paid in EI regular benefits is driven by three key indicators: the number of claims, the duration of benefits, and the average weekly benefit rate (level of benefits). In general, an increase in one of these three indicators will have a positive impact on the total amount paid. In the section 2.1, the number of claims and amount paid will be discussed, while the duration and level of regular benefits will be discussed in sections 2.3 and 2.4. For the purpose of these sections, EI regular claims refer to claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

2.1 Employment Insurance Regular Claims and Amount Paid[32]

The number of regular claims established in 2014/2015 remained relatively stable at 1.34 million from 1.33 million in 2013/2014, representing a slight increase of 1.3%. Despite a downward trend since 2008/2009, the number of new EI regular claims remained 3.8% higher than the level (1.29 million) observed in 2007/2008, prior to the onset of the 2008 recession (see chart 8).

In addition, the unemployment rate attained a high of 8.5% in 2009/2010 and has since been decreasing, reaching 6.9% in 2014/2015 (see Chart 9). Generally, the number of EI regular claims tends to be sensitive to economic cycles and labour market conditions. Canadian economic activity fell in the Oil and Gas Extraction industry in the last quarter of 2014/2015, particularly in the Western provinces, following a sharp decline in the price of oil between June 2014 and January 2015. This ended the post-recession downward trend in the number of EI regular claims since 2008/2009 and began an upward trend.

[32] Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, the amount paid in regular benefits include benefits under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for training purposes; prior years' figures have been restated to reflect this change. The previous reporting methodology for regular benefits excluded these benefits, although the latter were included in the total amount paid of Employment Insurance benefits shown in Annex 2.2.

Chart 8

Employment Insurance Regular Claims[1] and Amount Paid, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area corresponds to a recessionary period for Canada's economy.
[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits were paid.
Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Chart 9

Employment Insurance Regular Claims and Unemployment Rate, Canada, 2008/2009 to 2014/2015

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.
Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data (for data on regular claims); and Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0001 (for data on unemployment rate). ESDC data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Finally, as the number of EI regular claims stabilized, so did the amount of EI regular benefits paid to Canadians, which slightly increased to $10.6 billion in 2014/2015 from $10.4 billion in 2013/2014. This increase follows a four year downward trend in amount paid, decreasing since 2009/2010 when a high of $14.7 billion was reached. The amount paid in regular benefits is 26.6% higher than 2007/2008 levels, before the onset of the 2008 recession.

In 2014/2015, there was an average of 510,320 beneficiaries receiving EI regular benefits each month, a decrease of 1.5% from the average 518,080 regular beneficiaries in 2013/2014. The beneficiary count represents the number of EI claimants who received at least $1 of EI regular benefits during the reference period for the month (usually the week of the 15th day) and is affected by the inflow of new EI regular claimants and the outflow of EI regular claimants who have stopped receiving benefits, principally because they have exhausted their benefits entitlement or have returned to work.

Generally speaking, claims and beneficiaries tend to move together, except when there are changes in the average duration of benefits or a sudden, significant increase or decrease in new claims. When there is an economic shock, claim volumes will increase ahead of beneficiaries, due to the lag between when a new claim is received and when a benefit period is established and benefits are made payable. The beneficiary count will remain elevated after the volume of new claims have subsided as previous claims remain in pay, until benefits are exhausted or the claimants have returned to work.

2.1.1 Employment Insurance Regular Claims and Amount Paid, by Province and Territory, Gender and Age

As seen in Chart 10, while the number of new EI regular claims established remained relatively stable nationally (+1.3%), it fluctuated largely by province and territory. As such, while Alberta (+25.9%) and Saskatchewan (+15.0%) saw large increases in claims volume, the number of claims decreased noticeably in Ontario (-2.4%), as well as in Nunavut (-29.4%) and in Yukon (-6.9%). As indicated in section 2.1.2, changing economic conditions affecting the Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction industry in the Western provinces had a negative impact on the number of claims established in these regions. In addition, the increase in the number of EI claims in Alberta and Saskatchewan was observed for both men and women.

Chart 10

Employment Insurance Regular Claims[1], by Province and Territory, Canada, 2014/2015

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Chart 11

Amount Paid in Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2014/2015

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administatrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Similarly, the total amount of regular benefits paid also fluctuated significantly by province and territory (see Chart 11), with Alberta and Saskatchewan again seeing the largest increases from 2013/2014 to 2014/2015 at 11.4% and 9.3%, respectively, while Ontario and Nunavut decreased by 1.1% and 20.2%, in that order.

Table 8 depicts the percentage change in the number of new EI regular claims and amount paid by gender from 2013/2014 to 2014/2015. As can be seen, the number of regular EI claims established increased nationally for men (+2.3%) while it decreased slightly for women (-0.3%). Percentage changes by gender show big fluctuations by province: while the number of EI regular claims made by men increased by 35.6% in Alberta, it decreased by 7.2% in the Territories. Likewise, the number of EI regular claims established by women increased by 11.9% in Alberta while it decreased by 3.1% in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Table 8 also shows that gender fluctuations by province and territory usually follow the same trend: the number of EI regular claims increases or decreases for both genders in a specific area. This is not the case however for the provinces of Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, where while the number of claims increased for men, it decreased for women.

Similar to new claims established, the amount paid moved in the same direction for both men and women in 8 out of the 13 provinces and territories. The exceptions to this were the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, and Manitoba, as well as the Northwest Territories. Specifically, the Northwest Territories saw a gap of 13.6%, where amount paid to men modestly decreased by 3.0% but amount paid to women increased by 10.6%. Even more significant was Yukon, which witnessed the largest gender gap in the year-over-year percentage change at nearly 18%, although both men and women observed increases in amount paid.

Chart 12 shows that the proportion of claims made by claimants aged between 25 and 44 years old has been decreasing slightly since 2007/2008. On the other hand, claims made by older workers (55 years and older) are trending upward from 16% in 2007/2008 to 22% in 2014/2015.

Table 8

Employment Insurance Regular Claims[1] and Amount Paid, by Province, Territory and Gender, Canada, 2014/2015

	New Claims Established[1] (Annual Percentage Change)			Amount Paid (Annual Percentage Change)		
	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
Province and Territory						
Newfoundland and Labrador	1.1%	-1.2%	0.2%	2.8%	4.7%	3.4%
Prince Edward Island	4.5%	1.3%	3.2%	2.5%	1.8%	2.2%
Nova Scotia	5.1%	-3.1%	2.0%	0.9%	-2.7%	-0.2%
New Brunswick	0.6%	-3.1%	-0.7%	0.2%	-1.8%	-0.4%
Quebec	0.2%	-0.6%	-0.1%	5.1%	2.4%	4.3%
Ontario	-3.2%	-1.3%	-2.4%	-2.0%	0.3%	-1.1%
Manitoba	7.0%	0.8%	4.6%	5.4%	-0.5%	3.5%
Saskatchewan	21.1%	5.4%	15.0%	11.0%	5.3%	9.3%
Alberta	35.6%	11.9%	25.9%	14.4%	6.1%	11.4%
British Columbia	-0.3%	-2.4%	-1.3%	1.4%	1.2%	1.4%
Yukon	-4.7%	-11.0%	-6.9%	0.6%	18.5%	6.5%
Northwest Territories	1.9%	27.7%	9.8%	-3.0%	10.6%	1.2%
Nunavut	-30.4%	-27.6%	-29.4%	-15.3%	-31.2%	-20.4%
Canada	**2.3%**	**-0.3%**	**1.3%**	**2.7%**	**1.5%**	**2.3%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Chart 12

Employment Insurance Regular Claims[1], by Age Group, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Chart 13

Amount Paid in Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Age Group, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data

There is a parallel movement among the age groups for the amount paid in regular benefits (see Chart 13). Specifically, the share of the total amount paid to those aged 55 years and older has been increasing since 2009/2010, when it had remained steady at around 17% for several years. In 2014/2015 the amount paid to this age group increased to 23%. In addition, those aged 25 to 44 have seen the largest decrease, falling from 48% in 2007/2008 to 43% in 2014/2015. The other age groups (those aged 24 and under, and 45 to 55 years) have seen very modest decline in their share of total amount paid.

These trends may be attributed to the aging population. There is a positive correlation between the increase in the number of EI regular claims and amount paid among older workers and the increase in their share of the Canadian labour force. Older workers accounted for 19% of the labour force in 2014/2015, an increase from 15% in 2007/2008.

2.1.2 Employment Insurance Regular Claims and Amount Paid, by Industry and Employment Insurance Claimant Category

From 2013/2014 to 2014/2015, while the total number of EI regular claims remained stable, the number of EI regular claims in the Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction industry increased by 18.5%. This industry, which was impacted by the sharp decrease in the price of oil in 2014/2015, experienced the highest percentage increase in EI regular claims. Further analysis shows that the increase in EI regular claims in this industry was concentrated in three provinces: Alberta (+71.3%), British Columbia (+41.4%) and Nova Scotia (+31.3%). It has to be stated that, even with this increase in EI regular claims, the Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction industry only accounts for 2% of the overall EI regular claims.

Consistent with 2013/2014, the three industries that accounted for the highest number of claims in 2014/2015 were: the Construction industry (20%), the Manufacturing industry (11%) and the Educational Services industry (11%) (see Table 9). These three industries accounted for 42% of EI regular claims.

Table 9

Employment Insurance Regular Claims[1] and Amount Paid, by Industry, Canada, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

	New Claims Established[1]			Amount Paid		
			(Share)	($ Million)		(Share)
	2013/2014	2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2014/2015	2014/2015
Industry						
Goods-Producing Industries	**512,200**	**511,030**	**38%**	**4,349.4**	**4,379.8**	**41%**
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	57,140	56,880	4%	503.6	500.7	5%
Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction	24,380	28,900	2%	253.1	238.9	2%
Utilities	4,680	4,420	0%	40.0	41.1	0%
Construction	274,730	274,140	20%	2,324.7	2,376.8	22%
Manufacturing	151,270	146,690	11%	1,228.0	1,222.4	12%
Services-Producing Industries	**769,260**	**748,370**	**56%**	**5,734.3**	**5,656.9**	**53%**
Wholesale Trade	43,940	44,050	3%	435.7	421.0	4%
Retail Trade	79,210	72,850	5%	630.3	607.0	6%
Transportation and Warehousing	56,690	56,270	4%	412.9	400.3	4%
Finance and Insurance	14,750	13,820	1%	167.0	155.9	1%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	18,050	18,030	1%	155.3	163.7	2%
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	53,800	54,690	4%	510.6	505.4	5%
Business, Building and Other Support Services[2]	96,850	93,310	7%	784.5	787.0	7%
Educational Services	145,810	146,040	11%	605.8	634.6	6%
Health Care and Social Assistance	48,840	47,160	4%	360.2	362.2	3%
Information, Cultural and Recreation[3]	41,960	39,470	3%	332.8	318.3	3%
Accommodation and Food Services	63,360	58,550	4%	460.3	427.2	4%
Other Services (except Public Administration)	40,700	40,730	3%	336.6	334.4	3%
Public Administration	65,300	63,400	5%	542.3	539.9	5%
Unclassified	**44,350**	**83,210**	**6%**	**283.9**	**565.3**	**5%**
Canada	**1,325,810**	**1,342,610**	**100%**	**10,367.6**	**10,602.1**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

2 This industry comprises the industries with codes 55 (management of companies and enterprises) and 56 (administrative and support, waste management and mediation services) from the North American Industry Classification System.

3 This industry comprises the industries with codes 51 (information and cultural industries) and 71 (arts, entertainment and recreation) from the North American Industry Classification System.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

In 2014/2015, the number of new EI regular claims in the goods-producing industries remained fairly constant, decreasing by just 0.2%. The decrease in the number of claims in the goods industry was driven by a decrease in the Manufacturing industry, but was offset by the year-over-year increase of 18.5% in the Mining, Oil and Gas Extraction industry. As illustrated in Chart 14, the goods industry observed a modest employment loss of 0.6% in 2014/2015.

Unlike the goods industry, the services industry showed a modest employment gain of 0.9%, while the number of EI regular claims decreased by 2.7%. The decline in EI regular claims in the service industry was driven by decreases in new claims in Retail Trade (-8.0%), Accommodation and Food Services (-7.6%), and Business, Building and Other Support Services (-3.7%).

Despite the decrease in the number of regular claims, 2014/2015 saw a modest 0.7% increase in the amount paid in the goods-producing industries (see Chart 14). This is attributable to the increase in amount paid to the construction sector, which made up 54% of the goods-producing industries' new claims in 2014/2015. Unsurprisingly, the services-producing industries saw a 1.3% decline in the amount of regular benefits paid, driven primarily by the large overall decrease in the amount of regular claims in these industries.

Similar to last year, the distribution of EI regular claims by EI claimant category shows that frequent claimants accounted for roughly 23% of new claims established. The proportion of long-tenured workers and occasional claimants however fluctuated slightly: while the percentage of long-tenured workers decreased by 2 percentage points, from 21% to 19%, occasional claimants' share of EI claims increased by 3 percentage points, from 55% to 58% (see Table 10).

The total amount paid to the different EI claimant categories have also remained constant over the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 years. While occasional claimants make up the bulk of the both new claims and amount paid, this claimant category is underrepresented as a share of amount paid, making up 4 percentage points less of the total new claims. Conversely, frequent claimants are overrepresented, making up 3 percentage points more of the total amount paid than total new claims. This indicates that frequent claimants have, on average, longer benefit durations and/or higher average weekly benefit rates than occasional claimants.

Chart 14

Employment Insurance Regular Claims[1], Amount Paid in Benefits and Employment, by Industry Grouping, Canada, 2014/2015

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data (for data on regular claims and amount paid); and Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0007 (for data on employment). ESDC data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Table 10

Employment Insurance Regular Claims[1] and Amount Paid, by Employment Insurance Claimant Category, Canada, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

	New Claims Established[1]			Amount Paid		
			(Share)	($ Million)		(Share)
	2013/2014	2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2014/2015	2014/2015
Claimant Category[2]						
Long-tenured Workers	285,000	261,760	20%	2,377.2	2,136.9	20%
Occasional Claimants	731,030	776,150	58%	5,278.5	5,735.6	54%
Frequent Claimants	309,780	304,700	23%	2,712.0	2,729.6	26%
Canada	**1,325,810**	**1,342,610**	**100%**	**10,367.6**	**10,602.1**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

2 Long-tenured workers are Employment Insurance (EI) claimants who have paid at least 30% of the maximum annual EI premiums for the past 7 of 10 years and who, over the last 5 years, have collected EI regular or fishing benefits for 35 weeks or less. Frequent claimants are EI claimants who have had three or more claims for EI regular or fishing benefits and have collected benefits for a total of more than 60 weeks in the past 5 years. Occasional claimants are EI claimants who do not meet the requirements for either long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

The number of long-tenured workers has been declining since the 2008 downturn. As such, the number of EI regular claims established for long-tenured workers in 2014/2015 is close to half of those in 2008/2009 (261,760 and 519,780, respectively). Not only did the number of EI regular claims for long-tenured workers decline since 2008/2009 but their share of claims also declined (from 32% to 20%) (see Chart 15). In addition, the amount paid to this claimant category has declined 57.8% since the recession, when it reached a high of $5.1 billion in 2009/2010.

Unlike long-tenured workers, occasional claimants' share of EI regular claims has increased between 2008/2009 and 2014/2015 (from 51% to 58%). The number of EI claims made by occasional claimants has decreased between the years of 2008/2009 to 2012/2013 (from 830,660 to 720,810), but is trending upward since then (776,150 in 2014/2015). Consistent with this upward trend, this claimant category saw the highest increase in amount paid from 2013/2014 to 2014/2015, at 8.7% – it is the second consecutive year where occasional claimants saw an increase in amount paid.

Finally, the proportion of EI regular claims established by frequent claimants has increased every year from 2008/2009 to 2012/2013 (18% to 24%) and has been stable since then at around 23% (see Chart 15). The number of claims made by frequent claimants has increased for the period from 2008/2009 to 2011/2012, but has since been trending downward. Amount paid to frequent claimants has also continued to be constant, remaining around $2.7 billion for six consecutive years.

Chart 15

Employment Insurance Regular Claims[1] and Amount Paid, by Employment Insurance Claimant Category[2], Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

[2] Long-tenured workers are Employment Insurance (EI) claimants who have paid at least 30% of the maximum annual EI premiums for the past 7 of 10 years and who, over the last 5 years, have collected EI regular or fishing benefits for 35 weeks or less. Frequent claimants are EI claimants who have had three or more claims for EI regular or fishing benefits and have collected benefits for a total of more than 60 weeks in the past 5 years. Occasional claimants are EI claimants who do not meet the requirements for either long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

2.1.3 Employment Insurance Regular Claims, by Education Level, Hours of Insurable Employment, and Unemployment Rate in the Employment Insurance Economic Region

Analysis by educational level shows that most EI regular claims were made by claimants who worked in occupations that required college or apprenticeship training (34%) or secondary school and/or occupation specific training (33%). Data suggests that occupations that required a university degree or management studies tended to use less of the EI program. Table 11 also shows that the share of EI regular claims by education level has remained fairly stable over time.

In 2014/2015, 39% of EI regular claims made by youth (24 years and under) were in positions that required either a college diploma or apprenticeship training, and 25% occupied positions that required secondary school or occupation specific training. In contrast, 38% of regular claims established by workers aged 45 years and older were in positions that required secondary school or occupation specific training, and 31% were in positions that required either a college diploma or apprenticeship training. This fact suggests that older workers who establish an EI claim tend to be less educated than younger workers.

The unemployment rate in an EI economic region determines the number of hours of insurable employment needed to qualify for EI. The higher the unemployment rate, the lower is the number of hours needed to qualify. In 2014/2015, a high proportion of EI regular claims were made by claimants who had accumulated 1,820 hours or more of insurable employment during their qualifying period (26.4%), which was an increase of 0.8 percentage point compared to 2013/2014. Table 12 shows that this percentage has been increasing since 2011/2012. It also shows that this proportion was much higher in 2008/2009 (31.1%) when the last recession started. One of the reasons for this is that a higher proportion of long-tenured workers lost their jobs and started receiving EI benefits in 2008/2009, and that these claimants had accumulated several hours of employment in the qualifying period (generally 52 weeks prior to their claim).

Table 11

Distribution of Employment Insurance Regular Claims[1], by Education Level, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

	New Claims Established[1] (Share)							
	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Education Level								
Management	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
University	7%	7%	7%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
College or apprenticeship training	31%	32%	33%	32%	33%	33%	34%	34%
Secondary school and/or occupation specific training	36%	36%	35%	34%	34%	33%	33%	33%
On the job training	22%	21%	19%	22%	21%	21%	20%	20%
Canada	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Table 12

Distribution of Employment Insurance Regular Claims[1], by Hours of Insurable Employment, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

	New Claims Established[1] (Share)							
	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Hours of Insurable Employment								
Less than 700 hours	5.4%	4.6%	6.9%	6.9%	6.1%	5.5%	5.2%	4.8%
700 to 979 hours	15.9%	13.8%	15.6%	16.9%	16.3%	15.5%	15.2%	15.2%
980 to 1,259 hours	19.8%	17.7%	18.6%	19.6%	19.5%	19.3%	19.1%	19.1%
1,260 to 1,539 hours	17.7%	16.5%	16.6%	17.3%	17.9%	18.4%	18.4%	18.3%
1,540 to 1,819 hours	15.8%	16.3%	15.6%	15.7%	16.2%	16.5%	16.6%	16.3%
1,820 hours and more	25.3%	31.1%	26.7%	23.5%	24.1%	24.8%	25.6%	26.4%
Canada	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Statistics for the other increments of hours of insurable employment show that the proportion of claimants who accumulated less than 700 hours of insurable employment has been declining every year since 2010/2011. This is partially attributable to the gradual decrease of the unemployment rate in many EI economic regions, which consequently increases the number of hours needed to qualify for the program in these regions.

Chart 16 depicts the average number of hours of insurable employment per claim that qualified for EI benefits, which has been increasing every year since 2011/2012, from 1,338 to 1,381 hours. As expected, the number of hours of insurable employment per claim fluctuates by province. The number of hours in the Atlantic provinces tends to be lower than in other provinces. In 2014/2015, Newfoundland and Labrador showed the lowest average number of hours of insurable employment at 1,206, while claims established in Alberta had the highest average number of hours with 1,542 hours.

The average number of hours of insurable employment also fluctuates by sex and by age. Statistics show that claims made by men had, on average, 64 more hours of insurable employment than claims established for women in 2014/2015 (1,406 and 1,342 hours, respectively). This gap has remained constant over the last four years. Data by age show that claimants aged 55 years and over had accumulated the lowest number of hours of insurable employment in 2014/2015 (1,312), while those between 25 and 44 years of age had accumulated the highest number of hours (1,413).

Chart 16

Average Number of Hours of Insurable Employment for Regular Claims[1], by Gender, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.
Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% of EI administrative data.

Table 13

Distribution of Employment Insurance Regular Claims[1], by Regional Unemployment Rate, Canada, 2008/2009 to 2014/2015

	New Claims Established[1] (Share)						
	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Regional Unemployment Rate[2]							
0.1% to 6.0%	26%	8%	8%	13%	15%	14%	20%
6.1% to 7.0%	18%	9%	9%	12%	12%	15%	12%
7.1% to 8.0%	24%	11%	16%	12%	13%	20%	25%
8.1% to 9.0%	8%	14%	24%	33%	33%	25%	18%
9.1% to 10.0%	3%	28%	15%	10%	7%	4%	6%
10.1% to 11.0%	6%	8%	8%	5%	4%	6%	4%
11.1% to 12.0%	2%	6%	6%	3%	3%	4%	3%
12.1% to 13.0%	3%	4%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%
13.1% to 14.0%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%
14.1% to 15.0%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%
15.1% to 16.0%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	2%
16.1% or higher	6%	7%	7%	7%	7%	6%	8%
Canada	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

[2] Unemployment rates used for the Employment Insurance program are a moving average of seasonally adjusted rates of unemployment produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the Employment Insurance Regulations.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

To conclude, Table 13 shows that the distribution of new EI regular claims by regional unemployment rates fluctuates on a yearly basis. While the percentage of new EI regular claims established in EI economic regions with an unemployment rate of 6.0% or lower was 14% in 2013/2014, it increased to 20% in 2014/2015. The increase in the number of EI regular claims established in Alberta is one reason for the increase in EI regular claims in the unemployment rate threshold of "less than or equal to 6.0%", as more than 90% of claims established in Alberta (95,940 out of 105,780) were made in regions where the unemployment rate was under 6.1% in 2014/2015.

2.2 Coverage, Eligibility and Access to Employment Insurance Regular Benefits

As previously indicated, the Employment Insurance (EI) program provides temporary financial assistance to unemployed individuals who have recently lost employment for reasons outside their control (e.g., a valid job separation), contributed to the program and accumulated the required number of hours of insurable employment over the past year or since their last claim—whichever is shorter.

The following sections examine the unemployed population and various sub-populations of the unemployed population as they relate to the EI program. More specifically, the unemployed population is examined from the perspective of the core eligibility requirements (contribution to EI, valid job separation, and sufficient hours of insurable employment). As illustrated in Chart 17, in 2014 there were 1,259,500 unemployed individuals (bar U), of which 768,000 had contributed to the EI program (bar UC). Of those who had worked and contributed to EI, there were 580,500 individuals who had a valid job separation (bar S). The sub-populations include 482,600 individuals who were eligible for EI—meaning they also had accumulated enough hours of insurable employment to qualify for EI regular benefits (bar E); of that group, a total of 329,400 individuals received regular benefits (bar R).

The following sections elaborate on the number of unemployed individuals in 2014 who were covered by the EI program (section 2.2.1), were eligible for EI regular benefits (section 2.2.2) and had access to EI regular benefits (section 2.2.3). The majority of the statistics in these sections are based on results from the 2014 Employment Insurance Coverage Survey (EICS)[33] conducted by Statistics Canada. The EICS was originally launched in 1997, primarily to better understand the relationship between the number of persons in receipt of EI benefits and the number of unemployed. The results allow users to draw a comprehensive profile of the unemployed and other persons who may have been entitled to EI benefits due to a recent break in employment.

2.2.1 Coverage of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits

The EI program's definition of coverage is similar to that of other insurance programs. As such, an individual is considered to be covered by the EI program if he or she has paid EI premiums at a given time in the previous 12 months.

This section analyzes the unemployed population who paid EI premiums in the previous 12 months leading up to their period of unemployment in 2014. Also examined is the population of unemployed individuals who had not paid EI premiums in the previous 12 months.

Chart 17

From Unemployment to Eligibility for Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, Canada, 2014

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.
Source: Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Coverage Survey.

[33] The main purpose of the Employment Insurance Coverage Survey (EICS) is to study the coverage of the EI program. It provides a meaningful picture of who does or does not have access to EI benefits, among the jobless and underemployed. The EICS also covers access to maternity and parental benefits. For more information, please visit http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=4428&lang=en&db=imdb&adm=8&dis=2.

2.2.1.1 Coverage of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, National Statistics

According to the EICS, there were 1,259,500 unemployed individuals in Canada (shown as bar U in Chart 17) in 2014.[34] This represents a decrease of 4.0% from the 1,312,300 unemployed individuals reported in 2013.

The 2014 EICS estimated that, among the 1,259,500 unemployed individuals, 768,000 had paid EI premiums in the previous 12 months before becoming unemployed (referred to as contributors), representing 61.0% of all unemployed people (see Chart 17, pink bar UC), a small decline compared to 2013 (62.5%).

According to the 2014 EICS, there were 491,500 individuals who had not contributed to EI in the previous 12 months (referred to as non-contributors), representing 39.0% of the unemployed (see Chart 17, white bar located to the right of UC). Those who had not paid EI premiums include self-employed workers,[35] unpaid family workers, and individuals who have not worked in the previous 12 months including those who had never worked. As illustrated in Chart 17 (white bar located to the right of UC), in 2014, there were 54,900 self-employed and unpaid family workers representing 4.4% of the total unemployed population; in addition, there were 436,600 individuals who did not work in the previous 12 months including those who had never worked, representing 34.7% of the total unemployed population.

Table 14 provides a distribution of unemployed EI contributors and non-contributors. The EI coverage rate (proportion of the unemployed who had paid EI premiums in the previous 12 months) decreased from 70.0% to 61.0% between 2007 (just before the 2008 recession) and 2014. This decrease can be attributed to increases in the proportion of unemployed individuals who had not worked in the previous 12 months, which can be further broken down by i) individuals who had not worked in the previous 12 months, excluding those who had never worked (+5.7 percentage points), and ii) individuals who had never worked (+4.2 percentage points).

2.2.1.2 Coverage of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Region

EI coverage rates vary by region, ranging from a high of 79.4% in the Atlantic provinces to lows of 54.7% in Ontario and 59.6% in the Western provinces. Regions with higher coverage rates are those that have a lower proportion of individuals who had not worked in the previous 12 months. As indicated in Table 15, 18.0% of the Atlantic provinces' unemployed population did not work in the previous 12 months, which consists of those who i) had not worked in the previous 12 months (excluding those who had never worked) and ii) had never worked; the proportions were comparatively higher in Ontario (40.9%) and in the Western provinces (36.5%).

2.2.1.3 Coverage of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Gender and Age

In 2014, the male coverage rate was 69.0%, increasing from 64.3% in 2013, which can be attributed to decreases in the number of individuals who had no recent insurable employment and those who had not worked in the previous 12 months (excluding those who had never worked). Conversely, the female coverage rate was 50.1%, decreasing from 60.0% in 2013, which is primarily attributed to a significant increase in women who had never worked (+44.5% or +25,600). As a result, the gender gap in the coverage rate increased to 18.9 percentage points in 2014, an increase of 14.6 percentage points compared to 2013. The average gap over the previous five years was 6.2 percentage points.

In 2014, the youth (15 to 24 years) coverage rate decreased to 50.3%, from 54.0% in 2013. Adults (25 years and older) had a 65.3% coverage rate, decreasing slightly from 65.5% in 2013. Coverage rates among youth tend to be significantly lower than those of adults because youth are less likely to have insurable employment, and are more likely to have never worked. In 2014, among unemployed youth, 29.5% had never worked—almost double the proportion witnessed in 2008 (15.7%)—compared to 4.0% for those aged 25 and older.

[34] The Employment Insurance Coverage Survey (EICS) estimate of the number of unemployed people differs slightly from that of the Labour Force Survey (LFS), as the EICS statistics are collected quarterly, while LFS statistics are collected monthly.

[35] Self-employed individuals can opt in and subsequently pay EI premiums for special benefits (see chapter II, section 4), but they are not eligible for regular benefits.

Table 14

Distribution of Unemployed Employment Insurance Contributors and Non-Contributors, Canada, 2007 to 2014

	Unemployed Population (Share)							
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Employment Insurance Contributors and Non-Contributors								
Employment Insurance Contributors	**70.0%**	**70.1%**	**70.3%**	**64.7%**	**64.5%**	**61.7%**	**62.5%**	**61.0%**
Employment Insurance Non-contributors	**30.0%**	**29.9%**	**29.7%**	**35.3%**	**35.5%**	**38.3%**	**37.5%**	**39.0%**
Have No Recent Insurable Employment (e.g. Self-employed[1] and Unpaid Family Workers)	5.2%	4.4%	4.9%	3.0%	3.4%	4.4%	4.5%	4.4%
Have Not Worked in the Previous 12 Months (Excluding Those Who Have Never Worked)	17.6%	18.3%	18.3%	24.1%	25.0%	24.6%	24.3%	23.3%
Have Never Worked	7.2%	7.2%	6.5%	8.3%	7.1%	9.3%	8.8%	11.4%
Canada	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Self-employed individuals can opt in and subsequently pay EI premiums for special benefits, but they are not eligible for regular benefits.

Source: Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Coverage Survey.

Table 15

Distribution of Unemployed Employment Insurance Contributors and Non-Contributors, by Region, Canada, 2014

	Unemployed Population (Share)				
	Atlantic[1]	Quebec	Ontario	Western[2]	Canada
Employment Insurance Contributors and Non-Contributors					
Employment Insurance Contributors	**79.4%**	**65.4%**	**54.7%**	**59.6%**	**61.0%**
Employment Insurance Non-contributors	**20.6%**	**34.6%**	**45.3%**	**40.4%**	**39.0%**
Have No Recent Insurable Employment (e.g. Self-employed[3] and Unpaid Family Workers)	2.6%	5.4%	4.4%	3.9%	4.4%
Have Not Worked in the Previous 12 Months (Excluding Those Who Have Never Worked)	13.0%	20.7%	27.2%	23.4%	23.3%
Have Never Worked	5.0%	8.5%	13.7%	13.1%	11.4%
Canada	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] The Atlantic provinces comprise Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

[2] The Western provinces comprise Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

[3] Self-employed individuals can opt in and subsequently pay EI premiums for special benefits, but they are not eligible for regular benefits.

Source: Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Coverage Survey.

2.2.2 Eligibility for Employment Insurance Regular Benefits

To be eligible for EI regular benefits, individuals must first be covered by the EI program—meaning they must have paid EI premiums in the previous 12 months before their period of unemployment. In addition, to be eligible, individuals must have had a valid job separation and have accumulated enough hours of insurable employment before their job separation.

This section examines the individuals with a valid job separation and who have accumulated enough hours of insurable employment to be eligible for EI regular benefits (see Chart 17, pink bar E).

2.2.2.1 Eligibility for Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, National Statistics

The 2014 EICS estimated that 580,500 unemployed individuals had a valid job separation, making them potentially eligible for EI regular benefits (see Chart 17, purple bar S).

In 2014, there were also 187,400 (14.9%) individuals whose job separation did not meet the EI program's requirements (see Chart 17, white bar located to the right of S). These include unemployed individuals who quit their job to go to school (96,700 or 7.7% of the unemployed population) and those who quit for other reasons without just cause[36] (90,700 or 7.2% of the unemployed population).

Among the 580,500 unemployed population in 2014 who were covered by the EI program and had a valid job separation, 482,600 had accumulated enough hours to qualify for EI regular benefits (see Chart 17, pink bar E), for an eligibility rate of 83.1% (482,600 / 580,500). The 2014 EI eligibility rate of 83.1% represents a decrease of 2.7 percentage points from 85.8% in 2013 but remains above pre-recession levels (i.e. 82.3% in 2007 and 82.7% in 2006).

The remaining 97,900 of the unemployed population who had contributed to EI in the previous 12 months and had a valid job separation did not accumulate sufficient hours of insurable employment to qualify for EI regular benefits in 2014.

2.2.2.2 Eligibility for Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Province

In 2014, eligibility rates ranged from a low of 77.3% in British Columbia to a high of 94.1% in Newfoundland and Labrador (see Chart 18). Compared with 2013 EICS figures, the EI eligibility rate decreased in 7 out of the 10 provinces. The largest decreases occurred in Nova Scotia (-13.6 percentage points) and Alberta (-7.5 percentage points). From 2013 to 2014, in both Nova Scotia and Alberta, a smaller proportion of the unemployed with insurable employment and a valid job separation had accumulated enough hours of insurable employment to qualify for EI. The drops in eligibility in both Nova Scotia and Alberta may be associated with differences in the composition of workers. Manitoba (+5.8 percentage points), Saskatchewan (+3.1 percentage points) and Newfoundland and Labrador (+0.2 percentage point) showed slight to moderate increases to their eligibility rate.

Eligibility rates may increase or decrease nationally, and by province and region, over the course of several years. Chart 19 shows that the national eligibility rate increased in 2009, after the 2008 recession. It has since decreased in 2010 and 2011, and increased in 2012 and 2013, before decreasing again in 2014. More information on eligibility trends can be found in section 2.2.2.4.

[36] For more information on job separations that do not meet the EI program's requirements, please refer to http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/ei/types/regular.shtml#eligible.

Chart 18

Eligibility Rates for Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Province, Canada, 2013 and 2014

Source: Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Coverage Survey.

Chart 19

Eligibility Rates for Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Region, Canada, 2007 to 2014

Note 1: The Atlantic provinces comprise Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.
Note 2: The Western provinces comprise Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.
Source: Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Coverage Survey.

Table 16

Eligibility Rate for Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Demographic Groups, Canada, 2008 to 2014

	Eligibility Rate						
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Gender and Age Group							
Men	84.6%	87.3%	83.6%	79.4%	81.9%	89.8%	84.0%
Women	77.8%	84.3%	84.4%	77.0%	81.9%	80.0%	81.3%
Youth (15 to 24 Years)	51.9%	62.8%	48.4%	42.1%	45.2%	54.5%	44.0%
Adults (25 Years and Older)	89.1%	90.5%	89.6%	85.1%	87.9%	90.4%	87.9%
Adult Men (25 Years and Older)	90.6%	91.8%	89.5%	87.4%	86.8%	93.8%	88.8%
Adult Women (25 Years and Older)	86.4%	88.3%	89.6%	82.0%	88.9%	85.5%	86.3%
Canada	**82.2%**	**86.2%**	**83.9%**	**78.4%**	**81.9%**	**85.8%**	**83.1%**

Source: Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Coverage Survey.

Eligibility rates by province and region generally follow the national trends; however, the degree of eligibility varies. For example, from 2007 to 2014, the Atlantic provinces have consistently had higher eligibility rates than the rest of the country, averaging 91.3% during that time. Comparatively, Ontario's eligibility rate averaged 80.4% during the past eight years, lowest among all regions depicted in Chart 19. Quebec and the Western provinces experienced eligibility rates which more closely resembled the national trends.

2.2.2.3 Eligibility for Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Gender and Age

In 2014, EI eligibility rates decreased for all demographic groups, except for women and adult women (25 years and older) (see Table 16). The EI eligibility rate for men decreased from 89.8% in 2013 to 84.0% in 2014, while eligibility for women increased from 80.0% to 81.3%. The 5.8 percentage point decrease in the male eligibility rate in 2014 is attributed to i) a decrease in the number of men who had enough hours to qualify for EI regular benefits (-2.0%), and ii) an increase in the pool of men who had insurable employment and a valid job separation (+4.7%).

As reported in previous *EI Monitoring and Assessment Reports*, gender differences in eligibility rates reflect different employment characteristics among men and women. A higher proportion of men than women hold full-time and/or permanent jobs; women tend to be over-represented among those working in part-time and/or temporary jobs.

The youth (15 to 24 years) eligibility rate has shown large fluctuations between 2012 and 2014, increasing from 45.2% in 2012 to 54.5% in 2013, before decreasing to 44.0% in 2014. The youth eligibility rate has historically been associated with a significantly higher coefficient of variation,[37] which contributes to the large variations witnessed in recent years, compared to the adult eligibility rate, which is more stable. The significant decrease in the youth eligibility rate in 2014 can be primarily attributed to a decrease in the number youth who had enough hours to qualify for EI regular benefits (-35.2%), among youth who had insurable employment and a valid job separation.

The youth eligibility rate (44.0%) is the lowest among all age groups, consistent with prior year data. A low eligibility rate for youth is associated with the type of work that this group usually performs, which is either part-time and/or temporary work. Therefore, they tend to accumulate fewer hours of work. The adult (25 years and older) eligibility rate was considerably higher (87.9%) than that of youth (15 to 24 years). Higher adult eligibility rates reflect more stable employment and more hours of insurable employment (e.g. permanent full-time work).

[37] The coefficient of variation (CV) of an estimate is obtained by dividing the standard error of the estimate by the estimate itself and is expressed as a percentage of the estimate. It is used to measure the potential size of sampling error. The higher the coefficient of variation, the higher the chances of sampling error and more caution should be used when interpreting the estimate.

It is also important to note that among the 182,600 unemployed youth contributors to EI (who were potentially eligible for EI regular benefits), 65.3% quit without a just cause (45.1% to go to school, and 20.2% for other reasons), compared to 11.7% (2.5% to go to school, and 9.2% for other reasons) among adults (25 years and older) (see Chart 20). The high incidence of quits without a just cause among youth reduces the number of youth who could potentially be eligible for EI regular benefits. Only 34.8% of unemployed youth contributors had a valid job separation, compared to 88.3% for adults.

2.2.2.4 Eligibility Trends over the Economic Cycle

In general, the eligibility rate increases at the beginning of an economic downturn as the unemployed pool is composed of a greater percentage of newly unemployed workers who had relatively long, uninterrupted periods of employment. These workers would have accumulated enough hours to qualify for EI regular benefits. The eligibility rate also changes if there are structural changes in the labour market. When total employment is composed of a higher proportion of full-time employment (and a lower proportion of part-time employment), the incidence of being eligible for EI is higher. This is because full-time workers are more likely to have accumulated enough hours of insurable employment, and as a result, are more likely to be eligible to receive regular benefits.

From 2008 to 2009, as the recession took hold, the national eligibility rate increased to a high of 86.2% in 2009, from 82.2% in 2008 (see Table 17). The increase was attributed to the change in the composition of unemployed EI contributors. A large number of individuals became unemployed with insurable employment, a valid job separation and enough hours of insurable employment, making them eligible to receive EI regular benefits.

Chart 20

Distribution of Unemployed Contributors to Employment Insurance, Youth and Adults, Canada, 2014

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.
Source: Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Coverage Survey.

Table 17

Unemployment Rate, Eligibility Rate, and Unemployed Who Have Insurable Employment and a Valid Job Separation, by Previous Employment Characteristics, Canada, 2008 to 2014

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Unemployment Rate	**6.1%**	**8.3%**	**8.1%**	**7.5%**	**7.3%**	**7.1%**	**6.9%**
Eligibility Rate	**82.2%**	**86.2%**	**83.9%**	**78.4%**	**81.9%**	**85.8%**	**83.1%**
Permanent Workers	**87.6%**	**92.2%**	**92.4%**	**87.2%**	**89.9%**	**91.4%**	**87.7%**
Permanent Full-time Workers	92.7%	94.3%	94.5%	91.2%	94.6%	95.0%	90.1%
Permanent Part-time Workers	47.7%	68.8%	74.4%	54.9%	65.2%	71.4%	66.2%
Permanent Workers, Work Hours Unknown	100.0%	71.5%	91.7%	100.0%	96.4%	69.2%	80.6%
Temporary Workers	**73.5%**	**75.3%**	**72.3%**	**68.3%**	**72.5%**	**79.0%**	**77.7%**
Temporary Seasonal Workers	85.0%	81.4%	83.6%	81.2%	75.6%	85.0%	84.6%
Temporary Non-seasonal Workers	63.8%	70.5%	64.7%	60.0%	70.4%	74.5%	73.0%
Uncategorized Workers	N/A[1]	N/A[1]	N/A[1]	N/A[1]	N/A[1]	N/A[1]	N/A[1]
Unemployed Who Have Insurable Employment and a Valid Job Separation	**571,781**	**857,186**	**746,009**	**695,331**	**628,836**	**624,123**	**580,546**
Permanent Workers	**340,145 (59.5%)**	**546,357 (63.7%)**	**432,479 (58.0%)**	**362,126 (52.1%)**	**340,982 (54.2%)**	**336,637 (53.9%)**	**285,668 (49.2%)**
Permanent Full-time Workers	291,875 (51.0%)	500,683 (58.4%)	379,353 (50.9%)	315,310 (45.3%)	283,644 (45.1%)	285,670 (45.8%)	252,351 (43.5%)
Permanent Part-time Workers	40,245 (7.0%)	39,258 (4.6%)	45,333 (6.1%)	41,389 (6.0%)	54,532 (8.7%)	47,979 (7.7%)	27,169 (4.7%)
Permanent Workers, Work Hours Unknown	8,025 (1.4%)	6,416 (0.7%)	7,793 (1.0%)	5,427 (0.8%)	2,806 (0.4%)	2,988 (0.5%)	6,148 (1.1%)
Temporary Workers	**224,874 (39.3%)**	**305,501 (35.6%)**	**309,077 (41.4%)**	**322,551 (46.4%)**	**287,099 (45.7%)**	**283,634 (45.4%)**	**281,376 (48.5%)**
Temporary Seasonal Workers	102,482 (17.9%)	135,904 (15.9%)	125,186 (16.8%)	127,081 (18.3%)	115,569 (18.4%)	122,082 (19.6%)	114,468 (19.7%)
Temporary Non-seasonal Workers	122,392 (21.4%)	169,597 (19.8%)	183,891 (24.7%)	195,471 (28.1%)	171,529 (27.3%)	161,552 (25.9%)	166,908 (28.8%)
Uncategorized Workers	N/A[1]	N/A[1]	N/A[1]	N/A[1]	N/A[1]	N/A[1]	N/A[1]

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Too unreliable to be published.

Source: Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Coverage Survey.

Between 2010 and 2011, as the recovery began, the national eligibility rate decreased from 83.9% to a historical low of 78.4%. This was the result of a shift in the composition of unemployed workers, as the proportion of unemployed permanent full-time workers as a share of unemployed workers with insurable employment and a valid job separation, decreased from 50.9% in 2010 to 45.3% in 2011 (see Table 17). This group has historically had a high eligibility rate (90-95%). In contrast, the proportion of unemployed temporary non-seasonal workers as a share of unemployed workers with insurable employment and a valid job separation increased from 24.7% in 2010 to a high of 28.1% in 2011. This group has historically had a lower eligibility rate (60-70%).

In 2013, the eligibility rate increased to 85.8% from 81.9% in 2012, due to a combination of factors. First, the proportion of unemployed permanent full-time workers—whose eligibility rate was 95.0% in 2013—as a share of unemployed workers with insurable employment and a valid job separation, increased by almost a percentage point (from 45.1% to 45.8%)

between 2012 and 2013. Second, the number of unemployed who quit their job to go to school increased from 74,200 in 2012 to a recent high of 93,300 in 2013, representing an increase of 25.7%. As previously indicated, unemployed individuals with an invalid job separation are excluded when calculating eligibility rates and the exclusion of this group reduced the pool of unemployed workers who are less likely to have sufficient hours to be eligible for benefits. Finally, the proportion of unemployed temporary seasonal workers as a share of unemployed workers with insurable employment and a valid job separation increased from 18.4% in 2012 to 19.6% in 2013, while their eligibility rate increased from 75.6% to 85.0%. In 2012, the eligibility rate for temporary seasonal workers was lower than usual but returned to a normal level in 2013.

In 2014, the eligibility rate decreased to 83.1% from 85.8% in 2013, due to multiple reasons. First, the proportion of unemployed permanent full-time workers—whose eligibility rate was 90.1% in 2014—as a share of unemployed workers with insurable employment and a valid job separation, decreased from 45.8% in 2013 to 43.5% in 2014, while their eligibility rate decreased by almost 5 percentage points. Secondly, the proportion of unemployed temporary non-seasonal workers—whose eligibility rate was 74.5% in 2014—as a share of unemployed workers with insurable employment and a valid job separation, increased from 25.9% to 28.8% in 2014, while their eligibility rate decreased by 1.5 percentage points. This group has historically had a lower eligibility rate (60-75%), especially compared to permanent full-time workers (90-95%). Finally, there was a decline to the eligibility rate for permanent part-time workers (-5.2 percentage points, from 71.4% in 2013 to 66.2% in 2014).

As mentioned previously, poor economic conditions can result in a large pool of unemployed workers who have accumulated sufficient hours of insurable employment with a valid job separation, and are thus eligible for EI. As a result, higher eligibility rates tend to prevail during an economic slowdown or recession. However, during periods of economic recovery, the eligibility rates tend to decline, while during periods of more stable economic conditions, the eligibility may remain stable or even increase. This paradox highlights the fact that diverse compositions of the unemployed population accumulate varying degrees of hours of insurable employment from year-to-year, which contribute to fluctuations in eligibility rates, as witnessed over the past few years.

A recent study[38] using the Canada Out-of-Employment Panel (COEP) Survey showed that individuals' work patterns influence their likelihood of being eligible for EI regular benefits. The study found that full-time permanent job separators had the highest eligibility rate, which can be attributed to having the highest average number of hours of insurable employment. Non-permanent job separators had the lowest eligibility rate, due to fewer hours worked, on average.

Another recent study[39,40] was conducted based on the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID), in part, to assess the impact of changing working hours on EI eligibility, from 1996 (prior to the January 1997 EI change in the eligibility criteria, from a weeks-based system to an hours-based system) to 2010. The results suggest that, from 1996 to 2010 and among all workers combined, average weekly hours have only changed minimally, fluctuating between 33.5 and 35 hours. The study concluded that the eligibility rate was relatively stable over the past two decades. Due to the differences in hours worked, from 1996 to 2010, full-time workers had a significantly higher eligibility rate compared to those who were not, while youth (aged 16-24) and less educated workers (less than a high school diploma) had lower eligibility rates compared to their older and more educated counterparts.

2.2.2.5 Eligibility for Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, from Records of Employment

In addition to the EICS, another source often used to examine the eligibility of individuals for EI regular benefits is the Record of Employments (ROE). A recent evaluation study[41] was conducted on ROE-Based Measures and EI Eligibility.[42] The population and methodology used to determine eligibility rates in this ROE study differ from other eligibility measures (e.g. EICS). For example, eligibility rates cited in the ROE study are based on individuals with one or multiple ROEs, regardless if the individuals are unemployed or currently working in another job. In contrast, the EICS eligibility rate is based on the

[38] HRDSC, EI and Non-Standard Workers: Part-Time, Short-Term and Seasonal Workers (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2012).

[39] ESDC, *Changing Working Time and Employment Insurance* (Ottawa: ESDC, Policy Research Directorate, 2015).

[40] The methodology and population base used to calculate the eligibility rates from the paper *"Changing Working Time and Employment Insurance"* is different from that of other sources. As a result, caution should be used when comparing eligibility rates between various sources.

[41] ESDC, *ROE-Based Measures and EI Eligibility: Update 2001-2014* (Ottawa: ESDC, Economic Policy Directorate, 2016).

[42] The supplemental study *"ROE-Based Measures and EI Eligibility: Update 2001-2014"* includes preliminary 2013 and 2014 data.

unemployed population that has recently contributed to EI and had a valid job separation. In addition, while the ROE is a form that an employer must issue to an employee leaving a job, regardless of the reason, approximately 30% of job separations have missing ROE forms. As a result, ROE-based eligibility rates may be underestimated since an individual's complete employment history (i.e. all hours of insurable of employment) is not always taken into consideration, and the rates should be interpreted with caution when compared to other eligibility results, such as the EICS.

In this ROE-based study, the sample was based on 10% of individuals with ROEs submitted between 2001 and 2014. The study examined the percentage of job separators who were laid off due to shortage of work in the previous 52 weeks and who had accumulated enough hours of insurable employment to qualify for EI regular benefits, based on the Variable Entrance Requirement (VER). Based on the VER, individuals living in EI economic regions with high unemployment rates require fewer hours of insurable employment to qualify for benefits than do people in regions with lower unemployment rates.

The study found that regions with high unemployment rates had a larger proportion of job separators with sufficient hours to meet the entrance requirements than did regions with low unemployment rates. In 2014, in regions with an unemployment rate of 13.1% or higher, 83% of job separators with a layoff due to shortage of work accumulated enough hours of work to qualify for EI regular benefits. Conversely, only around 65% of job separators accumulated enough hours of work to qualify for EI regular benefits in regions of lower unemployment (unemployment rate below 8.0%).

In addition, the study determined that 67.1% of all job separators who were laid off due to shortage of work, had enough hours from their combined ROEs to be eligible for EI regular benefits in 2014. From 2001 to 2014, the figure ranged between 67.1% and 72.1%.

2.2.2.6 Eligibility for Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, Among the Employed Population

A study[43], using the Labour Force Survey (LFS),[44] measured the proportion of employees in Canada who would have had sufficient hours of insurable employment over the qualifying period to meet variable entrance requirements—ranging from 420 to 700 hours[45]—if all workers had been laid off in the year studied (i.e., during the 12 months of the calendar year).

The LFS-based simulations suggest that 88.5% of individuals who were working as paid employees in 2014 would have been eligible for regular benefits had they lost their job. The LFS-based simulations suggest that the proportion of employed individuals with sufficient hours to claim regular benefits had they lost their job varied only slightly across the country in 2014, ranging from a high of 90.3% in New Brunswick to 86.4% in Alberta. Eligibility rates from the LFS-based simulation are generally higher than those of the EICS because the LFS-based simulation is based on the employed population, which includes participants who likely have more hours of insurable employment compared to the unemployed population.

Men would have had a slightly higher eligibility rate (89.7%) than women (87.2%) had they lost their job in 2014, due to the fact that part-time employment is more common among women. Employed full-time workers would have been eligible to receive regular benefits 93.6% of the time had they lost their job, compared to 61.0% for employed part-time workers. In addition, 91.8% of employed adults (25 to 69 years) would have been eligible to receive regular benefits had they lost their job, compared to 65.5% for youth (19 to 24 years). Employed part-time workers and youth are less likely to qualify for regular benefits because they are less likely to accumulate enough hours of insurable employment over the qualifying period (usually 52 weeks preceding a claim). In addition, employed youth are more likely to be in school, and since they are newer to the labour force, they may face higher entrance requirements (910 hours under the NERE provision[46]) to qualify for EI regular benefits.

---

[43] Constantine Kapsalis, Potential EI Eligibility of Canadian Paid Workers Using the Labour Force Survey (Ottawa: Data Probe Economic Consulting Inc., 2015).

[44] The EI eligibility rate among the employed population was estimated using the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID) up until 2011. However, since the SLID has been discontinued, in this report we relied on the Labour Force Survey (LFS). Comparing the SLID and LFS results, the two data sources led to very similar estimates.

[45] Due to lack of available data, analysis does not apply to new entrants and re-entrants (NEREs), who require 910 hours of work to qualify for EI regular benefits. For more information on access requirements for EI regular benefits, see the Program Overview, sub-section 1.2.1.1.

[46] For more information on access requirements for EI regular benefits, including for new entrants and re-entrants (NEREs), see the Program Overview, sub-section 1.2.1.1.

2.2.3 Accessibility to Employment Insurance Regular Benefits

This section analyzes the level of access to EI regular benefits by unemployed individuals with valid job separations. Three measures of accessibility are discussed in this section. The first one is the R/S ratio (for receiving/separation), which is calculated by dividing the number of unemployed individuals who received regular benefits (see Chart 17, bar R) in the EICS reference week by the number of unemployed individuals with insurable employment and a valid job separation (see Chart 17, bar S). The second measure is the B/U ratio (for beneficiaries/unemployed) and is calculated by dividing regular beneficiaries in the LFS reference week by the number of the unemployed individuals (see Chart 17, bar U). The last measure is the B/UC ratio (for beneficiaries/unemployed contributors), calculated by dividing the number of regular beneficiaries in the LFS reference week by the number of unemployed EI contributors (see Chart 17, bar UC).

2.2.3.1 Accessibility to Employment Insurance Regular Benefits: the R/S ratio

The R/S ratio (see Chart 21, R/S) considers the unemployed population who previously worked and contributed to the EI program and had a valid job separation, while other measures of accessibility are based on a broader unemployed population. The 2014 EICS R/S access ratio was 56.7%, which represents a 1.3 percentage point decrease compared to 2013 (58.0%).

It is important to note that access to regular benefits (R/S) can differ from the eligibility rate (E/S) for a number of reasons: not all eligible persons opt to file a claim for benefits; monies paid on separation can delay immediate payment of benefits; claims that have not yet been established and put into pay; the individual worked while on claim[47] or returned to work full-time; and an individual's claim was deemed ineligible due to other factors (e.g., on vacation, out of the country, failure to follow direction).

Similar to the eligibility rate, accessibility to EI regular benefits (R/S) varies by demographics, labour market characteristics and province. The R/S ratio ranged from 46.1% in Alberta to 80.6% in Newfoundland and Labrador in 2014. From 2013 to 2014, the largest increase occurred in Saskatchewan, +15.4 percentage points (from 54.2% to 69.6%), while the largest decreases were witnessed in Nova Scotia, -9.1 percentage points (from 72.0% to 62.9%) and Quebec, -8.2 percentage points (from 63.8% to 55.6%).

In 2014, the R/S ratio for women (57.1%) was slightly higher than that for men (56.6%). Adults (25 years and older) (60.5%), seasonal (65.6%) and permanent full-time workers (56.5%) had among the highest accessibility ratios in 2014. Youth (aged 15 to 24 years) and permanent part-time workers had the lowest accessibility ratios, at 26.5% and 31.1%, respectively.

2.2.3.2 Accessibility to Employment Insurance Regular Benefits: the B/U Ratio[48]

Another measure, the beneficiaries-to-unemployed (B/U) ratio, is often used as an indicator of accessibility to the EI program. The B/U ratio differs from the previously mentioned R/S ratio for a few reasons. First, its numerator (B, total regular beneficiaries in the LFS reference week) includes EI beneficiaries who are not unemployed, such as claimants who received both benefits and earnings in a given week.[49] Second, its denominator (U, all unemployed) includes many people who are outside of the EI program's parameters for eligibility to regular benefits (e.g., self-employed[50] and unpaid family workers; individuals who did not pay EI premiums during the last 12 months; individuals who quit their job to go back to school or who quit their jobs for other reasons without just cause). Third, the B/U ratio is derived from two separate sources, as the numerator (B) comes from Statistics Canada's monthly EI Statistics release, which is derived from EI administrative data and the denominator (U) comes from Statistics Canada's Employment Insurance Coverage Survey.

---

[47] See section 2.3.3 of this chapter for more information on the Working While on Claim provision.

[48] The reporting of both the B/U and B/UC ratios include Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSM) clients under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* who received EI regular benefits. For more information on the reporting methodology, please refer to the *2013/2014 EI Monitoring and Assessment Report*, chapter 2, section 2.3.4.

[49] See section 2.3.3 of this chapter for more information on the Working While on Claim provision.

[50] Self-employed individuals can opt in and subsequently pay EI premiums for special benefits (see section 4 of this chapter for more information), but they are not eligible for regular benefits.

Chart 21

Employment Insurance Accessibility Ratios, Canada, 2004 to 2014

[1] The B/UC ratio is calculated as follows: [number regular beneficiaries ÷ number of unemployed who contributed to the Employment Insurance program].
[2] The R/S ratio is calculated as follows: [number of individuals who received regular benefits ÷ number of unemployed contributors who had a valid job separation].
[3] The B/U ratio is calculated as follows: [number of regular beneficiaries ÷ number of unemployed].
Sources: Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Coverage Survey (for data on those who received regular benefits (R), unemployed contributors who had a valid job separation (S), the unemployed (U), and unemployed contributors (UC)); and Statistics Canada, monthly Employment Insurance statistics release, CANSIM table 276-0020 (for data on regular beneficiaries (B)).

As shown in Chart 21, in 2014, the B/U ratio was 38.6%, increasing from 38.4% in 2013. The increase is attributable to the fact that the number of regular beneficiaries (B) decreased in 2014 at a slower rate (-3.4%) compared to the number of unemployed (-4.0%). The recent decline in the B/U ratio (from 51.8% in 2009 to 38.6% in 2014) can be attributed to improving labour market conditions, as the number of regular beneficiaries (B) decreased from 767,900 in 2009 to 486,700 in 2014, representing a decrease of 36.6%. The high number of beneficiaries in 2009 can likely be attributed to a higher number of workers who became unemployed during the recession.

Other factors, including increases in the proportion of the unemployed who are outside of EI program parameters, can help explain the recent drop in the B/U ratio. As illustrated in Chart 22, 42.2% of the unemployed were outside of EI program parameters in 2009.

Since then, this proportion has increased each year, reaching a high of 53.9% in 2014. For example, the proportion of individuals who quit their job to go to school as a proportion of the total unemployed increased from 5.8% in 2009 to 7.7% in 2014, an increase of 11,000. More striking, the number of individuals who did not work in the previous 12 months as a proportion of the total unemployed population has increased from 24.8% in 2009 to 34.7% in 2014, an increase of 68,600 during this period. By definition, unemployed individuals who did not work in the previous 12 months have not paid EI premiums, and therefore, cannot become a regular beneficiary. It is therefore not surprising that the recent increases in the proportion of unemployed individuals who are outside of the EI program parameters (from 42.2% in 2009 to 53.9% in 2014), have had a large influence on the recent decreases to the B/U ratio.

Chart 22

Distribution of Unemployed Individuals, Canada, 2008 to 2014

Unemployed, potentially eligible for EI regular benefits

- Insurable employment and valid job separation

Unemployed, outside of EI program parameters (for regular benefits)

- Quit without just cause, other reasons
- Quit without just cause, to go to school
- Did not work in previous 12 months
- Self-employed* and unpaid family workers

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* Self-employed individuals can opt in and subsequently pay EI premiums for special benefits (see chapter II, section 4), but they are not eligible for regular benefits.

2.2.3.3 Accessibility to Employment Insurance Regular Benefits: the B/UC Ratio[51]

A third measure, the beneficiaries-to-unemployed contributors (B/UC) ratio, is a modification of the B/U ratio in which the total number of unemployed individuals is replaced by the number of unemployed individuals who had paid EI premiums in the previous 12 months. The B/UC ratio's denominator includes all unemployed individuals who paid premiums, which comprises individuals who had either i) a valid job separation, or ii) an invalid job separation (e.g., those who quit their job to return to school or quit for other reasons without a just cause).

The B/UC ratio reached a recent high of 75.6% in 2010, then decreased each year until 2013 (61.5%), before increasing in 2014 (63.4%). The increase in the 2014 B/UC ratio (+1.9 percentage point) is attributed to the fact that the decrease in beneficiaries (-3.4%) was outpaced by the decrease in unemployed contributors (-4.0%).

2.3 Level of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits

The level of EI regular benefits (i.e., the weekly regular benefit rate) that an EI claimant is entitled to receive is calculated by taking 55% of their highest (best) weeks of insurable earnings in the 52-week qualifying period before their claim is established (or the time since the start of their last claim, whichever is shorter) up to the maximum weekly benefit rate. Under the *Employment Insurance Act*, the maximum weekly benefit rate that an EI claimant is entitled to receive is directly linked to the maximum insurable earnings threshold (MIE).[52] The MIE is the income level up to which EI premiums are paid and reflects

[51] The reporting of both the B/U and B/UC ratios include Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSM) clients under Part II of the Employment Insurance Act who received EI regular benefits. For more information on the reporting methodology, please refer to the 2013/2014 EI Monitoring and Assessment Report, chapter 2, section 2.3.4.

[52] The methodology used to determine the maximum insurable earnings (MIE) is outlined in the *Employment Insurance Act* and in the *2015 Actuarial Report on the Employment Insurance Premium Rate* (Ottawa: Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Canada, Chief Actuary, 2014) http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/Eng/Docs/EI2015.pdf .

average weekly earnings from the year before (AWE).[53] The MIE was $47,400 in 2013, $48,600 in 2014, and $49,500 in 2015. Accordingly, the maximum weekly benefit was $501 in 2013, $514 in 2014 and $524 in 2015.

The calculation of the weekly benefit rate has gone through a number of transformations over the past 10 years, which has enabled the EI program to become more responsive to changes in the local labour market. Up until November 2005, the weekly benefit rate was calculated using insurable earnings in the 26-week period before the establishment of a claim. During that period, weeks with relatively low insurable earnings could be excluded from the calculation, provided that the number of weeks of earnings exceeds the minimum divisor (through the Small Weeks Provision). The objective was to encourage EI claimants to accept all available work by excluding weeks of insurable earnings below $225[54] which otherwise would reduce the weekly benefit rate on a future EI claim. In November 2005, the Best 14 Weeks (B14) pilot project replaced the Small Weeks provision in 23 EI economic regions of high unemployment. The B14 pilot project tested whether basing claimants' benefits on their 14 best weeks of highest earnings in their qualifying period, which is generally 52 weeks preceding their claim, encouraged claimants to accept all available jobs. In 2008, the B14 pilot project parameters were renewed and extended to 25 EI economic regions until April 6, 2013.

On April 7, 2013, the newly legislated Variable Best Weeks (VBW) provision came into effect and was applied nationally to all EI economic regions. Under the VBW provision, the weekly benefit rate is calculated based on an EI claimant's highest (best) weeks of insurable earnings during the qualifying period. The number of weeks used to calculate the weekly benefit ranges from 14 to 22, depending on the monthly regional unemployment rate.[55] A more detailed analysis of VBW can be found in Section 2.3.2.

The average weekly regular benefit rate in 2014/2015 was $434, representing a modest increase of 3.6% when compared to 2013/2014 ($419). The 3.6% growth experienced in 2014/2015 was lower than the 5.8% increase in 2013/2014, but similar to increases in 2011/2012 and 2012/2013 (3.5% and 3.1% respectively). When excluding the peak years around the 2008 recession (2009/2010 and 2010/2011), the growth in the average weekly regular benefit rate has been consistently above 3.0% since 2006/2007. The growth rate in 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 was only 0.8% and 1.1% respectively, due to weaker growth in average weekly earnings. The recent moderate growth since 2011/2012 can be attributable to the recovery of the 2008 recession and changes to the EI program (see Chart 23). As indicated below, in 2014/2015 the average weekly regular benefit rate grew by 3.6% which is significantly higher than the growth in the maximum weekly benefit rate in 2014 (+2.5%) and 2015 (+1.9%). A more detailed analysis on the impact of VBW can be found in Section 2.3.2.

2.3.1 Level of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits by Province and Territory, Gender, Age and Employment Insurance Claimant Category

The level of average EI weekly regular benefits fluctuates by province and territory, with Western provinces having, on average, a higher average weekly regular benefit rate than the rest of Canada in 2014/2015. Chart 24 shows that the average weekly regular benefit rate was highest for the Northwest Territories ($498) and lowest in Prince Edward Island ($407), representing a $91 difference.

Lower earnings is a contributing factor to provinces having an average weekly regular benefit rate that is below the national average. The weekly benefit rate is calculated based on an EI claimant's weekly insurable earnings, so lower earnings would result in a lower weekly benefit rate. Analysis shows that out of 13 provinces and territories, six had average weekly earnings that were under the national average (Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Manitoba, British Columbia), while seven were over (Newfoundland and Labrador, Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Nunavut, Northwest Territories and Yukon). When comparing average weekly regular benefit rate to average weekly earnings, the data show that all of the provinces that had an average weekly benefit rate below the national average also had average weekly earnings below the national average, except Newfoundland and Labrador.

Year-over-year analysis in Chart 25 shows that EI regular claims from the provinces of Saskatchewan (+5.3%), Alberta (+4.8%) and Nova Scotia (+4.3%) experienced the largest increase in their average weekly regular benefit rate, while EI regular claims from Yukon (+0.2%) had the lowest increase.

---

[53] Average weekly earnings (AWE) figures are published by Statistics Canada under the authority of the *Statistics Act*.

[54] From 2001 to 2003, EI claimants could exclude weeks of earnings below $150, while from 2003 to 2013 the $225 threshold was used.

[55] The monthly regional unemployment rates used for the EI program are a moving average of seasonally adjusted rates of unemployment produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

Chart 23

Average Weekly Regular Benefit Rate, Canada, 2001/2002 to 2014/2015

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Chart 24

Average Weekly Regular Benefit Rate, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2014/2015

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Chart 25

Average Weekly Regular Benefit by Province and Territory, 2013/2014 to 2014/2015

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Using a breakdown by age, Table 18 indicates that the average weekly regular benefit rate was the highest for EI regular claimants aged between 25 and 44 years old ($445) in 2014/2015 and lowest for those who were less than 25 years old ($405). The increase in the average weekly regular benefit rate from 2013/2014 to 2014/2015 was similar across all age groups, with EI regular claimants who were under 25 years old experiencing the highest increase in their weekly regular benefit rate (4.1%, or $16) and those aged 55 years and older experiencing the smallest increase of (3.2%, or $13).

Table 18

Average Weekly Regular Benefit Rate, by Age and Gender, Canada, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

	Average Weekly Regular Benefit Rate					
	($)	($)	($)	($)	($)	($)
	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
	2013/2014	2013/2014	2013/2014	2014/2015	2014/2015	2014/2015
Age						
24 years and under	405	342	389	422	354	405
25 to 44 years	451	397	430	466	410	445
45 to 54 years	455	383	423	470	397	437
55 years and older	436	361	407	448	375	420
Canada	**443**	**382**	**419**	**458**	**395**	**434**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Table 18 also demonstrates that men tend to have a higher average weekly regular benefit rate than women. In 2014/2015, the average weekly regular benefit rate for men was $458 compared to $395 for women, a difference of $63. When comparing 2014/2015 to 2013/2014, the average weekly regular benefit rate experienced growth at roughly the same rate for men as for women (3.4% vs. 3.3%). In 2013/2014 and 2014/2015, among men, those aged between 45 and 54 years old had the highest average weekly regular benefit rate, while women between the ages of 25 and 44 had the highest average weekly regular benefit rate.

By EI claimant category, long-tenured workers had an average weekly regular benefit rate of $472 in 2014/2015. In contrast, occasional claimants had an average weekly regular benefit rate of $420, while frequent claimants had an average weekly regular benefit rate of $436 in 2014/2015 (see Table 19). A claimant's history of collecting benefits has an impact on the likelihood that he or she will receive the maximum weekly benefit, as individuals who are less likely to use the program (e.g., long-tenured workers) tend to have stronger labour force attachment and higher earnings. In 2014/2015, 65% of long-tenured workers and 47% of frequent claimants who had an EI claim established were entitled to the maximum weekly benefit rate, in contrast to only 42% of occasional claimants. While occasional workers had the lowest average weekly benefit in 2014/2015, they experienced the highest increase in their average weekly benefit when compared to 2013/2014 (+4.2%). Long-tenured workers were second with an increase of +4.0%, while frequent claimants experienced a below average increase of +2.6%.

2.3.2 Variable Best Weeks Provision

The VBW provision was introduced into all EI economic regions on April 7, 2013, which saw the implementation of a national method to calculate the weekly benefit rate for EI claimants based on their highest (best) weeks of insurable earnings. The number of weeks used to calculate the weekly benefit under VBW varies from 14 to 22 weeks (See Table 20). For 33 EI economic regions, the VBW provision replaced the Small Weeks provision, while it replaced the B14 pilot project for the remaining 25 EI economic regions. Under the previous legislation (i.e., Small Weeks), the calculation of the weekly benefit rate potentially discouraged individuals from working lower-earning weeks as the calculation of the weekly benefit took into account all weeks of earnings over the past 26 weeks above the $225 threshold. Due to this calculation method of the weekly benefit rate, it was not always beneficial for EI claimants to work lower-earning weeks as their weekly benefit rate for their following EI claim may be reduced. By allowing individuals to choose their highest weeks of earnings,

Table 19

Average Weekly Regular Benefit Rate, by Employment Insurance Claimant Category, Canada, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

	Average Weekly Regular Benefit ($)		Change (%)	EI Claimants who are Entitled to the Maximum Weekly Benefit (%)	Average Number of Weeks Used for Weekly Benefit Calculation (Weeks)
	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2014/2015
EI Claimant Category[1]					
Long-tenured Workers	454	472	4.0	65	20
Occasional Claimants	403	420	4.2	42	19
Frequent Claimants	425	436	2.6	47	17
Canada	**419**	**434**	**3.6**	**47**	**19**

[1] Long-tenured workers are Employment Insurance (EI) claimants who have paid at least 30% of the maximum annual EI premiums for 7 of the past 10 years and who, over the last 5 years, have collected EI regular or fishing benefits for 35 weeks or less. Frequent claimants are EI claimants who have had three or more claims for EI regular or fishing benefits and have collected benefits for a total of more than 60 weeks in the past 5 years. Occasional claimants are EI claimants who do not meet the requirements for either long-tenured workers or frequent claimants. Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

the EI program encourages individuals to accept more work and develop stronger labour force attachment. Given that the VBW provision has been in place for over two years, there are considerable data to analyze the impact that the provision has had on former B14 pilot and non-pilot regions. Section 2.3.2.1 will examine the impact that the VBW provision has had on the EI economic regions.

Table 20

Number of Variable Best Weeks Calculation Rates

Regional Rate of Unemployment	Number of Weeks
6% or less	22
6.1% to 7%	21
7.1% to 8%	20
8.1% to 9%	19
9.1% to 10%	18
10.1% to 11%	17
11.1% to 12%	16
12.1% to 13%	15
13.1% or More	14

Source: The *Employment Insurance Act*, Section 14.

2.3.2.1 The impact of the Variable Best Weeks provision on the Employment Insurance economic regions

The proportion of regular claims established in the 25 former B14 pilot regions remained consistent at 37% in Canada in 2014/2015. Since 2012/2013, 9 of the 25 former B14 pilot regions, on average, continued to have an unemployment rate of 13.1% or greater, which has resulted in no change in the number of best weeks used to calculate their weekly regular benefit rate (i.e., they continued to use 14 weeks). However, since the introduction of the VBW provision, 16 regions experienced an increase in the number of best weeks used to calculate their weekly benefit rate as their local labour market improved. As of 2014/2015, one region experienced an increase of one to two weeks, ten regions experienced an increase of three to five weeks, and five regions experienced an increase of six weeks or more.[56]

Due to the fact that the VBW provision changed how the weekly benefit rate was calculated, a key metric to assess the relative impact of the VBW provision is the average weekly regular benefit rate. The average weekly regular benefit rate of former B14 pilot regions continued to rise in 2014/2015, and converged with that of non-pilot regions. The convergence of the average weekly regular benefit rate between former pilot and non-pilot regions is consistent with the objective of enhancing fairness in calculating the weekly benefit under the VBW provision (see Chart 26). In 2014/2015, in former B14 pilot regions, the average weekly regular benefit rate increased by $15 to $431, up almost a full percentage point over the year before (3.6% vs. 2.5%). This growth in the average weekly benefit rate in former B14 pilot regions is slightly higher than the growth in the MIE in 2014 (2.5%), suggesting that the average impacts of changing from B14 to VBW were minimal in these regions. Analysis suggests that the majority of claims established in former B14 pilot regions in 2014/2015 (75%) would have encountered no change in their weekly benefit if the B14 calculation methods were still in place. The negative impacts associated with changing from the B14 to VBW were limited for other claims established in former B14 pilot regions. Of those claims that were negatively impacted, the weekly regular benefit rate in former B14 pilot regions would have been approximately $15 higher (or 3.5%), on average, than what they received under the VBW calculation method.

As expected, the average weekly regular benefit rate grew more significantly in former non-pilot regions since the VBW provision came into effect in April 2013; specifically, in 2013/2014, the fiscal year following the introduction of VBW, the average weekly regular benefit rate in former non-pilot regions increased by 7.8% (see Chart 27). This is a growth rate that is almost three times as large as that experienced in former pilot regions over the same period. This is mainly due to the fact that claimants in former non-pilot regions are now able to use their best weeks from the 52 weeks preceding the claim to calculate their weekly benefit. By contrast, before the VBW provision came into effect, their weekly benefit rate was determined by dividing their insurable earnings accumulated during the 26-week period before the establishment of the claim by the greater of the number of weeks the claimant worked in this period or the minimum divisor, which varied between 14 and 22 depending on the monthly regional unemployment rate. The VBW calculation method benefits those who have inconsistent work patterns

[56] The number of former B14 pilot regions that experienced an increase in the number of best weeks used was based on comparing a weighted average of the monthly unemployment rate from April 2012 to March 2013 to April 2014 to March 2015. On October 12, 2014, the EI economic regions of Prince Edward Island, Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut were split to create eight EI economic regions; however, for comparison purposes, we analyze Prince Edward Island, Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut at the provincial level.

(i.e., weeks of low earnings and weeks of high earnings) as these EI claimants are now able to exclude weeks with lower earnings or no earnings from the calculation of their weekly benefit. In 2014/2015 the growth rate of the average weekly benefit rate in former non-pilot regions resembled that of former pilot regions, at roughly 3.0%, which is marginally higher than the growth in the MIE in 2014 (2.5%).

Chart 26

Average Weekly Regular Benefit Rate for Former and Non-Former Best 14 Pilot Regions, Canada, 2009/2010 to 2014/2015

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Chart 27

Growth in the Average Weekly Regular Benefit Rate for Former and Non-Former Best 14 Pilot Regions, Canada, 2010/2011 to 2014/2015

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

As shown in Table 21, when former B14 pilot regions are broken down by the change in the number of best weeks from 2012/2013 to 2014/2015, very little difference is present between the groupings for the change in the best weeks in regards to the average weekly regular benefit rate. The difference among the groupings was more important in the year after the implementation of the VBW provision (i.e., 2012/2013 vs. 2013/2014). For the most part, regions experiencing a change in the best weeks saw an increase in their weekly regular benefit rate similar to the growth in the MIE over the same time (5.5%). All 25 former pilot regions experienced growth in their average weekly regular benefit rate from 2012/2013 to 2014/2015. Table 21 shows, however, that as the change in the number of best weeks increases, the percentage change in the average weekly regular benefit rate decreases. For example, regions that did not experience a change in the number of best weeks saw their average weekly regular benefit rate increase by 7.0%, while regions with an increase of 6 or more weeks experienced an increase of 4.3% in their average weekly regular benefit rate.

The introduction of the VBW provision has not resulted in a significant change in insurable hours of work accumulated before the termination of employment. Indeed, claimants in former B14 pilot regions had worked on average 1,287 hours in 2014/2015, which represented an increase of only 17 hours (or 1.3%) compared to 2012/2013.

Overall, the minimal effect of the VBW provision on insurable hours is a result of the fact that the majority of claimants (greater than 90%) qualify for EI with more than 700 insurable hours, indicating that the majority of individuals had substantial insurable employment prior to the introduction of the VBW provision.

2.3.3 Working While on Claim Pilot Projects[57]

The purpose of the Working While on Claim (WWC) provision is to encourage work attachment by allowing claimants to accept available work while receiving EI benefits. Prior to the introduction of the WWC provision in 1997, all employment earnings earned while receiving Employment Insurance (EI) benefits were deducted dollar for dollar from the claimant's weekly EI benefit. Under the WWC provision, claimants may earn employment income, up until a specified earnings threshold, with reduced or no deductions in employment insurance benefits. The specific earnings threshold is determined by the legislation or pilot project prevailing at the time. Above this threshold, earnings are again deducted dollar for dollar from the claimant's weekly EI benefit. If a claimant's weekly benefit is reduced to zero, that week of entitlement may be deferred for later use within the same benefit period, which generally ends 52 weeks from the start of the claim. The WWC provision currently applies to regular, fishing, parental, compassionate care benefits and parents of critically ill children.

For the past eight years, working while on claim has been governed by several pilot projects, each of which amended the WWC earnings threshold and benefit reductions, set forth in the legislation under the *Employment Insurance Act* and the *Employment Insurance Regulations*. Under legislation, which was last in effect in December 2008, claimants could earn the greater of 25% of their weekly EI benefit or $50 without any reduction in their weekly benefit, after which their benefits were reduced dollar for dollar.

2.3.3.1 Working While on Claim Pilot Projects[58]

The first WWC pilot project (Pilot Project 8) was introduced in 23 EI Economic Regions on December 11, 2005 and ran until December 6, 2008. The purpose was to test whether allowing Employment Insurance (EI) claimants to earn more income while claiming EI benefits would encourage them to accept more available work while receiving EI benefits. Under this WWC pilot, the amount EI claimants could earn while on claim without a reduction in their benefits, was increased to the greater of $75 or 40% of their weekly benefit, with benefits reduced dollar for dollar beyond this threshold. EI claimants not in the 23 EI Economic Regions continued to be subject to an allowable earnings threshold of $50 or 25% of their weekly EI benefit based on the WWC provision in the *Employment Insurance Act*.

The pilot project was re-introduced (Pilot Project 12) on December 7, 2008 on a national level (in all EI economic regions) and ran until August 6, 2011. Budget 2011 announced a new pilot (Pilot Project 17) under the same parameters of the previous pilot to assess the effectiveness of the pilot during a period of economic recovery and a full economic cycle. This pilot began on August 7, 2011, and ran until August 4, 2012.

---

[57] For more information on current working while on claim provisions please visit http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/ei/information/wwc.shtml.

[58] For more information on current working while on claim provisions please visit http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/ei/information/wwc.shtml.

Table 21

Insurable Hours and Weekly Regular Benefit Rate for Former Best 14 Pilot Regions, 2012/2013 to 2014/2015

	Insurable Hours					Weekly Regular Benefit Rate				
				Change (2012/2013 - 2014/2015)					Change (2012/2013 - 2014/2015)	
	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	(hrs)	(%)	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	(hrs)	(%)
Change in Best Weeks by EI Economic Region										
Zero Weeks	**1,147**	**1,175**	**1,174**	**27**	**2.4**	**401**	**417**	**429**	**28**	**7.0**
Newfoundland-Labrador	1,124	1,165	1,151	27	2.4	397	414	426	29	7.3
Eastern Nova Scotia	1,140	1,147	1,173	33	2.9	394	413	432	38	9.6
Restigouche-Albert	1,139	1,163	1,159	20	1.8	397	412	421	24	6.0
Gaspésie-Iles-de-la-Madeleine	1,106	1,145	1,126	20	1.8	404	421	430	26	6.4
Northern Manitoba	1,262	1,278	1,268	6	0.5	396	409	418	22	5.6
Northern Saskatchewan	1,299	1,293	1,321	22	1.7	421	432	453	32	7.6
Yukon	1,224	1,270	1,297	73	6.0	457	477	476	19	4.2
Northwest Territories	1,273	1,319	1,393	120	9.4	463	487	492	29	6.3
Nunavut	1,189	1,244	1,218	29	2.4	462	460	464	2	0.4
One to two weeks	**1,324**	**1,326**	**1,316**	**-8**	**-0.6**	**415**	**429**	**439**	**24**	**5.8**
Northern Ontario	1,324	1,326	1,316	-8	-0.6	415	429	439	24	5.8
Three to five weeks	**1,301**	**1,306**	**1,333**	**32**	**2.5**	**407**	**414**	**431**	**24**	**5.7**
Prince Edward Island	1,198	1,214	1,243	45	3.8	389	395	407	18	4.6
Western Nova Scotia	1,285	1,270	1,289	4	0.3	382	388	405	23	6.0
Madawaska-Charlotte	1,248	1,259	1,267	19	1.5	383	391	399	16	4.2
Northwester Quebec	1,281	1,287	1,303	22	1.7	419	422	437	18	4.3
Lower St. Lawrence	1,281	1,292	1,281	0	0.0	414	422	429	15	3.6
Chicoutimi-Jonquiere	1,324	1,322	1,309	-15	-1.1	410	413	427	17	4.1
Niagara	1,388	1,415	1,407	19	1.4	405	415	433	28	6.9
Windsor	1,409	1,413	1,536	127	9.0	408	408	456	48	11.8
Northern Alberta	1,433	1,457	1,494	61	4.3	451	465	490	39	8.6
Northern British Columbia	1,407	1,321	1,387	51	3.8	432	444	462	30	6.9
Six weeks or more	**1,354**	**1,366**	**1,370**	**16**	**1.2**	**408**	**413**	**426**	**18**	**4.3**
St. John's	1,407	1,452	1,442	35	2.5	422	434	447	25	5.9
Trois-Rivières	1,333	1,336	1,356	23	1.7	411	409	418	7	1.7
Central Quebec	1,333	1,333	1,339	6	0.5	404	407	419	15	3.7
Oshawa	1,420	1,482	1,465	45	3.2	422	432	454	32	7.6
Huron	1,403	1,395	1,411	8	0.6	412	420	431	19	4.6
All Pilot Regions	**1,270**	**1,283**	**1,290**	**20**	**1.6**	**406**	**416**	**431**	**25**	**6.1**

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

As part of the Budget 2012, a new national WWC pilot project (Pilot Project 18) was introduced on August 5, 2012. Under this new WWC pilot project, a claimant's benefits are reduced by 50% of his or her earnings while on claim, starting with the first dollar earned, until the claimant's earnings reach 90% of the average weekly earnings used to establish his or her weekly benefit rate. At that point, the claimant's benefits are reduced dollar for dollar, to ensure claimants do not receive more in earnings and benefits than they would have earned working full time. This pilot concluded on August 1, 2015, and was replaced by Pilot Project 19, which kept the same provisions as Pilot Project 18.

A key difference between the Pilot Project 17 and Pilot Project 18 provisions is in the total income (EI benefits and employment income) claimants earn at different earnings levels: for lower earnings, generally two days of work or less (80% of the benefit rate), Pilot Project 17 provides more total income; however, for higher earnings Pilot Project 18 provides more total income. After the new WWC Pilot Project 18 began, some claimants indicated they could not find additional work beyond approximately one day per week and they were experiencing difficulty transitioning to the new pilot rules. As a result, eligible EI claimants who had earnings while on claim between August 7, 2011, and August 4, 2012, and were covered by the provisions of the previous WWC pilot project (Pilot Project 17), have the option to revert to the rules of the previous WWC pilot project. Once a claimant reverts, the Pilot Project 17 rules apply for the duration of the claim or until August 2016 (i.e. when Pilot Project 19 is set to expire), whichever is earlier. So long as claimants have chosen to revert in all previous claims, they are given the opportunity to revert on subsequent claims. However, once a claimant does not revert, they no longer have the option to revert.

The option to revert was operational on January 6th, 2013. As of March 31, 2015, a total of 19,144 claims had reverted. The number of claims that reverted peaked during the first month, followed by an immediate and significant decline, before finally it leveled off at this lower level. Of all claims that reverted to the parameters of the previous WWC pilot (earnings allowance of $75 or 40% of benefits), over 90% were located in Atlantic Canada and Quebec. According to internal estimates, the provincial breakdown is as follows: Newfoundland 11%, Nova Scotia 7%, New Brunswick 15%, Prince Edward Island 5%, Quebec 53%, Ontario 6 %, and British Columbia 1%; all other provinces and territories were below 1%.[59]

As of March 31, 2015 only 12,029 claimants had taken advantage of the option to revert, out of a pool of 773,778 who had the opportunity – namely those who had earnings between August 7, 2011, and August 4, 2012. It should be noted that this pool of claimants who are considered to have had the opportunity to revert includes a large number of claimants who had earnings while on claim during the August 2011 to August 2012 period, but have not actually claimed during the Pilot Project 18 or 19 period, and therefore cannot technically be considered reverters. Nevertheless, the low number of reversions seems to indicate that many claimants were either indifferent or found the new WWC provisions beneficial. Findings from a focus group study in 2014,[60,61] however, would suggest that some claimants did not clearly understand the new WWC provisions and the option to revert. For instance, while 70% of respondents to a telephone questionnaire claimed they were aware of the new WWC provisions, some of these were found to have only a vague understanding of the actual changes that had been introduced. In addition, just over 10% of telephone respondents who were eligible to revert were aware of the option to revert. However, some of these respondents who claimed awareness of the option to revert did not think they were eligible when in fact they were, demonstrating a lack of true understanding. These misperceptions suggest that the low rate of reversion may not be entirely driven by claimants' preferences but may reflect a lack of understanding.

2.3.3.2 Claims Utilizing Working While on Claim Provision[62]

This section examines the regular claims established in fiscal year 2013/2014 that worked while on claim at least once, regardless of the amount of time worked during the claim and who these claimants worked for. The analysis in this section (2.3.3.2) focuses on completed claims only, and therefore is delayed one year (to 2013/2014). The extent or intensity to which regular claimants worked while on claim is analyzed in the next section (2.3.3.3).

---

59 Estimates are calculated using manual processing data, where claims are assigned to the province where the processing center that handled the claim was located.

60 ESDC, Focus Groups for the Evaluation of Working While on Claim (WWC): Synthesis Report (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2014).

61 Statistically speaking, focus groups are not statistically significant, and simply represent the opinions of individuals from a small sample.

62 Data and analysis on WWC statistics in section 2.3.3.2 relate to claims established in 2013/2014 to ensure all claims were completed.

EI administrative data indicate that among all EI regular claims established in 2013/2014, a total of 691,870 involved at least one week worked while on claim, which represented 51% of all regular claims established that year (see Table 22). On average, these claims worked 11.6 weeks while on claim. The total number and proportion of those who worked while on claim have been following a downward trend since 2009/2010, when a high of 926,560 regular claims involved worked while on claim. This downward trend is analyzed at the end of section 2.3.3.3.

The proportion of regular claims with at least one week worked while on claim varies according to industry and age. The Educational Services industry had the highest proportion of working claimants in 2013/2014 at 60% of regular claims, followed by Construction at 58%. Conversely, Finance and Insurance had the lowest proportion of working claimants at just 33% of regular claims. The high number of working claimants in the Educational Services and Construction industries reflects the seasonality of these industries, a characteristic often related with working while on claim (as discussed in the subsequent paragraph). Older workers (55 years and older) who established a regular claim in 2013/2014 were the least likely to have worked at least one week while on claim, with an incidence of just 39%. This compares to 55% for those aged under 55 years old. Despite noteworthy variation by the above socio-demographic characteristics, working while on claim varied little by gender: the proportion of men receiving regular benefits who took advantage of the WWC provision was 50%, very similar to that of women at 53%.

Regions also diverged significantly with respect to their proportion of claims with at least one week worked. Among regular claims established in the Atlantic provinces in 2013/2014, 60% involved working while on claim, as did 59% of EI regular claims established in Quebec. In the rest of Canada, just 44% of regular claims established in 2013/2014 involved working while on claim. This regional variability in the frequency of working while on claim could be influenced by a number of factors, including the Atlantic province and Quebec's above average proportion of seasonal[63] and frequent claimants, as well as higher average unemployment rates[64] – characteristics that are associated with higher rates of working while on claim. Specifically, across Canada, the proportion of seasonal workers who have at least one week worked while on claim was 60%, compared to non-seasonal workers with 47%. Similarly, claims made by frequent claimants included working while on claim in 60% of regular claims across Canada, compared to only 48% and 49% for claims made by long-tenured workers and occasional claimants, respectively. Finally, in 2013/2014, among EI economic regions with unemployment rates of 10.0% or lower, 49% of regular claims involved working while on claim, while among regions with unemployment rates higher than 10.0%, 60% of regular claims involved working while on claim.

Table 22

Share of Employment Insurance Regular Claims Involving at Least a Week Worked While on Claim and Average Number of Weeks Worked While on Claim, by Year, Canada

	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014
Portion of Claims with at least one Week Worked While on Claim	56%	56%	55%	52%	51%
Average Number of Weeks Worked	12.9	12.8	13.9	11.9	11.6

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

[63] See Chapter II, section 2.7 Employment Insurance Regular Benefits and Seasonal Workers for more information.

[64] See Chapter I, section 2.3.1 Unemployment Rate and Duration, by Province and Territory, Gender and Age.

For regular claims established in 2013/2014 involving work while on claim, the average actual duration was 18.7 weeks of regular benefits paid, lower than the 20.2 weeks for those regular claims that did not include any work while on claim (see Table 23). However, the average maximum duration for those claims with working while on claim was 32.2 weeks, higher than the 31.4 weeks provided to those without working while on claim. These differences in average maximum and actual duration may indicate that those working while on claim use less benefits, regardless of a higher average maximum duration.

The average actual duration of those claims with working while on claim did not differ by age nor gender. On the contrary, it varied significantly across regions, due to the high correlation of regional unemployment rates and average maximum duration, as well as by industry, as it does for all regular benefits.[65] Specifically, the regions in Canada ranged from a low of 15.1 weeks in Alberta to a high of 31.1 weeks in Nunavut, while the industries ranged from 13.4 weeks in the Educational Services industry to 23.0 weeks in the Finance and Insurance industry. A 2015 study[66] looking at pure regular claimants[67] who worked while on claim found that the longer the duration of a claim,[68] the more likely the claimant was to work while on claim and to work for more than one employer. Specifically, of claims lasting 14 weeks or less, 48% worked while on claim and 14% worked for more than one employer. Conversely, those claims lasting 45 weeks or more had 67% of claimants working while on claim, with 30% working for more than one employer. The study also found that the number of weeks worked as well as the number of "full-time" weeks (defined as a claimant having their benefits reduced to zero and therefore deferring the week) also increased with the duration of the claim.

The above study also found that 74% of pure regular claimants who worked while on claim did so for a single employer, and 91% of hours worked while on claim were for one employer. In addition, the average working claimant worked approximately one third of the time (measured in weeks). Finally, the study found that 80% of working claimants had worked for the same employer previous to their claim, while 82% stayed with the same employer they worked for on claim after their claim had ended. In total, 95% of working claimants worked at least one week for the same employer before or after their claim. A subset of these claimants worked both before and after the claim, which made up 65% of working claimants. These statistics suggest that many claimants are being laid-off by their employer during a temporary work-shortage, with the possibility of returning intermittently during their EI claim when their employer requires it, and returning full-time when the work-shortage subsides. This could explain the high correlation of seasonal industries and claims, which produce and follow work-shortage trends, with working while on claim.

Table 23

Average Duration of Benefits Paid and Average Maximum Duration for Regular Claims[1], Canada, 2013/2014

	With Working while on Claim	Without Working while on Claim
Average Actual Duration of Benefits	18.7	20.2
Average Maximum Duration of Benefits	32.2	31.4

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

[65] See section 2.4 Maximum and Actual Duration of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits.

[66] ESDC, *Who are EI Claimants Working for While on Claim* (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2016).

[67] Pure regular claimants are those EI claimants who receive only the one benefit type, namely regular benefits.

[68] The duration of a claim in *Who are EI Claimants Working for While Working While on Claim* was defined as the time period that the claim remained open, less the two week waiting period, and including deferred weeks.

2.3.3.3 Weeks of Work While on Claim[69]

This section examines the Working While on Claim provision from the perspective of weeks worked while on claim, focusing primarily on regular claims. The analysis examines all benefits paid for fiscal year 2014/2015 and whether or not employment income was reported during a week in which a claimant received EI benefits, regardless of when the claim was established.

EI administrative data indicate that among all EI benefit weeks paid in 2014/2015, 14% of weeks paid involved the claimant working while on claim. For regular claims, the proportion stood at 24% and was much higher than fishing, parental and compassionate care benefits. As Chart 28 shows, since 2011/2012, the proportion of weeks worked while on claim declined for all types of benefits.

Chart 28

Share of Weeks Worked While on Claim, by Benefit Type, Canada, 2004/2005 to 2014/2015[1,2]

[1] Data are based on the weeks worked while on claim during this period, regardless of when the claim was established.
[2] Excludes weeks worked while on claim with missing earnings data, which represent less than 1% of the weeks.
Note: Excludes claims that reverted to Pilot Project 17.
Source: ESDC Employment Insurance (EI) Adminsitrative Data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI adminsitrative data.

[69] The analysis on weeks of work while on claim is based on a weekly compilation of claims involving weeks worked while on claim. Any given claim can have multiple weeks of work while on claim, with each week treated separately.

Table 24 shows the proportion of weeks worked while entitled to receive regular benefits, broken down by socio-demographic characteristics over the past five fiscal years. The number of weeks worked vary in a very similar manner to the number of claims which had at least one week worked. Again, those under the age of 55 had a higher proportion of weeks worked while on claim, while those aged 55 years and over have a smaller proportion of weeks worked while on claim. In addition, the proportion of weeks worked while on claim varies significantly by province and territory. Again, the Atlantic provinces and Quebec have the highest proportion of regular weeks worked while on claim than the rest of Canada. In addition, British Columbia and the Yukon have higher proportions of weeks worked while on claim than the other Western provinces and the territories, but figures remain lower than the national average.

Table 24

Share of Regular Weeks Worked While on Claim, by Province, Gender and Age, Canada, 2014/2015[1,2,3]

	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
	Pilot Project 12	Pilot Projects 12 and 17	Pilot Projects 17 and 18	Pilot Project 18	Pilot Project 18
Province					
Newfoundland and Labrador	31%	32%	31%[r]	28%	27%
Prince Edward Island	33%	33%	30%[r]	28%	26%
Nova Scotia	32%	32%	31%[r]	29%	28%
New Brunswick	36%	36%	35%[r]	33%	32%
Quebec	33%	35%	34%[r]	32%	31%
Ontario	20%	20%	19%[r]	18%	18%
Manitoba	17%	16%	14%[r]	14%	13%
Saskatchewan	17%	16%	15%	13%	13%
Alberta	15%	17%	15%	14%[r]	12%
British Columbia	22%	23%	22%[r]	21%[r]	20%
Yukon	18%	17%	18%	15%	14%
Northwest Territories	12%	12%	8%	9%	9%
Nunavut	11%	14%	12%	7%	8%
Gender					
Men	25%	26%	25%	24%[r]	23%
Women	28%	30%	29%[r]	27%	26%
Age					
24 and under	23%	24%	24%	23%	23%
25 to 44 years old	26%	28%	27%	26%[r]	25%
45 to 54 years old	30%	32%	32%	31%[r]	30%
55 and over	21%	23%	20%	18%	18%
Canada	**26%**	**27%**	**27%**	**25%**	**24%**

1 Data are based on the weeks worked while on claim during the specified period, regardless of when the claim was established.

2 Excludes weeks worked while on claims with missing earnings data, which represent less than 1% of the weeks.

3 Excludes claims that reverted to Pilot Project 17.

r Revised.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

The WWC rules have varied over the last three years and the following analysis compares results of these WWC pilot projects. Table 24 shows that the changes in pilot projects have had little effect on different socio-demographic groups- there is only a modest upward trend in the proportion of weeks worked with the introduction of Pilot Project 17 and a modest downward trend following the introduction of Pilot Project 18, consistent across all groups. Under Pilot Project 18, 25% of weeks were worked while on regular claim between August 2012 and March 2015.[70] This is lower than for Pilot Project 17, running from August 2011 to August 2012, under which the proportion of weeks worked was 28%.

Table 25 presents the distribution of weeks worked based on the earnings in relation to the claimants' weekly benefit rate. With the implementation of Pilot Project 18, there has been a shift in the distribution towards higher earnings, despite the downward trend in total number of weeks worked. In other words, there has been an increase in the intensity of work compared to the previous WWC pilot, implying that the average number of hours or days worked while on claim per week has increased. As shown in Table 25, the percentage of claims with earnings greater than 40% of their weekly benefit rate (the allowable earnings threshold under the previous pilots) increased, from between 81% to 84% under Pilot Project 17 to between 87% and 90% under Pilot Project 18.

Table 25

Number and Share of Regular Weeks Worked While on Claim, and Distribution of Earnings While Receiving Regular Benefits, Canada, 2011/2012 to 2014/2015[1,2,3]

	2011/2012			2012/2013			2013/2014	2014/2015
	April 2011 to July 2011	August 2011 to March 2012	April 2011 to March 2012	April 2012 to July 2012	August 2012 to March 2013	April 2012 to March 2013	April 2013 to March 2014	April 2014 to March 2015
	Pilot Project 12	Pilot Project 17	Pilot Projects 12 and 17 combined	Pilot Project 17	Pilot Project 18	Pilot Projects 17 and 18 combined	Pilot Project 18	Pilot Project 18
Weeks worked while receiving regular benefits	3,571,450	6,870,920	10,442,370[r]	3,362,170[r]	5,986,500[r]	9,348,670	8,235,980[r]	7,779,430
Share of weeks worked while receiving regular benefits	29%	27%	27%	30%	25%	27%	25%	24%
Distribution of earnings while receiving regular benefits (Earnings as a share of EI Weekly Benefit Rate)[4]								
25% or less	6%	7%	7%	6%	6%	6%	5%	5%
26% to 40%	10%	12%	11%	10%	7%	8%	5%	5%
41% to 125%	20%	21%	20%	19%	22%	21%	22%	23%
126% to 140%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%	5%
141% to 182%	17%	17%	17%	18%	19%	18%	20%	20%
183% or more	42%	39%	40%	44%	42%	43%	43%	42%
Canada	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

[1] Data are based on the weeks worked while on claim during the specified period, regardless of when the claim was established.

[2] Excludes weeks worked while on claims with missing earnings data, which represent less than 1% of the weeks.

[3] Excludes claims that reverted to Pilot Project 17.

[4] Percentages with decimals are rounded up or down. For example, if a claimant earned 25.3% of his or her EI benefit in a given week, that week would fall under the 25% or less category.

[r] Revised.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

[70] This proportion refers to the entire duration of the pilot project, and therefore does not appear in Table 24.

Chart 29 also shows the distribution of earnings from Table 25, in smaller increments, under the three different WWC regimes: the legislation, the provisions of Pilot Projects 12 and 17 and the provisions of Pilot Project 18. Under the legislation and Pilot Projects 12 and 17, 25% and 40% earning allowances did not reduce EI benefits until claimants earned more than those thresholds, after which earnings were deducted from benefits dollar for dollar. This provided a strong incentive to work up to the threshold amount (25% or 40%) but no incentive to work beyond it, since claimants receive no additional income (combined EI benefits and earnings) from working while on claim until they've surpassed their weekly benefit rate. Under the current pilot project, a claimant's combined EI benefits and earnings from working while on claim rise consistently for every hour of work he or she accepts for significantly more earnings– specifically until they have surpassed 90% of their weekly benefit rate. As depicted in Chart 29, behavioural impacts of the incentives are suggested by the two distinct peaks in the data for the legislation and Pilot Projects 12 and 17, where claimants reached the respective thresholds. It also suggests a change in claimant behaviour under the current pilot project: there is now a smoother distribution of weeks worked while on claim, which demonstrates a more consistent incentive to accept available work, and therefore an increase in work intensity.

Chart 29

Distribution of Weeks Worked[1,2,3], by Pilot Projects and Legislation, Canada, 2004 to 2015

[1] Data are based on the weeks worked while on claim during the specified period, regardless of when the claim was established.
[2] Excludes weeks worked while on claim with missing earnings data, which represent less than 1% of the weeks.
[3] Excludes claims that reverted to Pilot Project 17.
[4] Percentages with decimals are rounded up or down. For example, if a claimant earned 25.3% of his or her EI benefit in a given week, that week would fall under the 25% or less category. Percentage above 180% were excluded.
[5] Days worked is estimated by calculating the proportion of their full-time wage worked and converting it to days. For example, if a claimant worked for 20% of his or her benefit rate, recalling that the benefit rate is 55% of full time wage, then the claimant is working 11% (20% x 55%) of his or her full-time wage, or aproximately 1/2 a day (11% x 5 days). This assumes that working claimants are earning approximately the same hourly wage as at their employment with which they qualified for benefits, that they had been working full time prior to establishing a claim, and that they had earrned the maximum insurable earnings or below.

The increase in work intensity under Pilot Project 18 can also be demonstrated by examining, on an aggregate level, the employment income earned while on claim with the level of regular benefits paid. As shown in Table 26, despite a decrease in the last two years, earnings expressed as a percentage of total regular benefits paid to all claimants has increased since 2009/2010 (54% to 59%), which suggests that the overall intensity of working while on claim has increased in recent years.

This increase in work intensity seems to explain the decreases in the number of claims with working while on claim as well as the number of weeks worked since 2009/2010. The decline in the proportion of working claimants could be attributed to employers utilizing fewer employees as some working claimants increase their work intensity, decreasing the need for additional workers. Conversely, under the legislation and Pilot Projects 12 and 17, claimants may have chosen lower work intensities, increasing employers' need to hire additional workers.

2.3.4 Benefit Repayment Provision[71]

Claimants whose annual net income[72] exceeds 125% of the maximum insurable earnings (MIE) are required to repay, for a taxation year, the lesser of 30% of total EI benefits they received, other than special benefits, or 30% of their net income above this threshold (i.e., 125% of the MIE)[73]. Claimants who received no regular or fishing benefits in the preceding ten taxation years are exempt from this provision.

For the 2013 taxation year, 157,109 claimants repaid $201.7 million in benefits. It is estimated that, among all claimants other than those who only received special benefits, about 11% (or 9% of all EI claimants) repaid a portion of their EI benefits received in 2013.

It should be noted that since the benefit repayment provision does not apply to special benefits, the use of the term "claimants" in the remainder of this section excludes claimants who only received special benefits.

Table 26

Income Earned While on Claim, Canada, 2009/2010 to 2014/2015[1,2,3]

	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
	Pilot Project 12	Pilot Project 12	Pilot Projects 12 and 17	Pilot Projects 17 and 18	Pilot Project 18	Pilot Project 18
Employment Income Earned While on Regular Claim ($B)[4]	8.0	7.3	7.0	6.9	6.4	6.3
Total regular Benefits Paid to all Claimants ($B)[5]	14.7	12.8	11.1	10.5	10.4	10.6
Ratio of Earnings to Regular Benefits[6]	54%	57%	63%	66%	62%	59%

1 Data are based on the weeks worked while on claim during this period, regardless of when the claim was established.

2 Excludes weeks worked while on claims with missing earnings data, which represent less than 1% of the weeks.

3 Excludes claims that reverted to Pilot Project 17

4 As of the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, the methodology for the employment income earned while on regular claim has changed; previous years' data were revised to reflect this change.

5 As of the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, the total regular benefits paid to all claimants includes those training benefits paid under article 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act*; previous years' data were revised to reflect this change.

6 Ratio of earnings to regular benefits is calculated by dividing the employment income earned while on regular claim by the total regular benefits paid to all claimants. As of the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, the methodology has changed for the employment income earned while on regular claim and the total regular benefits paid to all claimants (see footnotes 4 and 5), and as such so has the ratio of earnings to regular benefits.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

71 As benefit repayments are administered through the tax system, the most recent data available for this section are for the 2013 taxation year.

72 The definition of annual net income is based on "net income before adjustments" from line 234 of the T1 General Income Tax and Benefit Return.

73 For the taxation year 2013, the threshold was $59,250, which is equal to 1.25 times the MIE in 2013 ($47,400).

Table 27

Employment Insurance Claimants Who Repaid a Portion of Their Employment Insurance Benefits, Canada, 2013

	Claimants (Excluding Those That Only Received Special Benefits)	Claimants Who Repaid a Portion of Their Benefits	
	2013/2014	2013	2013 (%)
Province			
Newfoundland and Labrador	70,660	12,787	18
Prince Edward Island	18,020	1,048	6
Nova Scotia	63,870	7,722	12
New Brunswick	73,390	6,499	9
Quebec	430,000	40,948	10
Ontario	413,110	38,373	9
Manitoba	39,530	2,918	7
Saskatchewan	31,150	4,585	15
Alberta	98,000	22,813	23
British Columbia	148,690	18,676	13
Yukon	2,070	288	14
Northwest Territories	1,680	275	16
Nunavut	890	108	12
Foreign services/non-residents	Not applicable	69	Not applicable
Gender			
Men	863,710	140,103	16
Women	527,350	17,006	3
Age			
24 years and under (Youth)	150,030	6,098	4
25 to 44 years	609,290	68,297	11
45 to 54 years	338,760	41,376	12
55 years and over (Older Workers)	292,980	41,338	14
Canada	**1,391,060**	**157,109**	**11%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data on claimants are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data; and data on claimants who repaid a portion of their benefits are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data.

2.3.4.1 Benefit Repayment, by Province and Territory, Gender and Age Group

Among provinces and territories, Alberta had the highest percentage of EI claimants who repaid a portion of their benefits (23%), followed by Newfoundland and Labrador (18%) and Northwest Territories (16%) [see Table 27].

Among gender, 16% of male claimants were subject to repayment, compared to only 3% of female claimants. As a result, men continued to comprise the vast majority of claimants who repaid EI benefits; they accounted for 89% of the total number of EI claimants who repaid benefits in 2013, a share that has remained stable for over a decade. Statistics by age category indicate that older workers (55 and older) were more likely to repay EI benefits (14%) in 2013 while youth (24 years and under) were less likely to repay (4%).[74]

[74] See Annex 2.21 for more historical data on the benefit repayment.

Differences in frequency of benefit repayment between genders and among age groups reflect differences in pre-claim earnings among members of these groups and their likelihood to repay EI benefits. For example, based on the latest available statistics, in 2011, younger workers (24 years and under) had a total income of $14,200, compared to $48,500 for core-aged workers (25 to 54 years) and $38,400 for older workers (55 years and older).[75] As a result, it is more likely that workers older than 25 will exceed the net income threshold necessary to be subject to the benefit repayment provision, while the opposite effect is true for youth.

On average, EI claimants subject to the benefit repayment provision repaid $1,284 in 2013; this amount has increased for three consecutive years, is slightly higher than the amount repaid in 2012 ($1,218), and is higher than the average over the past decade ($1,093). EI claimants who repaid a portion of their benefits received $5,434 in EI benefits[76] in 2013, on average, higher than the amount in 2012 ($5,101). In 2013, EI claimants who repaid a portion of their benefits were on claim for an average of 12.0 weeks, slightly higher than the previous year (11.5 weeks). However, EI claimants who repaid EI benefits in 2013 were on an EI claim for a shorter duration compared to the overall population of EI regular claimants (19.4 weeks) in 2013/2014. This suggests that high-earning EI claimants generally are on EI benefits for shorter periods compared to their lower-earning counterparts.

Among those who repaid EI benefits in 2013, men repaid the highest amounts ($1,305) and were on an EI claim for the longest duration (12.1 weeks). Across age groups, older workers (55 and older) repaid the highest amounts ($1,514) and were on an EI claim for the longest duration (14.9 weeks).

In 2013, EI claimants in the Atlantic provinces repaid the largest amounts of EI benefits on average, most notably in Nova Scotia ($1,883) and Prince Edward Island ($1,841); these amounts were much higher than the national average ($1,284). In addition, EI claimants from the Atlantic provinces who were subject to repayment were on an EI claim for longer durations, most notably in Prince Edward Island (18.7 weeks) and Nova Scotia (17.9 weeks). Conversely, claimants from Quebec ($1,107) and Ontario ($1,159) repaid the lowest average amount of benefits and the duration of their benefits was shorter than almost all other jurisdictions (10.9 and 11.0 weeks, respectively). The Western provinces and territories ranged from $1,242 (Saskatchewan) to $1,422 (Yukon) for the amount repaid and from 10.9 weeks (Alberta) to 14.6 weeks (Nunavut) for the duration on claim. The data suggest that among EI claimants who were subject to the benefit repayment provision, a direct correlation exists between weeks on EI and benefits repaid; this is due to the fact that longer durations on EI result in higher amounts of EI received, a portion of which may have to be subsequently repaid.

2.4 Maximum and Actual Duration of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits[77]

EI claimants can be paid between a maximum of 14 and 45 weeks of EI regular benefits, depending on the unemployment rate in the EI economic region in which they reside and the number of hours of insurable employment they accumulated during their qualifying period (see Table 28).[78] Individuals residing in regions with a high unemployment rate are entitled to receive more weeks of EI regular benefits, and those with a low number of hours of insurable employment are entitled to receive fewer weeks of benefits. For example, an individual residing in an EI economic region with an unemployment rate higher than 16.0%, and who has accumulated 1,820 hours of insurable employment during the qualifying period (generally the 52 week period preceding the claim), is entitled to a maximum of 45 weeks of EI regular benefits. Conversely, an individual residing in an EI economic region with an unemployment rate of 6.0% or lower, and who has accumulated 700 hours of insurable employment, is entitled to a maximum of 14 weeks of EI regular benefits. The EI program automatically adapts to the economic conditions of the regions in which individuals reside, as the regional unemployment rates used to establish the maximum duration of regular benefits are adjusted on a monthly basis for all EI economic regions.

---

[75] Statistics Canada, Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics, CANSIM Table 202-0407.

[76] For the purposes of this analysis, the EI benefits received could include any type of EI benefit, including regular, fishing and special benefits. However, the amount repaid can only be deducted from benefits received, excluding special benefits.

[77] Previous *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Reports* presented maximum duration statistics based on the fiscal year covered by the report, whereas actual duration statistics lagged by one fiscal year to ensure that all claims were completed. Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, statistics on maximum duration and actual duration of regular benefits will both be presented for the fiscal year covered by the report, in order to provide timely, relevant and consistent reporting. This change was made possible because of methodological improvements and larger historical data availability. However, actual duration statistics for the year covered by the Report will be presented on a preliminary basis. Revisions will be made, if necessary, in the next *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*.

[78] Please note that Table 28 does not apply to new entrants and re-entrants (NEREs), who require 910 hours of work to qualify for EI regular benefits. For more information on access requirements for EI regular benefits, see the Program Overview, sub-section 1.2.1.1.

Table 28

Maximum Number of Weeks of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits a Claimant Can Receive, by Regional Unemployment Rate and Number of Hours of Insurable Employment

Number of Hours of Insurable Employment	Regional Unemployment Rate											
	6.0% and under	6.1% – 7.0%	7.1% – 8.0%	8.1% – 9.0%	9.1% – – 10.0%	10.1% – 11.0%	11.1% – 12.0%	12.1% – 13.0%	13.1% – 14.0%	14.1% – 15.0%	15.1% – 16.0%	More than 16.0%
420–454	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	28	30	32
455–489	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	26	28	30	32
490–524	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	25	27	29	31	33
525–559	0	0	0	0	0	21	23	25	27	29	31	33
560–594	0	0	0	0	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34
595–629	0	0	0	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34
630–664	0	0	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35
665–699	0	15	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35
700–734	14	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36
735–769	14	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36
770–804	15	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37
805–839	15	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37
840–874	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38
875–909	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38
910–944	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39
945–979	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39
980–1,014	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40
1,015–1,049	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40
1,050–1,084	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41
1,085–1,119	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41
1,120–1,154	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42
1,155–1,189	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42
1,190–1,224	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43
1,225–1,259	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43
1,260–1,294	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44
1,295–1,329	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44
1,330–1,364	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45
1,365–1,399	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45
1,400–1,434	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44	45
1,435–1,469	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45	45
1,470–1,504	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44	45	45
1,505–1,539	27	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45	45	45
1,540–1,574	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44	45	45	45
1,575–1,609	29	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45	45	45	45
1,610–1,644	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44	45	45	45	45
1,645–1,679	31	33	35	37	39	41	43	45	45	45	45	45
1,680–1,714	32	34	36	38	40	42	44	45	45	45	45	45
1,715–1,749	33	35	37	39	41	43	45	45	45	45	45	45
1,750–1,784	34	36	38	40	42	44	45	45	45	45	45	45
1,785–1,819	35	37	39	41	43	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
1,820 and more	36	38	40	42	44	45	45	45	45	45	45	45

Source: *Employment Insurance Act*, section 12.

Actual duration reflects the number of weeks during which an EI claimant receives EI regular benefits, which cannot exceed the maximum duration levels indicated in Table 28, under the current legislation and regulations. Actual duration is usually much smaller than maximum duration for a number of reasons. For example, an EI claimant may find work before the end of their benefit period. A detailed analysis on maximum and actual duration is provided in the following subsection.

2.4.1 Maximum and Actual Duration of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits

From 2013/2014 to 2014/2015, the average maximum duration of regular benefits decreased from 31.7 weeks to 31.4 weeks, while the average actual duration remained stable at 19.4 weeks (see Chart 30). For five consecutive years starting in 2010/2011, both average maximum and average actual duration of regular benefits have decreased or remained stable.

The annual decrease in the average maximum duration of regular benefits in 2014/2015 was very minor (-0.3 week) and may reflect the slight decrease in the unemployment rate in Canada, from 7.0% in 2013/2014 to 6.9% in 2014/2015.

The trend in the average maximum duration of regular benefits over the past five years shows a more significant decline. After reaching a high of 42.8 weeks in 2009/2010 after the 2008 recession, the average maximum duration of regular benefits has decreased for five straight years from 2010/2011 (36.0 weeks) to 2014/2015 (31.4 weeks). This decrease can be attributed to two factors: improved economic conditions and the termination of two pilot projects. Firstly, as economic conditions improve and the unemployment rate declines, the maximum duration of regular benefits tends to decrease. Secondly, the termination of the pilot for the Extension of EI Benefits for Long-Tenured Workers on September 11, 2010 and the termination of the pilot for Extended EI benefits on September 15, 2012, which temporarily increased maximum duration of

Chart 30

Average Maximum and Actual Duration of Regular Benefits, and Unemployment Rate, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

* These years coincide with the Employment Insurance (EI) temporary measures announced in Budgets 2009 and 2010, that increased the maximum number of weeks for which regular benefits could be paid.

(p) Preliminary data for the figures on actual duration.

Sources: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data (for data on duration of regular benefits); and Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0007 (for data on unemployment rates). ESDC data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

regular benefits,[79] also contributed to the decline in average maximum duration of regular benefits over the past five years. It is important to note that these termination dates refer to the last day an EI claim could be established under a particular pilot. The full impact of a pilot is not realized until all related EI benefits are paid, which can be several months after a pilot's termination date.

With respect to actual duration, in 2014/2015, EI regular claimants used, on average, 19.4 weeks of regular benefits, the same as 2013/2014. Average actual duration of EI regular benefits has decreased over the past five years, because of the decline in the average maximum duration of regular benefits and better economic conditions. First, actual duration is impacted by maximum duration; generally, as the maximum number of weeks decrease, so too do the number of weeks of actual duration. Second, improved economic conditions, in general, lead to a shorter duration of regular benefits since EI claimants can find employment sooner after an interval of receiving EI benefits.

An evaluation study[80] suggested that the effect of the program's automatic adjustments to regular entitlement weeks, combined with the Extension of EI Regular Benefits temporary measure, led to an increase of 2.1 weeks in the average duration of claims established between March 2008 and September 2010. A supplemental study[81] using a geography-based approach to assess the impact of the pilot project relating to Extended Benefits on EI usage determined that the number of EI regular benefit weeks used increased by 2.7 weeks in the pilot regions, for claims established between September 12, 2010 and September 15, 2012.

A recent study[82], using data from the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID), looked at the impact of participation in job-related training on the incidence of receiving EI regular benefits and the duration of regular benefit payments during the period 2002 to 2008 (when SLID collected data on participation in training). The study suggests that for males who participated in job-related training in a given year, the probability of receiving EI regular benefits in the following year was reduced by 1.4 percentage point, from an average predicted probability[83] of 4.7%. For females who participated in job-related training, the probability of receiving EI regular benefits was found to be reduced by 0.6 percentage point, from an average predicted probability of 4.1%. The study also shows that it is employer-sponsored and workplace-based job-related training that reduce the incidence of receiving EI regular benefits; self-sponsored and classroom-based job-related training were not found to have an impact. With respect to the duration of EI regular benefits, the study suggests that job-related training had only a limited impact, reducing the duration of benefit payments by 1.6 day among male recipients and 0.9 day among female recipients.

2.4.1.1 Maximum Duration and Actual Duration of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, and Claimant Category

In 2014/2015, the average maximum duration of EI regular benefits for each gender, all age groups, and most EI claimant categories, hovered close to the national average of 31.4 weeks. However, the average maximum duration of regular benefits by province and territory showed more variance (see Table 29).

The four Atlantic provinces experienced the highest average maximum duration of regular benefits (ranging from 33.2 weeks in Prince Edward Island to 38.2 weeks in Newfoundland and Labrador). British Columbia and Alberta had the lowest average, with 29.7 weeks each. This discrepancy is explained by provincial differences in economic conditions. As seen in Chapter I, the unemployment rates were the highest in the Atlantic provinces (ranging from 8.9% to 12.2%) and were amongst the lowest in British Columbia and Alberta (unemployment rates of 6.0% and 4.9%, respectively). From 2013/2014 to 2014/2015, there were modest changes to the average maximum duration among provinces, ranging from -0.9 week in New Brunswick to +0.8 week in Newfoundland and Labrador.

---

[79] The Extended EI Regular Benefits pilot project provided 5 extra weeks of regular benefits for all claims, and the Extension of EI Benefits for Long-Tenured Workers pilot project extended the duration of regular benefits for eligible claimants by up to another 20 weeks. For more information on these temporary measures, see Annex 7.1.

[80] ESDC, Extended Duration of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits: Second Evaluation Study Update (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2013).

[81] ESDC, *Geography-based Analysis of the Impact of EI Measures* (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2016).

[82] ESDC, Training and the Duration of Employment Insurance Benefits (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2015).

[83] "The average predicted probability represents the probability of receiving regular benefits computed at the means of all characteristics included in the regression model."

Table 29

Average Maximum Duration and Average Actual Duration of Regular Benefits, by Province and Territory, Gender, Age Group, and Employment Insurance Claimant Category, Canada, 2012/2013 to 2014/2015

	Average Maximum Duration of Regular Benefits (Weeks)				Average Actual Duration of Regular Benefits (Weeks)			
	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	Change	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015[p]	Change
Province and Territory								
Newfoundland and Labrador	39.2	37.4	38.2	0.8	26.1	25.6	25.3	-0.3
Prince Edward Island	34.9	33.5	33.2	-0.3	23.3	22.7	23.3	0.6
Nova Scotia	35.5	34.0	34.4	0.4	23.9	23.1	23.5	0.4
New Brunswick	37.0	36.5	35.6	-0.9	23.5	23.8	23.4	-0.4
Quebec	31.1	31.0	30.7	-0.3	18.4	18.6	18.7	0.1
Ontario	32.3	31.5	30.9	-0.6	19.8	19.1	18.7	-0.4
Manitoba	29.9	29.6	30.0	0.4	17.6	17.5	18.0	0.5
Saskatchewan	32.9	32.4	33.0	0.6	18.1	17.9	18.6	0.7
Alberta	28.4	29.1	29.7	0.6	16.0	16.3	17.4	1.1
British Columbia	30.5	30.2	29.7	-0.5	18.8	18.6	18.8	0.2
Yukon	41.8	41.6	32.9	-8.7	24.0	24.0	22.5	-1.5
Northwest Territories	42.8	41.9	40.0	-1.9	26.2	25.9	25.7	-0.2
Nunavut	41.9	41.6	40.0	-1.6	28.2	29.2	29.3	0.1
Gender								
Men	32.7	32.3	32.0	-0.3	19.7	19.5	19.5	0.0
Women	31.4	30.8	30.5	-0.3	19.6	19.3	19.4	0.1
Age								
15 to 24 years (Youth)	31.2	30.7	30.5	-0.2	17.6	17.6	17.9	0.3
25 to 44 years	32.4	31.9	31.6	-0.3	18.9	18.6	18.7	0.1
45 to 54 years	32.7	32.3	32.0	-0.3	20.1	19.9	19.8	-0.1
55 years and over (Older workers)	31.6	31.1	30.8	-0.3	21.6	21.4	21.1	-0.3
EI Claimant Category[1]								
Long-Tenured Workers	34.9	34.7	34.5	-0.2	18.3	17.9	17.5	-0.4
Occasional Claimants	31.4	31.1	30.9	-0.2	19.1	19.0	19.1	0.1
Frequent Claimants	31.2	30.4	30.1	-0.3	22.2	22.0	22.0	0.0
Canada	**32.2**	**31.7**	**31.4**	**-0.3**	**19.6**	**19.4**	**19.4**	**0.0**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Long-tenured workers are Employment Insurance (EI) claimants who have paid at least 30% of the maximum annual EI premiums for 7 of the past 10 years and who, over the last 5 years, have collected EI regular or fishing benefits for 35 weeks or less. Frequent claimants are EI claimants who have had three or more claims for EI regular or fishing benefits and have collected benefits for a total of more than 60 weeks in the past 5 years. Occasional claimants are EI claimants who do not meet the requirements for either long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

[p] Preliminary data.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

In 2014/2015, the average maximum duration of regular benefits in the territories was 32.9 weeks in the Yukon, and 40.0 weeks in the Northwest Territories and Nunavut. From 2013/2014 to 2014/2015, the territories witnessed decreases in average maximum duration, with Yukon experiencing the largest decline (-8.7 weeks or -21.2%), followed by Northwest Territories (-1.9 week or -4.5%) and Nunavut (-1.6 week or -3.8%).

The large decreases in the average maximum duration of regular benefits in the territories is attributed to improvements in data coverage, which allowed for the introduction of a new unemployment rate calculation methodology that better represents labour market conditions. In the past, the unemployment rate used for the purposes of the EI program in the territories was set at 25.0%. Effective October 12, 2014, the unemployment rate comes from Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey and reflects the actual labour market conditions. Also, effective October 12, 2014, EI economic regions for all three territories and Prince Edward Island were redefined by dividing each of the four regions into two EI economic regions, one consisting of the capital area and the remaining consisting of the non-capital area. Table 30 illustrates the impact of these changes, emphasizing the significance of the unemployment rate changes and the effect they had on the range of maximum entitlement during 2014/2015.

Table 30

Monthly Regional Unemployment Rate and Range of Maximum Duration of Regular Benefits, by Employment Insurance Economic Region, Prince Edward Island and Territories, 2014/2015

	Employment Insurance Economic Region	Monthly Regional Unemployment Rate[1]				Range of Maximum Duration of Regular Benefits	
		April 1, 2014 to October 11, 2014		October 12, 2014 to March 31, 2015		April 1, 2014 to October 11, 2014	October 12, 2014 to March 31, 2015
		Minimum (%)	Maximum (%)	Minimum (%)	Maximum (%)	(Weeks)	(Weeks)
Province and Territory							
Prince Edward Island	Charlottetown[2]	9.8	12.0	8.0	8.6	20 to 45	17 to 42
	Prince Edward Island[3]	9.8	12.0	11.5	12.7	20 to 45	23 to 45
Yukon	Whitehorse[2]	25.0	25.0	4.1	5.8	32 to 45	14 to 36
	Yukon[3]	25.0	25.0	7.3	9.8	32 to 45	17 to 44
Northwest Territories	Yellowknife[2]	25.0	25.0	3.6	4.5	32 to 45	14 to 36
	Northwest Territories[3]	25.0	25.0	13.1	14.2	32 to 45	26 to 45
Nunavut	Iqaluit[2]	25.0	25.0	3.9	5.0	32 to 45	14 to 36
	Nunavut[3]	25.0	25.0	16.8	18.2	32 to 45	32 to 45

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Unemployment rates used for the Employment Insurance program are a moving average of seasonally adjusted monthly rates of unemployment produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

2 From April 1, 2014 to October 11, 2014, the current EI economic regions "Charlottetown", "Whitehorse", "Yellowknife", and "Iqaluit" did not exist. However, the prevailing unemployment rates (for the purposes of the Employment Insurance Program) for these areas were based on those of the former EI economic regions they were a part of (i.e., Prince Edward Island 9.8-12.0%; Yukon 25.0%; Northwest Territories 25.0%; and Nunavut 25.0%).

3 For the purposes of the Employment Insurance program, unemployment rates for the Employment Insurance (EI) economic regions of Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut were set at 25% up until October 11, 2014.

Sources: ESDC, *Employment Insurance Act*, section 12 (for data on maximum duration); and ESDC, Labour Force Survey (for data on EI monthly regional unemployment rates).

The redefining of the previously mentioned EI economic regions had more of an impact on the territories, most notably Yukon, than it did for the only province impacted by the change, Prince Edward Island. For example, in 2014/2015, from the period between April 1, 2014 and October 11, 2014 compared to the period between October 12, 2014 and March 31, 2015, the monthly unemployment rate in the EI economic region of Yukon decreased from 25.0% to 7.3–9.8%, resulting in a drop in the range of maximum entitlement of regular benefits from 32–45 weeks, to 17–44 weeks (see Table 30). During the same period, Whitehorse's monthly unemployment rate decreased from 25.0%[84] to 4.1–5.8%, resulting in a drop in the range of maximum entitlement from 32–45 weeks, to 14–36 weeks. The impact of the unemployment rate calculation methodology changes in the Yukon territory (comprising the new EI economic regions of Yukon and Whitehorse), which took effect on October 12, 2014, was the primary reason for the 8.7 week drop in average maximum duration.

Across gender, men had slightly higher levels of average maximum duration of regular benefits than women. Maximum duration of regular benefits was also the highest, on average, among claimants between 25 to 54 years of age. Finally, long-tenured workers[85] had much longer maximum duration of regular benefits than occasional[86] and frequent claimants.[87]

In 2014/2015, Nunavut (29.3 weeks), Northwest Territories (25.7 weeks) and Newfoundland and Labrador (25.3 weeks) experienced the largest average actual duration of regular benefits, whereas Alberta (17.4 weeks) and Manitoba (18.0 weeks) witnessed the lowest average of all provinces and territories. Between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015, the largest decrease in average actual duration of regular benefits occurred in the Yukon (-1.5 week), while the largest increase was observed in Alberta (1.1 week) and Saskatchewan (0.7).

The decrease in Yukon is due to changes in the unemployment rate calculation methodology mentioned previously: the average actual duration for the territory was 24.0 weeks in 2013/2014, before dropping to 22.5 weeks in 2014/2015. In addition, the large increase in Alberta and Saskatchewan coincides with the spike observed in these provinces for the number of new regular claims established in 2014/2015. As described in section 2.1, the number of claims jumped by 25.9% in Alberta and by 15.0% in Saskatchewan because of the changing economic conditions affecting the Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction industry. As a result, not only did the number of regular claimants in Alberta and Saskatchewan rise, but the period of time during which the claimants collected regular benefits also increased.

In 2014/2015, actual duration of regular benefits was nearly identical for both men and women, while it was highest among older workers (55 years and older) and frequent claimants.

2.4.1.2 Maximum Duration and Actual Duration of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Industry and Employment Interval Group

In 2014/2015, EI regular claimants in the Mining, Oil and Gas Extraction industry experienced, on average, the largest maximum duration at 34.6 weeks, followed by the Manufacturing industry (34.3 weeks)—similar to results from the previous year (see Table 31). The higher maximum duration levels in these industries can be attributed to a large proportion of claimants with 1,400 or more hours of insurable employment, claimants who are more likely to reside in regions with higher unemployment rates (e.g. 12.1% or higher), and individuals who work, on average, among the highest number of hours, at 41.0 and 37.1 hours per week, including overtime, respectively (refer to Chapter I, Chart 19).

[84] From April 1, 2014 to October 11, 2014, the EI economic region of Whitehorse did not exist. However, the monthly regional unemployment rate of residents living in this area was identical to that of residents of the former EI economic region of Yukon during this period (25.0%).

[85] Long-tenured workers are individuals who have paid at least 30% of the annual maximum employee's EI premiums in 7 of the past 10 years, and who, over the last 5 years, have collected 35 or fewer weeks of EI regular or fishing benefits.

[86] Occasional claimants are individuals who do not meet the definition of long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

[87] Frequent claimants are individuals who have had three or more claims for EI regular or fishing benefits, and have collected more than 60 weeks of EI regular or fishing benefits in the past 5 years.

Table 31

Average Maximum Duration and Average Actual Duration of Regular Benefits[1], by Industry, Canada, 2012/2013 to 2014/2015

	Average Maximum Duration of Regular Benefits (Weeks)				Average Actual Duration of Regular Benefits (Weeks)			
	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	Change	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015[p]	Change
Industry								
Goods-producing industries	33.1	32.6	32.3	-0.3	19.3	19.1	19.0	-0.1
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	31.3	30.8	30.8	0.0	21.6	21.4	21.9	0.5
Mining, Oil and Gas Extraction	35.2	34.9	34.6	-0.3	20.3	20.4	19.7	-0.7
Utilities	34.4	33.4	31.7	-1.7	17.0	18.3	17.7	-0.6
Construction	32.3	31.7	31.3	-0.4	18.1	18.1	17.9	-0.2
Manufacturing	34.7	34.5	34.3	-0.2	20.4	19.9	19.7	-0.2
Services-producing industries	31.7	31.2	30.9	-0.3	19.8	19.5	19.5	0.0
Wholesale Trade	34.3	34.0	33.7	-0.3	23.4	22.9	22.4	-0.5
Retail Trade	32.7	32.4	32.2	-0.2	22.7	22.2	22.1	-0.1
Transportation and Warehousing	31.3	30.5	30.3	-0.2	19.3	18.7	19.1	0.4
Finance and Insurance	34.9	34.3	34.2	-0.1	24.7	24.7	23.1	-1.6
Real Estate, Rental and Leasing	32.3	32.3	31.8	-0.5	21.7	22.2	21.6	-0.6
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	33.7	33.4	33.1	-0.3	21.3	21.3	20.8	-0.5
Business, Building and Other Support Services[2]	31.7	31.0	30.8	-0.2	21.5	21.3	21.4	0.1
Educational Services	29.4	28.6	28.2	-0.4	11.9	11.7	12.3	0.6
Health Care and Social Assistance	33.0	32.5	32.2	-0.3	21.5	21.3	21.3	0.0
Information, Culture and Recreation[3]	30.5	29.6	29.2	-0.4	20.7	20.4	20.6	0.2
Accommodation and Food Services	31.1	30.7	30.3	-0.4	22.4	22.2	22.3	0.1
Other Services (except Public Administration)	32.6	32.0	31.7	-0.3	21.3	21.0	21.4	0.4
Public Administration	31.9	31.4	31.1	-0.3	19.9	20.5	20.6	0.1
Unclassified Industries	31.3	31.3	31.1	-0.2	22.1	21.5	21.3	-0.2
Canada	**32.2**	**31.7**	**31.4**	**-0.3**	**19.6**	**19.4**	**19.4**	**0.0**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits were paid.

2 This industry comprises the industries with codes 55 (management of companies and enterprises) and 56 (administrative and support, waste management and mediation services) from the North American Industry Classification System.

3 This industry comprises the industries with codes 51 (information and cultural industries) and 71 (arts, entertainment and recreation) from the North American Industry Classification System.

p Preliminary data.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

In 2014/2015, the average maximum duration of EI regular benefits slightly declined or remained stable for all industries, except for the Utilities industry. EI claimants within the Utilities industry witnessed a decrease in maximum duration of 1.7 week.

Average actual duration levels were highest in the Finance and Insurance industry (23.1 weeks) and lowest in the Educational Services industry (12.3 weeks) in 2014/2015. The shorter intervals of actual average duration witnessed in the Educational Services industry are influenced by a shorter maximum duration (28.2 weeks, on average).

The largest variation in average actual duration levels in 2014/2015 occurred in the Finance and Insurance industry (-1.6 week). There were only minor increases and decreases in the other industries.

EI regular claimants accumulate varying hours of insurable employment beyond the minimum requirement, under the Variable Entrance Requirement (VER) provision, and can be divided into three groups: i) short employment interval (0 to 70 hours beyond minimum requirement); ii) medium employment interval (71 to 910 hours beyond minimum requirement); and iii) long employment interval (911 or more hours beyond minimum requirement). As illustrated in Chart 31, in 2014/2015, 44% of all regular claimants had long employment intervals, compared to 53% for those with medium employment intervals. Only 3% of regular claimants had short employment intervals, which implies that a small proportion of claimants just barely qualify for regular benefits.

Chart 31

Distribution of Regular Claims[1], by Employment Interval Group, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Chart 31 provides a visual illustration of the proportion of regular claimants who have, on average, shorter or longer weeks of duration (e.g. the short employment interval group is linked to shorter duration levels). Since 2007/2008, the share of EI regular claims has remained relatively constant among all three employment interval groups, although the proportion increased slightly for claimants from the long employment interval group, in 2008/2009 and 2009/2010, during the 2008 recession. During the recession, a large number of workers who had permanent full-time work became unemployed, and many of them had accumulated several hundred hours of insurable employment beyond the minimum requirement.

2.4.2 Proportion of Regular Benefit Weeks Used[88]

The average proportion of regular benefit weeks used is the number of weeks of regular benefits used (i.e., actual duration) expressed as a proportion of the maximum number of weeks of regular benefits available to EI claimants (i.e., maximum duration). In 2013/2014, claimants used an average of 63.5% of their regular benefit weeks, representing a slight increase compared to 2012/2013 (63.1%), and the fourth consecutive year of increases. Regular claimants have consistently used between 58% and 64% of their regular benefit weeks since 2002/2003.

As in previous periods, in 2013/2014, the average proportion of regular benefit weeks used was highest in the Atlantic provinces, ranging from 67.3% in New Brunswick to 71.4% in Prince Edward Island. Among provinces, claimants in Saskatchewan and Alberta used the lowest proportion of their regular benefit weeks (57.9% and 58.1%, respectively).

Historically, women and men have used a similar proportion of their regular benefit weeks. That was also the case for claims established in 2013/2014, as men used an average of 63.4% of their regular benefit weeks, compared to an average of 63.7% for women.

Older workers (55 years and older) tend to use more of their regular benefit weeks than their younger counterparts. This is due to the fact that, as seen in Chapter I, duration of unemployment is longer, on average, for people from older cohorts than for younger individuals. In 2013/2014, older workers used, on average, 70.8% of their regular benefit weeks, compared to 59.9% for youth (15 to 24 years), 60.7% for claimants between 25 and 44 years, and 63.6% for those between 45 and 54 years.

An EI regular claimant's reason for job separation may also have an impact on the proportion of their regular benefit weeks used. Approximately 85% of regular claims are established due to a layoff, as the reason for job separation. In 2013/2014, EI regular claimants[89] who have a layoff as reason for job separation, used on average, 67.8% of their benefit weeks, compared to 77.3% and 81.6% for EI regular claimants with dismissals and voluntary separations, respectively. A reason for job separation which results in a lower proportion of regular benefit weeks used may signal quicker re-employment.

An analysis of the proportion of regular benefit weeks used also indicates that more hours of insurable employment is associated with a lower proportion of regular benefits used. In 2013/2014, claimants with more hours of insurable employment (1,820 hours or more) used 52.0% of their regular benefit weeks, compared to 85.5% for those with less hours (804 hours or less), as shown in table 32.

Furthermore, higher unemployment rates are also associated with a higher proportion of regular benefit weeks used, although the correlation is weaker than for hours of insurable employment, and results do not hold true for all insurable hour groupings. In 2013/2014, claimants in lower unemployment rate regions (8.0% and less) used 62.5% of their regular benefit weeks, compared to claimants in higher unemployment rate regions (12.1% and higher), who used 67.7% of their benefit weeks.

Previous work patterns have an influence on the number of hours of insurable employment accumulated and the proportion of regular benefit weeks used. In 2013/2014, long-tenured workers[90] used 52.5% of their regular benefit weeks, compared to 63.0% for occasional claimants,[91] and 75.2% for frequent claimants[92] as illustrated in Chart 32.

---

[88] The most recent data available for the proportion of regular benefit weeks used is based on the 2013/2014 fiscal year, to ensure all claims were completed.

[89] In this context, regular claimants include claimants who received regular benefits and/or benefits paid under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for training purposes.

[90] Long-tenured workers are individuals who have paid at least 30% of the annual maximum employee's EI premiums in 7 of the past 10 years, and who, over the last 5 years, have collected 35 or fewer weeks of EI regular or fishing benefits.

[91] Occasional claimants are individuals who do not meet the definition of long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

[92] Frequent claimants are individuals who have had three or more claims for EI regular or fishing benefits, and have collected more than 60 weeks of EI regular or fishing benefits in the past 5 years.

Table 32

Proportion of Regular Benefit Weeks Used[1], by Hours of Insurable Employment and Regional Unemployment Rate, Canada, 2013/2014

	Regional Unemployment Rate[2]			
	8.0% and less	8.1% to 12.0%	12.1% and higher	Average
Hours of Insurable Employment				
804 hours and less	83.7%	85.2%	87.5%	85.5%
805 to 1,819 hours	64.7%	64.4%	65.4%	64.7%
1,820 hours and higher	53.4%	51.1%	47.8%	52.0%
Canada	**62.5%**	**63.4%**	**67.7%**	**63.5%**

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits were paid.

[2] Unemployment rates used for the Employment Insurance program are a moving average of seasonally adjusted monthly rates of unemployment produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Chart 32

Proportion of Regular Benefit Weeks Used, by Employment Insurance Claimant Category[1], Canada, 2007/2008 to 2013/2014

[1] Long-tenured workers are Employment Insurance (EI) claimants who have paid at least 30% of the maximum annual EI premiums for 7 of the past 10 years and who, over the last 5 years, have collected EI regular or fishing benefits for 35 weeks or less. Frequent claimants are EI claimants who have had three or more claims for EI regular or fishing benefits and have collected benefits for a total of more than 60 weeks in the past 5 years. Occasional claimants are EI claimants who do not meet the requirements for either long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

In summary, long-tenured workers generally have more weeks of entitlement to regular benefits, collect fewer weeks of benefits and therefore use a lower proportion of their benefit weeks. The situation is reversed for frequent claimants: they have fewer weeks of entitlement, collect more weeks of regular benefits and consequently use a higher proportion of their benefit weeks.

2.5 Exhaustion of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits[93]

The aim of monitoring exhaustees is to determine whether EI provides adequate temporary income support to those looking for suitable employment. Up to 2012, analysis regarding exhaustion of regular benefits contained in the *EI Monitoring and Assessment Report* was based on claimants who used all the regular weeks to which they were entitled.

As of the 2012/13 *EI Monitoring and Assessment Report*, analysis of regular benefits exhaustion was expanded to include claims for which the benefit period ends before all potential regular benefit weeks of entitlement are paid.[94] As a result, two distinct groups of exhaustees are now scrutinized—claims for which all eligible regular weeks are paid (entitlement exhaustees) and claims that reach the final week of the benefit period before all eligible regular benefits are paid (benefit period exhaustees).

The analysis of regular benefits exhaustion also takes into consideration regular claimants who re-qualify for a new EI claim within 4 weeks of exhausting their prior claim. These claimants experience a relatively short, if any, interruption in EI benefits. Information on these claimants is presented as entitlement exhaustee requalification rates.

In addition, analysis will be provided on the proportion of benefit period exhaustees who requalify for a new EI claim within 4 weeks of reaching the final week of the benefit period (usually 52 weeks) before all benefits are paid. Information on these claimants is presented as benefit period requalification rates.

Analysis of exhaustees is based on regular claims completed in 2014/2015, which facilitates more timely analysis and reporting of exhaustion rates. In reports prior to 2012/2013, analysis of exhaustees was based on claims that were established in a specific year, and in order to utilize mature data, the results were reported considerably later in relation to the reference period.

2.5.1 Entitlement Exhaustion of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits

Of all regular claims completed in 2014/2015, approximately one-third (34.7% or 461,000) of claimants exhausted their entitlement to regular benefits. This represents a slight increase of 0.4 percentage points compared to 2013/2014 (34.3%), and is 7.9 percentage points higher compared to 2010/2011 (26.8%). The lower rate of exhaustion for claims completed in 2010/2011 is attributable to two factors: longer entitlement resulting from automatic adjustments to entitlement levels, linked to higher unemployment rates during the recession and subsequent recovery; and the EI temporary measures extending regular benefits introduced under the Economic Action Plan.[95]

As depicted in Chart 33, the volume of regular claimants who exhausted their entitlement has remained relatively stable over the past four years, ranging between 458,000 and 463,000 from 2011/2012 to 2014/2015.

Of claimants exhausting their EI regular entitlement in 2014/2015, 9.1% were able to establish a subsequent claim within 4 weeks. This proportion has increased every year since 2009/2010 when 5.2% of entitlement exhaustees re-qualified for a new claim. If re-qualifiers are removed from the equation, then the proportion of regular claimants who exhausted their entitlement and were unable to establish a new claim decreases to 31.5% (referred to as an adjusted entitlement exhaustion rate), which is less than the 34.7% of pure entitlement exhaustees mentioned previously. The majority of the analysis that ensues is based on the pure number of entitlement exhaustees.

[93] Exhaustee statistics are based on the fiscal year the claims were completed, not the fiscal year the claims were established.

[94] The benefit period is 52 weeks for most EI claimants, although it can be extended under certain circumstances.

[95] Refer to the *2012 EI Monitoring and Assessment Report* for analysis of Economic Action Plan measures.

Chart 33

Exhaustion Rate and Exhaustees, Canada, 2009/2010 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area(s) correspond to recessionary period(s) for Canada's economy.
Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

2.5.1.1 Entitlement Exhaustion by Demographics

While the national entitlement exhaustion rate remained stable from 2013/2014 to 2014/2015, there were mostly modest changes among the provinces and territories, and the different demographic groups. However, Yukon showed the largest change in entitlement exhaustion, more than doubling to 35.1% in 2014/2015 compared to 2013/2014 (17.4%). This can be attributed to a 8.7 week drop in average maximum duration, which was impacted by the introduction of a new unemployment rate calculation methodology that better represents labour market conditions, effective on October 12, 2014.[96]

Nunavut exhibited the highest entitlement exhaustion rate (42.2%) while Saskatchewan exhibited the lowest rate (28.3%). Table 33 presents entitlement exhaustion rates by various demographic groups for 2014/2015.

Newfoundland and Labrador exhibited the highest requalification rate at 24.3%, while Nunavut experienced the lowest rate (2.1%).

Women have higher entitlement exhaustion rates than men, as they accumulate on average fewer hours of insurable employment, resulting in fewer weeks of entitlement to regular benefits. Claimants aged 55 and older tend to have the highest entitlement exhaustion rate, which is likely attributable to the challenges they face in securing new employment following a job loss.

The likelihood of entitlement exhaustion varies for different categories of EI claimants. For instance, frequent claimants had an exhaustion rate of 38.7% in 2014/2015, a small increase compared to 2013/2014 (37.3%). Also, just over one-fifth of these claimants were able to re-qualify for a new EI claim. In comparison, entitlement exhaustion rates were 35.7% for occasional claimants, and 27.1% for long-tenured workers, while requalification rates were 5.6% and 3.0%, respectively.

[96] For more information on the new unemployment rate calculation methodology and its impact on duration levels, please see section 2.4.1.1.of this chapter.

Table 33

Exhaustion Rates, by Demographics Groups, Canada, 2012/2013 to 2014/2015

	Entitlement Exhaustion Rate (%)			Benefit Period Exhaustion Rate (%)		
	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Province and Territory						
Newfoundland and Labrador	26.9%	33.2%	37.7%	43.4%	39.4%	34.5%
Prince Edward Island	34.7%	45.1%	40.1%	31.7%	28.0%	27.6%
Nova Scotia	32.9%	39.5%	38.3%	30.2%	28.0%	25.7%
New Brunswick	26.5%	29.5%	30.5%	41.0%	37.8%	39.5%
Quebec	30.7%	33.2%	33.8%	27.8%	25.8%	26.7%
Ontario	35.2%	35.2%	35.6%	17.9%	18.9%	18.0%
Manitoba	32.1%	31.4%	33.3%	17.5%	19.4%	22.2%
Saskatchewan	26.9%	26.7%	28.3%	19.0%	21.2%	23.7%
Alberta	33.2%	31.4%	29.3%	13.2%	14.2%	15.8%
British Columbia	37.4%	38.3%	37.4%	18.3%	18.1%	20.8%
Yukon	15.0%	17.4%	35.1%	31.1%	25.0%	24.8%
Northwest Territories	34.3%	27.3%	30.2%	29.7%	29.0%	24.0%
Nunavut	35.6%	39.2%	42.2%	25.8%	21.1%	14.0%
Gender						
Men	30.4%	32.7%	33.2%	26.1%	25.2%	24.9%
Women	35.9%	36.7%	36.9%	21.1%	20.5%	21.4%
Age						
24 years and under (Youth)	31.4%	32.5%	32.1%	19.0%	18.0%	18.5%
25 to 44 years	30.9%	32.2%	32.1%	21.6%	21.1%	21.2%
45 to 54 years	31.3%	32.7%	33.7%	27.6%	26.8%	27.1%
55 years and older (Older Workers)	38.7%	41.2%	42.0%	28.0%	26.5%	26.6%
EI Claimant Category[1]						
Long-Tenured Workers	27.4%	28.1%	27.1%	19.7%	20.4%	21.6%
Occasional Claimants	35.4%	35.4%	35.7%	19.6%	19.6%	19.9%
Frequent Claimants	31.8%	37.3%	38.7%	39.5%	34.5%	34.2%
Seasonality						
Seasonal[2]	22.0%	25.8%	26.8%	37.2%	36.1%	36.2%
Non-Seasonal	37.1%	38.1%	38.3%	18.7%	17.6%	18.2%
Canada	**32.6%**	**34.3%**	**34.7%**	**24.1%**	**23.3%**	**23.6%**

1 Long-tenured workers are EI claimants who have paid at least 30% of the maximum annual EI premiums for 7 of the past 10 years and who, over the last 5 years, have collected EI regular or fishing benefits for 35 weeks or less. Frequent claimants are EI claimants who have had three or more claims for EI regular or fishing benefits and have collected benefits for a total of more than 60 weeks in the past 5 years. Occasional claimants are EI claimants who do not meet the requirements for either long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

2 Seasonal regular claims are those claims, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, by claimants who have established at least three regular or fishing claims in the last five years, two of which had to have started during the same period of year as the current claim. This period is defined as the 8 weeks before and 8 weeks after the current claim commenced, for a total window of 17 weeks.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

2.5.1.2 Entitlement Exhaustion by the Variable Entrance Requirement

Entitlement exhaustion rates are negatively correlated with the number of weeks of regular benefits entitlement, which is a function of both the number of hours of insurable employment accumulated and the regional unemployment rate.[97]

As illustrated in Table 34, in 2014/2015, entitlement exhaustion rates decreased significantly as the number of hours of insurable employment increased with the exception of claimants who accumulated 1,800 hours or more. For instance, 67.6% of regular claimants with 420 to 769 hours exhausted their entitlement, compared to 21.9% of regular claimants with 1,470 to 1,819 hours. The entitlement exhaustion rate for regular claimants with more than 1,820 hours was slightly higher at 25.2%, likely because those with more than 1,820 hours face a more significant job loss shock. These claimants may be long-tenured workers facing more significant challenges in finding new employment.

Table 34 also shows that entitlement exhaustion rates vary based on the unemployment rate, with rates ranging from 25.1% in regions with an unemployment rate of 16.1% or higher, to 36.3% in regions with an unemployment rate between 8.1% and 10.0%.

Exhaustion rates tend to be low when both the unemployment rates and the number of hours of insurable employment are high. Under these circumstances, regular claimants have a higher maximum duration of regular benefit weeks. For example, only 12.1% of regular claimants exhausted their benefit weeks, if they resided in regions with 16.1% or higher unemployment rates, and accumulated between 1,470 and 1,819 hours of insurable employment. In contrast, 71.8% of regular claimants exhausted their benefit weeks, if they resided in regions with unemployment rates between 8.1% and 10%, and accumulated between 420 and 769 hours of insurable employment.

Table 34

Regular Entitlement Exhaustion Rate, by Hours of Insurable Employment and Regional Unemployment Rate, Canada, 2014/2015

	Regional Unemployment Rate[1]					
	0,1% - 8.0%	8.1% - 10.0%	10.1% - 12.0%	12.1% - 16.0 %	16.1% or more	Average
Hours of Insurable Employment						
420 to 769 hours	63.0%	71.8%	68.3%	68.6%	51.7%	67.6%
770 to 1,119 hours	54.2%	56.4%	51.8%	34.9%	25.8%	51.9%
1,120 to 1,469 hours	31.1%	30.3%	25.9%	18.9%	15.8%	29.3%
1,470 to 1,819 hours	23.4%	22.3%	14.5%	14.7%	12.1%	21.9%
1,820 hours and higher	27.1%	25.8%	16.0%	14.8%	15.4%	25.2%
Canada	**34.0%**	**36.3%**	**34.1%**	**34.9%**	**25.1%**	**34.7%**

[1] Unemployment rates used for the Employment Insurance program are a moving average of seasonally adjusted monthly rates of unemployment produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

[97] Note that the exact number of weeks of entitlement depends on the effective regional unemployment rate at the time the claim was established and the number of hours worked in the qualifying period. For more details on EI regular benefits entitlement, refer to Table 2, Chapter 1 of the *2011 EI Monitoring Assessment Report*, at http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/ei/reports/mar2011/chapter1.shtml

2.5.1.3 Entitlement Exhaustion and Requalification Rates

The entitlement exhaustee requalification rate refers to regular claimants who exhaust their EI entitlement but are able to establish a new claim for EI benefits within four weeks. Similar to entitlement exhaustion rates, requalification rates vary significantly depending on a claimant's work force attachment (hours of insurable employment) and the regional unemployment rate. As shown in Table 35, the requalification rate for claimants who exhausted their entitlement with between 420 and 769 hours of insurable employment was 15.0% in 2014/2015, compared to 3.2% or less for claimants who established their claims with 1,470 or more hours of insurable employment. Similarly, 24.6% of entitlement exhaustees in regions with unemployment rates between 12.1% and 16.0% established a subsequent claim within four weeks after exhaustion, versus approximately 6.0% of entitlement exhaustees in regions with an unemployment rate of 8.0% or lower.

2.5.1.4 Entitlement Exhaustion of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits – Seasonal Claimants and Seasonal Gappers

Historically, entitlement exhaustion rates have always been lower for seasonal claimants than for non-seasonal claimants. That held true for claims completed in 2014/2015, as the entitlement exhaustion was at 26.8% for seasonal claimants and 38.3% for non-seasonal claimants (see Table 33).

The variance in exhaustion rates between seasonal and non-seasonal regular claimants is due to the fact that when seasonal claimants are laid off, most have a job lined up for the next season and will return to work at approximately the same time the following year. However, most non-seasonal regular claimants have to look for work once they are laid off, and are therefore more likely to rely on EI for longer periods and exhaust their benefit entitlement.

The level of entitlement and duration of regular benefits have a particular impact on seasonal claimants who have a combined work-benefit period of less than 52 weeks per year. This group of claimants is referred to as "seasonal gappers." These workers may go through a period where neither work income nor EI is available to them, if the seasonal job to which they are returning is not yet available when they exhaust their EI benefits.

Among individuals who completed claims in 2014/2015, there were 16,080 seasonal gappers, representing slightly over 1% of all regular claimants who completed a claim in 2014/2015. Seasonal gappers who completed claims in 2014/2015 averaged 18.9 weeks of work and 26.6 weeks of EI benefits, including the waiting period, resulting in an average gap of 6.5 weeks. Over half (56.2%) of seasonal gappers experienced a gap of less than 6 weeks, 26.7% a gap of 6 to 11 weeks and 17.1% a gap of 12 weeks or more.

Table 35

Requalification Rates for Entitlement Exhaustees, by Hours of Insurable Employment and Regional Unemployment Rate, Canada, 2014/2015

	Regional Unemployment Rate[1]					
	0,1% - 8.0%	8.1% - 10.0%	10.1% - 12.0%	12.1% - 16.0 %	16.1% or more	Average
Hours of Insurable Employment						
420 to 769 hours	7.0%	8.3%	15.9%	26.0%	24.6%	15.0%
770 to 1,119 hours	8.4%	11.1%	19.8%	35.7%	14.4%	12.3%
1,120 to 1,469 hours	9.9%	10.5%	19.3%	14.2%	10.3%	11.0%
1,470 to 1,819 hours	3.0%	2.9%	4.4%	6.1%	4.6%	3.2%
1,820 hours and higher	0.5%	0.5%	1.4%	0.8%	1.3%	0.6%
Canada	**6.0%**	**7.4%**	**15.7%**	**24.6%**	**16.2%**	**9.1%**

[1] Unemployment rates used for the Employment Insurance program are a moving average of seasonally adjusted monthly rates of unemployment produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

As mentioned in previous reports, the likelihood of becoming a seasonal gapper is higher in regions with high unemployment, where claimants require fewer hours to qualify for benefits, and there can be extended periods of unemployment between seasons. The Atlantic provinces were overrepresented in regard to seasonal gappers (27%), while only representing 15% of all regular claims completed in 2014/2015. For the same period, Ontario accounted for 21% of seasonal gappers, but was actually underrepresented as the province accounted for 30% of regular claims in Canada.

2.5.2 Benefit Period Exhaustion of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits

As stated previously, benefit period exhaustees refers to regular claims that reach their final week of the benefit period before all regular benefits are paid. Among all regular claims completed in 2014/2015, 23.6% (or 313,000) of claimants exhausted their benefit period before receiving their full entitlement of regular benefit weeks. This represents a slight increase from 2013/2014 (23.3%).

Benefit period exhaustion rates are influenced by variables affecting the duration of an EI claim, such as regular benefit entitlement, weeks worked while on claim and usage of special benefits. The relationship between these factors and the exhaustion of the benefit period is examined in further detail in section 2.5.4.

2.5.2.1 Benefit Period Exhaustion by Demographics

Among provinces and territories, there were fluctuations in the benefit period exhaustion rate in 2014/2015, with the largest increases occurring in Manitoba (+2.8 percentage points) and British Columbia (+2.7 percentage points), and the largest decreases occurring in Nunavut (-5.1 percentage points) and Northwest Territories (-5.0 percentage points), as shown in Table 33 in section 2.5.1.1. There were modest increases and decreases in the benefit period exhaustion rate across gender and all age groups. New Brunswick experienced the highest benefit period exhaustion rate (39.5%), while Nunavut exhibited the lowest rate (14.0%).

Men tend to have higher benefit period exhaustion rates than women, as they are generally entitled to more weeks of regular benefits. They are also more likely to work while on claim and defer EI benefits. Claimants aged 45 and older tend to have a higher benefit period exhaustion rate than younger claimants. Since 2010/2011, the benefit period exhaustion rate for claimants aged 45 and older decreased more significantly than for claimants under 45 years of age.

As shown in Table 33, the likelihood of exhausting the benefit period before full entitlement was paid varies greatly for different categories of EI claimants. For claims completed in 2014/2015, 21.6% of long-tenured workers and 19.9% of occasional claimants exhausted their benefit period, while 34.2% of frequent claimants exhausted their benefit period, of whom approximately six out of seven re-qualified for a new claim. Although the average duration of regular benefits for seasonal claimants is shorter than that for non-seasonal claimants, 36.2% of seasonal claimants exhausted their benefit period in 2014/2015 compared to 18.2% of non-seasonal claimants. The benefit period exhaustion rate for seasonal claimants has decreased slightly from its high in 2011/2012 at 38.8%, but remains higher than in 2009/2010 when it stood at 25.4%.

2.5.2.2 Benefit Period Exhaustion by the Variable Entrance Requirement

As illustrated in Table 36, benefit period exhaustion rates are moderately correlated with the number of hours of insurable employment used to establish the claim for benefit. Claimants who accumulated between 420 and 769 hours in 2014/2015 experienced a 11.4% benefit period exhaustion rate, compared to about 28%-29% of claimants who accumulated between 1,120 and 1,819 hours. However, it decreased to 22.6% for claimants with more than 1,820 hours. These are similar patterns to last year.

Benefit period exhaustion rates are positively correlated to the unemployment rate. It varied more significantly by unemployment rates than by hours of insurable employment in 2014/2015 as claimants from regions with an unemployment rate of 8.0% or lower experienced an average benefit period exhaustion rate of 19.4%. By comparison, claimants in regions with unemployment rates of 16.1% or higher incurred average benefit period exhaustion rates more than twice as high (42.4%).

Table 36

Benefit Period Exhaustion Rate, by Hours of Insurable Employment and Regional Unemployment Rate, Canada, 2014/2015

	Regional Unemployment Rate[1]					
	0.1% - 8.0%	8.1% - 10.0%	10.1% - 12.0%	12.1% - 16.0 %	16.1% or more	Average
Hours of Insurable Employment						
420 to 769 hours	9.4%	8.7%	7.6%	12.6%	23.3%	11.4%
770 to 1,119 hours	13.0%	15.3%	21.5%	38.0%	49.4%	19.4%
1,120 to 1,469 hours	23.7%	27.7%	36.4%	48.3%	51.3%	28.9%
1,470 to 1,819 hours	23.6%	26.6%	39.4%	51.4%	46.7%	27.9%
1,820 hours and higher	18.2%	21.3%	37.1%	40.9%	39.0%	22.6%
Canada	**19.4%**	**21.8%**	**29.4%**	**35.2%**	**42.4%**	**23.6%**

[1] Unemployment rates used for the Employment Insurance program are a moving average of seasonally adjusted monthly rates of unemployment produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Higher benefit period exhaustion rates in regions with high unemployment rate reflects a greater usage of EI benefits and a greater proportion of claimants living in these regions working while on claim. While approximately 51% of all regular claimants worked while on claim, the figure was significantly higher (60%) for claimants residing in regions with unemployment rates of 10.1% or higher. As outlined in section 2.3.1, claimants who work while on claim and have sufficient earnings can defer their week of EI benefits to a future week within the same benefit period.

2.5.2.3 Benefit Period Exhaustion and Requalification Rates

Compared to entitlement exhaustees whose requalification rate[98] was 9.1% in 2014/2015, benefit period exhaustees had an average requalification rate[99] of 70.5%, as shown in Table 37. The requalification rate has continuously increased since 2010/2011 when it stood at 58.2%. Requalification rates vary by demographics, as 85.2% of frequent claimants who exhausted their benefit period re-qualified for a new EI claim, compared to 59.5% of long-tenured workers.

Moreover, as shown in Table 37, benefit period exhaustees who had accumulated more hours of insurable employment and/or who lived in a region with a lower unemployment rate were less likely to re-qualify for a new EI claim in 2014/2015.

2.5.3 Profile of Claimants by Exhaustion Type (Entitlement and Benefit Period)

As stated previously, more than two-thirds of benefit period exhaustees re-qualified[100] for a new EI claim in 2014/2015. To do so, these claimants had to accumulate sufficient hours of insurable employment during their qualifying period, which corresponded to the benefit period that they exhausted. As shown in Table 38, nearly three-quarters (72%) of benefit period exhaustees worked while on claim and averaged 16.0 weeks of work.

On average, in 2014/2015, non-exhaustees used 13.1 weeks of regular benefits, while entitlement exhaustees used 27.7 weeks. Benefit period exhaustees used 18.7 weeks of regular benefits, a figure that was comparable to that for all regular claimants (19.2 weeks).

[98] The entitlement exhaustee requalification rate is the proportion of entitlement exhaustees establishing a new EI claim within 4 weeks of exhausting a prior EI claim.

[99] The benefit period exhaustee requalification rate is the proportion of benefit period exhaustees establishing a new EI claim within 4 weeks of reaching the final week of the benefit period (usually 52 weeks) before all benefits are paid.

[100] Regular claimants establishing a new EI claim within 4 weeks of reaching the final week of the benefit period (usually 52 weeks) before all benefits are paid are deemed benefit period exhaustee re-qualifers.

Table 37

Requalification Rates for Benefit Period Exhaustees, by Hours of Insurable Employment and Regional Unemployment Rate, Canada, 2014/2015

	Regional Unemployment Rate[1]					
	0.1% - 8.0%	8.1% - 10.0%	10.1% - 12.0%	12.1% - 16.0 %	16.1% or more	Average
Hours of Insurable Employment						
420 to 769 hours	63.9%	60.8%	74.3%	77.5%	83.3%	72.8%
770 to 1,119 hours	74.7%	73.9%	82.4%	87.0%	84.5%	79.4%
1,120 to 1,469 hours	81.2%	78.1%	83.9%	80.7%	83.7%	80.9%
1,470 to 1,819 hours	69.4%	64.6%	73.5%	73.8%	71.7%	69.1%
1,820 hours and higher	48.6%	45.9%	61.9%	69.8%	69.5%	53.1%
Canada	**67.8%**	**65.2%**	**75.3%**	**78.7%**	**79.3%**	**70.5%**

[1] Unemployment rates used for the Employment Insurance program are a moving average of seasonally adjusted monthly rates of unemployment produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

On average, non-exhaustees received 41.8% of their regular entitlement (i.e. weeks of benefits) with nearly two-thirds (62.1%) receiving less than 49.5% of their regular benefit entitlement. In comparison, entitlement exhaustees used all of their regular entitlement, by definition, while benefit period exhaustees used 56.0% of their regular benefits entitlement, with 56.2% of claimants using at least 50% of their regular benefits entitlement.

Working while on claim and receiving special benefits influence the benefit period exhaustion rate, since they lengthen claim duration. Of all benefit period exhaustees, 16.1% received special benefits in 2014/2015, a figure that was significantly higher than for all regular claimants (10.8%). When special benefits are combined with regular benefits, the probability of reaching the final week of the 52-week benefit period increases. However, those who collected special benefits were far less likely to re-qualify for a new EI claim as 38.7% of benefit period exhaustees who claimed special benefits re-qualified for a new claim, compared to 76.6% who did not.

2.5.4 Aggregated Exhaustion of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits

The aggregated exhaustion of EI regular benefits reflects all claims for which claimants ceased to receive EI regular benefits payments because all weeks of entitlement were paid or because the final week of the benefit period was reached. In 2014/2015, the aggregated exhaustion rate was 58.2%, a slight increase compared to 2013/2014 (57.6%). Removing claimants who are able to re-qualify for EI, the aggregate adjusted rate of exhaustion declines to 38.5%. The exhaustion rates examined and reported in this section reflect the proportion of regular claimants who no longer have access to EI regular benefits. However, it is important to note some of these individuals will have found or returned to work and as a result have no immediate need for EI regular benefits. There is insufficient administrative data to report on the proportion of claimants who exhaust benefits (entitlement or benefit period) and return to work within a short period of time.

Table 38

Profile of Claimants, by Exhaustion Type, Canada, 2014/2015

	All Regular Claims	Non-Exhaustees	Entitlement Exhaustees	Benefit Period Exhaustees
Exhaustion Rate	Not applicable[1]	Not applicable[1]	34.7%	23.6%
Gap To Next Claim				
Re-qualifiers (New Claim)	19.3%	1.1%	9.1%	70.5%
Non Re-qualifiers (No New Claim)	80.7%	98.9%	90.9%	29.5%
Adjusted Exhaustion Rate	Not applicable[1]	Not applicable[1]	31.5%	6.8%
Proportion of Claims Involving at Least One Week Worked While On Claim	50.6%	50.4%	36.2%	72.3%
Average Weeks Working While On Claim	11.5	7.9	12.0	16.0
Average Weeks of Regular Benefits Paid	19.2	13.1	27.7	18.7
Mixed Claims (Collected Special Benefits)	10.8%	8.8%	9.8%	16.1%
Percentage of EI Entitlement Used				
Less than 24.5%	17.7%	32.7%	Not applicable	13.7%
24.5% to less than 49.5%	19.1%	29.4%	Not applicable	26.2%
49.5% to less than 74.5%	15.2%	19.3%	Not applicable	29.0%
74.5% or more	48.0%	18.7%	100.0%	31.1%
Averaged Entitlement Used	63.0%	41.8%	100.0%[2]	56.0%

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] By definition, exhaustion rates are only applicable for exhaustee populations (entitlement and benefit period exhaustees).

[2] By definition, entitlement exhaustees have used all their entitled weeks of regular benefits.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

2.6 Connecting Canadians with Available Jobs Provision

The Connecting Canadians with Available Jobs (CCAJ) initiative, announced in Budget 2012, consists of a number of actions that were taken with the objective to better connect unemployed Canadians with jobs where they live. The CCAJ initiative was implemented in January 2013 and introduced the following four measures:

1. Enhancements to Job Alerts and labour market information to support job-search activities;
2. Legislative changes and new integrity measures to strengthen claimants' obligations to undertake a "reasonable job search" for "suitable employment";
3. Improved connections between the Temporary Foreign Worker Program (TFWP) and the EI program to ensure Canadians are considered before temporary foreign workers; and
4. Collaboration projects with interested provinces and territories to make employment supports available to EI claimants earlier in their claim.

2.6.1 Enhanced Job Alerts

EI claimants may, on a voluntary basis, sign up to receive daily Job Alerts, which include job postings and other labour market information. Launched on January 6, 2013 the Enhanced Job Alerts (EJA) service is a free email service that proactively sends subscribers new available jobs up to twice a day. The EJA service provides a comprehensive list of available jobs in an individual's chosen occupation(s) and community(ies) by incorporating job postings from Job Bank and private sector job boards. Claimants also receive additional labour market information, such as similar occupations for which they may be qualified, that can help them decide how and when to expand their job search. The EJA service is also available to individuals who are not EI claimants, but are interested in receiving job postings.

In addition to this Job Alerts service, there are other on-line tools available on the Job Bank website that provide valuable labour market information to help unemployed or underemployed individuals in making career decisions. Examples of available labour market information are occupational reports containing wages and outlooks, career tools to help analyze what careers a person may be interested in, as well as data on top advertised jobs.

From April 1, 2014 to March 31, 2015, there were 578 million job alerts (+392%) sent to 583,000 subscribers (+91.0%). In addition, 142,277 (-12.3%) employers created 1,265,057 (-13.7%) new job postings that were available through the Job Bank web site.

2.6.1.1 Job Alerts Exit Survey

The Job Alerts Exit Survey is a voluntary survey sent to a user when they unsubscribe from Job Alerts. All users who unsubscribe receive the survey with close to 70% of users completing it.

In 2014/2015, 104,989 users (+93.4%) completed the Job Alerts Exit Survey. Of those who responded, 34,208 (32.6%) indicated that they were EI claimants, while 19,892 (58.1%) of these claimants answered that they had found a job while subscribing to Job Alerts.

2.6.2 Employment Insurance Claimants' Responsibilities

Under the CCAJ initiative, changes were made to update the EI Regulations to clarify the responsibilities of EI claimants receiving regular and fishing benefits, by defining what constitutes a reasonable job search and suitable employment. The criteria used to define suitable employment include type of work, wages, commuting time, working conditions, hours of work and personal circumstances. Requirements regarding the type of work and wages vary based on a claimant's previous use of the EI program, as well as the time spent on claim. Under these definitions, EI claimants are categorized according to their use of the EI program. For more information regarding the national distribution of the regular claims by EI claimant category, please refer to section 2.1.2 of Chapter II.

2.6.2.1 Claimant Information sessions

In February 2013, Claimant Information (CI) sessions were re-designed and became tailored to each of the three EI claimant groups; frequent claimants, occasional claimants and long-tenured workers. Claimants directed to CI sessions are identified based upon local job-demand in their previous occupation and availability of work.

From April 1, 2014 to March 31, 2015, 10,195 CI sessions were held nationally, with 168,531 claimants directed to attend.

For analytical purposes, claimants who are directed to information sessions are compared to a random sample of claimants with similar attributes who are not directed to information sessions (e.g. control group). A review of claims that started from April 2013 to March 2014 and have since completed showed that EI claimants directed into CI sessions had on average 1 less week of benefits paid than those not directed to report and were 1.3 times more likely to report having found work.

2.6.2.2 Disqualification and Disentitlement

EI claimants have always been required to undertake a job search for suitable employment. In addition, the *Employment Insurance Act* stipulates that individual can be disentitled from EI benefits for a variety of reasons. The CCAJ initiative did not add new reasons or operational codes for disentitling a claimant. As such, there is no administrative data that precisely identifies EI claimants that have been denied benefits as a result of the regulations and CI sessions that were introduced as part of the CCAJ initiative. However, two specific disentitlements are closely related to the new regulations and the refined CI sessions, which can provide some insight in terms of the impact on EI claimants. In fiscal year 2014 a total of 1,250 disentitlements were imposed because claimants failed to search for work (1,070) or refused to accept suitable employment (180). This represents a small proportion (0.08%) of total EI regular and fishing claims established, and does not take into consideration that in some situations, benefits would have been reinstated once the claimant demonstrated they were fulfilling their responsibility.

2.6.3 Improved coordination between Employment Insurance and Temporary Foreign Worker programs

Measures to strengthen the links between the EI program and the Temporary Foreign Worker program were implemented as part of the CCAJ initiative. The improved coordination between the two programs is intended to better connect employers and those claiming EI and ensure qualified Canadians are considered before hiring temporary foreign workers.

2.6.4 Collaboration with Provinces and Territories

Budget 2012, under the CCAJ initiative, also included a commitment to "work with provincial and territorial governments to make employment supports available to EI claimants earlier in their claim period" to facilitate faster returns to work and savings to the EI Operating Account. In support of this commitment, ESDC developed collaboration projects with British Columbia and Manitoba in 2013 and, in 2013/2014, tested the impact of early interventions in the delivery of active measures on EI claimants. Results suggest that early intervention is most effective when focused on clients with relatively high re-employment potential.

2.7 Employment Insurance Regular Benefits and Seasonal Workers

2.7.1 Seasonal Workers

Due to definitional differences between seasonal claims and seasonal workers by different entities, it is possible to see variation in figures within this section. The Statistics Canada Labour Force Survey (LFS) defines seasonal workers as those whose employment is in an industry where employment levels rise and fall with the seasons.

According to the LFS, there were 423,100 seasonal workers in 2014/2015[101], a 2.0% decrease from 2013/2014. The number of seasonal workers has dropped to its lowest point since 2009/2010 (420,000), and remains slightly higher than the levels witnessed prior to the onset of the 2008 recession (418,900 in 2007/2008).

Seasonal workers represented 20.9% of all temporary workers and 2.8% of all employees in 2014/2015, reaching its lowest proportions in the last decade, according to the LFS. During the last decade, among all temporary workers, the proportion of seasonal workers has ranged between 20.9% and 23.7%; among all employees, the proportion of seasonal workers has fluctuated between 2.8% and 3.1%.

A study in seasonal employment[102] found that seasonal workers were more likely to be male, to have less education and to have fewer dependants than workers in general. These workers were also more prominent in the Atlantic provinces and in primary industries.

2.7.2 Seasonal Claims Made by Employment Insurance Regular Benefit Claimants

EI seasonal claimants are claimants who have established at least three regular or fishing claims in the last five years, two of which had to have started during the same period of year as the current claim. This period is defined as the 8 weeks before and 8 weeks after the current claim established, for a total window of 17 weeks. There were 446,000 seasonal claims in 2014/2015, of which 26,000[103] were from EI fishing claims. The analysis in the following subsections will focus on Seasonal Regular claims, excluding fishing benefits.

EI administrative data show that there were 420,000 seasonal regular claims in 2014/2015. These seasonal regular claims represented 31% of regular claims established. After increasing for the last five consecutive years, the share of seasonal claims returned to the pre-recession level of 2007/2008. Historically, labour market conditions have had less of an effect on the volume of seasonal claims than on the volume of non-seasonal regular claims, as shown in Chart 34.

As illustrated in Table 39, seasonal claims are more common among workers aged 45 and older, in the Atlantic provinces and Quebec, and in the goods sector. The construction, manufacturing and education industries account for over half of all EI seasonal regular claims.

In terms of volume, Quebec has the highest incidence of seasonality; the province accounted for 159,000 (37.9%) of all seasonal regular claims in 2014/2015, compared with 265,000 (29%) of all non-seasonal regular claims. Conversely, Ontario accounted for 97,000 (23%) of seasonal regular claims, and 294,000 (32%) of non-seasonal regular claims. The disparity is partially explained by differences in the seasonality of their Construction and Manufacturing industries. For instance, 47,000 (or 52%) of all regular claims in Quebec's Construction industry and 14,000 (30%) of all regular claims in Quebec's Manufacturing industry were seasonal in 2014/2015. In comparison, 23,000 (or 33%) and 5,000 (12%) of all regular claims in Ontario's Construction and Manufacturing industry, respectively, were seasonal. For the rest of Canada, 32,000 (or 30%) of all Construction and 17,000 (34%) of all Manufacturing claims were seasonal (see Chart 35).

---

[101] Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0079

[102] *HRDSC, An Evaluation Overview of Seasonal Employment: Update* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2009).

[103] Estimates for fishing claims are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Chart 34

Employment Insurance Seasonal Regular Claims[1], Canada, 2000/2001 to 2014/2015

[1] Seasonal regular claims are those claims, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, by claimants who have established at least three regular or fishing claims in the last five years, two of which had to have started during the same period of year as the current claim. This period is defined as the 8 weeks before and 8 weeks after the current claim commenced, for a total window of 17 weeks.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) Administrative Data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Chart 35

Employment Insurance Seasonal Regular Claims[1], by Industry and Province, Canada, 2014/2015

[1] Seasonal regular claims are those claims, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, by claimants who have established at least three regular or fishing claims in the last five years, two of which had to have started during the same period of year as the current claim. This period is defined as the 8 weeks before and 8 weeks after the current claim commenced, for a total window of 17 weeks.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) Administrative Data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

In 2014/2015, 6% of the Atlantic provinces' workers were seasonal, compared to just 3% in the rest of Canada. Similarly, Atlantic provinces also reported high volumes of seasonal regular claims, and collectively accounted for 24% of all seasonal regular claims compared to only 12% of all non-seasonal regular claims in 2014/2015.

To capture the regional distribution of seasonal regular claims, the ratio used is seasonal regular claims as a proportion of all regular claims. Using this ratio, 47% of all regular claims in the Atlantic provinces were seasonal in 2014/2015, compared to 28% for the rest of Canada. The high frequency of seasonal claims in the Atlantic provinces can be largely attributed to its goods-producing industries, of which 53% of the regular claims were seasonal, compared to 33% for the rest of Canada. Within the Atlantic provinces, the industries with the highest frequency of seasonal regular claims were as follows: Agriculture, Forestry and Hunting (68%), Manufacturing (57%) and Construction (47%).

Among provinces, Alberta had the lowest frequency of seasonal claims, as 13% of its regular claims were seasonal. In particular, Alberta's goods sector had a very low frequency of seasonal regular claims, 11%, compared with 53% in the Atlantic provinces' goods-producing industries. This stark contrast can be attributed to differences in industrial and economic conditions; historically, Alberta has had lower unemployment rates compared to the Atlantic provinces, and this was again true in 2014/2015, despite less favourable market conditions in the Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction industry (see Table 39).

In 2014/2015, about half of all seasonal regular claims were established in the third quarter of the fiscal year, between October and December (see Table 40). Further, 162,000 claims were initiated by men in the third quarter, representing 62% of all seasonal claims initiated by men and 39% of all seasonal regular claims. Seasonal patterns in claim establishment may vary significantly by gender and industry. Industrial analysis indicates that 64% of all seasonal regular claims in the goods sector, where male workers typically dominate, were initiated in the third quarter of 2014/2015; in all of 2014/2015, men accounted for 155,000 or 86% of all seasonal regular claims in the goods-producing industries. In 2014/2015, while 27% of all seasonal regular claims were initiated in the second quarter, women initiated 49% of all their seasonal regular claims in that quarter (between July and September). A large proportion, 52,000 claims, was initiated by women in the educational services industry (which includes teaching assistants, librarians, office staff, etc.) in that quarter. Interestingly, of the entire population of seasonal regular claims initiated by women in 2014/2015 (158,000), 41% were in the educational services industry.

2.7.3 Eligibility for Employment Insurance Regular Benefits among Seasonal Claimants

The Employment Insurance Coverage Survey (EICS) of Statistics Canada shows that eligibility for regular benefits among seasonal workers is higher than that for temporary non-seasonal workers[104] but lower than that for permanent full-time workers. In 2014, 84.6% of unemployed seasonal workers who had been paying premiums and then were laid off or quit with just cause were eligible for regular benefits. In comparison, 90.1% of full-time permanent workers were eligible for regular benefits, compared to 73.0% for temporary non-seasonal workers. A recent study,[105] based on the Canadian Out-of-Employment Panel Survey (COEP), further confirmed that seasonal workers are less likely than permanent full-time job separators (by 12 percentage points) to be eligible for EI regular benefits.

2.7.4 Duration of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits among Seasonal Claimants

In 2014/2015, the average maximum duration of seasonal regular claims was 30.3 weeks of regular benefits, consistent with the 30.6 weeks experienced in 2013/2014. Average maximum duration of seasonal regular claim has been declining since 2009/2010 when the average duration was 39.0 weeks, which included the additional weeks provided by the temporary measures introduced in Budget 2009/2010. The average maximum duration of regular benefits among seasonal regular claims is still slightly below the pre-recession level, which was 31.9 weeks in 2007/2008.

---

[104] The EICS defines temporary seasonal workers (or other non-standard workers) as people in non-permanent paid jobs that were temporary, term, contractual, casual or other non-permanent (but not seasonal) jobs. These unemployed people were not self-employed.

[105] HRDSC, *EI and Non-Standard Workers: Part-Time, Short-Term and Seasonal Workers* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2013).

Table 39

Employment Insurance (EI) Regular Claims[1] and EI Seasonal Regular Claims[2], Canada, 2014/2015

	Volume Distribution (number)			Volume Distribution (%)			Frequency (%)	
	Regular Claims	Seasonal Regular Claims	Non-seasonal Regular Claims	% of Regular Claims	% of Seasonal Regular Claims	% of Non-seasonal Regular Claims	Seasonal Regular Claims as a % of Regular Claims	Non-seasonal Regular Claims as a % of Regular Claims
Regions of Canada								
Atlantic Provinces	209,630	98,950	110,680	15.6	23.5	12.0	47.2	52.8
Rest of Canada	1,132,980	320,770	812,210	84.4	76.5	88.0	28.3	71.7
Newfoundland and Labrador	63,410	30,720	32,690	4.8	7.3	3.6	47.9	52.1
Prince Edward Island	16,560	8,580	7,980	1.2	1.9	0.8	51.6	48.4
Nova Scotia	60,730	25,560	35,170	4.5	6.2	3.8	42.5	57.5
New Brunswick	68,930	34,090	34,840	5.1	8.1	3.7	49.7	50.3
Quebec	423,840	159,240	264,600	31.5	38.0	28.6	37.6	62.4
Ontario	391,380	97,110	294,270	29.2	23.1	32.0	24.8	75.2
Manitoba	37,280	10,820	26,460	2.8	2.6	2.9	29.0	71.0
Saskatchewan	31,500	7,770	23,730	2.2	1.8	2.4	25.4	74.6
Alberta	105,780	13,700	92,080	8.1	3.3	10.2	13.0	87.0
British Columbia	139,040	31,370	107,670	10.3	7.4	11.6	22.6	77.4
Yukon	1,880	520	1,360	0.1	0.1	0.1	28.7	71.3
Northwest Territories	1,680	210	1,470	0.1	0.0	0.2	12.4	87.6
Nunavut	600	30	570	0.0	0.0	0.1	5.0	95.0
Gender								
Men	826,410	261,810	564,600	61.6	62.4	61.2	31.7	68.3
Women	516,200	157,910	358,290	38.4	37.6	38.8	30.6	69.4
Age								
15 to 24 years	129,700	10,540	119,160	9.7	2.5	12.9	8.1	91.9
25 to 44 years	592,390	154,680	437,710	44.1	36.9	47.4	26.1	73.9
45 to 54 years	323,840	120,920	202,920	24.1	28.8	22.0	37.3	62.7
55 years and over	296,680	133,580	163,100	22.1	31.8	17.7	45.0	55.0
Industries								
Goods-Producing Industries	511,030	180,310	330,720	38.1	43.0	35.8	35.3	64.7
Service-Producing Industries	748,370	220,260	528,110	55.7	52.5	57.2	29.4	70.6
Unclassified Industries	83,210	19,150	64,060	6.2	4.6	6.9	23.0	77.0
Canada	**1,342,610**	**419,720**	**922,890**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**31.3**	**68.7**

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

2 Seasonal regular claims are those claims, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, by claimants who have established at least three regular or fishing claims in the last five years, two of which had to have started during the same period of year as the current claim. This period is defined as the 8 weeks before and 8 weeks after the current claim commenced, for a total window of 17 weeks.

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Table 40

Employment Insurance Seasonal Regular Claims[1], by Quarter, Canada, 2014/2015

	Total Seasonal Regular Claims	Distribution of Seasonal Regular Claims by Quarter (%)			
		Q1 (April to June)	Q2 (July to September)	Q3 (October to December)	Q4 (January to March)
Regions of Canada					
Atlantic	98,950	14.1	20.5	50.3	15.2
Quebec	159,240	12.0	21.2	56.1	10.7
Ontario	97,110	9.4	35.0	42.6	13.0
Western	63,660	13.5	36.0	40.3	10.2
Territories	760	10.5	15.8	61.8	11.8
Gender					
Men	261,810	9.6	13.1	61.7	15.6
Women	157,910	16.3	48.6	28.5	6.6
Industries					
Goods-Producing Industries	180,310	7.6	12.7	63.9	15.9
Service-Producing Industries	220,260	16.1	38.5	36.5	9.0
Unclassified	19,150	9.1	18.1	57.9	14.8
Canada	**419,720**	**12.1**	**26.5**	**49.2**	**12.2**

[1] Seasonal regular claims are those claims, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, by claimants who have established at least three regular or fishing claims in the last five years, two of which had to have started during the same period of year as the current claim. This period is defined as the 8 weeks before and 8 weeks after the current claim commenced, for a total window of 17 weeks.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Compared with non-seasonal regular claimants, seasonal regular claimants tend to use less of their entitlement. On a per-claim basis, on average, seasonal regular claimants used 62% of their regular benefit entitlement for claims established in 2013/2014.[106] In comparison, non-seasonal regular claimants used 64% of their regular benefit entitlement for claims established in 2013/2014.

Correspondingly, the average actual duration of regular benefits among seasonal regular claimants is also shorter than that for non-seasonal regular claimants. The average seasonal regular claim established in 2013/2014 received 17.9 weeks of benefits, while non-seasonal regular claims received an average of 20.1 weeks. The same holds true for claims established in 2012/2013, as seasonal regular claims received an average of 18.1 weeks of benefits, while non-seasonal regular claims received an average of 20.3 weeks.

2.7.5 Overlapping Definitions of Seasonal and Frequent Claimants: Internal Analysis

The Connecting Canadians with Available Jobs (CCAJ) initiative, announced in 2012, introduced new EI claimant categories. The three new categories are long-tenured workers, frequent claimants and occasional claimants. Since then, frequent claimants are defined as claimants who have had three or more claims for EI regular or fishing benefits and received over 60 weeks of benefits in the past five years. While seasonal claimants are not officially defined in the *Employment Insurance Act* or *Employment Insurance Regulations*, for the purpose of this analysis seasonal claimants are claimants who have established at least three regular or fishing claims in the last five years, two of which had to have established during the same period of year as the current claim.[107]

[106] Data analysis is based on all completed claims initiated in 2013/2014 to ensure that all claims in question have been completed.

[107] This period is defined as the 8 weeks before and 8 weeks after the current claim commenced, for a total window of 17 weeks.

Table 41

Employment Insurance Frequent[1] and Seasonal[2] Claims, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Frequent	286,950	292,030	300,370	309,230	321,040	319,580	309,780	304,700
Seasonal	395,140	412,660	417,430	381,810	412,230	419,930	422,410	419,720

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Frequent regular claims are those claims, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, established by claimants who have had three or more claims for EI regular or fishing benefits and received over 60 weeks of benefits in the past five years.

2 Seasonal regular claims are those claims, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, by claimants who have established at least three regular or fishing claims in the last five years, two of which had to have started during the same period of year as the current claim. This period is defined as the 8 weeks before and 8 weeks after the current claim commenced, for a total window of 17 weeks.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Chart 36

Employment Insurance Frequent[1] and Seasonal[2] Regular Claims, Canada, 2014/2015

1 Frequent regular claims are those claims, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, established by claimants who have had three or more claims for EI regular or fishing benefits and received over 60 weeks of benefits in the past five years.

2 Seasonal regular claims are those claims, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, by claimants who have established at least three regular or fishing claims in the last five years, two of which had to have started during the same period of year as the current claim. This period is defined as the 8 weeks before and 8 weeks after the current claim commenced, for a total window of 17 weeks.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) Administrative Data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

The definitions of seasonal and frequent claimants overlap as they must have established three or more claims each in the past five years, but they do differ as per two criteria:

1. Frequent claimants are defined also on the number of weeks of EI regular or fishing received, while seasonal claimants are not; and
2. While there is a criterion of timing of the establishment of claims for seasonal claimants, this criterion does not apply for frequent claimants.

Analysis of frequent regular claimants and seasonal regular claimants shows that fewer claimants qualify as frequent regular claimants compared to seasonal regular claimants (see Table 41). This suggests several seasonal regular claimants do not meet the frequent regular claimant definition because they use less than 60 weeks of regular benefits. These claimants then fall into the occasional and long-tenured workers claimant categories. Conversely, more claimants meet the seasonal claimant definition because they use less than 60 weeks of regular benefits but establish their claim at about the same time of the year.

Deeper analysis shows that 254,000 regular claims met the definitions of both frequent and seasonal regular claims. This means that 51,000 of regular claims (305,000 – 254,000) only met the definition of frequent regular claims and that 166,000 of regular claims (420,000 – 254,000) only met the definition of seasonal regular claims (see Chart 36).

The distribution of seasonal regular claims among claimant categories shows that frequent regular claims accounted for 61% of seasonal regular claims in 2014/2015, while occasional regular claimant and long-tenured worker claims accounted for 29% and 10% of seasonal regular claims respectively (see Chart 37). Industrial analysis shows that across the country, the main difference between seasonal and frequent regular claims occurs in the Educational Services industry: 18% of seasonal claims were in this industry, compared with just 5% of frequent claims. Seasonal claims represent 52% of the Educational Services industry. Other large industrial breakdowns of regular claims that are similar between frequent and seasonal claimants: Construction industry claims accounted for 27% and 25% of frequent and seasonal claims respectively, while claimants from the Manufacturing industry represented 10% and 9% of frequent and seasonal claims respectively.

Additionally, seasonal regular claims make up 83% of frequent regular claims, while non-seasonal regular claims make up just 17% (see Chart 38). Conversely, seasonal regular claims make up just 17% and 16% of long-tenured workers and occasional claimants, respectively, while non-seasonal regular claims make up 83% and 84% of the two categories. Industrial analysis reveals that 49% and 23% of seasonal long-tenured regular claimants were employed in the educational services and construction industry, respectively. Correspondingly, 33% and 23% of seasonal occasional regular claimants were employed in these two industries.

Chart 37

Employment Insurance (EI) Seasonal Regular Claims[1] by EI Claimant Category, Canada, 2014/2015

[1] Seasonal regular claims are those claims, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, by claimants who have established at least three regular or fishing claims in the last five years, two of which had to have started during the same period of year as the current claim. This period is defined as the 8 weeks before and 8 weeks after the current claim commenced, for a total window of 17 weeks.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) Administrative Data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Finally, frequent regular claimants tend to qualify for EI with less hours of insurable employment than seasonal claimants: in the last three years, frequent regular claimants qualified for EI with 100 less hours than seasonal regular claimants (1,230 hours vs 1,126 hours). This may suggest that frequent regular claimants occupy more temporary and part-time positions than Seasonal Regular claimants.

2.8 Employment Insurance Regular Benefits and Labour Mobility

A significant movement of labour takes place in Canada, mainly from regions of high unemployment and low wages to regions of lower unemployment and higher wages. However, regional variations in unemployment rates that have persisted for decades continued during the 2008 recession and onwards, which potentially suggests that labour is not as mobile as the Canadian labour market requires, at least to some extent. Despite the fact that jobs may be available in other regions of the country, some workers are not able or prefer not to move, while others may not be aware of job opportunities outside of their region of residence. This situation contributes to regional pockets of high unemployment.

Subsection 2.8.1 analyzes labour mobility within Canada, primarily concerning the flow of migration between provinces and territories. Subsection 2.8.2 examines the current research surrounding the impact of the EI program on labour mobility decisions.

2.8.1 Labour Mobility within Canada

Demographic estimates from Statistics Canada on interprovincial mobility in 2014/2015 showed that only two provinces—Alberta (+31,600) and British Columbia (+13,600)—had positive net migration flows of population within the country, as shown in Chart 39. Ontario (-13,600), Quebec (-14,000) and Manitoba (-7,700) had the highest negative net migration flows of population.

Chart 38

Employment Insurance (EI) Seasonal Regular[1] and Non-seasonal Claims by EI Claimant Category, Canada, 2014/2015

[1] Seasonal regular claims are those claims established, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, by claimants who have established at least three regular or fishing claims in the last five years, two of which had to have started during the same period of year as the current claim. This period is defined as the 8 weeks before and 8 weeks after the current claim commenced, for a total window of 17 weeks.

[2] Long-tenured workers regular claims are those claims, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, established by claimants who have paid at least 30% of the annual maximum EI premium in at least seven of the past ten years and, over the last five years, have received 35 weeks or less of EI regular or fishing benefits.

[3] Occasional regular claims are those claims, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, established by claimants who do not fall into the long-tenured workers or frequent claimant EI claimant categories.

[4] Frequent regular claims are those claims, for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid, established by claimants who have had three or more claims for EI regular or fishing benefits and received over 60 weeks of benefits in the past five years.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) Administrative Data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Alberta is the only province that has experienced positive net migration every year since 2010/2011. Over the last five years combined, Alberta (+131,500), British Columbia (+18,800), and to a lesser extent, Yukon (+700), and Newfoundland and Labrador (+300) have had positive net migration flows, while the other provinces and territories experienced negative net migration flows.

The two most prevalent trends in interprovincial mobility in Canada are movement from east to west, and movement toward Alberta. According to analysis of migration data from Statistics Canada, among provincial residents who moved to another province in 2014/2015[108], 60% moved west, while the remaining 40% moved east. This trend has been consistent over the past six years.

In 2014/2015, Alberta was the preferred destination among all interprovincial migrants with 30% of them choosing Alberta as their province of destination. Most notably, Saskatchewan and British Columbia saw 49% and 52% of their out-migrants choose Alberta, respectively, while 32% of out-migrants from the Atlantic provinces chose Alberta as their destination province.

Alberta's growing economy may have attracted several individuals to migrate to the province. Over the last five years, Alberta has seen employment gains of 248,500 (+12%), with the largest growth occurring in the Construction industry (54,800 or +27%), the Mining, Oil and Gas Extraction industry (33,400 or +24%), and the Health Care and Social Assistance industry (31,300 or +14%).

[108] Out-migrants/in-migrants from/to the territories are excluded, since the majority of their migration pattern is south/north.

Chart 39

Interprovincial Mobility, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2014/2015

Note: Figures for 2014/2015 are preliminary.
Source: Statistics Canada, Estimates of Total Population, Canada, Provinces and Territories, CANSIM Table 051-0017.

Labour mobility (and in particular movement from east to west) is considered by many academics to have a positive impact on the national economy, insofar as it provides workers with the opportunity to access other labour markets and obtain a job that is suitable to their skill set. From a national perspective, interprovincial mobility is desirable when workers from provinces with high unemployment and an excess of labour supply move to provinces with a low unemployment rate and an excess of labour demand (i.e., labour shortages).[109]

A study by the Bank of Canada[110] examined the potential factors of regional migration within Canada and found that regional differences in employment rates and household incomes are positively related to migration flows (i.e., regions tend to receive migrants when their employment rates and median household incomes are higher than the region where the migrants originate from), while provincial labour market borders and language differences are negatively related (i.e., regions tend to receive fewer migrants from the region where the migrants originate from when they are separated by a provincial border or there is a language barrier). The authors suggest that if provincial labour market border barriers were removed (e.g., provincial licensing), labour mobility could potentially be easier for individuals which would have a positive impact on output growth for the country.

Another study[111] on interprovincial employment in Canada found that unemployment disparities incentivize employees to migrate or become interprovincial employees. Interprovincial employees are employees who accept jobs in other provinces while maintaining residence in their home province (e.g., commuting or fly-in/fly-out). In 2011, it was estimated that 420,000 individuals were classified as interprovincial employees (or roughly 3% of the paid Canadian workforce). The results of this study indicated that smaller provinces (e.g., the Atlantic

[109] André Bernard, Ross Finnie and Benoit St-Jean, *Interprovincial Mobility and Earnings* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2008).

[110] Davis Amirault, Daniel de Munnik, and Sarah Miller, *Explaining Canada's Regional Migration Patterns* (Ottawa, Bank of Canada Review, Spring 2013).

[111] René Morissette and Hanqing Qiu, *Interprovincial Employment in Canada, 2002 to 2011* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, Social Analysis and Modelling Division, 2015).

provinces) had a larger percentage of their paid workforce participating in interprovincial employment. From 2002 to 2011, roughly 10% of the paid workforce in Newfoundland and Labrador were interprovincial employees compared to only 1.7% in Ontario. The authors also found that total wages and salaries from interprovincial employment account for a substantial percentage of aggregate total wages and salaries for small provinces. For all employees residing in Newfoundland and Labrador in 2011, 8.5% of total wages and salaries for the province came from interprovincial employment with corresponding percentages of 6.2%, 4.5%, and 4.6% for Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, respectively. The study concludes that interprovincial employees were more likely to be men and under 25 years old.

While several factors can have an influence on an individual's decision to move to another province, including but not limited to job opportunities, education/school, or family reasons, the need to seek a higher standard of living is a driving force. According to a recent report[112] on skills shortages in Atlantic Canada, while the proportion of Atlantic employment with post-secondary education has increased, the fields of study or skills acquired may not necessarily meet the needs of employers in Atlantic Canada. The skills and education that are in-demand are changing due in large part to the restructuring of the labour market from being manufacturing-based to knowledge- and service-based. For example, from 2004 to 2012, the Atlantic region saw a loss of roughly 30,000 manufacturing jobs, matched by the creation of an equal number of jobs in health and social services. Although many skills are transferrable across employment sectors, a certain level of new skills and education are usually required. This level of training is typically costly and time consuming, which creates a shortage of in-demand workers for employers.

According to the same study, over the last decade, Atlantic Canada has lost on a net basis about 50,000 youth (15 to 29 years) to the rest of Canada, largely due to net outflows to Alberta. This can be attributed to a shortage of entry-level jobs in the Atlantic region which may also be discouraging the entry of well-qualified young people into the Atlantic labour market. However, even though a large number of young people are moving away from the Atlantic region, the authors suggest that most university students want to remain in the Atlantic region, but are forced to leave for higher earnings and employment opportunities.

2.8.2 Impact of the Employment Insurance Program on Labour Mobility

The employment insurance (EI) program supports labour mobility through the following two key policies:

1. If an individual is receiving EI benefits and decides to move to look for work, they will continue to receive EI benefits with no change in the level of benefits or the number of weeks of benefits that they are entitled to, as EI benefits are based on where the individual resides at the time the claim is established.
2. If an individual voluntarily leaves his or her job to follow a spouse, common-law partner or dependent child[113] to a new place, he or she will still be eligible to receive benefits.

Several studies over the past decade have looked at the determinants of labour mobility and how the EI program (e.g., variable entrance requirement) impacts the decision process to migrate for employment. Results of these studies indicate that the EI program does not appear to have a significant effect on mobility decisions,[114] while factors such as personal and regional labour market characteristics (e.g., age, gender, employment rates, population size, etc.), as well as moving costs, play a key role in such decisions.[115]

A 2011 study[116] concluded that among EI regular claimants, those in regions with a high unemployment rate (12.1% or higher) were more likely to commute to work from one EI economic region to another, but less likely to permanently move to another EI economic region; however, the overall effect of EI benefits on geographical attachment was very minimal.

Another study[117] compared the commuting and mobility patterns of EI recipients and non-recipients. The findings suggested that EI does not discourage workers from being mobile. EI recipients were found to be more likely than non-EI recipients to commute

---

[112] Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, *Is There a Skills Shortage in Atlantic Canada?* (Halifax: Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, 2013). Downloaded from https://www.apec-econ.ca/publications/view/?do-load=1&publication.id=231&site.page.id=2000

[113] An ill or injured dependent child may force a person or family to temporarily or indefinitely relocate in order to be closer to treatment centres.

[114] HRSDC, The Impact of EI Regional Boundary Revisions on Mobility in New Brunswick: Evidence from the LAD (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2010).

[115] André Bernard, Ross Finnie and Benoît St-Jean, *Interprovincial Mobility and Earnings* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2008).

[116] HRSDC, Regional Out-Migration and Commuting Patterns of Employment Insurance (EI) Claimants (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2012).

[117] HRSDC, Commuting and Mobility Patterns of Employment Insurance (EI) Recipients and Non-Recipients (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2011).

30 kilometers or more to work and more likely to work outside their census subdivision of residence. Also, following a job loss, EI recipients were more likely than non-EI recipients to move over 100 kilometers away.

In general, the available evidence suggests that EI is generally not a barrier to labour mobility, nor does it play a significant role in a person's decision to move to another province or to commute.

2.9 Impact of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits on Income Redistribution[118]

Similar to the impact analysis of total EI benefits on income redistribution conducted in section 1.6 of this chapter, this report also examines the impact regular benefits have on income redistribution.

To assess the level of income redistribution, the amount paid in regular benefits to each province or territory, selected demographic groups and industries is divided by the total amount of EI premiums collected. These regular benefits-to-contributions (B/C) ratios are then normalized so that the ratio for Canada is equal to 1.0.[119] The resulting ratios–the adjusted regular benefits-to-contributions ratios–for each jurisdiction, demographic group or industry indicate whether it received more in regular benefits than it contributed to the program, relative to Canada as a whole. In this section, the amount of EI premiums collected is based on the latest available Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) tax data, which are for 2013. Regular benefits data used for this analysis of B/C ratios are therefore for 2013 as well.

As contributions are not broken down by benefit type, the amount of EI premiums used to calculate the B/C ratios has been modified to ensure that the regular benefits-to-contributions ratio and the adjusted regular benefits-to-contributions ratio take into account the reduction in premiums related to special benefits, due to the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP) and the Premium Reduction Program (PRP). To factor in the QPIP, which reduces the premiums paid by employers and employees in Quebec,[120] and the PRP, which reduces the premiums paid by employers who offer their employees a short-term disability plan,[121] the regular benefits-to-contributions ratios (adjusted and non-adjusted) have been calculated based on an estimate of the employment insurance premiums that would have been paid by employees and employers in the absence of QPIP and PRP, rather than on the premiums that were actually paid.

A province or territory, demographic group or industry with an adjusted ratio higher than 1.0 means that the underlying population is a net beneficiary of the EI program, while those with an adjusted ratio lower than 1.0 are net contributors to the program, relative to Canada as a whole. Annex 2.23 provides a detailed account of EI premiums collected and regular benefits paid across different provinces and territories, demographic groups (sex and age group) and industries. The following sections summarize the key findings.

2.9.1 Adjusted Regular Benefits-to-contributions Ratios, by Province and Territory[122]

The Atlantic provinces, Quebec and Yukon continued to be net beneficiaries of regular benefits from the EI program in 2013, as they were in previous years, with adjusted ratios greater than 1.0. By contrast, Ontario, the Western provinces and Northwest Territories remained net contributors, with adjusted ratios below 1.0 (see Chart 40). Nunavut was the only jurisdiction with an adjusted ratio equal to 1.0.

Generally, provinces with higher regular benefits-to-contributions ratios also have higher unemployment rates. In 2013, the Atlantic provinces had the highest unemployment rates in the country, while rates were lower in the Western provinces due to the region's strong economic performance.

---

118 This section examines the impact of EI regular benefits on income redistribution. Section 1.6 of Chapter II provides a similar analysis for the impact of total EI benefits.

119 For ease of analysis, the benefits-to-contributions ratios have been adjusted so that the national figure equals 1.0. Provincial and territorial, demographic and industry figures have been normalized to enable a standardized base for comparative purposes. In the absence of this adjustment, the ratio for Canada would be lower than 1.0, because the numerator takes into account only regular benefits and, therefore, does not include other types of benefits (e.g. special benefits). If all EI benefits were considered, the ratio for Canada would be closer to 1.0.

120 Since 2006, Quebec has paid parental, adoption, maternity, and paternity benefits under the QPIP, and they replace the same type of special benefits provided by the EI program. For this reason, the premium rate is lower in Quebec for employees and employers than elsewhere in Canada because the province itself collects the premiums to finance its plan.

121 The PRP reduces EI premiums of employers when their employees are covered by a short-term disability plan that meets or exceeds certain requirements established by the Canada Employment Insurance Commission.

122 Provincial and territorial B/C ratios are determined by the location of employers for premiums and by the residence of claimants for benefits. As a result, it is possible that some provincial and territorial B/C ratios may be under- or overstated if contributions are being accredited to a province or territory, while the employment is actually situated in another province or territory.

Chart 40

Adjusted Regular Benefits-to-contributions Ratio and Unemployment Rate, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2013

Note: The unemployment rates for Yukon, Northwest Territories and Nunavut are not available.
Source: Canada Revenue Agency [CRA], T4 slips with employment income (for data on contributions); ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data (for data on benefits); and Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0087 (for data on unemployment rates). CRA data are based on a 10% sample of T4 slips with employment income, and ESDC data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

2.9.2 Adjusted Regular Benefits-to-contributions Ratios, by Gender and Age

Older workers (55 years and older) were net beneficiaries of regular benefits in 2013, with an adjusted regular benefits-to-contributions ratio equal to 1.2. This is consistent with the findings of an evaluation study,[123] which showed that older workers were generally more likely to be net beneficiaries of regular benefits.

Men were net beneficiaries with an adjusted regular benefits-to-contributions ratio equal to 1.2. However, women (adjusted regular B/C ratio of 0.8) were net contributors to the EI program in 2013 when considering regular benefits only, in contrast to their status when considering all EI benefits (adjusted total B/C ratio of 1.1). This is in line with unemployment rates being higher among males than females.

2.9.3 Employment Insurance Regular Benefits-to-contributions Ratios, by Industry

In 2013, the goods-producing industries, as a whole, were net beneficiaries of regular benefits from the EI program, with an adjusted regular benefits-to-contributions ratio of 1.8, while the services-producing industries were net contributors to regular benefits, with an adjusted ratio of 0.8. As described in Chapter I and section 2.1 of this chapter, in 2014/2015, the goods-producing industries comprised 22% of employment and 38% of all regular claims, indicating that they were overrepresented among EI regular claims. Conversely, the service sector comprised 78% of employment and 56% of all regular claims, indicating that the services-producing industries were underrepresented among EI regular claims.

[123] HRSDC, *EI Payments and the GIS System* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2009).

The goods sector includes some industries with a large share of seasonal workers who are more likely to be laid off and collect regular benefits, such as in the Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting industry (adjusted B/C ratio of 4.7), and the Construction industry (adjusted B/C ratio of 2.9) [see Chart 41]. These goods-producing industries were significant net beneficiaries of regular benefits in 2013, as in previous years.

Within the service sector, two industries were net beneficiaries of regular benefits from the program, with an adjusted regular benefits-to-contributions ratio larger than 1.0. These two industries were the Business, Building and Other Support Services industry (B/C ratio of 1.3), and the Accommodation and Food Services industry (B/C ratio of 1.3).

Chart 41

Adjusted Regular Benefits-to-contributions Ratio, by Industry, Canada, 2013

Source: Canada Revenue Agency [CRA], T4 slips with employment income (for data on contributions); and ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data (for data on benefits). CRA data are based on a 10% sample of T4 slips with employment income, and ESDC data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

3. Employment Insurance Fishing Benefits

Employment Insurance (EI) fishing benefits were created in 1956 and are paid to eligible self-employed fishers who do not meet the eligibility requirements for EI regular benefits.

For the purposes of these benefits, a self-employed fisher is defined as a self-employed person engaged in fishing (other than for their own sport). This definition includes a person engaged in one of the following activities:

(i) making a catch;

(ii) any work incidental to making or handling a catch (such as loading, unloading, or transporting the catch made by the crew of which the person is a member, or preparing, repairing and laying-up the fishing vessel or fishing gear used by that crew), provided the person is also engaged in making the catch;

(iii) the construction of a fishing vessel for their own use or for the use of the crew of which the person is a member in making a catch.

The amount paid in fishing benefits is driven by three key indicators: the number of claims, the average weekly benefit rate (i.e. the level of benefits) and the duration of benefits. In general, an increase in one of these indicators will have a positive impact on the total amount paid. The number of claims and amount paid are discussed in the next section (Section 3.1), while the level and duration of benefits are analyzed in Sections 3.3. and 3.4. In these sections, fishing claims refer to claims for which at least one dollar of fishing benefits was paid.

3.1 Employment Insurance Fishing Claims and Amount Paid

The number of new fishing claims established in 2014/2015 increased by 1.5% compared to 2013/2014, a year that saw a 14-year historic low. New claims numbered 27,587 in 2014/2015, compared to 27,175 the previous year (see Chart 42). The general downward trend in the past few years is strongly correlated with the decrease in the number of commercial fishing licence holders in Canada observed between 2003 and 2013. This number had been decreasing almost continuously every year, going from 27,600 licences in 2003 to 21,500 in 2013.[124]

Moreover, in 2014–2015, an average of 11,200 claimants were receiving fishing benefits each month, up 0.6% from 11,130 claimants in 2013/2014, according to Statistics Canada.[125] This number is the number of EI claimants who received at least one dollar in fishing benefits during the reference period within the given month (usually the week of the 15th day of the month). The number is affected by the inflow of new EI claimants and the outflow of EI claimants no longer receiving fishing benefits, mainly because they have exhausted the number of weeks of benefits to which they were entitled or because they have returned to work.

Usually, EI claims and the number of claimants tend to change in the same direction, except when there is a change in the duration of benefits or a large, sudden jump or decrease in the number of claims. During an economic shock, the number of claims increases faster than the number of claimants because there is a lag between the time that the new claims are received and the time that the benefit period is established and benefits are payable. Conversely, if the number of claims decreases, the number of claimants will remain high for a time, because of earlier claims for which benefits continue to be paid, until the benefits are exhausted or the claimants find work.

The amount paid in benefits increased to $256 million in 2014/2015, an increase of 3.1% over the $248 million paid in 2013/2014. The number of fishing claims and the amount paid in fishing benefits in 2014/2015 both represent only 2% of all EI claims and the total amount paid in EI benefits.

3.1.1 Employment Insurance Fishing Claims and Amount Paid, by Province and Territory, Gender and Age

The number of new fishing claims established in the Atlantic provinces varied very little in 2014/2015. These provinces accounted for 80% of all fishing claims, a proportion similar to the three previous fiscal years (81% each time). The main change was in British Columbia where the number of claims established increased by 18.2% in 2014/2015 compared to the previous year. The number of claims in 2014/2015 in this province simply returned to the average level seen between 2009/2010 and 2011/2012, whereas the claims established in 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 were below the historical average.

[124] 2013 is the last year of data available from Fisheries and Oceans Canada.

[125] Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Statistics, CANSIM Table 276-0020.

Chart 42

Employment Insurance Fishing Claims[1] and Amount Paid, Canada, 2004/2005 to 2014/2015

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of fishing benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) adminitrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data, except for amount paid, which is based on a 10% sample.

Newfoundland and Labrador (with 11,160 claims established) accounted for 40% of all claims in Canada, followed by Nova Scotia (5,185 claims established or 19% of the total), British Columbia (3,124 claims or 11%), Prince Edward Island (2,844 claims or 10%), New Brunswick (2,791 claims or 10%) and Quebec (1,390 claims or 5%).

In 2014/2015, the amount paid in fishing benefits in the Atlantic provinces represented 78% of fishing benefits paid in Canada. Of the $256 million paid in EI fishing benefits, the fishers of Newfoundland and Labrador received the largest share ($99 million or 39%), followed by those of Nova Scotia ($50 million or 20%), British Columbia ($32 million or 12%), New Brunswick ($27 million or 10%), Prince Edward Island ($14 million or 9%) and Quebec ($13 million or 5%).

In 2014/2015, men were responsible for 82% of fishing claims and received 83% of the amount paid (the same proportions as in the past). It should be noted that the proportion of claims established for women varied enormously from one province to another. This proportion went from a minimum of 5% in Quebec to 24% in Newfoundland and Labrador and Prince Edward Island (see Table 42).

Population aging demographics has affected the fishing workforce in recent years. Although the number of fishing claims that have been established has decreased over time, older workers (55 and older) have made a growing number of claims each year since 2000/2001, and 2014/2015 (+6.8%) was no exception. In 2014/2015, older workers were responsible for 36% of all fishing claims that were established. In the last six years, their share of fishing claims has increased by 7 percentage points (it was 29% in 2009/2010).

Conversely, the number of claims established for core age workers (25 to 54 years), which represented 60% of all new fishing claims in 2014/2015, decreased by 1.9%. This was the third consecutive annual decrease. The proportion of new claims established for workers from this age group declined gradually each year between 2009/2010 and 2014/2015. The decrease was of 7 percentage points, from 67% in 2009/2010 to 60% in 2014/2015. Within this age group, workers aged 25 to 44 experienced a slightly greater decrease than the 45 to 54 age group, since the proportion in the first group dropped from 35% to 30% over the same period, compared to a 32% to 30% decrease for those aged 45 to 54 years.

Table 42

Proportion of Employment Insurance Fishing Claims[1] Established for Men and Women, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2014/2015

Province and Territory	Claims Established for...	
	Men	Women
Newfoundland and Labrador	76%	24%
Prince Edward Island	76%	24%
Nova Scotia	91%	9%
New Brunswick	92%	8%
Quebec	95%	5%
British Columbia	82%	18%
Other Provinces and Territories	80%	20%
Canada	**83%**	**17%**

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of fishing benefits were paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data.

The number of new claims established for young workers (24 years and under) remained low, accounting for only 4% of all EI fishing claims in 2014/2015.

The distribution of amount paid follows a similar pattern. Older workers collectively received 10.8% more in fishing benefits in 2014/2015 compared to the previous fiscal year, and received 36% of all benefits paid in 2014/2015 (representing an increase of 8 percentage points compared to 2009/2010). Core age fishers, who received 60% of fishing benefits (a decrease of 7 percentage points compared to 2009/2010), saw the total amount of benefits paid to them drop by 0.5 % in 2014/2015, following two annual decreases of more than 4.0% in 2012/2013 and 2013/2014. Finally, the amount paid in EI benefits to young self-employed fishers represented only 4% of the overall fishing benefits paid in 2014/2015.

3.1.2 Employment Insurance Fishing Claims and Amount Paid, by Claimant Category[126] and Employment Insurance Economic Region

Fishing benefits are seasonal. Nearly 9 out of 10 claims (88%) in 2014/2015 were established for frequent claimants, whereas 11% of claims were established for occasional claimants, and less than 1% of claims for long-tenured workers. The amount paid in benefits is distributed in the same proportions, which remained relatively stable over the past several years.

Most people who receive EI fishing benefits live in rural communities. As shown in Chart 43, fishing claims are made mainly by fishers residing in EI economic regions with small populations. Each point on the chart represents an EI economic region, and coastal regions with a minimum of 100 fishing claims in 2014/2015 (represented by the blue points) are almost all in the lower section of the chart, that is, in the section with the sparsely populated areas, with the exception of the economic region of Vancouver. This is in contrast to the situation observed with respect to regular claims, which are distributed among economic regions (represented by black plus signs) relatively proportionately to the size of their population, whether they are large (such as Toronto, Montreal or Vancouver) or small. These findings suggest that fishing benefits account for a substantial share of the rural economy of coastal regions. This is particularly true for the economic region of Newfoundland/Labrador, which dominates the country with a proportion of 39% of new fishing claims established in Canada in 2014/2015, while it represents only 1% of the Canadian population.

[126] The three EI claimant categories are the following: long-tenured workers, occasional claimants and frequent claimants. Long-tenured workers are EI claimants who have paid at least 30% of the maximum annual EI premiums in 7 of the past 10 years and who, over the last five years, have collected EI regular or fishing benefits for 35 weeks or less. Frequent claimants are EI claimants who have had three or more EI regular or fishing claims and have collected benefits for a total of more than 60 weeks in the past five years. Occasional claimants are EI claimants who do not meet the requirements for either long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

Chart 43

Employment Insurance Economic Regions and Coastal Economic Regions, by Share of Canadian Population and Share of Employment Insurance Claims[1], Canada, 2014/2015

Coastal Economic Regions, by share of fishing claims the region represents (includes only coastal Economic Regions with at least 100 fishing claims established)

All Employment Insurance Economic Regions, by share of Employment Insurance claims the region represents

Note: Employment Insurance Economic Regions where borders were changed in 2014/2015 are not reflected in this chart.

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurane was paid (regular or fishing benefits).

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey (for data on population); and ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data (for data on EI claims). ESDC data is based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data, except for fishing claims which are based on a 100% sample.

3.2 Coverage, Eligiility and Access to Employment Insurance Fishing Benefits

3.2.1 Coverage and Eligibility for Employment Insurance Fishing Benefits

To be covered by EI fishing benefits, an individual must meet the definition of a self-employed fisher and pay EI premiums during the qualifying period (usually the 31-week period prior to making a claim). We estimate that the EI Program covers approximately 20,000 to 21,000 self-employed fishers[127].

Eligibility for fishing benefits is based on the insurable earnings from fishing, rather than the number of hours of insurable employment (the hours worked), as is the case for other types of EI benefits.[128] To be eligible to receive fishing benefits, applicants must be ineligible to receive regular EI benefits and must have earned, during their qualifying period, minimum insurable earnings ranging from $2,500 to $4,200 as a self-employed fisher, depending on the regional rate of unemployment in the EI economic region where they live (see Table 43)[129]. These income thresholds have remained the same since 1996.

[127] According to Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) data, 21,950 taxpayers reported fishing income in 2013, and 93% of them (20,400 individuals) had paid EI premiums (CRA data are based on a 10% sample of T1 tax data).

[128] See section 1 of the Program Overview that precedes chapter I for information on EI access requirements.

[129] Additional information on the amount that fishers must earn in order to qualify for fishing benefits is available in Service Canada's *Employment Insurance Benefits for Fishers* publication at http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/ei/publications/fishing.pdf.

Table 43

Minimum Threshold of Insurable Earnings for Employment Insurance Fishing Benefits, by Regional Unemployment Rate, Canada, 2014/2015

Regional Unemployment Rate[1]	Insurable Earnings
6.0% or Lower	$4,200
6.1%–7.0%	$4,000
7.1%–8.0%	$3,800
8.1%–9.0%	$3,600
9.1%–10.0%	$3,400
10.1%–11.0%	$3,200
11.1%–12.0%	$2,900
12.1%–13.0%	$2,700
13.1 or Higher	$2,500

[1] Unemployment rates used for the EI program are moving averages of seasonally adjusted monthly unemployment rates produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

Source : *Employment Insurance Regulations (fishing)*, section 8.

Claimants who qualify for fishing benefits may receive benefits for a maximum of 26 weeks per claim, with the possibility of establishing two claims per year: one in the winter and another in the summer (since there are two separate qualifying and benefit periods for fishing benefits: a winter qualifying period that corresponds to the winter fishing season, for which the benefit period can start in April, and a summer qualifying period that corresponds to the summer fishing season, for which the benefit period can start in October).

However, if an individual has just started working as a self-employed fishers or is returning to fishing after an absence of a year or more preceding the qualifying period, he or she is considered as a new-entrant/re-entrant (NERE) and must earn at least $5,500 in insurable earnings from self-employed in fishing to qualify for fishing benefits.

For roughly the last ten years, over 95% of fishers who have had a fishing claim established qualified to receive these benefits with insurable earnings above $5,500, which is the minimum eligibility requirement for NERE fishers. In 2014/2015, this proportion was 99% (see Chart 44).

3.2.2 Accessibility to Employment Fishing Benefits

Although 27,587 new claims for fishing benefits were established in 2014/2015, only 19,732 fishers had a claim established during this period, which represented an increase of 416 fishers (+2.2%) since 2013/2014. The large difference between the number of fishing claims and the number of fishers making these claims is explained by the fact that some fishers are active in both fishing seasons (winter and summer) and are eligible for fishing benefits twice a year. As a result, some fishers made two claims in 2014/2015.

Among the provinces leading the fishing activities in Canada in 2014/2015, there was a year-over-year increase in the number of fishers who had a claim established in British Columbia (+493 for a total of 3,081 fishers), New Brunswick (+26 for a total of 1,951 fishers), Nova Scotia (+9 for a total of 3,805 fishers) and Prince Edward Island (+8 for a total of 1,904 fishers). Newfoundland and Labrador (-118 for a total of 7,172 fishers) and Quebec (-13 for a total of 828 fishers) were the only provinces that posted decreases in the number of fishers who had fishing claims in 2014/2015.

In 2014/2015, 2,596 fishers (13% of the total) had a fishing claim established during the winter qualifying period only, while 9,284 fishers (47% of the total) did so during the summer qualifying period only. Moreover, during the same period, 7,852 fishers (40% of the total) made more than one fishing claim. As a result, the number of claims from individuals who made multiple claims (15,707) accounted for more than half (57%) of all fishing claims that were established in 2014/2015. Compared to 2013/2014, the number of fishers who had only a single claim established in 2014/2015 increased by 420 (+3.7%), while the number of fishers who had multiple claims dropped by only 4 (-0.1%).

The Atlantic Provinces and Quebec accounted for 98% of all fishers who made multiple fishing claims. The number of fishers who had multiple claims established varied as follows in 2014/2015: Newfoundland and Labrador (+60 for a total of 3,987 fishers), New Brunswick (+13 for a total of 839 fishers), Prince Edward Island (+1 for a total of 939 fishers), Quebec (-6 for a total of 562 fishers) and Nova Scotia (-48 for a total of 1,380 fishers). The fishers in Quebec and Newfoundland and Labrador were most likely to be active in both seasons, as 68% and 56% of claimants in these provinces, respectively, made multiple fishing claims in 2014/2015.

Chart 44

Employment Insurance Fishing Claims[1], by Insurable Earnings, Canada, 2014/2015

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of fishing benefits was paid.
Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data.

Table 44

Denominator for the Calculation of Employment Insurance Fishing Benefits, by Regional Unemployment Rate, Canada, 2014/2015

Regional Unemployment Rate[1]	Denominator
6.0% or Lower	22
6.1%–7.0%	21
7.1%–8.0%	20
8.1%–9.0%	19
9.1%–10.0%	18
10.1%–11.0%	17
11.1%–12.0%	16
12.1%–13.0%	15
13.1 or Higher	14

[1] Unemployment rates used for the EI program are moving averages of seasonally adjusted monthly unemployment rates produced by Statistics Canada, in accordance with Section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

Source : *Employment Insurance Regulations (fishing)*, Section 8.2.

3.3 Level of Employment Insurance Fishing Benefits

The weekly benefit rate for fishers is calculated by dividing the total insurable earnings from fishing during the qualifying period (usually the 31-week period prior to making a claim) by the divisor that corresponds to the unemployment rate of the EI economic region in which the claimant lives (see Table 44), then by multiplying the result by the earnings replacement rate of 55%, without exceeding the allowed maximum weekly benefit, which was $514 (in 2014) and $524 (in 2015) [see the example in the sidebar].

The average weekly fishing benefit rate increased by 4.1%, from $465 in 2013/2014 to $484 in 2014/2015. With this increase, the average weekly benefit rate for fishers remained significantly higher than that paid to regular claimants ($434), as has been the case for a number of years, by about 10%. Over the past few years, average weekly fishing benefit rates have tended to be systematically lower in British Columbia than in the other provinces (gap of 5 to 10% compared to the national average). The same trend was observed in 2014/2015.

The average weekly fishing benefit rate remained close to the maximum weekly benefit rate of $514 (in 2014) and $524 (in 2015). The proportion of benefit claims for which fishers received the maximum benefit rate increased from 67% in 2013/2014 to 75% in 2014/2015. This proportion is much higher than for regular claimants who received the maximum benefit rate (47% in 2014/2015).

In part, this is because in 2014/2015, 59% of self-employed claimants who had a fishing claim lived in an economic region with an unemployment rate higher than 13%; in addition, they represented almost two-thirds (64%) of all fishing claims that were established. In regions with a high unemployment rate, the divisor used to calculate weekly earnings is lower, resulting in a higher benefit rate, which increases the likelihood of receiving the maximum benefit rate.

In comparison with regular claimants who received an average of $6,950 in regular benefits in 2014/2015, fishers who established a claim in 2014/2015 received an average of $10,646 in fishing benefits, while fishers who established two claims in 2014/2015 received an average of $9,776 for the first claim and of $8,754 for the second claim, averaging a total of $18,530.

Example:

Calculation of the weekly fishing benefit

In 2015, Jean earned $9,865 as a self-employed fisher during the 31 weeks of his qualifying period. The rate of unemployment in his region of residence is 11.5%; the divisor is therefore 16. If we divide his fishing earnings of $9,865 by 16, we obtain weekly insurable earnings of $616.56. Jean will therefore receive $339 a week in fishing benefits, that is, 55% of $617, which is lower than the maximum weekly benefit ($524 in 2015). If Jean's weekly insurable earnings had been $1,000, Jean would have received the maximum weekly benefit of $524 (and not 55% of $1,000, or $550).

3.3.1 Working while on claim

EI administrative data indicate that, of all the weeks of benefits paid to fishers in 2014/2015, 10% of these weeks were paid to claimants who worked during the week in question. As mentioned in Section 2.3.1.3 of chapter II, this proportion is lower than the proportion observed for regular benefits but higher than the proportion for parental and compassionate care benefits.

3.4 Maximum Duration and Actual Duration of Employment Insurance Fishing Benefits[130]

The maximum duration of the fishing benefits is established at 26 weeks per claim, regardless of the claimant's region of residence.

In 2014/2015, the average actual duration of fishing benefits was 20.7 weeks (preliminary data),[131] compared to 20.8 weeks in 2013/2014 and 20.5 weeks in 2012/2013. Among the provinces leading the fishing activities in Canada, British Columbia, whose fishers generally fish for only a single season and historically have the longest average actual duration of benefits, had an average of 23.2 weeks, slightly up from 2013/2014 (22.8 weeks). The average actual duration of benefits in the Atlantic provinces and Quebec varied between 19.5 and 20.7 weeks per claim, slightly down from 2013/2014 (between 19.8 and 21.0 weeks).

Fishers who had a single claim in 2014/2015 received an average of 24.7 weeks of fishing benefits, compared to 24.8 weeks in 2013/2014 and 24.5 weeks in 2012/2013. Fishers who had two claims received benefits for an average of 20.3 weeks for their first claim (compared to 20.8 and 20.1 weeks in 2013/2014 and 2012/2013 respectively) and for 18.2 weeks for the second claim (compared to 17.8 and 18.0 weeks in 2013/2014 and 2012/2013 respectively), which represents an overall average of 38.6 benefit weeks in total (compared to 38.6 and 38.0 weeks in 2013/2014 and 2012/2013 respectively).

[130] Previous *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Reports* presented data on the actual duration of EI fishing benefits with a one-year delay from the period covered by the report in order to ensure that all claims were complete.

Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, data on the actual duration of fishing benefits will be reported for the year covered by the report in order to provide timely, relevant and consistent information. This was made possible due to methodological improvements and increased availability of historical data. However, the data for the year covered by the report are preliminary. If necessary, they will be revised in the following *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*.

[131] Data for 2014-2015 are preliminary and, if necessary, will be revised in the next *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report* (see previous footnote for explanation).

4. Supporting Working Canadians and Their Families: Employment Insurance Special Benefits

In addition to assisting Canadians during unemployment, the Employment Insurance (EI) program provides temporary financial assistance to employees and insured self-employed persons who are sick, pregnant, caring for a newborn, newly adopted or critically ill child, or caring for a family member who has a serious medical condition with a significant risk of death. These benefits play an important role in supporting working Canadians to balance work and family responsibilities.

To be eligible for EI special benefits, individuals who are employees must have accumulated a minimum of 600 hours of insurable employment in their qualifying period (usually the 52-week period prior to making a claim).[132] Self-employed persons are also eligible if they opted into the EI program at least one full year prior to claiming special benefits, paid EI premiums and met the minimum self-employment earnings threshold in the calendar year preceding the claim. This threshold was $6,515 (2013 earnings) for claims established in 2014 and was $6,645 (2014 earnings) for claims established in 2015. Self-employed fishers can also qualify for special benefits if they have fishing earnings of at least $3,760.

In the following sections, each type of EI special benefits is discussed one by one. Section 4.1 analyzes the EI special benefits as a whole. Section 4.2 examines the maternity and parental benefits. Sickness benefits are discussed in Section 4.3. Section 4.4 analyses the compassionate care benefits, while benefits for parents of critically ill children are examined in Section 4.5. Finally, Section 4.6 looks at the usage of special benefits by self-employed persons.

Sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.6 do not include data or analysis on maternity and parental benefits for employees or self-employed persons residing in Quebec, as these benefits are available for residents of this province under the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP). However, information on sickness, compassionate care and parents of critically ill children benefits paid to workers residing in Quebec is included in their respective sections.

4.1 Employment Insurance Special Benefits

The amount paid in EI special benefits is driven by three key indicators: the number of claims, the average weekly benefit rate (i.e. the level of benefits) and the duration of benefits. In general, an increase in one of these indicators will have a positive impact on the amount paid. The number of claims and amount paid are discussed in the next section (Section 4.1.1), while the level of benefits will be analysed in Section 4.1.2. The duration of benefits is discussed later, in the sections on the various types of special benefits (sections 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5). In this part (Section 4.1 and its subsections), special claims refer to claim for which at least $1 of special benefits was paid.

4.1.1 Employment Insurance Special Claims and Amount Paid

Economic cycles and labour market conditions tend to have a smaller effect on the number of special claims and the amount paid in benefits than on the number of regular claims. However, the figures for special claims are in general more affected by demographic changes and changes in the characteristics of the labour force.

In 2014/2015, 526,000 special claims were established, which represented a 1.8% increase from 2013/2014. This annual increase–the fourth in a row–follows a 1.3% increase in 2013/2014. For the sixth consecutive year, the percentage annual growth of special claims outpaced that of regular claims, due mainly to improvements in economic conditions that have been observed since the 2008 recession and which led to a decline in the number of regular claims.

Moreover, in 2014/2015, an average of 231,300 claimants were receiving special benefits each month, up 1.0% from 229,000 claimants in 2013/2014, according to Statistics Canada.[133] This number is the number of EI claimants who received at least one dollar in special benefits during the reference period within the given month (usually the week of the 15th day of the month). The number is affected by the inflow of new EI claimants and the outflow of EI claimants no longer receiving special benefits, mainly because they have exhausted the number of weeks of benefits to which they were entitled or because they have returned to work.

---

[132] Unlike the other types of EI benefits, the eligibility requirements for special benefits are the same across all EI economic regions.

[133] Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Statistics, CANSIM Table 276-0020. Does not include benefits for parents of critically ill children.

Usually, EI claims and the number of claimants tend to move together, except when there is a change in the duration of benefits or a large, sudden increase or decrease in the number of claims. When there is a sudden rise, the number of claims increases faster than the number of claimants because there is a lag between the time that the new claims are received and the time that the benefit period is established and benefits are payable. Conversely, if the number of claims decreases, the number of claimants will remain high for a time, because of earlier claims for which benefits continue to be paid, until the benefits are exhausted or the claimants return to work.

Among the different types of special benefits, the number of claims for parents of critically ill children (PCIC) recorded the largest increase (+74.1%), which is explained by the fact that PCIC benefits were available during the entire 12 months of a year for the very first time since its introduction.[134] A rise was also recorded in the number of EI sickness claims, with a 2.5% increase, while parental claims decreased by 3.7% during the same period compared with 2013/2014. There was little variation in the other benefits (see Table 45).

The 526,000 special claims established in 2014/2015 led to payments of $4,95 billion in benefits, a 4.1% increase compared with 2013/2014. This is the fourth consecutive annual increase. Furthermore, for the fifth year in a row, the amount paid in special benefits rose more rapidly than regular benefits.

Benefits for parents of critically ill children recorded the highest increase in the amount paid (+112.7%), while parental benefits (adoptive) displayed the most significant decrease, namely -10.7%. Sickness benefits, up 4.3%, also recorded a significant increase.

In the provinces and territories, the number of new special claims was little changed, except in British Columbia (+3,770 claims or 5.3%) and Alberta (+3,560 claims or 6.5%) whose increases explain nearly all the national 1.8% growth (see Table 46). In percentage, Yukon (+13,6%) and Prince Edward Island (+7.1%) experienced the largest increases.

The amount paid increased in almost all the provinces, but declined in the three territories. The most significant increase was recorded in Prince Edward Island (+20.3%), followed by Alberta (+6.9%), British Columbia (+6.5%) and Nova Scotia (+6.5%).

Table 45

Employment Insurance Special Claims[1] and Amount Paid, by Type of Benefits, Canada, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

	New Claims Established[1,2]		Amount Paid ($ Million)	
	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014	2014/2015
Type of Benefits				
Maternity	169,640	169,080	1,029.5	1,064.3
Parental (Biological)	189,480	189,740	2,401.0	2,501.6
Parental (Adoptive)	1,640	1,580	20.6	18.4
Sickness	336,800	345,070	1,276.8	1,331.7
Compassionate Care	6,150	6,120	13.1	12.6
Parents of Critically Ill Children	1,470	2,560	7.9	16.8
Canada	**515,820**	**526,100**	**4,748.9**	**4,945.6**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of special benefits was paid.

2 The numbers in this table do not add up to the total presented because Employment Insurance (EI) claimants can receive multiple types of EI benefits in one claim.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

134 PCIC benefits has been available since June 9, 2013.

Table 46

Employment Insurance Special Claims[1] and Amount Paid, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

	New Claims Established[1]		Amount Paid ($ Million)	
	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014	2014/2015
Provinces and Territories				
Newfoundland and Labrador	11,660	11,970	93.5	98.0
Prince Edward Island	5,930	6,350	33.0	39.7
Nova Scotia	21,150	21,660	154.2	164.3
New Brunswick	24,220	24,920	157.3	156.8
Quebec	105,400	107,700	367.5	375.2
Ontario	185,180	184,240	2,105.9	2,176.8
Manitoba	19,610	18,990	206.0	212.6
Saskatchewan	15,270	14,790	187.3	188.0
Alberta	54,880	58,440	712.7	761.7
British Columbia	75,580	75,350	705.4	750.9
Yukon	590	670	8.1	7.7
Northwest Territories	690	600	10.7	8.5
Nunavut	380	350	6.0	5.0
Missing Data	280	70	1.2	0.4
Canada	**515,820**	**526,100**	**4,748.9**	**4,945.5**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of special benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Women had a substantial proportion (66%) of special claims established in 2014/2015 and received 83% of total amount paid. These figures are similar to those observed in previous years. Three main factors explain why women receive such a large proportion of special benefits. First, only women are eligible for maternity benefits, which comprised 22% of total amount paid in special benefits in 2014/2015. Second, women accounted for 86% of the biological parental claims established in 2014/2015. Finally, women tend to receive benefits for a longer duration when compared with men. For example, in 2014/2015, the average duration of biological parental benefits was 32.1 weeks for women and 16.7 weeks for men.

4.1.2 Level of Employment Insurance Special Benefits

En 2014/2015, the average weekly benefit rate rose 2.7%, from $403 to $414. This increase is in line with that of the maximum insurable earnings (MIE). MIE increased by 1.9% in 2014, from $47,400 to $48,600, and by 2,5% in 2015, from $48,600 to $49,500. The growth in the average weekly benefit rate was positive across all special benefit types (see Table 47).

Table 47

Average Weekly Benefit, by Type of Special Benefits, Canada, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

	Average Weekly Benefit Rate		
	($) 2013/2014	($) 2014/2015	(Annual Percentage Change) 2014/2015
Type of Benefits			
Maternity	416	427	2,6%
Parental (Biological)	425	436	2,6%
Parental (Adoptive)	464	473	1,9%
Sickness	388	398	2,6%
Compassionate Care	414	428	3,4%
Parents of Critically Ill Children	416	427	2,6%
Canada	**403**	**414**	**2.7%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

A way to assess the level of benefit support is to look at the proportion of claimants receiving the maximum weekly benefit rate. In 2014/2015, 41% of special benefit claimants received the maximum weekly benefit rate compared with 42% in 2013/2014.[135] This proportion is higher than levels observed between 2007/2008 and 2012/2013, when they hovered between 37% and 38%. This spike in the proportion of special claims receiving the maximum weekly benefit rate could be attributed to a higher proportion of special claims made by men, who accounted for 33.8% of all EI special benefit claims in 2014/2015, compared with 31.7% in 2007/2008. Indeed, the average weekly benefit rate for men was higher than that for women. The increase could also be the result of an increase in earnings from women making special claims.

4.2 Employment Insurance Maternity and Parental Benefits

Since 1971, the Employment Insurance (EI) program offers replacement income to contributors who must take a leave from work following a pregnancy, a birth or the adoption of a child.

Maternity benefits are offered to biological mothers during their pregnancy, and for a specific time period surrounding the birth of the child. The principle underlying these benefits under the current EI program is to provide biological mothers with a certain level of protection against earnings loss caused by their physical inability to work or to seek work in the weeks surrounding the birth of the child. Maternity benefits are different from parental benefits, which are offered to parents caring for a child.

To receive maternity benefits under the EI program, claimants must demonstrate that they meet the required eligibility conditions for this type of benefit, namely that they must have had an interruption of earnings and accumulated 600 insurable hours or more during the qualifying period.[136] A qualified EI claimant may receive up to 15 weeks of maternity benefits per benefit period (with a two-week waiting period). They may be paid as early as eight weeks before the expected date of birth and may end as late as 17 weeks after the actual date of birth.

[135] These figures exclude claims for parents of critically ill children.

[136] It should be noted that these benefits are also available to pregnant women who are already receiving employment insurance benefits.

As for EI parental benefits, they have been offered since 1990 to parents who take a leave from work to care for a newborn or a newly adopted child. They may be paid to either one of the biological or foster parents or shared between the two parents for a combined total maximum of 35 weeks of benefits (with a two-week waiting period).

To receive parental benefits under the EI program, claimants must demonstrate that they meet the required eligibility conditions related to these benefits, which are identical to maternity benefits. Furthermore, they must provide proof of the child's date of birth, or in the case of an adoption placement, the date of the child's placement in their home; they must also provide the name of the adoption agency or the agency authorized to act in this capacity.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the maternity and parental benefits offered under the EI program only apply to parents who reside outside of Quebec. In this province, it is the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP) that provides benefits to workers and self-employed individuals who are eligible to take a maternity, paternity, parental or adoption leave.[137]

The amount paid in EI maternity and parental benefits is driven by three key factors: the number of claims, the duration of benefits, and the average weekly benefit rate (level of benefits). In general, an increase in one of these three factors will have a positive impact on the total amount paid. In the section 4.2.1 the number of claims and amount paid will be discussed, while the duration and level of benefits will be discussed in sections 4.2.3 and 4.2.4.

For the purpose of these sections, EI maternity claims refer to claims for which at least $1 of maternity benefits was paid. And EI parental claims refer to claims for which at least $1 of parental benefits was paid.

4.2.1 Employment Insurance Maternity and Parental Claims and Amount Paid

4.2.1.1 Employment Insurance Maternity Claims and Amount Paid

In 2014/2015, the total number of new maternity claims decreased by 0.3% (-560), from 169,640 in 2013/2014 to 169,080. This is the second consecutive decrease since an increase in the number of claims recorded in 2012/2013.

Unlike the decrease in the total number of claims, total EI maternity benefits increased by 3.4% ($34.8 million), from $1,029.5 million in 2013/2014 to $1,064.3 million in 2014/2015. This increase in benefits is attributable to a 2.6% increase in average weekly benefit rate and in average duration of benefits in some provinces which have recorded a rise in the number of claims, as shown in Annex 2.12.

In 2014/2015, according to Statistics Canada, there was an average of 48,526 beneficiaries receiving EI maternity benefits each month, an increase of 1.3% from the average of 47,923 maternity beneficiaries in 2013/2014.[138] The beneficiary count represents the number of EI claimants who received at least $1 of EI maternity benefits during the reference period for the month (usually the week of the 15th day) and is affected by the inflow of new EI maternity claimants and the outflow of EI maternity claimants who have stopped receiving benefits, principally because they have exhausted their benefits entitlement or have returned to work.

Generally speaking, claims and beneficiaries tend to move together, except when there are changes in the average duration of benefits or a sudden, significant increase or decrease in new claims. When there is a rapid but temporary increase, claim volumes will increase ahead of beneficiaries, due to the lag between when a new claim is received and when a benefit period is established and benefits are made payable. The beneficiary count will remain elevated after the volume of new claims have subsided as previous claims remain in pay, until benefits are exhausted or the claimants have returned to work.

---

[137] Benefits paid out to Quebec residents du Québec, through the QPIP, replace maternity, parental and adoption benefits offered to new Quebec parents under the federally-run Employment Insurance program.

[138] Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Statistics, CANSIM Table 276-0020.

4.2.1.2 Employment Insurance Maternity Claims and Amount Paid, by Province, Territory, Age, and Industry

In 2014/2015, the total number of new claims and amount paid varied by claimants' provinces and territories of residence, age, and the industry they worked in prior to their maternity leave.

The number of new maternity claims established by claimants increased in five provinces, while it decreased in the others. The largest increase in the number of claims took place in Nova Scotia (+12.2%), whereas the most pronounced decline was observed in Manitoba (-9.2%), as shown in Annex 2.12. Furthermore, as in 2013/2014, 82% of new claims were established by claimants from Ontario, Alberta, and British Columbia.

As seen in Annex 2.12, the total number of maternity claims declined slightly for all age groups. Among claimants, those aged 25 years and older established 89% of new EI maternity claims, while those under 25 years accounted for 11% of total new claims, as in the previous two years.

Furthermore, similar to what was observed in the previous year, in 2014/2015, around 68% of new EI maternity claims were established by claimants working in the following industrial sectors: Healthcare and Social Assistance (16.4%), Public Administration (11.2%), Educational Services (11.0%), Retail Trade (10.0%), Accommodation and Food Services (7.2%), Professional, Scientific and Technical Services (6.1%), and Finance and Insurance (6.4%).

Amount Paid to Mothers with a Child up to 12 Months Old

In 2014/2015, the total amount of maternity benefits paid to mothers during their pregnancy and the period surrounding the birth of their child rose in eight provinces and decreased in all territories and two provinces (see Annex 2.12). These increases and decreases are attributable primarily to changes to the average weekly benefit rate and to the number of claims, as shown in Annex 2.12.

As per the previous years, the amounts paid to claimants from all provinces and territories were proportional to the number of claims they established, as shown in Table 48. For example, the Atlantic Provinces, which accounted for 7.9% of the total number of claims, received 7.8% of the total amount paid in 2014/2015.

Table 48

Employment Insurance Special Claims[1] and Amount Paid, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

	Claims	Share (%)	Amount Paid	Share (%)
Provinces and Territories				
Newfoundland and Labrador	2,730	1.6	17.6	1.7
Prince Edward Island	1,060	0.6	6.9	0.6
Nova Scotia	5,430	3.2	32.1	3.0
New Brunswick	4,230	2.5	25.6	2.4
Quebec	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ontario	82,350	48.7	522.4	49.1
Manitoba	8,090	4.8	49.5	4.7
Saskatchewan	7,780	4.6	48.2	4.5
Alberta	31,070	18.4	198.1	18.6
British Columbia	25,690	15.2	159.7	15.0
Yukon	250	0.1	1.5	0.1
Northwest Territories	260	0.2	2.0	0.2
Nunavut	140	0.1	0.8	0.1
Total (Canada)	**169,080**	**100.0%**	**1,064.3**	**100.0%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance maternity benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Table 49

Benefits Paid to Mothers with a Child up to 12 Months Old, Canada, by Type of Benefits, 2013/2014 to 2014/2015

	2013/2014	2014/2015
Type of Benefits		
Maternity Benefits, of which:	$1,029.5	$1,064.3
Sickness Benefits	$48.1	$52.4
Parental Benefits	$377.7	$399.8
Regular Benefits	$6.9	$6.5

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data.

In terms of benefits, of the total maternity benefits of 1,064.3 million paid in 2014/2015, claimants from Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia, who established 82% of all maternity claims, received 82% of benefits. Additionally, among claimants, those aged 25 years and older received 92% of the total benefits compared to 8% for those aged under 25 years. Furthermore, 70% of the total benefits were paid to claimants working in the following industries: Health and Social Assistance; Public Administration; Educational Services; Retail Trade; Accommodation and Food Services; Professional, Scientific and Technical Services; and Finance and Insurance.

Furthermore, out of the 169,080 maternity claims for which payments were made in 2014/2015, 161,660 included parental claims (161,660) and 23 970 contained sickness claims. As a result, the EI program paid to claimants $52.4 million for illness; $399.7 million for parental benefits to allow mothers to care for their child; and $6.4 million for regular benefits (see Table 49).

4.2.1.3 Employment Insurance Parental (Biological) Claims and Amount Paid

In 2014/2015, the total number of parental (biological) claims as well as the total of amount paid increased compared to the previous year, although not in the same way.

The number of claims slightly increased by 0.1%, from 189,480 in 2013/2014 to 189,740 in 2014/2015 (see Annex 2.13). This slight increase is primarily attributable to a decline in the number of claims made in Ontario (-1,650) and Manitoba (-600). Furthermore, these 189,740 claims resulted in the payment of $2,501.6 million in benefits, a 4.2% increase compared with the previous year. This increase is primarily driven by the rise in average weekly benefits rate, which has increased by 2.6% to reach $436 in 2014/2015, as shown in Annex 2.13.

4.2.1.4 Employment Insurance Parental (Biological) Claims and Amount Paid, by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, and Industry

In 2014/2015, the number of parental claims established by biological parents increased in four provinces and territories, and decreased in others. The most significant increases in the number of claims were recorded in Nova Scotia and Alberta. In contrast, the sharpest decreases in the number of parental claims were observed in Manitoba and Newfoundland and Labrador. Furthermore, similar to 2013/2014, 82% of parental (biological) claims were established by claimants from Ontario, Alberta, and British Columbia.

In 2014/2015, according to Statistics Canada, there was an average of 115,458 beneficiaries receiving EI parental (biological) benefits each month, an increase of 1.0% from the average of 114,507 beneficiaries in 2013/2014.[139] The beneficiary count represents the number of EI claimants who received at least $1 of EI parental (biological) benefits during the reference period for the month (usually the week of the 15th day) and is affected by the inflow of new EI parental (biological) claimants and the outflow of EI parental (biological) claimants who have stopped receiving benefits, principally because they have exhausted their benefits entitlement or have returned to work.

[139] Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Statistics, CANSIM Tableau 276-0020

In terms of benefits, in 2014/2015, the total of benefits paid to claimants of almost provinces increased, except for claimants from New Brunswick and Saskatchewan who witnessed a decrease in their benefits, as shown in Annex 2.13. The most significant increases in amount paid for biological parental claims were recorded in Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland and Labrador. Additionally, among claimants, those from Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia received 83% of the total amount paid in 2014/2015.

Of the 189,740 biological parental claims, it must be noted that 86% were established by women, while 14% come from men. And as the Annex 2.13 shows, in 2014/2015, women received 92% of the total amount of benefits and men received 8%.

In addition, the distribution of claimants by age groups shows that those aged 25 to 44 years and those under 25 years accounted for 91% and 8%, respectively, of the total number of claims and they received 93% and 7%, respectively, of the total amount paid in benefits, as shown in Annex 2.13.

Furthermore, among claimants who established claims in 2014/2015, those working in Public Administration established the highest number of EI parental claims (14.5%). They were followed by claimants employed in Healthcare and Social Assistance (14.1%), Educational Services (10.0%), Retail Trade (9.0%), Accommodation and Food Services (6%), Professional Scientific and Technical Services (6%), Manufacturing (6.0%), and Finance and Insurance (6%). Together, claimants from these industries accounted for 71% of the total number of claims established in 2014/2015 compared to 73% in the previous years, and they received 74% of benefits over the past two years. On the other hand, claimants who established fewer claims worked in the following industrial sectors: Utilities; Management of Companies and Enterprises; Arts, Entertainment and Recreation; Mining; Oil and Gas; and Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting. Together, claimants from these industries who accounted for 4% of the total number of claims, established in 2014/2015, received 4% of the total amount paid in benefits.

4.2.1.5 Employment Insurance Parental (Adoptive) Claims and Amount Paid

The number of parental (adoptive) claims established decreased in 2014/2015 by 3.7% to 1,580 claims. The number of parental (adoptive) claims made by self-employed individuals was negligible. Adoptive parents received a total of $18.4 million in benefits, a 10.7% decrease compared to the previous year.

The entitlement to this benefit is often shared. For the purpose of this report, unless otherwise indicated, the average duration figure provided will be the number of weeks used per family basis. The average duration of EI parental (adoptive) claims[140] was 25 weeks per family in 2014/2015, a decrease of 6.4% (-1.7 week) compared with the duration in 2013/2014 (26.7 weeks). In 2014/2015, the average duration of biological parental claims was 30 weeks per claim, 5 weeks higher than parental (adoptive) claims, versus 3.7 weeks the previous year.

4.2.2 Accessibility to Employment Insurance Maternity and Parental Benefits

According to the 2014 Employment Insurance Coverage Survey (EICS), the number of mothers with a child up to 12 months old increased by 2.7% in 2014, to 411,358 individuals, compared to 400,456 in 2013. A total of 74.7% of these mothers had insured income before giving birth to, or adopting their child, compared with 77.0% in 2013. Among these insured mothers, 89.0% received maternity or parental benefits, a decrease of 2.9 percentage points from 2013 (91.9 %). Overall, 66.5% of mother with a child up to 12 months received maternity and/or parental benefits in 2014, which represents two-thirds of all new mothers.[141]

The proportion of fathers who took or intended to take parental leave decreased, from 30.8% in 2013 to 27.1% in 2014.

In Quebec, the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP) has had a major impact on the number of fathers who claimed or intended to claim parental benefits. QPIP includes leave that is available exclusively to biological fathers (paternal leave). Since its introduction on January 1, 2006, the proportion of fathers in Quebec who took or intended to take parental leave has increased, from 27.8% % to 78.3% in 2014. However, this proportion decreased by 4.7 percentage points compared to 2013 (83.0%). The statistics reported above originate from the 2014 Employment Insurance Coverage Survey and include parents in Quebec receiving benefits from the provincial program.

---

[140] To ensure that all claims are finalized, data regarding claim duration does not apply to claims that begin during the first half of the fiscal year.

[141] Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Coverage Survey, 2014.

4.2.3 Level of Employment Insurance Maternity and Parental Benefits

In 2014/2015, the average weekly maternity benefit rate continued to increase to reach $427 (+2.6%) compared to $416 in 2013/2014.

With regard to biological parental benefits, the average weekly benefit rate increased by 2.6%, from $425 in 2013/2014 to $436 in 2014/2015. And 53% of claimants received the maximum weekly benefit rate in 2014/205 compared to 53.1% in 2013/2014.

The average weekly benefit rate paid to adoptive parents who established claims, in 2014/2015, increased by 1.9%, from $464 in 2013/2014 to $473 in 2014/2015. And 71% of adoptive parental claimants received the maximum weekly benefit rate in 2014/2015 compared to 67% in 2013/2014, an increase of 4 percentage points.

4.2.4 Duration of Employment Insurance Maternity and Parental Benefits

For assessment purposes, various time periods in EI administrative data are used to ensure accuracy when analyzing the duration of EI special benefits. In this report, to assess the average claim duration of EI parental benefits, only claims established in the first half of 2014/2015 were used, to ensure data were based on as many completed EI parental claims as possible. Given the shorter duration of maternity benefits, all claims established in 2014/2015 were used.

As in previous years, in 2014/2015, claimants used almost all of the EI maternity and parental weeks to which they were entitled. Although the vast majority of mothers (90.5 %) used the full 15 weeks available, the average duration of maternity benefits remained at 14.6 weeks.

However, the average duration of parental claims can be adjusted to reflect the fact that parents can share the 35 weeks of parental benefits available to them. In 2014/2015, the average duration of biological parental claims, as calculated on a family basis, was 32.5 weeks for parents who decided to share the parental benefits and 32.1 weeks for those who decided not to share. Claimants who received both maternity and parental benefits used 47.1 weeks of the 50 weeks of maternity and parental benefits available to them on average in 2014/2015, of which 32.5 weeks were parental benefits and 14.6 weeks were maternity benefits. Similar to last year, low-income claimants receiving maternity and parental benefits as well as the Family Supplement collected an average of 46.6 weeks of maternity and parental benefits, namely 32 weeks of parental benefits and 14.6 weeks of maternity benefits.

Furthermore, the decision to share parental (biological) benefits has a limited effect on the average duration of benefits. As shown in Chart 45, in 2014/2015, when parental benefits were shared, on average, women collected 22.6 weeks, while men collected 10.6. When parental benefits are not shared, women collect 32.7 weeks on average, while men collect 28.8 weeks on average. Similar results were observed in the past few years.

4.3 Employment Insurance Sickness Benefits

Employment Insurance (EI) provides up to 15 weeks of temporary financial assistance to qualified claimants who are unable to work because of illness, injury or quarantine. The exact maximum duration that a sickness claimant is entitled to depends on the recommendation from their physician. In conjunction with corresponding job protection through the Canada Labour Code and provincial / territorial labour statutes, EI sickness benefits allow claimants time to restore their health and maintain their attachment to the labour market. Employers who offer sickness wage loss plans to their employees that are at least equivalent to the EI sickness benefit can register their plans with the Employment Insurance Commission to obtain a reduction in their EI premiums through the Premium Reduction Program (PRP).

The amount paid in EI sickness benefits is driven by three key indicators: the number of claims, the duration of benefits, and the average weekly benefit rate (level of benefits). In general, an increase in one of these three indicators will have a positive impact on the total amount paid. In the section 4.3.1 the number of claims and amount paid will be discussed, while the duration and level of regular benefits will be discussed in sections 4.3.2 and 4.3.3. For the purpose of these sections, EI sickness claims refer to claims for which at least $1 of sickness benefits was paid.

4.3.1 Employment Insurance Sickness Claims and Amount Paid

In 2014/2015, the number of EI sickness claims established increased by 2.5% to 345,070, from 336,800 claims in 2013/2014. Similarly, the amount paid in EI sickness benefits increased by 4.3%, from $1,277 million in 2013/2014 to $1,331.7 million in 2014/2015. This increase is attributable to an increase in the number of claims (2.5%), the duration of benefits (2.0%), and average weekly benefit rates (2.6%).

Chart 45

Average Parental Weeks Used per Claim by Parents Who Decided to Share and Not Share, Canada, by Gender, From 2012/2013 to 2014/2015

Source ESDC, EI administrative data.

In 2014/2015, according to Statistics Canada, there was an average of 67,330 beneficiaries receiving EI sickness benefits each month, an increase of 1.2% from the average of 66,514 sickness beneficiaries in 2013/2014.[142] The beneficiary count represents the number of EI claimants who received at least $1 of EI sickness benefits during the reference period for the month (usually the week of the 15th day) and is affected by the inflow of new EI sickness claimants and the outflow of EI sickness claimants who have stopped receiving benefits, principally because they have exhausted their benefits entitlement or have returned to work.

Generally speaking, claims and beneficiaries tend to move together, except when there are changes in the average duration of benefits or a sudden, significant increase or decrease in new claims. When there is a rapid but temporary increase, claim volumes will increase ahead of beneficiaries, due to the lag between when a new claim is received and when a benefit period is established and benefits are made payable. The beneficiary count will remain elevated after the volume of new claims have subsided as previous claims remain in pay, until benefits are exhausted or the claimants have returned to work.

4.3.1.1 Employment Insurance Sickness Benefits Claims and Amounts Paid, by Province / Territory, Gender and Age

The total number of EI sickness claims increased in 2014/2015 across all regions in Canada, with the exception of Saskatchewan, which witnessed a decrease of 2.3%. Provinces that witnessed the largest increase in the number of sickness claims established were Prince Edward Island (9.3%) and British Columbia (7.3%). There were also large percentage increases reported in the number of EI sickness claims established (and amount paid in EI sickness benefits) in the territories.

Similarly, amount paid in sickness benefits increased in all provinces, with the exception of Nova Scotia, which registered a decrease of 1.7% in 2014/2015. Provinces that witnessed the largest increases in amount paid included British Columbia (10.9%), Manitoba (9.5%) and Prince Edward Island (8.3%).

In 2014/2015, EI sickness claims made my men increased by 3.7% while those made by women increased by 1.5%. In addition, their respective share of claims remained similar to the proportion in the previous year – approximately 57 % and 43%, each.

[142] Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Statistics, Table CANSIM 276-0020.

The amount paid in sickness benefits to men and women followed a similar upward trend – increasing by 3.3% for men to $621.1 million and by 5.2% for women, to reach $710.6 million.

Sickness claimants aged 25-44 years accounted for 41% of all EI sickness claims established in 2014/2015 and 40% of total benefits paid. This is not surprising given that this group represents the largest category of workers in the labour force (43%). Conversely, claimants aged 55 years and older, who represented 20% of the labour force, accounted for 26 % of all claims and received 27% of total benefits paid, indicating that this age group is overrepresented in the number of sickness claims. Among the age groups that experienced an increase in their number of sickness claims established, the largest increase occurred in claims established by those aged 55 years and older (7%), followed by those aged 25 to 44 years (2%). In contrast to the variation in their number of claims, all age groups recorded an increase in total sickness benefits paid in 2014/2015, with claimants aged 55 years and older recording the largest increase in benefits paid (8%). The number of sickness claims made by older workers (those aged 55 and older) as well as the amount paid to older workers, is expected to continue to increase, as the Canadian population ages.

4.3.1.2 Employment Insurance Sickness Benefits Claims and Amounts Paid, by Claimant category, and Industry

As was the case in 2013/2014, sickness claims were more likely to be made by occasional claimants and long-tenured workers than frequent claimants. Indeed, of the 345,070 EI sickness claims established in 2014/2015, 57% were paid to occasional claimants, 31% to long-tenured workers, and 12% to frequent claimants, compared to 53%, 35% and 12% in the previous year.[143] In fact, as shown in Table 50 below, the share of new sickness claims established and total amount paid to occasional and claimants grew significantly by 9.8% and 14.7%, respectively.

Among EI sickness claims established in 2014/2015, the largest share of claims were paid to individuals working in the following industries, as shown in the Table 51: Retail Trade (12%), Health Care and Social Assistance (12%) and Manufacturing (11%) and Construction (10%). Table 51 shows a similar industrial decomposition of amount paid in sickness benefits.

Table 50

Employment Insurance Sickness Claims[1] and Amount Paid, by Employment Insurance Claimant Category, Canada, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

	New Claims[1] Established			Amount Paid		
	2013/2014	2014/2015	2014/2015 (Share)	2013/2014 ($ Million)	2014/2015 ($ Million)	2014/2015 (Share)
EI Claimant Category						
Long-Tenured Workers	117,200	105,780	31%	$514.2	$479.5	36%
Occasional Claimants	179,110	196,750	57%	$622.8	$715.6	54%
Frequent Claimants	40,490	42,540	12%	$139.8	$136.6	10%
Canada	**336,800**	**345,070**	**100%**	**$1,276.8**	**$1,331.7**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] 1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance sickness benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

[143] Long-tenured workers are Employment Insurance (EI) claimants who have paid at least 30% of the maximum annual EI premiums for the past 7 of 10 years and who, over the last 5 years, have collected EI regular or fishing benefits for 35 weeks or less. Frequent claimants are EI claimants who have had three or more claims for EI regular or fishing benefits and have collected benefits for a total of more than 60 weeks in the past 5 years. Occasional claimants are EI claimants who do not meet the requirements for either long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

Table 51

Employment Insurance Sickness Claims[1] and Amount Paid, by Industry, Canada, 2013/2014 and 2014/2015

	New Claims[1] Established			Amount Paid		
	2013/2014	2014/2015	2014/2015 Share	2013/2014 ($ Million)	2014/2015 ($ Million)	2014/2015 Share
Industry						
Goods-Producing Industries	**88,970**	**88,630**	**25,7%**	**$362.8**	**$362.0**	**27.2**
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	13,370	13,060	3.8%	43.4	$44.0	3.3%
Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction	3,010	3,050	0.9%	15.7	$13.0	1.0%
Utilities	520	490	0.1%	2.0	$2.7	0.2%
Construction	32,600	33,820	9.8%	148.9	$146.2	11%
Manufacturing	39,470	38,210	11.1%	152.9	$156.1	11.7%
Services-Producing Industries	**247,830**	**256,440**	**74.3%**	**$914.0**	**$969.7**	**72.8%**
Wholesale Trade	13,390	13,040	3.8%	52.8	$52.5	4.0%
Retail Trade	41,630	41,730	12.1%	130.1	$136.8	10.3%
Transportation and Warehousing	18,130	17,470	5.1%	81.1	$77.9	6.0%
Finance and Insurance	4,370	4,600	1.3%	18.0	$20.9	1.6%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	5,260	5,820	1.7%	20.0	$22.0	1.7%
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	9,000	9,520	2.8%	36.1	$37.7	2.8%
Business, Building and Other Support Services[2]	26,570	26,820	7.8%	96.7	$105.1	7.9%
Educational Services	9,760	9,320	2.7%	33.1	$34.1	2.6%
Health Care and Social Assistance	39,820	40,870	11.8%	160.8	$164.2	12.3%
Information, Cultural and Recreation[3]	7,600	7,030	2.0%	$27.3	$25.7	1.9%
Accommodation and Food Services	26,330	25,140	7.3%	77.4	$80.9	6.1%
Other Services (Excluding Public Administration)	14,550	14,070	4.1%	54.4	$52.1	3.9%
Public Administration	21,070	22,040	6.4%	95.9	$101.5	7.6%
Unclassified	**10,350**	**18,970**	**5.5%**	**30.4**	**$58.2**	**4.4%**
Canada	**336,800**	**345,070**	**100.0%**	**1,276.8**	**$1,331.7**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance sickness benefits sickness was paid.

2 This industry comprises the industries with codes 55 (management of companies and enterprises) and 56 (administrative and support, waste management and mediation services) from the *North American Classification System*.

3 This industry comprises the industries with codes 51 (information and cultural industries) and 71 (arts, entertainment and recreation) from the *North American Classification System*.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

4.3.2 Level of Employment Insurance Sickness Benefits

As with regular benefits, the level of EI sickness benefits paid to sickness is tied to the maximum insurable earnings. Under the *Employment Insurance Act*, the rate of EI weekly benefits that may be paid to individuals who became unable to work because of sickness, injury or quarantine is 55% of their average insurable weekly earnings, up to a maximum rate of EI weekly benefits. As of January 1, 2014, the maximum yearly insurable earnings amount was $48,600 and the maximum amount a claimant could receive was $514 per week. For qualified low-income claimants with dependent children, the rate of weekly benefits may be increased by the amount of the family supplement as high as 80% of their average insurable weekly earnings.

In 2014/2015, the average weekly sickness benefits rose by 2.6% to reach $398. The proportion of claims that were paid the maximum benefit rate (based on the MIE) in 2014/2015 was 33%, which was comparable 2013/2014 (at 34%).

Sickness claims made by men received, on average, $438 per week while women received an average of $368 per week in 2014/2015. Regardless of gender, claimants aged 25 to 44 years and 45 to 54 years received the highest amount average weekly sickness benefits ($406 and $407, respectively in 2014/2015).

Among the claimant categories, long-tenured workers received the highest average weekly sickness benefits in 2014/2015 ($439) followed by frequent claimants ($426 in 2014/2015) during the same period. Although occasional claimants accounted for 57% of all claims established in 2014/2015, they received the lowest average weekly sickness benefits during that period at $370.

In 2014/2015, claimants who worked in the Mining, Oil and Gas Extraction industry had the highest average weekly sickness benefits ($504 per claim) followed by individuals working in the Construction industry who received $480 per claim. In contrast, claimants who worked in the Accommodations and Food Services industry had the lowest average weekly sickness benefits ($304 per claim) followed by individuals from the Retail Trade industry ($323 per claim).

4.3.3 Entitlement, Duration and Exhaustion of Employment Insurance Sickness Benefits

4.3.3.1 Entitlement to and Duration of Employment Insurance Sickness Benefits

The number of weeks for which EI sickness benefits may be paid to qualified claimants because of illness, injury or quarantine is capped at 15 weeks pursuant to the *Employment Insurance Act*. In 2014/2015, the average actual duration of sickness benefits was 10 weeks, representing 66.7% of the maximum duration of 15 weeks, compared to 9.7 weeks or 65 % of the maximum duration in the past two years. However, it should be noted that the average duration of EI sickness benefits also varied across provinces and territories, gender, age, industries, and claimant categories.

In 2014/2015, the average actual duration of EI sickness benefits was higher in the Western provinces (10.7 weeks in British Columbia and Alberta) than in the other provinces (8.7 weeks in New Brunswick). The average duration was also slightly higher for women (10.1 weeks), compared to men (9.9 weeks), as well as for older age categories – 10.7 weeks for those 55 years and older, compared to 9.0 weeks for those under 25 years old. This is consistent with the trends found in the previous year.

EI sickness claimants who worked in Administrative and Support, Waste Management, and Retail Trade had the longest average actual duration of sickness benefits (10.4 weeks, respectively) while, in contrast, claimants working in the Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting industry had the lowest average actual duration of benefits (8.1 weeks) in 2014/2015. In comparison, in 2013/2014, EI sickness claimants who worked in Finance and Insurance had the highest average actual duration of EI sickness benefits (10.6 weeks) while those who worked in Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting had, on average, the lowest duration of benefits (7.9 weeks).

4.3.3.2 Exhaustion of Employment Insurance Sickness Benefits

As in the previous year, in 2014/2015 the likelihood of exhausting sickness benefits tended to increase when claimants were aged 55 and older, female, long-tenured workers, or from the central or western provinces.

As Table 52 shows, of all EI sickness claims completed in 2014/2015, 34.8% of claimants exhausted the maximum 15 weeks of benefit entitlement. This figure represents an increase of 1.4 percentage point compared to claims completed in the previous year, and this is the third consecutive year of increase. It is important to note that while there is a maximum entitlement of 15 weeks, not all sickness claimants are entitled to the entire 15 weeks, as the duration depends on the recommendation from a physician.

As shown in Table 52, claimants across the various dimensions (province, age, gender, claimant categories) experienced an increase in their entitlement exhaustion of EI sickness benefits, with exception of those from Newfoundland and Labrador, and Prince Edward Island whose entitlement exhaustion rates decreased[144].

[144] Exhaustion rate refers to the percentage of EI sickness claims for which all 15 weeks of benefit entitlement are paid.

Table 52

Entitlement Exhaustion Rate, Completed Employment Insurance Sickness Claims, 2013/2014 to 2014/2015

	2013/2014	2014/2015
Provinces and Territories		
Newfoundland and Labrador	35.0%	32.8%
Prince Edward Island	22.5%	20.4%
Nova Scotia	30.7%	33.0%
New Brunswick	21.6%	23.7%
Quebec	27.3%	29.5%
Ontario	39.1%	39.6%
Manitoba	36.5%	40.5%
Saskatchewan	38.6%	39.2%
Alberta	40.0%	41.3%
British Columbia	38.1%	39.4%
Yukon	29.6%	16.7%
Northwest Territories	32.4%	46.2%
Nunavut	25.0%	33.3%
Gender		
Male	31.3%	32.4%
Female	35.0%	35.9%
Age		
Under 25 years	23.0%	27.4%
25-44 years	30.1%	31.4%
45-54 years	36.3%	36.5%
55 years and plus	39.8%	41.3%
Claimant Categories		
Long-Tenured Workers	37.1%	38.6%
Occasional Claimants	34.8%	36.2%
Frequent Claimants	17.1%	18.5%
Canada	**33.4%**	**34.8%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

4.3.4 Premium Reduction Program

The EI program supports the delivery of sickness benefits through employers via the Premium Reduction Program (PRP). For participating employers and employees, the PRP provides a premium reduction in exchange for companies offering their employees sickness benefits that are at least equivalent to those available through EI, and the employer plan is the first payer.

In 1971, when the federal government extended unemployment insurance benefits to insured workers temporarily absent from work because of illness, injury or quarantine, it amended at the same time Unemployment Insurance Act to introduce the PRP to encourage employers to continue to offer their wage-loss replacement plans and assume the risk of the first-payer position when their employees were temporarily out of work because of illness or injury. As a result, when an employer provides their employees with wage-loss replacement plans in case of illness or injury that would have the effect of reducing EI sickness payable to those insured employees, they may be eligible for EI premium reductions, provided that these plans were registered with the Canada Employment Insurance Commission and met certain requirements stipulated in the *Employment Insurance Act* and *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

To be eligible for EI premium reductions, a wage-loss replacement plan offered by an employer to his or her employees must be registered with the Commission and meet or exceed certain requirements specified in the *EI Regulations*, including the following:

- Provide at least 15 weeks of disability benefits for short-term disability;
- Match or exceed the level of benefits provided under the EI sickness program;
- Pay benefits to employees within 14 days of illness or injury;
- Be accessible to employees within three months of hiring;
- Cover employees on a 24-hour-a-day basis; and
- Pass at least five-twelfths (5/12) of the premium reduction on to the employees covered by the plans.

Under the PRP there are two types and four categories of wage-loss replacement plans for which EI premium reductions may be granted. The two types of plans that could be considered as qualifying plans under *EI Regulations* are Weekly Indemnity Plans and Cumulative Paid Sick Leave Plans.[145]

Based on the findings of the most recent departmental supplemental study on the PRP,[146] in 2013, there were 26,650 employers receiving EI premium reductions through the PRP, down from 31,040 participating employers in 2000. This represents a decrease of 2.2% in participation rate for 2013. Larger firms were found to be more likely to participate in the PRP. Indeed, 59.3% of firms with more than 500 employees participated in 2013 in the PRP; 31.7% of firms with 200-499 employees; 17.1% of firms with 100-199 employees. The participation rate for firms with fewer than 50 employees was under 10.0%. However, the changes observed in employer participation did not result in a decline in the percentage of workers covered: both the number of workers and the proportion of workers covered increased over the period. As of 2013, 7.1 million (34.8%) of workers had employment in firms receiving a premium reduction. The average number of employees covered by firms generally also increased from 182 employees in 2000 to 268 employees in 2013. Furthermore, in 2013, firms in Saskatchewan and Manitoba had the highest participation rates, at 4.8% and 3.8%, respectively, while firms in the Atlantic region were less likely to participate in PRP.

Premium reductions were observed for one-third of businesses in Public Administration and about one-fifth (22.1%) of businesses in the Utilities sector. Other industry sectors have participation rates of under 5%, except Educational Services (7%), Manufacturing (6.7%), Finance and Insurance (5.6%) and Information and Cultural Services (5.1%). Interestingly, many of those industries with the highest sickness claims volumes (as indicated section 4.3.1.2) are overrepresented in the participation rate of PRP; specifically, Retail Trade, Wholesale Trade and Manufacturing have the highest number of sickness claims established but remain overrepresented in the number of firms participating in PRP. These three industries represent 9.8%, 7.9% and 12.4% of participating firms in Canada, but only 8.0%, 4.0% and 4.0% of all firms in Canada, respectively.

4.4 Employment Insurance Compassionate Care Benefits

For individuals facing the difficult situations where a family member is dying or at risk of death, the emotional and financial demands related to caring for individuals can affect both a person's employment and their financial security. The Employment Insurance (EI) program offers up to 6 weeks of compassionate care benefits (CCB) to employees needing to take time away from work to provide care or support to family members who are gravely ill and who face significant risk of dying within 26 weeks.

Self-employed individuals who have opted to contribute to EI are also eligible to receive CCB after 12 months from confirmation of their registration for EI. Self-employed workers in Quebec are eligible to claim CCB through the Employment Insurance program, rather than through the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan, which is used by self-employed workers in Quebec for maternity, paternity, and parental benefits.

For the purposes of this section (except for subsection 4.4.2), EI compassionate care claims refer to claims for which at least $1 of compassionate care benefits were paid.

---

[145] Service Canada, The Employment Insurance Premium Reduction Program – A Guide for employers offering short-term disability plans to their employees (Ottawa: Service Canada, 2011). Downloaded from: http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2011/servicecanada/SG5-54-2011-eng.pdf

[146] ESDC, EI Payroll Tax Refunds: The Characteristics of Firms Benefitting from the EI Premium Reduction Program 2000-2013 (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2016).

Chart 46

Employment Insurance Compassionate Care Claims[1] and Amounts Paid, Canada, 2008/2009 to 2014/2015

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of compassionate care benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of the EI administrative data, except for amount paid, which is based on a 10% sample.

4.4.1 Employment Insurance Compassionate Care Claims and Amount Paid

In 2014/2015, there were 6,244 new claims established for CCB, a 4.0% increase compared to the number of claims established in 2013/2014 (6,003). The amount paid in benefits totalled $12.6 million in 2014/2015, a 3.8% decrease from the $13.1 million in total compassionate care benefits paid in 2013/2014 (see Chart 46).

In 2014/2015, 44% of all CCB claims established in Canada were from Ontario, 17% were from Quebec, and 15% were from British Columbia. As shown in Table 53, there has been little variation in the percentage shares of CCB claims established in each province since 2011/2012, even though there have been some fluctuations for amounts paid, especially in Ontario, Alberta and Quebec.

The provinces which reported the largest year-over-year increases in the number of claims established in 2014/2015 were Alberta (+22%), Newfoundland and Labrador (+19%), and New Brunswick (+17%), while the provinces that reported the largest percentage declines in the number of claims made between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 were Saskatchewan (-21%) and Manitoba (-7%).

In 2014/2015, four out of ten provinces witnessed an increase in the amount of CCB paid, while five provinces experienced declines. The provinces of New Brunswick (+50%) and Nova Scotia (+25%) witnessed the highest rate of increase in total benefits paid. In contrast, the provinces of Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan and British Columbia witnessed the most significant percentage decreases in the amount of CCB paid.

The wide variability of percentage increases and decreases in the amount of total claims and benefits paid between years is primarily due to the low total counts of claims established and amounts paid in most provinces and territories, meaning that comparatively small shifts in the total number of claims made or amounts paid between years can impact annual percentage changes significantly.

Table 53

Share of Compassionate Care Benefit Claims Established[1] and Amount Paid, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2011/2012 to 2014/2015

	New Claims Established[1]				Amounts Paid			
	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Province and Territory								
Newfoundland and Labrador	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Prince Edward Island	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Nova Scotia	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	2%	3%	4%
New Brunswick	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Quebec	17%	17%	15%	17%	16%	15%	12%	14%
Ontario	46%	44%	45%	44%	46%	48%	44%	43%
Manitoba	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%	2%	4%	5%
Saskatchewan	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	2%
Alberta	8%	9%	9%	11%	8%	10%	13%	12%
British Columbia	15%	16%	16%	15%	17%	14%	17%	16%
Territories	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Canada	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

[1] Includes all claims for which at least $1 in compassionate care benefits was paid.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data, except for amount paid, which is based on a 10% sample.

Women made 71% of compassionate care claims in 2014/2015, while men made 29% of them. When compared with the labour force as a whole, in 2014/2015, women represented 47.6% of the labour force while men represented 52.4%. From 2013/2014 to 2014/2015, the number of CCB claims established increased at a faster rate for men (+11%) while the number of CCB claims for women remained stable (+1%). Between 2012/2013 and 2014/2015 men have reported higher rates of increases in the number of claims established than women, opting to take advantage of CCB available to them more frequently on average, while the number of women who have opted to claim CCB has remained comparatively stable over the same period.

The age group responsible for the largest share of compassionate care claims in 2014/2015 were those between the ages of 25 to 54 years (68% of all claims), followed by those 55 years of age and older (30% of all claims) and those 25 years or younger (2% of all claims). When compared to Canada's labour force as a whole, youth (15 to 24 years) represented 15%, core-aged workers (25-54) represented 65.6% and older workers (over 55) represented 19.4% of the labour force. Based on these results, compassionate care claimants in 2014/2015 were over representative of older workers in the labour force and underrepresented the share of youth in the labour force as a whole.

Compared to the previous fiscal year, the number of claims increased most for youth (+18% between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015), while claims made by people aged 25 to 54 years of age increased the least (+2%). The large percentage increase in claims by those under 25 years of age is partly attributable to this age group making a small total number of all claims for CCB in both years (equivalent to 2% of all CCB claims initiated in 2014/2015), meaning that small changes in totals reported year over year are reflected as large percentage changes in annual totals.

4.4.2 Accessibility to Employment Insurance Compassionate Care Benefits

When applying for CCB, claimants are required to indicate their relationship to the spouse or other family member they are caring for, and provide a medical certificate proving that the family member is seriously ill and at significant risk of death within 26 weeks. Since June 2006, regulatory amendments have broadened the definition of a 'family member' to

Table 54

Compassionate Care Claimants, by Type of Relationship to Gravely Ill Person, Canada, 2012/2013

Type of Relationship	Share of Compassionate Care Applicants
Mother or Father	55.9%
Spouse or Partner	26.0%
Child	6.8%
Sister or Brother	4.4%
Other	6.9%
Canada	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Note: Table includes all applications under which a claim for compassionate care benefits was made, not only those in which at least $1 in compassionate care benefits were paid.

Source: ESDC, *Compassionate Care Benefits: Update. Ottawa*, ESDC Evaluation Directorate, 2015

include siblings, grandparents, grandchildren, in-laws (e.g. aunts, uncles, cousins, nieces and nephews), foster parents, wards and any other individuals considered family members by the gravely-ill person being cared for, or those considered family members by his or her representative, to be eligible to claim compassionate care benefits.

A supplementary study completed in 2015 on data for compassionate care claimants in 2012/2013 found that a large majority (81.9%) of CCB applicants[147] were those that needed to care for a parent (55.9%), or for a spouse or partner (26.0%) in 2012/2013.[148] Individuals that applied for CCB to care for a child (either their own child, the child of a spouse or the child of a common law partner) represented 6.8% of all applicants, while those who applied to care for a sibling represented 4.4%. These proportions were consistent with rates reported in previous years.

The same study also found that the acceptance rate (defined as the share of all CCB applications, by type of family relationship, where benefits were paid) of CCB claims was highest among applicants who sought benefits to care for a sister or brother (70.8%), followed by a spouse or partner (69.3%) and mother or father (68.1%). CCB applicants looking to receive benefits for a child reported the lowest acceptance rate (52.4%) of claims established. Finally, the study also found that 75.9% of those who received care from individuals claiming CCB were over the age of 55, and that claims where the care recipient was over 55 years old also reported the highest acceptance rates of CCB claims that were established.

4.4.3 Level of Employment Insurance Compassionate Care Benefits

In 2014/2015, the average weekly benefit rate for CCB increased to $428 (+3.4% compared to an average weekly benefit rate of $414 in 2013/2014). As mentioned in previous sections, increases in weekly benefit rates are explained in part by increases in average weekly nominal earnings and increases in maximum insurable earnings (MIE) for Employment Insurance from year to year.

4.4.4 Maximum Duration and Actual Duration of Employment Insurance Compassionate Care Benefits

The maximum duration of compassionate care benefits is 6 weeks per claim and benefits can be shared with other family members if they are also eligible for these benefits. On average, EI claimants used 4.7 weeks of compassionate care benefits, equal to 78% of the maximum entitlement of 6 weeks for CCB in 2014/2015. The proportion of CCB claimants who used all of their 6 week entitlement was 71% in 2014/2015, and this proportion was slightly lower than that observed in 2013/2014 (72%) and 2012/2013 (73%) for this measure.

Although eligible family members can share the 6 weeks of entitlement for CCB, there were only 123 claims (2% of all CCB claims established) where benefit sharing was done in 2014/2015. The rate of uptake and the amount of use of CCB sharing was similar to previous years.

[147] Note that percentages listed in this paragraph refer to the percentage shares of CCB applicants who submitted a claim for benefits, not those for which benefits were paid. The share of applicants for CCB differs from the number of established CCB claimants, which is the term referring to CCB claimants that had claims established and where at least $1 of compassionate care benefits was paid.

[148] ESDC, *Compassionate Care Benefits: Update* (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2015).

A recent study on the use and duration of CCB found that the main reason a claimant does not receive or claim the entire 6 weeks of benefits is that the recipient of care passes away while the claimant is receiving CCB. The same study also found that claimants caring for a spouse are more likely to use the entire 6 week benefit period than those caring for other kinds of family members, and those living with a gravely ill recipient are more likely to use the entire 6-week period than those who do not live with the care recipient. Finally, claimants who combine CCB with another type of EI benefit are more likely to use the full 6 weeks available to them than those who only received CCB.[149]

4.5 Parents of Critically Ill Children Benefits

EI special benefits for Parents of Critically Ill Children (PCIC) first became available to eligible insured workers, and to self-employed individuals who have opted into EI, on June 9, 2013. Under PCIC benefits, claimants are provided with up to 35 weeks of benefits (with a two week waiting period) that can be split into segments of a claimant's 52 week qualification period, and benefits can also be shared among eligible parents.

Claimants for PCIC benefits must be able to demonstrate that their regular weekly earnings from work, or the amount of time used by a claimant to devote to their business for self-employed persons, have declined by more than 40% in order to provide care for a critically ill or injured child; must be the parent of a child who is critically ill or injured; and demonstrate that their child is under 18 years of age at the time the 52-week window during which benefits can be paid is opened (based on the date that a specialist medical doctor states that the child became critically ill or injured).

Eligible employees must have worked a minimum of 600 hours during their qualifying period to be eligible to claim PCIC benefits, while self-employed workers must demonstrate that they have confirmed their registration for EI special benefits twelve months prior to submitting a claim, and demonstrate that they meet the minimum earnings requirement for the year where they apply.

The amount paid in PCIC benefits is impacted by three key indicators: the number of claims, the duration of benefits, and the average weekly benefit rate (level of benefits). In general, an increase in one of these indicators will lead to increases in the total amount of benefits paid.

The following sections will discuss the amount paid, number of claims, the level and duration of PCIC benefits in the two years where the benefit has been available. For the purposes of this section, PCIC claims established refers to claims for which at least $1 of PCIC benefits was paid. The reported amounts paid in PCIC benefits also factor in payments provided under the Family Supplement for those who claimed PCIC benefits.

Generally speaking, changes in the number of claims and beneficiaries tend to move together, with the exception of changes to the average duration of benefits or a sudden, significant increase or decrease in new claims. The beneficiary count will remain elevated after the volume of new claims subsides and previous claims remain in pay, until benefits are exhausted or the claimant returns to work.

As PCIC claims continue to be processed using a manual pay system unlike other EI benefits, and given the benefit is relatively new compared to other special benefits, the level of data available to examine the benefits continues to be limited.[150] For example, data on claim duration taking into account the sharing of benefits by parents, and data on the industry of occupation for claimants, were not available at the time of publication for the *2014/2015 EI Monitoring and Assessment Report*.

4.5.1 Parents of Critically Ill Children Claims Established and Benefits Paid

2014/2015 marked the first full fiscal year where PCIC benefits were available to Canadians year-round, and as a result a significant increase was reported in the number of new claims established. The number of new PCIC claims established across Canada increased by 74%, from 1,469 claims in 2013/2014 to 2,560 claims in 2014/2015.

Claimants residing in the province of Ontario established the largest number of PCIC claims in 2014/2015 with 893 (35% of all claims), followed by the province of Quebec with 637 claims (25% of all claims) and Alberta with 350 claims (14% of all claims). The shares of new PCIC claims across provinces in 2014/2015 did not change significantly from shares observed for 2013/2014.

---

149 ESDC, *Compassionate Care Benefits: Update*. (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2015).

150 All information available on Parents with Critically Ill Children benefits, including information available for previous years, are found under Annex 2.17

The provinces which reported the largest year-over-year increases in the number of claims made in 2014/2015 were Newfoundland and Labrador (+211%), New Brunswick (+177%) and Alberta (+132%), while the province that reported the smallest percentage increase was Nova Scotia (+77%). The significant percentage increases observed between years are partly attributable to PCIC benefits being available to claimants year-round in 2014/2015, compared to 2013/2014 when PCIC benefits were only offered for ten months of the fiscal year. There were no provinces or territories which reported declines in the number of claims established between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

The amount of PCIC benefits paid in 2014/2015 more than doubled in 2014/2015, rising 113% to reach $16.8 million compared to $7.9 million in PCIC benefits paid in 2013/2014. All ten provinces witnessed an increase in the amount of PCIC paid, while the Northwest Territories and Nunavut (-21%), combined[151], were the only jurisdictions to report declines in the amount of benefits paid. New Brunswick witnessed the largest increase in total benefits paid (+300%), followed by Quebec (+186%) and British Columbia (+164%). In contrast, the provinces of Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan witnessed the smallest percentage increases in the amount of PCIC paid (+46% and +50%, respectively).

Women represented 78% of all PCIC claims established and 79% ($13.2 million) of all PCIC benefits paid in 2014/2015, while men represented 22% of all PCIC claims established and 21% ($3.6 million) of all PCIC benefits paid.

Claimants between the ages of 25 and 44 years represented the overwhelming majority of both total claims established (86%) and benefits paid (85%) in 2014/2015, consistent with results reported for 2013/2014 (84% of total claims established and 84% of total benefits paid). Those between the ages of 45 and 54 reported the second highest share of total claims established (6%) and benefits paid (10%) in 2014/2015, followed by claimants under the age of 24 (6% of total claims and 5% of benefits paid).

4.5.2 Level of Parents of Critically Ill Children Benefits

In 2014/2015, the average weekly benefit rate for PCIC increased to $427 (+2.6% compared to an average weekly benefit rate of $416 for PCIC claimants in 2013/2014). The provinces with the highest weekly benefit rates in 2014/2015 were Saskatchewan ($453), Alberta ($447) and Ontario ($427), while the provinces with the lowest average weekly benefit rates were Prince Edward Island ($368), Nova Scotia ($396) and New Brunswick ($406). Canada's territories reported the highest average weekly benefit rates, however these rates are influenced by the small number of total claims and benefits paid in each territory in 2014/2015.

Women ($420) continued to report lower average weekly benefit rates for PCIC than men ($453) in 2014/2015, however the annual increases in average weekly benefit rates for women (+4.5%) continued to rise while the average weekly benefit rate for men declined (-1%) between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

Those between the ages of 25 and 44 ($433) reported the highest average weekly benefit rate among all age groups, while those 24 years and under ($337) reported the lowest average weekly benefit rate in 2014/2015. All age groups reported increases in their average weekly benefit rates for 2014/2015 compared to 2013/2014, with older workers (+9.5%) reporting the largest increases in average weekly benefit rates and younger workers (+1%) reporting the smallest increases.

As mentioned in previous sections, increases in weekly benefit rates are determined in part by increases in average weekly nominal earnings and increases in maximum insurable earnings (MIE) for EI from year to year.

4.5.3 Duration of Parents of Critically Ill Children Benefits

On average, PCIC claimants used 16.0 weeks of benefits in 2014/2015, an increase of 17% compared to the national average of 13.7 weeks reported in 2013/2014. The national average duration of PCIC claims in 2014/2015 was equivalent to 46% of the maximum entitlement available for PCIC at 35 weeks. A total of 414 claims (16% of all PCIC claims made) exhausted their full entitlement of 35 weeks for PCIC benefits in 2014/2015, while 855 claims (33% of all PCIC claims made) in 2014/2015 lasted 20 weeks or longer.

Given the limitations of available data on PCIC due to claims being processed manually, the average duration of claims does not account for spouses who opt to share PCIC benefits, since current tabulations

[151] Data for Canada's Territories related to PCIC benefits have been combined for the purposes of confidentiality

count each spouse as a separate claimant. It is likely that the count of benefit exhautees reflects only claimants who are single parents, since couples or spouses claiming PCIC only report the duration of their individual claim of each partner in the available data, not the average duration of the shared benefit for both partners. The manual pay system used to process PCIC claims currently provides no clear way to link claims established as shared benefits, and thus the averages listed above likely understate the duration of PCIC claims.

The province which reported the highest average duration in 2014/2015 was Newfoundland and Labrador at 21.8 weeks, followed by Nova Scotia with 18.5 weeks and Saskatchewan at 16.9 weeks, while provinces reporting the lowest average duration were Prince Edward Island at 10.1 weeks, Manitoba at 15.0 weeks, and Quebec at 15.1 weeks.

The provinces which reported the most significant percentage increases in average duration of PCIC benefits between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 were Saskatchewan (+48%), New Brunswick (+40%) and Nova Scotia (+27%), while the provinces that reported the largest declines were Prince Edward Island (-33%) and Manitoba (-27%).

Women, at 16.4 weeks, reported claiming slightly longer average durations for PCIC benefits than those reported for men at 14.6 weeks, however men (17.7%) reported a higher rate of increase between years in reported average duration than women (+14.7%).

Table 55

Data on Parents of Critically Ill Children Benefits, 2014/2015

	New Claims	% of All PCIC Claims Made	Average Weekly Benefit Rate ($ per Week)	Amount Paid ($ Millions)[2]
Province and Territory				
Newfoundland and Labrador	28	1%	$408	$0.2
Prince Edward Island	8	0.3%	$368	$0.0
Nova Scotia	62	2.4%	$396	$0.5
New Brunswick	72	2.8%	$406	$0.4
Quebec	637	24.9%	$419	$4.0
Ontario	893	34.9%	$427	$6.0
Manitoba	82	3.2%	$424	$0.5
Saskatchewan	51	2.0%	$453	$0.3
Alberta	350	13.7%	$447	$2.4
British Columbia	305	11.9%	$425	$2.1
Yukon Territory[1]	5	Not available[c]	Not available[c]	$0.0
Northwest Territories[1]		Not available[c]	Not available[c]	$0.0
Nunavut[1]		Not available[c]	Not available[c]	$0.0
Missing Data	67	2.6%	Data not available	$0.4
Gender				
Men	563	22.0%	$453	$3.6
Women	1,997	78.0%	$420	$13.2
Age				
24 Years and Under (Youth)	162	6.3%	$337	0.8
25 to 44 Years	2,193	85.7%	$433	14.3
45 to 54 Years	194	7.6%	$425	1.7
55 Years and Over (Older Workers)	11	0.4%	$391	0.1
Canada[1]	**2,560**	**100.0%**	**$427**	**$16.8**

[1] For confidentiality reasons, some data for the territories have been combined. As a result, the total number of claims may not add up to the total presented.

[2] Includes all claims for which at least $1 in PCIC benefits were paid.

[c] Not available for confidentiality reasons

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data.

Table 55 provides a general overview of reported results for PCIC benefits in 2014/2015.

4.6 Employment Insurance Special Benefits for Self-employed Persons

Self-employed workers have been able to opt into the EI program on a voluntary basis since January 31, 2010, by entering into an agreement with the Canada Employment Insurance Commission (CEIC) to pay EI premiums in order to obtain access to EI special benefits. Special benefits available to self-employed persons are the same as those offered to the salaried employees. EI special benefits for self-employed persons became payable as of January 1, 2011.

To be eligible for EI special benefits for self-employed persons, an individual must:

1. register with the CEIC;
2. waits for 12 months from the date of his or her confirmed registration before claiming EI special benefits;
3. have reduced the amount of time devoted to his or her business by more than 40%;
4. have earned the minimum amount of self-employed earnings during the calendar year preceding the year he or she applies for benefits. This threshold was $6,515 (2013 earnings) for claims established in 2014 and was $6,645 (2014 earnings) for claims established in 2015.
5. pay EI premium at the same rate as salaried employees for at least one year before he or she may claim benefits.[152]

As shown in the Table 56, from April 1, 2014 to March 30, 2015, 1,448 new self-employed workers entered into a voluntary agreement with the CEIC to be eligible for EI special benefits and 498 opted out, bringing the total number of self-employed persons who are enrolled in the Employment Insurance program since January 2010 to 15,842 participants.

4.6.1 Employment Insurance Special Benefits for Self-employed Persons, Claims and Amount Paid

In 2014/2015, 749 special claims were established for self-employed workers. The amount paid in benefits was $7.7 million.

The benefit type most frequently used by self-employed persons were parental benefits, which made up 62% of the amount paid to self-employed.

Furthermore, special claims made by self-employed were principally established in Ontario (at 46%) and for women (at 96%) (see Table 57).

Table 56

Self-employed Persons Enrolled in the Employment Insurance Program, Canada, 2009/2010 to 2014/2015

Fiscal Year	Participants to the Program (Opted in) (Number of Participants)	Registrants Who Cancelled or Terminated Participation to the Program (Opted Out) (Number of Participants)	Net Enrolments (Number of Participants)	Net Enrolments – Cumulative Total at the End of Fiscal Year(Number of Participants)
2009/2010 (January 31 to March 31, 2010)	2,145	191	1,954	1,954
2010/2011	6,806	1,646	5,160	7,114
2011/2012	4,887	1,526	3,361	10,475
2012/2013	3,315	926	2,389	12,864
2013/2014	2,063	533	1,530	14,394
2014/2015	1,946	498	1,448	15,842

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: ESDC, administrative data from My Service Canada Account.

[152] For more information on special benefits for self-employed workers, please visit: http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/sc/ei/sew/eligibility.shtml.

Table 57

Employment Insurance Special Claims for Self-employed Persons[1] and Amount Paid, by Type of Benefits, Province and Territory and Gender, Canada, 2010/2011 to 2014/2015

Type of Benefits, Province and Territory, and Gender	New Claims Established[1]					Amount Paid ($ Millions)				
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Type of Benefits[2]										
Maternity	190	455	497	558	565	0.5	1.8	1.9	2.1	2.8
Parental	214	505	548	593	602	0.2	4.3	3.5	5.8	4.8
Sickness	41	107	135	162	148	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.1
Compassionate Care	0	3	2	4	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Parents of Critically Ill Children	0	0	0	1	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Province and Territory										
Newfoundland and Labrador	7	11	11	8	17	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.3
Prince Edward Island	4	2	3	3	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nova Scotia	5	14	14	20	24	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Brunswick	3	13	14	15	12	0.0	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.1
Quebec	11	15	34	48	29	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Ontario	130	270	309	332	341	0.2	2.3	2.3	3.6	3.5
Manitoba	7	22	19	22	34	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.2
Saskatchewan	9	19	25	28	27	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.1
Alberta	33	112	98	110	114	0.2	1.6	1.0	1.7	0.8
British Columbia	49	137	158	167	143	0.1	1.5	1.8	2.0	2.3
Yukon	0	1	0	0	2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2
Northwest Territories	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nunavut	0	0	0	1	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Missing Data	1	0	0	1	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender										
Men	23	29	23	37	29	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3
Women	236	588	662	718	720	0.7	6.2	5.6	8.1	7.4
Canada	**259**	**617**	**685**	**755**	**749**	**0.7**	**6.4**	**5.7**	**8.2**	**7.7**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance special benefits was paid to self-employed persons.

2 The numbers for claims by type of benefits do not add up to the total presented because EI claimants can receive multiple types of EI benefits in one claim.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data, except for the amount paid which is based on a 10% sample.

4.6.2 Level of Employment Insurance Special Benefits for Self-employed Persons

In 2014/2015, the average weekly benefit rate for special benefits paid to self-employed workers was $309 per claim. In comparison, the average weekly benefit rate for the same benefits paid to salaried employees was $414.

5. Employment Insurance Work-Sharing Benefits

The Work-sharing program is an adjustment program designed to help employers and workers avoid layoffs when there is a temporary reduction in the normal level of economic activity that is a result of factors beyond the control of the employer. It provides income support in the form of Employment Insurance (EI) Work-Sharing benefits to eligible employees who agree to work a temporarily reduced work week while their employer recovers. The goal is for all the participating employees to return to normal levels of working hours by the end of the Work-Sharing agreement.

The program assists employers to retain skilled and valuable employees while avoiding the costly process of training and recruiting new employees when the business recovers. The program also helps workers maintain their employment and skills while supplementing their wages with Work-Sharing benefits for the days they are not working but would have otherwise been willing to work under normal business operations.

Work-sharing agreements are signed for a duration period of between 6 to 26 consecutive weeks, with a possible extension of up to 12 additional weeks (up to 38 weeks total) under exceptional circumstances such as an unanticipated and prolonged period of economic contraction. To be eligible for work-sharing benefits, an affected group of employees in a work unit must experience a minimum 10% reduction in their normal weekly earnings.

Under a work-sharing agreement, available work is redistributed through a reduction in hours worked by all employees within one or more work units of a company. Affected workers must be year-round employees, meet the eligibility criteria to receive EI regular benefits, and must agree to a reduction in their normal amount of working hours to be eligible to participate in a work-sharing agreement.

To be eligible to participate, the employer must be either a publicly held company, private business or non-profit organization experiencing reductions in business activity that are beyond their control and be in operation year-round in Canada for at least two years prior to applying. The employer must be willing to implement a recovery plan to return affected work units to normal staffing levels and hours of work by the end of the agreement period. To qualify for Work-Sharing, the employer must also employ a minimum of two EI-eligible employees within the Work-Sharing unit and agreements must be signed by the affected employees, employer, and Service Canada.

Employers who provide temporary or seasonal work arrangements, or which are subject work stoppages due to a labour dispute, are not considered eligible for work-sharing agreements.

Employers experiencing reduced business activity that is attributable to a predictable seasonal shortage of work or any other recurring production slowdown are not eligible for Work-Sharing. Employers directly involved in a work stoppage attributable to a labour dispute are also not eligible for work-sharing agreements.

An internal evaluation of the Work-Sharing program was finalized in 2014/2015 to assess and determine the overall impacts and effects of the temporary policy changes introduced during and after the 2008 recession. The evaluation found that the program continues to be relevant and was particularly effective during the economic downturn. Results of the evaluation demonstrate that firms which participated in Work-Sharing were unlikely to completely shut-down after the termination of their agreement. This suggests that the program is not delaying closures of failing businesses, but rather supporting companies who are facing work shortages due to temporary business downturns. For example, evidence from the evaluation's review of program files confirmed that 74% of the 226 approved Work-Sharing agreement files reviewed returned to normal levels of business activity by the end of the agreement.[153]

The evaluation proposed a number of recommendations, including:

- exploring ways to improve reporting processes for smaller companies;
- improving the speed of benefit delivery to employees;
- examining ways to further streamline multiple signing authorities for agreements where laid-off workers are called back to employment;
- increasing outreach activities for employers and employees;
- improving the consistency and efficiency of program delivery across regions; and
- finding more ways to increase the use of the program by non-manufacturing sectors.

[153] ESDC, *Evaluation of the Work-Sharing Program* (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate. 2015).

The amount paid in EI work-sharing benefits is impacted by three key indicators: the number of claims, the duration of benefits, and the average weekly benefit rate (level of benefits). In general, an increase in one of these indicators will increase the total amount of benefits paid. The following sections will discuss the amount paid, number of claims, the level and duration of work-sharing benefits in recent years. For the purposes of this section, EI work-sharing claims refers to claims for which at least $1 of work-sharing benefits was paid.

5.1 Employment Insurance Work-Sharing Claims[154] and Amounts Paid

The rate of use of work-sharing benefits is countercyclical. The total number of claims established and amount paid in Employment Insurance benefits normally increase during time periods of labour market contraction, and decline during time periods of economic expansion. As illustrated in Chart 47, the number of new work-sharing claims peaked in 2009/2010, reaching a total of just over 127,000 claims as a result of the impacts from the 2008 recession and temporary Employment Insurance changes introduced by the Government.[155] As the economy began to recover in the following years, the number of work-sharing claims declined significantly. In 2014/2015, there were 8,024 new work-sharing claims established, representing a decrease of 31% compared to claims reported in 2013/2014. The economy continuing to improve between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 meant that the number of work-sharing claims was well below pre-recession levels as fewer employers needed support to keep their businesses operating at normal levels.

In 2014/2015, there was an average of 2,685 beneficiaries receiving work-sharing benefits each month, a decrease of 26% from the monthly average of 3,636 beneficiaries reported in 2013/2014.[156] The count of beneficiaries represents the number of claimants who received at least $1 of EI work-sharing benefits during the reference period for the month (usually the week of the 15th day) and is affected by the inflow of new claimants and the outflow of claimants who have stopped receiving work-sharing benefits.

Generally speaking, changes in the number of claims and beneficiaries tend to move together, with the exception of changes to the average duration of benefits or a sudden, significant increase or decrease in new claims. When there is an economic shock, claim volumes will increase ahead of beneficiaries due to a lag between when a new claim is received and when a benefit period is established and benefits are made payable. The beneficiary count will remain elevated after the volume of new claims subsides and previous claims remain in pay, until benefits are exhausted, the claimant has returned to their regular working hours, or the work-sharing agreement ends.

The amount paid in Work-Sharing benefits grew significantly during the aftermath of the 2008 recession but has since declined. In 2014/2015, total Work-Sharing benefits paid to Employment Insurance claimants amounted to $17.7 million, a 17% decrease from the $21.3 million reported in 2013/2014 and a large decline from the peak of $295 million in benefits paid that was reached in 2009/2010.

Factors which contributed to the significant increase in Work-Sharing benefits paid in recent years include a higher volume of claims established in the 2008 recession, as well as temporary policy changes introduced under previous Budgets for 2009, 2010, and 2011.

5.1.1 Employment Insurance Work-sharing Claims and Amount Paid, by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, and Industry

As demonstrated in Table 58, Quebec accounted for 45% of Work-Sharing claims established and amounts paid in 2014/2015, while Ontario accounted for 28% of work-sharing claims established and 30% of the total amount paid. Together, these two provinces accounted for 73% of all claims established and 76% of all amounts paid in 2014/2015.

The province of Saskatchewan saw the largest increases in the total number of new claims established and amounts paid under work-sharing between 2013/2014 (1% of claims made and 1% of benefits paid) and 2014/2015 (9% of claims made and 14% of benefits paid). Together, the Atlantic provinces represented 1% of all new claims made and

---

[154] Work-Sharing claims differ from work-sharing agreements. Claims are made by employees who are subject to a Work-Sharing agreement agreed to with the employer. A work-sharing agreement can consist of multiple workers and multiple claims at once.

[155] Given the level of uncertainty faced by both employers and workers during the 2008 recession, the federal government introduced temporary measures to the Work-sharing program to mitigate the effects of the downturn. Temporary measures introduced under Budget 2009 extended agreement durations, streamlined the administrative process, and eased eligibility requirements for employers. Temporary measures were also introduced in Budgets 2010, 2011, and the Economic and Fiscal Update 2011. All temporary Work-Sharing measures concluded in October 2012. Annex 7 provides more detailed information on some of these temporary changes.

[156] Statistics Canada. Labour Force Survey. CANSIM Table 276-0020.

Chart 47

EI Work-sharing Claims[1] and Benefits, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of work-sharing benefits were paid

Note: Shaded area corresponds to a recessionary period for the Canadian economy. The shaded area also corresponds to the introduction of temporary measures related to the Work-Sharing program.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance administrative data, based on a 100% sample.

2% of amounts paid in 2014/2015, while the Western provinces represented 26% of all new claims and 23% of amounts paid in 2014/2015. There were no new work-sharing claims established for, or benefits paid to, individuals working in Canada's Territories in 2014/2015.

Men continue to be more likely to make use of the Work-Sharing program, accounting for 74% of new Work-Sharing claims and 80% of Work-Sharing benefits paid in 2014/2015. By age, workers aged 25 to 44 were the heaviest users of the Work-sharing program, accounting for 43% of work-sharing claims and 47% of work-sharing benefits in 2014/2015. Together, core aged labour force participants (those aged 25 to 54) accounted for 73% of all work-sharing claims and 76% of benefits paid, representing a higher share of work-sharing claimants than their share of total employment in Canada. Youth were under-represented for the number of new claims established and benefits paid in terms of their total share of employment (see Table 58).

Work-Sharing has been utilized most frequently by employees in the manufacturing industry historically, and this trend continued in 2014/2015. Employees in the manufacturing industry accounted for 63% of EI Work-Sharing Claims and 63% of EI Work-Sharing benefits paid, despite accounting for just 10% of total employment share for Canadian industries (see Table 58). These totals are slightly below the share of EI Work-Sharing claims and benefits paid attributed to the manufacturing industry in previous years (73% of claims and 69% of benefits paid in 2013/2014, and 77% of claims and 73% of benefits paid in 2012/2013). This indicates that the manufacturing industry continues to be over-represented in the number of Work-Sharing claims initiated and benefits paid, relative to its share of total employment across all industries.

Table 58

Employment Insurance Work-Sharing Claims[1], Amounts Paid in Benefits, and Total Employment, by Province and Territory, Gender, Age and Industry (Share of Total Employment), Canada, 2014/2015

Categories	New Claims Established	Amount Paid	Employment
Province and Territory			
Quebec	45%	45%	23%
Ontario	28%	31%	39%
Saskatchewan	9%	14%	3%
All Other Provinces and Territories	18%	11%	35%
Gender			
Male	74%	80%	52%
Female	26%	20%	48%
Age			
24 Years and Under (Youth)	6%	5%	14%
25 to 54 Years	73%	76%	66%
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	21%	19%	20%
Industry			
Manufacturing	63%	63%	10%
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	11%	13%	8%
Wholesale Trade	11%	14%	15%
All Other Industries	16%	11%	68%
Canada	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**

[1] Includes claims for which at least $1 of work-sharing benefits was paid.

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Sources: ESDC, Employment Insurance administrative data (for data on new claims established and amounts paid); and Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0087 (for data on employment). ESDC data is based on a 100% sample of Employment Insurance administrative data.

5.2 Level and Duration of Employment Insurance Work-sharing Benefits

The following section outlines the level of benefits received by Work-Sharing participants, and the average duration of benefits provided under work-sharing agreements entered into by Service Canada, employers and employees.

In 2014/2015, the average benefit rate of work-sharing benefits was $129 per week in 2014/2015, an increase of 10.3% compared to the average weekly benefit of $117 reported in 2013/2014. This represents the third consecutive annual increase in the level of average weekly work-sharing benefits, and was higher than the level of benefits paid during the aftermath of the 2008 recession, in line with improving economic conditions and wage increases reported during that time.

Nova Scotia ($202) and Saskatchewan ($196) received the highest average weekly benefit rates, while those from New Brunswick ($80) received the lowest. Similar to previous years, there was a high level of variability between the averages for weekly benefits paid in each province in 2014/2015 (see Chart 48).

Men received an average weekly benefit rate of $135, while women received average weekly benefit rate of $112 in 2014/2015.

The industry which reported the highest average weekly benefit for Work-Sharing was the Mining, Oil and Gas Extraction industry ($198), followed by the Wholesale Trade industry ($169) and Transportation and Warehousing industry ($157). The industries which reported the lowest average weekly benefit rate for Work-Sharing were the Utilities industry (no benefits were paid to this industry) and the Arts,

Chart 48

Average Weekly Work-sharing Benefit, Canada and by Province, 2014/2015

Note: No work-sharing claim was established in the Northwest Territories, Yukon or Nunavut in 2014/2015.
Source: ESDC. Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data.

Entertainment and Recreation industry ($83) in 2014/2015. Similar to figures reported on a provincial basis, there was also significant variation in average weekly benefits on the basis of industry classification, attributable in part to significant variability of average wages across professions in these industries and the number of claims made per industry.

The average duration of Work-Sharing claims established in 2014/2015 was 15.5 weeks, an increase from 2013/2014 (14.3 weeks) and 2012/2013 (13.6 weeks). The current average duration is also above the average duration of 13.1 weeks for claims established in 2007/2008, before the recession.

5.3 Employment Insurance Work-Sharing Agreements

Similar to the number of Work-Sharing claims established and amounts paid, the numbers of Work-Sharing Agreements that are agreed to in a given fiscal year tend to follow a counter cyclical pattern, with the number of new agreements established increasing during periods of economic shocks and declining during periods of economic growth.

Consistent with the ongoing period of economic recovery in 2014/2015, the number of new Work-Sharing agreements declined for the fifth consecutive year, from 649 agreements in 2013/2014 to 412 in 2014/2015, equivalent to a decline of 36.5%. The number of new agreements has decreased significantly since the peak of 7,717 agreements in 2009/2010 and for the first time since the start of the 2008 recession the number of new agreements initiated fell below pre-recession levels in 2014/2015 (see Chart 49).

5.3.1 Employment Insurance Work-Sharing Agreements by Province and Territory, Industry and Enterprise Size

In 2014/2015, Ontario (137 agreements) and Quebec (173 agreements) together represented 75% of all Work-Sharing agreements. Western provinces, with 89 agreements total, made up 22% of all agreements, while the Atlantic provinces accounted for 3% of all Work-Sharing agreements in 2014/2015. There were no Work-Sharing agreements started in Canada's territories in 2014/2015.

Chart 49

Total Count of Work-Sharing Agreements, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

Note: Shaded area corresponds to a recessionary period for the Canadian economy. The shaded area also corresponds to the introduction of temporary measures related to the Work-Sharing program.

The industry which reported the largest number of work-sharing agreements in 2014/2015 was the manufacturing industry with 227 agreements. This amount was equivalent to 55% of all agreements made. The manufacturing industry was followed by firms in the Professional, Scientific and Technical Services industry with 56 agreements (14% of all agreements), the Wholesale Trade industry with 34 agreements (8% of all agreements), and the Construction industry with 28 agreements (7% of all agreements). Similar to the case of Work-Sharing claims and benefits paid, Work-Sharing agreements in the Manufacturing industry were heavily over-represented among industries since manufacturing represented 10% of all employment positions in Canada during 2014/2015 (see Table 59). Based on observed results since 2007/2008, the goods-producing industries of Canada`s economy represented the majority of all work-sharing agreements initiated (over 60% of all agreements for each year reviewed) than firms in the services-producing industries of the economy.

Table 59

Percentage Share of Work-Sharing Agreements, Canada, by Industry, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015

	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Goods-producing Industries	**63%**	**69%**	**63%**	**61%**	**68%**	**68.5%**	**69%**	**65%**
Construction	1%	2%	5%	7%	6%	5%	5.5%	7%
Manufacturing	61%	65%	56%	52.5%	61%	62%	59%	55%
Services-producing Industries	**13%**	**22%**	**36%**	**39%**	**32%**	**31.5%**	**31%**	**35%**
Wholesale Trade	2%	5.5%	8%	7%	7%	5%	7%	8%
Retail Trade	1%	3%	4%	6.5%	6%	6%	4%	4%
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	4%	5%	9%	9%	8%	9%	12%	14%
Unclassified Industries	**24%**	**9%**	**1%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
Canada	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. Chart reflects percentage shares of top five industries who have initiated work-sharing agreements, as well as for all Good-producing and Services-producing industries.

Source: ESDC, Common System for Grants and Contributions.

When assessed by firm size, micro (firms with less than 5 employees) and small-sized enterprises (fewer than 50 employees) comprised 75.7% of all Work-sharing agreements in 2014/2015. Combined, micro, small and medium sized enterprises accounted for 99.8% of all Work-sharing agreements, consistent with previous years. There was only one agreement made that involved a large-sized enterprises (500 employees or more). Results for 2014/2015 were consistent with results from previous years since the 2008 recession, with a significant share of all Work-sharing agreements being initiated to assist micro, small and medium sized businesses recover from disruptions to their normal levels of business activity.

5.3.2. Employment Insurance Work-Sharing Agreements Subject to Early Termination

Early termination is a concept referring to a Work-Sharing agreement ending before the anticipated end date of the agreement, indicating that the firm subject to the agreement has either returned to operating at normal levels of business activity ahead of the timelines provided in their recovery plan, or that a firm is no longer interested in participating in the program for other reasons. Of the 412 Work-sharing agreements established in 2014/2015, a total of 124 were terminated earlier than their scheduled end date, accounting for 30% of all agreements during that year.

Of the 124 agreements that ended earlier than anticipated, 110 agreements (89%) concluded due to the participating firms returning to their normal level of employment, while in 11% of cases where agreements ended earlier than anticipated, the level of employment did not return to normal levels (see Table 60).

The proportion of Work-sharing agreements that ended ahead of schedule in 2014/2015 (30%) was lower than the corresponding proportion in 2013/2014 (41%) and 2012/2013 (43%). Manufacturing industries concentrated in Ontario (23 agreements), Quebec (28 agreements) and British Columbia (8 agreements) were the firms that reported the majority (56.4%) of cases where Work-Sharing agreements were terminated early because they returned to normal levels of business.

5.4. Number of Estimated Layoffs Averted from Work-Sharing Agreements

One of the main goals of the Work-Sharing program is to attempt to avert the number of layoffs a firm will have to face and to return participating employees to normal working hours by the end of the term of the Work-Sharing agreement.

Table 60

Employment Insurance Work-sharing Agreements, by Early Termination, 2014/2015

Category	Count	Share of All Work-sharing Agreements (2014/2015)
Agreements Terminated on Schedule	**288**	**70%**
Agreements Terminated Earlier than Scheduled End Date	**124**	**30%**
Early Termination Because Level of Employment Returned to Normal Levels	110	27%
Early Termination with Employment Not Returning to Normal Levels	14	3%
Canada	**412**	**100%**

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: ESDC, Common System for Grants and Contributions.

A recent program study undertaken by ESDC attempts to quantify the number of layoffs averted as a result of the intervention of a work-sharing agreement.[157] When assessing results of the Work-sharing program since 2007/2008, the number of layoffs averted in each fiscal year varied from a low of 1,546 in 2007/2008 to a high of 24,906 in 2009/2010.[158]

The number of layoffs averted or postponed by Work-Sharing agreements tends to vary in proportion to the number of Work-Sharing participants in a given year. As well, net layoffs averted by Work-Sharing agreements, as a share of the total estimated layoffs averted or postponed, tends to decrease during peak recessionary periods while the number of layoffs averted tends to increase during periods of initial economic recovery as the economy returns to growth. As a result, the performance reported of Work-Sharing agreements helping to avert layoffs during recessionary periods is reinforced by Work-Sharing agreements performing even more effectively when it attempts to avert layoffs during times of economic expansion, when the circumstances of the interruptions in normal business activity faced by firms are more local or targeted in nature (e.g. specific to local economic conditions) or based on economic downturns of shorter and less intense duration.

Since the beginning of 2010/2011, the proportion of net layoffs averted from Work-sharing agreements has fluctuated from a low of 66.5% in 2010/2011 to a high of 83% in 2014/2015 with each year since 2011/2012 reporting proportions of net layoffs averted above 70% (see Table 61).

Table 61

Estimated Count and Percentage Share of Net Layoffs Averted by Work-Sharing Agreements, Canada, 2007/2008 to 2014/2015[1]

Fiscal Year	Total Estimated Layoffs Averted or Postponed under WS Agreements[2]	Number of Actual Layoffs Observed[3]	Net Layoffs Averted[4]	Net Layoffs Averted as a Share of Total Estimated Layoffs Averted or Postponed under WS Agreements
2007/2008	4,000	2,947	1,053	26%
2008/2009	22,000	10,811	11,189	51%
2009/2010	35,500	11,115	24,385	69%
2010/2011	6,000	2,047	3,953	66%
2011/2012	7,000	1,959	5,041	72%
2012/2013	4,500	1,346	3,154	70%
2013/2014	3,500	1,057	2,443	70%
2014/2015[5]	2,500	435	2,065	83%
Totals	**85,000**	**31,717**	**53,283**	**63%**

Notes:

1 Assumes total work reduction is equal under Work-sharing or layoff alternatives. Also assumes that the average work reduction is the same during the weeks which could not be assessed.

2 The estimated number of layoffs averted listed in this column is not equal to the number of Work-Sharing claims made. The number of estimated layoffs averted or postponed is assumed to be equal to the number of positions in the affected work unit that would have been laid off if the Work-Sharing agreement had not occurred.

3 The number of layoffs is equal to the number of Work-sharing claimants who claimed regular EI benefits within 26 weeks of receiving their last Work-Sharing benefit.

4 The number of net layoffs averted is estimated as the difference between the number of positions in the affected work unit that would have been laid off minus the number of layoffs experienced by a company within 26 weeks of receiving their last Work-Sharing weekly benefit payment.

5 Results for 2014/2015 are likely to change in future years as some lag time exists for receiving information for completed Work-Sharing claims.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance administrative data based on a 100% sample.

157 ESDC, *Usage of the Work-Sharing Program: 2000/01 to 2014/2015.* (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate. 2016).

158 In order to explore this question, a supplemental study of the Work-Sharing program introduced a number of assumptions about the program to reach its findings including: the actual share of work hours reduced under a Work-sharing agreement is equivalent to the share of employees who would be laid off if no Work-Sharing agreement had been implemented (e.g. a 20% reduction in working hours would be equivalent to laying off 20% of an affected work units employees). The number of net layoffs averted is also assumed to be equal to the difference between the number of positions in the affected work unit that would have been laid off, minus the number of layoffs experienced by a company within 26 weeks of receiving their last Work-sharing weekly benefit payment. This indicator helps to highlight how effective the Work-sharing program was at averting layoffs beyond the timeframe of the Work-sharing agreement period.

6. Employment Insurance Benefits and Firms[159]

This section gives a profile of EI claimants by firms' characteristics and provides updated data on the Hiring Credit for Small Business measure. Section 6.1 provides an overall overview of the number of firms with employees receiving EI benefits. Section 6.2 focuses on firms and employees receiving regular benefits while section 6.3 analyzes firms with employees receiving special benefits. In addition, section 6.4 provides analysis on the impact of the Hiring Credit for Small Business that was introduced in Budget 2011 and extended in Budget 2013.

6.1 Firms with Employees Receiving Employment Insurance Benefits

The number of firms[160] operating in Canada in 2013 remained relatively stable, decreasing by only 0.2% to 1,164,500 from 1,166,700.

The proportion of firms with an employee receiving EI benefits decreased by 1.1 percentage point to 32.3% in 2013.[161] There was also a decline in the proportion of firms with at least one employee receiving EI regular benefits in 2013 (26.4%) compared to 2012 (27.7%). These decreases were largely driven by improving labour market conditions in the post-recession period.

Firms with employees receiving EI benefits accounted for 86.7% of total employment in 2013, compared to 87.0% in 2012. This decline is driven by the fact that firms with employees receiving EI regular benefits accounted for 81.9% of total employment, down from 82.5% in 2012.

Overall, these findings point to the fact that while the number of firms remained relatively stable in 2013, firms laid off a smaller proportion of their employees in 2013 than they did in 2012.

6.2 Firms and Employment Insurance Regular Benefits

Employers' utilization of EI regular benefits in 2013 can be examined based on the geographic location by province or territory, on the size of their firms and on their type of industries. Analysis in this section examines EI regular benefits which account for the majority of EI benefits paid (64.5% in 2014/2015).

6.2.1 Firms and Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Firm Location

Table 62 shows that, in 2013, 87.0% of firms in Canada were located in Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia and Alberta. Comparing the provincial and territorial distribution of firms (column 1) to that of their workforce (column 2), we see that British Columbia and Alberta were overrepresented in their number of firms, while Ontario and Quebec were underrepresented, indicating that firms in Ontario and Quebec are relatively larger in terms of their workforce than firms in other provinces.

Table 62 also shows that the Atlantic provinces and Quebec were overrepresented as EI regular claimants (column 3) compared to their workforce (column 2). For example, while the Atlantic provinces represented 12.4% of EI regular claimants, they only accounted for 5.9% of the workforce. All other provinces were underrepresented when comparing their workforce to their EI regular claimants.

Comparing the distribution of EI regular claimants based on where their firm is located (column 3) and where they resided (column 4) indicates that individuals employed by firms in Ontario and Alberta were overrepresented relative to where the individuals resided. In 2013, 33.6% of EI regular claimants worked for a firm located in Ontario while only 30.2% of EI regular claimants resided in that province. Similarly, Alberta firms represented 8.4% of EI regular claimants compared to 6.4% of EI regular claimants who resided in Alberta. All other provinces were underrepresented.

[159] As some information in this section is administered through the tax system, the most recent data available for this section are for the 2013 taxation year.

[160] A firm is an organization that has a Payroll Deduction Account Number at the nine-digit level assigned by the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA), and has at least one employee with employment income, as indicated on a T4 form. This definition includes public and private sector enterprises, as well as small businesses, fishers and a portion of the self-employed. Note that this definition includes some firms that did not contribute EI premiums.

[161] The data source for this firm analysis is EI and CRA administrative data. The 2013 CRA data is subject to change.

Table 62

Firms, Employment and Employment Insurance Regular Claimants, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2013

	Distribution of Firms[1]	Distribution of the Firm's Workforce[1,2]	Distribution of the Firm's EI Regular Claimants[1,3]	Distribution of EI Regular Claimants (Based on Residence)[4]
Province and Territory				
Newfoundland and Labrador	1.5%	1.2%	3.4%	4.7%
Prince Edward Island	0.4%	0.4%	0.9%	1.2%
Nova Scotia	2.3%	2.5%	3.9%	4.5%
New Brunswick	2.0%	1.8%	4.2%	5.3%
Quebec	20.1%	22.4%	30.4%	31.8%
Ontario	36.4%	41.6%	33.6%	30.2%
Manitoba	3.2%	3.2%	2.5%	2.7%
Saskatchewan	3.4%	2.6%	1.7%	2.1%
Alberta	15.2%	12.2%	8.4%	6.4%
British Columbia	15.4%	11.7%	10.5%	10.7%
Yukon	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Northwest Territories	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Nunavut	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Canada	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 The location of the firm, the firm's workforce and the firm's EI regular claimants is based on the location of the firm's headquarters, which is determined by the Business Register of Statistics Canada. If the firm's headquarters is located outside Canada, then the location of the firm is based on the location of the job based on T4 data.

2 The number of workers in a firm is the number of individuals with employment income in that firm, as indicated on a T4 form. The number of workers is adjusted so that each individual in the labour force is only counted once and individuals who work for more than one firm are taken into account. For example, if an employee earned $25,000 in firm 1 and $25,000 in firm 2, then he or she was recorded as 0.5 employee at the first firm and 0.5 employee at the second firm.

3 These are the number of people receiving EI regular benefits in 2013.

4 The residence-based location of an EI regular claimant is where the EI claimant resided when he or she filed for a claim.

Source: ESDC, Employment Insurance administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI data; CRA administrative data. CRA data are based on a 100% sample.

6.2.2 Firms and Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Firm Size

Small-sized firms represented 90.7% of all firms in Canada in 2013.[162] The remainder of the firms were small-to-medium-sized firms (7.8%), medium-to-large-sized firms (1.3%) and large-sized firms (0.3%). These figures are similar to those of 2012.

Table 63 indicates that workers in large-sized firms were underrepresented among EI regular claimants as they represented 43.1% of workers but only 30.5% of EI regular claimants. All other categories of firms were overrepresented among EI regular claimants. For example, small-sized firms represented 21.7% and 27.7% of workers and EI regular claimants, respectively. These results are similar to those of the last two years.

EI regular benefits were received by employees of 20.9% of small-sized firms in 2013. In comparison, 76.8%, 96.0% and 99.5% of small-to-medium, medium-to-large and large-sized firms had employees who received EI regular benefits, respectively.

In addition, among firms with employees who were in receipt of EI regular benefits, roughly one-third of employees (31.5%) in small-sized firms received EI regular benefits. With 14.4% of employees receiving regular benefits, small-to-medium firms also recorded

[162] The categories of firm size reflect those found in Business Dynamics in Canada, a Statistics Canada publication. Small-sized firms are defined as those that employ 1 to 19 employees. Small-to-medium sized firms employ 20 to 99 employees. Medium-to-large sized firms employ 100 to 499 employees. Large-sized firms employ 500 employees or more.

Table 63

Firms, Employment and Employment Insurance Regular Claimants, by Size of Firms, Canada, 2013

Size of Firms	Distribution of Firms[1]	Distribution of the Firm's Workforce[1,2]	Distribution of the Firm's EI Regular Claimants[1,3]
Small	90.7%	21.7%	27.7%
Small-Medium	7.8%	19.4%	24.6%
Medium-Large	1.3%	15.8%	17.2%
Large	0.3%	43.1%	30.5%
Canada	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 The location of the firm, the firm's workforce and the firm's EI regular claimants is based on the location of the firm's headquarters, which is determined by the Business Register of Statistics Canada. If the firm's headquarters is located outside Canada, then the location of the firm is based on the location of the job based on T4 data.

2 The number of workers in a firm is the number of individuals with employment income in that firm, as indicated on a T4 form. The number of workers is adjusted so that each individual in the labour force is only counted once and individuals who work for more than one firm are taken into account. For example, if an employee earned $25,000 in firm 1 and $25,000 in firm 2, then he or she was recorded as 0.5 employee at the first firm and 0.5 employee at the second firm.

3 These are the number of people receiving EI regular benefits in 2013.

Source: ESDC, EI administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI data; CRA administrative data. CRA data are based on a 100% sample.

figures above the national average of 11.2%. Although almost all medium-to-large and large-sized firms had employees in receipt of EI regular benefits in 2013, 10.3% and 6.5% of workers in these firms received EI regular benefits, respectively. These figures are consistent with those of 2012.

Overall, this analysis of the utilization of EI regular benefits by firm size suggests that various factors contribute to the overrepresentation of small and underrepresentation of large firms among firms with EI regular benefit claimants. In the case of smaller firms, it may be due to the fact that fewer smaller firms utilized EI regular benefits; however, given their small size, it is more likely that a higher proportion of their employees will be in receipt of EI regular benefits. Meanwhile, there is a higher probability that larger firms will have employees who are in receipt of EI regular benefits, but they will represent a smaller percentage of their employees.

6.2.3 Firms and Employment Insurance Regular Benefits, by Industry

Analysis by industry shows discrepancies between distribution of firms, distribution of firm's workforce and distribution of firm's EI regular claimants. Table 64 shows that firms in the Construction industry, the Business, Building and Other Support Services industry and the Other Services industry represented 12.4%, 12.4% and 9.7% of all firms in Canada in 2013. The goods-producing industries represented 22.0% of all firms while services-producing industries accounted for the remaining 78.0%.

Workers in the goods-producing sector were overrepresented as EI regular claimants: while they represented 20.1% of workers, they accounted for 38.0% of EI regular claimants. The overrepresentation of EI regular claimants in the goods-producing industries is mainly driven by the Construction industry: while they represented 6.9% of the workforce, they accounted for 20.1% of EI regular claimants in 2013. To a lesser extent, workers in the Manufacturing industry and in the Agriculture, Fishing, Forestry and Hunting industry were also overrepresented as EI regular claimants with 9.4% and 1.7% of workers and 11.5% and 4.1% of EI regular claimants, respectively.

By contrast, workers from the services-producing sector were underrepresented as EI regular claimants in 2013 with only 62.0% of EI regular claimants but 79.9% of workers. More specifically, workers in the Public Administration industry, the Retail Trade industry and in Information, Cultural and Recreation industry represented 9.8%, 11.4% and 8.3% of workers but only 5.1%, 7.0% and 4.1% of EI regular claimants, respectively.

Table 64

Firms, Employment and Employment Insurance Regular Claimants, by Industry, Canada, 2013

Industry	Distribution of Firms[1]	Distribution of the Firm's Workforce[1,2]	Distribution of the Firm's EI Regular Claimants[1,3]
Goods-Producing Industries	**22.0%**	**20.1%**	**38.0%**
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	4.5%	1.7%	4.1%
Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction	0.8%	1.4%	1.9%
Utilities	0.1%	0.7%	0.4%
Construction	12.4%	6.9%	20.1%
Manufacturing	4.3%	9.4%	11.5%
Services-Producing Industries	**78.0%**	**79.9%**	**62.0%**
Wholesale Trade	4.2%	4.7%	3.9%
Retail trade	8.9%	11.4%	7.0%
Transportation and Warehousing	5.4%	4.1%	4.3%
Finance and Insurance	2.6%	3.6%	3.5%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	2.6%	3.9%	1.4%
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	4.3%	1.7%	1.5%
Business, Building and Other Support Services[4]	12.4%	5.6%	4.4%
Educational Services	5.4%	7.1%	7.9%
Health care and Social Assistance	1.1%	7.3%	9.1%
Information, Cultural and Recreation[5]	8.4%	8.3%	4.1%
Accommodation and Food Services	6.3%	7.5%	5.4%
Other Services (except Public Administration)	9.7%	4.0%	3.5%
Public Administration	0.5%	9.8%	5.1%
Unclassified	5.9%	0.8%	0.9%
Canada	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 The location of the firm, the firm's workforce and the firm's EI regular claimants is based on the location of the firm's headquarters, which is determined by the Business Register of Statistics Canada. If the firm's headquarters is located outside Canada, then the location of the firm is based on the location of the job based on T4 data.

2 The number of workers in a firm is the number of individuals paid employment income by that firm, as indicated on a T4 form. The number of workers is adjusted so that each individual in the labour force is only counted once and individuals who work for more than one firm are taken into account. For example, if an employee earned $25,000 in firm 1 and $25,000 in firm 2, then he or she was recorded as 0.5 employee at the first firm and 0.5 employee at the second firm.

3 These are the number of people receiving EI regular benefits in 2013.

4 This industry comprises the industries with codes 55 (management of companies and enterprises) and 56 (administrative and support, waste management and mediation services) from the North American Industry Classification System.

5 This industry comprises the industries with codes 51 (information and cultural industries) and 71 (arts, entertainment and recreation) from the North American Industry Classification System.

Source: ESDC, EI administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI data; CRA administrative data. CRA data are based on a 100% sample.

6.3 Firms and Employment Insurance Special Benefits

Analysis in this section examines EI special benefits which accounted for 31.3% of EI benefits paid in 2014/2015.

6.3.1 Firms and Employment Insurance Special Benefits, by Firm Location

Comparing the distribution of the workforce to EI special claimants, Table 65 shows that the Atlantic provinces were overrepresented as EI special claimants with 9.2% versus 5.9% of the workforce. As opposed to regular claimants (see section 6.2.1), Quebec is underrepresented as EI special claimants. This is explained by the fact that Quebec administers its own program for maternity and parental benefits.

Similarly to what was observed in section 6.2.1, comparing distribution of EI special claimants based on where their firm is located and where they resided indicates that individuals employed by firms in Ontario and Alberta were overrepresented relative to where the individuals resided. In 2013, 43.1% of EI special claimants worked for a firm located in Ontario while only 35.5% of them resided in Ontario. To a lesser extent, Alberta firms represented 11.0% of EI special claimants compared to 10.7% of EI special claimants resided in Alberta. All other provinces were underrepresented, especially Quebec: 17.4% of EI special claimants worked for a firm located in that province while 20.6% of EI special claimants resided there.

Table 65

Firms, Employment and Employment Insurance Special Claimants, by Province and Territory, Canada, 2013

	Distribution of Firms[1]	Distribution of the Firm's Workforce[1,2]	Distribution of the Firm's EI Special Claimants[1,3]	Distribution of EI Special Claimants (Based on Residence)[4]
Province and Territory				
Newfoundland and Labrador	1.5%	1.2%	1.7%	2.3%
Prince Edward Island	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%	1.1%
Nova Scotia	2.3%	2.5%	3.4%	4.2%
New Brunswick	2.0%	1.8%	3.4%	4.9%
Quebec	20.1%	22.4%	17.4%	20.6%
Ontario	36.4%	41.6%	43.1%	35.5%
Manitoba	3.2%	3.2%	3.4%	3.7%
Saskatchewan	3.4%	2.6%	2.6%	2.9%
Alberta	15.2%	12.2%	11.0%	10.7%
British Columbia	15.4%	11.7%	13.0%	13.7%
Yukon	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Northwest Territories	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%
Nunavut	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Canada	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 The location of the firm, the firm's workforce and the firm's EI special claimants is based on the location of the firm's headquarters, which is determined by the Business Register of Statistics Canada. If the firm's headquarters is located outside Canada, then the location of the firm is based on the location of the job based on T4 data.

2 The number of workers in a firm is the number of individuals paid employment income by that firm, as indicated on a T4 form. The number of workers is adjusted so that each individual in the labour force is only counted once and individuals who work for more than one firm are taken into account. For example, if an employee earned $25,000 in firm 1 and $25,000 in firm 2, then he or she was recorded as 0.5 employee at the first firm and 0.5 employee at the second firm.

3 These are the number of people receiving EI special benefits in 2013.

4 The residence-based location of an EI special claimant is where the EI claimant resided when he or she filed for a claim.

Source: ESDC, EI administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI data; CRA administrative data. CRA data are based on a 100% sample.

6.3.2 Firms and Employment Insurance Special Benefits, by Firm Size

As seen in section 6.2.2, small-sized firms represented 90.7% of all firms in Canada in 2013,[163] while large-sized firms represented only 0.3% of firms. Whereas section 6.2.2 showed large differences in the distribution of the workforce and EI regular claimants, Table 66 indicates that the picture differs for EI special claimants. The distribution of the firm's workforce and EI special claimants were pretty similar by firm size, the largest percentage point difference (2.6) coming from small-sized firms.

While large firms were slightly underrepresented among EI special claimants (43.1% of the workforce vs 42.3% of EI special claimants), the magnitude of the underrepresentation was much lower than that found under EI regular claimants. Small firms were underrepresented among EI special claimants: while they represented 21.7% of workers, they represented only 19.1% of EI special claimants. Small-to-medium sized firms and medium-to-large firms were overrepresented among EI special claimants, as was the case for EI regular claimants (see section 6.2.2).

In summary, the section on firms has revealed several interesting facts: 1) large firms were well underrepresented when comparing the distribution of the workforce to that of EI regular claimants, while the opposite holds true for small-sized firms; 2) goods-producing industries were overrepresented as EI regular claimants compared to their workforce, while services-producing industries were underrepresented; and 3) large discrepancies exist between the distribution of firms' workforce and the distribution of EI special claimants by province.

6.4 Firms and Temporary Hiring Credit for Small Business

In recognition of the challenges small businesses were facing across the country, Budget 2011 announced a temporary Hiring Credit for Small Business (HCSB) for two years. Employers whose EI premiums were $10,000 or less in 2010 received a refund for any increase in their 2011 EI premiums over those paid in 2010, to a maximum of $1,000. The measure also applied for 2012 EI premiums.

Budget 2013 extended the temporary credit for one more year, and expended it to employers whose EI premiums were $15,000 or less in 2012, with a maximum credit of $1,000.

Table 66

Firms, Employment and Employment Insurance Special Claimants, by Size of Firm, Canada, 2013

Size of Firms	Distribution of Firms[1]	Distribution of the Firm's Workforce[1,2]	Distribution of the Firm's EI Special Claimants[1,3]
Small	90.7%	21.7%	19.1%
Small-Medium	7.8%	19.4%	21.0%
Medium-Large	1.3%	15.8%	17.5%
Large	0.3%	43.1%	42.3%
Canada	**100.0%**	**100.0%**	**100.0%**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 The location of the firm, the firm's workforce and the firm's EI special claimants is based on the location of the firm's headquarters, which is determined by the Business Register of Statistics Canada. If the firm's headquarters is located outside Canada, then the location of the firm is based on the location of the job based on T4 data.

2 The number of workers in a firm is the number of individuals paid employment income by that firm, as indicated on a T4 form. The number of workers is adjusted so that each individual in the labour force is only counted once and individuals who work for more than one firm are taken into account. For example, if an employee earned $25,000 in firm 1 and $25,000 in firm 2, then he or she was recorded as 0.5 employee at the first firm and 0.5 employee at the second firm.

3 These are the number of people receiving EI special benefits in 2013.

Source: ESDC, EI administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI data; CRA administrative data. CRA data are based on a 100% sample.

[163] The categories of firm size reflect those found in Business Dynamics in Canada, a Statistics Canada publication. Small-sized firms are defined as those that employ 1 to 19 employees. Small-to-medium sized firms employ 20 to 99 employees. Medium-to-large sized firms employ 100 to 499 employees. Large-sized firms employ 500 employees or more.

In 2013, 562,870 businesses received the HCSB at a total cost of $235.3M (see Table 67). This figure compares to 554,146 businesses at a total cost of $219.2M in 2012. The average credit for businesses was $418 in 2013 compared to $396 in 2012. In addition, 107,707 businesses received the maximum credit of $1,000 in 2013 compared to 92,368 such businesses in 2012. In 2011, 552,043 businesses received the credit at a cost of $210.4M. Businesses received in average $381 in credit and 87,055 got the maximum credit of $1,000 in 2011.

7. Employment Insurance Financial Information

The Employment Insurance (EI) program is financed entirely by contributions that employees and employers pay on insurable earnings. To record all EI related financial transactions, the federal government established the Employment Insurance Operating Account. All amounts received under the *Employment Insurance Act* are deposited into the Consolidated Revenue Fund (CRF) and credited to the Account, while all benefits and administration costs provided for under the *Act* are paid out of the CRF and debited from the Account. The Employment Insurance Operating Account was created on January 1, 2009, with a zero balance, replacing the former Employment Insurance Account. The following sections provide information on the EI premium rate and recent trends in revenues and expenditures recorded in the Employment Insurance Operating Account.

7.1 Employment Insurance Premium Rate

The EI program is based on the principle of universal coverage of all employees in insurable employment. Employees in insurable employment must pay EI premiums for every $100 of insurable earnings, up to the maximum yearly insurable earnings threshold.[164] Employers pay premiums that are 1.4 times those of their employees. This means that employees pay 5/12 of program costs, while employers pay 7/12.

In 2015, the premium rate for employees (who were not covered by a provincial parental insurance plan) was $1.88 per $100 of insurable earnings, the same amount as in 2014 and 2013. As a result, the premium rate of employers also remained unchanged from 2013 to 2015, at $2.632 for every $100 of insurable earnings.

The EI program provides for a reduction in the premium rate of employees covered by a provincial parental insurance plan. For employees living in a province with this type of program, the premium rate was $1.54 in 2015, $1.53 in 2014, and $1.52 in 2013 per $100 of insurable earnings. For their employers, the rate was therefore $2.156 in 2015, $2.142 in 2014, and $2.128 in 2013 per $100 of insurable earnings (see Table Y1).

Quebec is currently the only province that administers its own plan. Since 2006, Quebec has paid parental, adoption, maternity, and paternity benefits under the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan, and they replace the same type of special benefits provided by the EI

Table 67

Temporary Hiring Credit for Small Business, Canada, 2011 to 2013[1]

	2011	2012	2013
Total Credits (in millions)	$210.4 M	$219.2 M	$235.3 M
Employers Receiving Credit	552,043	554,146	562,870
Average Credit	$381	$396	$418
Employers Getting the Maximum Credit of $1,000	87,055	92,368	107,707

[1] Figures are as of February 29, 2016.

Source: CRA administrative data. CRA data are based on a 100% sample of T4 file.

[164] Under the *Employment Insurance Act*, the maximum insurable earnings (MIE) is indexed annually based on the average industrial earnings in Canada, as published by Statistics Canada. The MIE was $47,400 in 2013, $48,600 in 2014, and $49,500 in 2015. The MIE is also drawn from to calculate the maximum benefit rate that an EI claimant can receive (for more information, see Section 1.4 of Program Overview, which precedes Chapter I).

Table 68

Employment Insurance Premium Rates for Employees and Employers, Canada, 2013 to 2015

		Premium Rate per $100 of Insurable Earnings		
		2013	2014	2015
Residents of a province without a provincial parental insurance plan	Employees	$1.88	$1.88	$1.88
	Employers (calculated at the rate of 1.4 times the employee premiums)	$2.632	$2.632	$2.632
Residents of a province with a provincial parental insurance plan	Employees	$1.52	$1.53	$1.54
	Employers (calculated at the rate of 1.4 times the employee premiums)	$2.128	$2.142	$2.156

Source: Government of Canada, Public Accounts of Canada 2015, volume I: Summary Report and Consolidated Financial Statements (Ottawa: Receiver General of Canada, 2015)

program. Thus, the premium rate is lower in Quebec than elsewhere in Canada because the province itself collects the premiums to finance its plan.

The Premium Reduction Program (PRP) also reduces EI premiums of employers when their employees are covered by a short-term disability plan (i.e., a cumulative paid sick leave plan or weekly indemnity plan) that meets or exceeds certain requirements established by the Canada Employment Insurance Commission. To qualify, employers must show how they return to their employees their portion of the savings (i.e., 5/12 of the total savings) that are generated by reducing the premium rate. Further information on the PRP is presented in Section 5.2 of Chapter II.

Finally, the EI program also includes a provision for contributors who are unlikely to be eligible for EI benefits. Employees whose insurable earnings are equal to or lower than $2,000 in a calendar year are eligible for a full refund of their premiums when filing their income tax return. Additional information on the premium refund provision is provided in Section 1.5 of Chapter II.

7.2 Recent Trends in Revenues and Expenditures

According to the *Public Accounts of Canada*, in 2014/2015, total EI revenues ($23.0 billion) were higher than EI expenditures ($19.7 billion), generating a $3.3 billion surplus. By comparison, surpluses of $3.2 billion and $2.0 billion were recorded in 2013/2014 and 2012/2013, respectively.

On March 31, 2015, the accumulated surplus in the Employment Insurance Operating Account was $0.5 billion, compared with an accumulated deficit of $2.7 billion on March 31, 2014 and $6.0 billion on March 31, 2013. This increase in the balance is mainly a result of the decline in the number of claims established, which can be attributed to the fact that the unemployment rate has fallen after peaking during the 2008 recession. Annex 5 summarizes the EI revenues and expenditures for the past three fiscal years, which are reported in the Employment Insurance Operating Account financial statements and published in the *Public Accounts of Canada*.

Chapter III

Impacts and Effectiveness of Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSMs–Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act*)

Activities delivered under Part II of the Employment Insurance (EI) Act *help unemployed individuals in Canada prepare for, find and maintain suitable employment. Under the umbrella of Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSMs), these activities include similar programs delivered by provinces and territories under Labour Market Development Agreements (LMDAs), as well as the Government of Canada's pan-Canadian programming and functions of the National Employment Service (NES).*

This chapter presents EBSM program results achieved under Part II of the *EI Act* during the 2014/2015 reporting period. A national overview of EBSM-similar programming, delivered under the LMDAs and by Aboriginal Skills and Employment Training Strategy (ASETS) agreement holders, is provided in section 1, entitled "National Overview". Provincial and territorial employment programming activities are presented in section 2, "Provincial and Territorial Summaries", with a description of each jurisdiction's labour market and employment priorities. Section 3 presents the results of an analysis of the incremental impacts of LMDAs for the "long-tenured workers" EI claimant type and a cost-benefit analysis of all LMDAs. Finally, section 4 discusses the results of Employment and Social Development Canada's (ESDC's) delivery of pan-Canadian activities, and the administration of certain NES functions.

Notes to Readers

i. The data used to analyze EBSM activities were collected from provinces, territories and ASETS agreement holders. Accordingly, the data were processed through several systems using a variety of sources. Governments are continuing to improve data quality and collection to ensure accurate, reliable and consistent information. While all data sets are verified before publication, systems and operational changes may affect the comparability of data from year-to-year. These instances are noted, where applicable.

ii. Throughout this chapter, references to average levels of activity, and highs and lows generally use the 10-year period from 2004/2005 to 2014/2015 as a frame of reference.

iii. Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey (LFS) is the source of labour market data reported herein. Data for Canada and the provinces are fiscal-year averages, calculated using seasonally unadjusted data, while monthly references are seasonally adjusted. Data for the Northwest Territories, Yukon and Nunavut are calculated using unadjusted three-month moving average monthly data. In discussions of employment trends by industry, standard industry titles are taken from the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS).

iv. Real GDP data and other non LFS macroeconomic indicators are from Statistics Canada's Economic accounts. Forecasts are based on published analysis from the Bank of Canada, the Conference Board of Canada, Canadian Banks, OECD and Statistics Canada, as well as on internal analysis, using information available as of February 2016.

1. National Overview

1.1 Context

1.1.1 Economic Conditions

Canada's real growth domestic product (GDP) rose moderately by 2.4% in 2014, slightly above the 2.1% growth recorded in 2013. At the subnational level, the strongest real GDP growth in 2014 was recorded in the Northwest Territories (+5.9%) followed by Alberta (+4.5%), Nunavut (+3.6%), British Columbia (+2.6%) and Ontario (+2.5%). Growth rates in Manitoba (+2%), Saskatchewan (+1.6%), Prince Edward Island (+1.5%), Quebec (+1.4%), and Nova Scotia (0.7%) were below the national average. New Brunswick (-0.3%), Yukon (-0.8%) and Newfoundland and Labrador (-2.3%) all experienced negative growth.

The Canadian economy experienced a mild recession through the first half of 2015. For the whole year, Canada's real GDP growth will likely be around 1.2%. The sharp decline in crude oil prices has weighed on the Canadian economy. Since peaking at $107USD per barrel in June 2014, oil prices have experienced a steady decline, averaging under $50 USD per barrel in the first quarter 2015[1]. This drop has had an impact on Canada's energy sector, as high-cost oil producers responded by cancelling capital projects, decreasing drilling activities and laying off workers.

In 2014, Canada's economy was driven mainly by an increase in household final consumption expenditure (+2.8%), as outlays on goods (+3.4%) and services (+2.2%) both advanced. Spending on durable (+5.3%), semi-durable (+3.6%) and non-durable (+2.4%) goods all increased. Household disposable income (in current dollars) grew by 3.4%, the slowest pace in five years. As a result, the household saving rate declined from 5.2% in 2013 to 4.0% in 2014.

In 2014, exports rose by 5.4% after increasing 2.0% in the previous year. Exports of goods rose by 6.0%, while those of services were 2.3% higher. Imports grew 1.7%, following a 1.3% increase the previous year. The imports of goods increased by 2.4% and were partially offset by a 1.3% decline in imports of services.

Governments' gross fixed capital formation decreased (-2.3%) for the fourth consecutive year, amid fiscal constraint among many of the provincial and territorial governments throughout 2014/2015.

Mining and oil and gas extraction, as well as manufacturing, were the main contributors to overall growth in goods production (+2.4%). Construction and utilities also grew. The gains were partly offset by a decrease in the agriculture and forestry sectors, pulled down by falling crop production following strong growth in 2013. Wholesale and retail trade; finance and insurance; the public sector (education, health and public administration combined); transportation and warehousing services; professional services; as well as accommodation and food services, contributed to the increase in the service-producing sector (+2.4%).

In 2014, Canada's business productivity grew by 2.5%, following a gain of 1.2% in the previous year. Business productivity increased in every province and territory except Yukon, Newfoundland and Labrador, and New Brunswick. Growth in business productivity was above the national average in Nunavut (10%) and British Columbia (3%), while Alberta (2.6%), Quebec (2.5%), Ontario (2.4%) and Saskatchewan (2.3%) were similar to the national growth rate. Business productivity remained unchanged in New Brunswick, while Yukon and Newfoundland and Labrador declined by -10% and -1.5%, respectively.

Compared internationally, Canada's annualized real GDP growth is forecasted at 2.4% for 2014, which is above the OECD average of 1.8%. Among the G-7 countries, Canada's 2014 forecast ranks second—along with that of the United States—only behind the United Kingdom's. For 2015, Canada's ranking is expected to slip, with a real GDP growth rate of just over 1%. The United Kingdom, the United States and Germany are projected to experience stronger growth.[2] Lower oil prices have had a net negative impact on Canada's economy, while creating large regional differences. According to the Conference Board of Canada, Canada's oil industry is expected to post a pre-tax loss of $2.1 billion in 2015, compared to a profit of close to $6 billion the previous year.[3]

1.1.2 Labour Market Context

Overall, labour market conditions improved in Canada for a fifth consecutive year, with employment levels reaching an all-time high of 17.8 million, and a net gain of 103,000 jobs recorded in 2014/2015. This represented a 0.6% year-over-year increase. In addition, both full-time and part-time employment jobs expanded, by 0.4% and 1.2%, respectively. The work force expanded by 1.1% to a total of 29.06 million, while the labour force grew at a rate of 0.4% (19.1 million).

---

[1] http://www.eia.gov/dnav/pet/pet_pri_spt_s1_d.htm

[2] Retrieved October 2015: https://data.oecd.org/gdp/real-gdp-forecast.htm#indicator-chart

[3] http://www.conferenceboard.ca/press/newsrelease/15-10-28/canadian_oil_industry_to_lose_more_than_2_billion_in_2015.aspx

1.1.3 Client Trends

Provinces and territories supported a lower number of LMDA clients (-3.1%) accessing EBSM interventions in 2014/2015. All three client type counts declined, as EI active claimants dropped by 2.7%, former clients edged down by 6.0% and non-insured clients decreased by 2.7%. The share of active clients (49.3%) edged down by 0.2 percentage points year-over-year, while former clients (12.5%) dropped by 0.4 percentage points. The share of non-insured clients increased by 0.2 percentage points to a total of 38.2%, representing an all-time high, as provinces and territories increasingly provided Employment Assistance Services (Support Measures) to non-insured clients.

1.1.4 Trends in Program Delivery

In 2014/2015, the number of EBSM interventions delivered by provinces, territories and Indigenous organizations decreased by 2.8%. Both Employment Benefits and Support Measures were down year-over-year, -4.8% and -2.7% respectively. Support Measures, which represented 86.8% of all interventions, increased in their share by 0.3 percentage points as clients relied more heavily on short-term interventions for quicker returns to work in a strengthening labour market.

1.2 Main Results

Provinces, territories and Indigenous organizations helped a total of 689,459 clients prepare for, obtain and maintain employment during the 2014/2015 reporting period. This represented a 3.0% drop year over year. Canada's unemployed accessed a declining number (1,106,750) of EBSM interventions (-2.8% year over year). Accordingly, the ratio of the number of interventions per client increased slightly to 1.61, compared with 1.60 in the previous year. The number of EI active and former claimants returning to employment after participation in EBSM-similar programming rose to 173,593 (+1.0%), while unpaid benefits from the EI Operating Account increased significantly, reaching $1,121,980 in 2014/2015 (+5.7%).

1.2.1 Canada's Labour Market

Key Labour Market Indicators

In 2014/2015, Canada's labour market recorded soft but continued growth. Employment edged up by 0.6% adding 103,000 jobs, compared to 1.2% growth the previous year. Unemployment fell by 2.3% year over year (-30,600), bringing Canada's unemployment rate down to 6.9%. This was the first fiscal year since 2008/2009 with an unemployment rate below 7%.

Canada

EBSM Key Facts

Clients Served: 689,459		
EI Active & Former	**Non-Insured**	**Pan-Canadian[1]**
431,794 ↓	257,665 ↓	15,378 ↑
Active	**Former**	**Non-Insured**
49.3% ↓	13.3% ↓	37.4% ↓
Youth (15–24)[2]	**Core Age (25–54)**	**Older Workers (55+)**
19.4% –	68.1% ↓	12.5% ↑

Interventions: 1,106,750		
	2014/2015	**Year-over-Year Change**
Employment Benefits	142,389	4.8% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	936,144	2.7% ↓
Pan-Canadian	28,217	7.0% ↑

Relative Share		
	2014/2015	**Year-over-Year Change**
Employment Benefits	13.2%	0.2 ↓
Support Measures: EAS	86.6%	0.2 ↑

Allocation: $2,076.6 Million		
	2014/2015 ($ Million)	**Year-over-Year Change**
Employment Benefits	$1,149.2	2.4% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	$629.9	6.1% ↑
LMPs and R&I	$160.7	1.2% ↑
Pan-Canadian	$116.7	0.2% ↓
Total Expenditures[3]	**$2,056.6**	**0.5% ↑**

Managing for Results		
Indicator	**Total**	**Year-over-Year Change**
Active Claimants Served	339,795	2.6% ↓
Returns to Employment (active and former clients)	173,593	1.0% ↑
Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)	$1,121.98	5.7% ↑

1 EI Part II Pan-Canadian services to individuals are through the Aboriginal Skills and Employment Training Strategy.
2 Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-Apprentices and Group Services.
3 Totals may not add up exactly due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

For a second consecutive year, the employment rate edged down in 2014/2015, dropping to 61.4%. As well, the labour market participation rate declined to 65.9%, a drop of 0.5 percentage points, the lowest rate since 2000/2001. While the economy has continued to expand since the 2008-2009 recession, the downward trending participation rate will likely remain in place over the medium term as the baby-boomer generation enters retirement with fewer labour market entrants to replace them.

In 2014/2015, employment gains were concentrated in the services-producing sector (+128,000), which more than offset the employment losses in the goods-producing sector (-25,000). All goods-producing industries recorded employment losses with the exception of construction, which experienced a growth of 3,900 net jobs. The manufacturing sector is often seen as the segment of the Canadian economy that benefits the most from the fall in oil prices through its weakening effect on the Canadian dollar. However, the export growth has been weaker than initially anticipated, holding back potential job gains. The services-producing sector was sustained by strong employment increases in: health care and social assistance (+42,400); accommodation and food services (+35,400); and, educational services (+30,200). Employment losses in the services-producing sector were observed in: other services (-12,200); information, culture and recreation (-4,700); and business, building, and other support services (-1,600).

Labour Market Tightness

According to Statistics Canada's Business Payroll Survey (BPS)[4], Canadian businesses reported on average 235,300 job vacancies in 2014/2015, representing a 10% increase compared to the 214,000 average reported in 2013/2014. In absolute terms, growth in the number of job vacancies was concentrated in Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia, which respectively registered increases of 14,200 (21.8%), 4,700 (11.6%) and 4,400 (14.7%). Job vacancies declined in Alberta (-2,800 or -5.8%) and Manitoba (-1,300 or -12.8%) and remained relatively constant in other provinces.

Over the same period, the number of unemployed persons across Canada was 1.317 million, compared to 1.348 million in 2013/2014, a decrease of 2.3% year-to-year.[5] The largest drops in unemployed persons were recorded in Ontario (-23,800), British Columbia (-11,200) and Quebec (-2,800). Alberta and Newfoundland & Labrador saw the largest increase in the unemployed, with jumps of 9,500 and 1,000 respectively.

Chart 1

Canada's Labour Force Participation 2000/2001 - 2014/2015

[4] Statistics Canada's Business Payroll Survey on job vacancies provides information at the regional and industrial level; it does not do so for occupations. Job vacancy rates reported in this section use Statistics Canada data available at time of production. In August 2015, Statistics Canada published its first quarterly data of the new Job Vacancy and Wage Survey (JVWS), providing more comprehensive information on job vacancies by industry sector. Once more complete data is available, this analysis will use the JVWS in future iterations of the Monitoring and Assessment Report to analyze Canada's current and emerging labour market demand.

[5] Based on the unemployment numbers used to derive job vacancy related statistics. Total unemployment numbers from the Labour Force Survey are likely to differ.

Labour market tightness is often assessed using the unemployment-to-job vacancies (U/V) ratio.[6] In 2014/2015, 5.6 individuals sought employment for every job vacancy, compared to 6.3 a year earlier. The decrease in the U/V ratio (number of unemployed people for every vacant position) suggests employers face more challenges in filling job vacancies, as the number of unemployed workers shrinks, or they are increasingly unable to find the required skills for their job openings.

Table 1

Labour Market Tightness, 2013/2014 – 2014/2015

Canada	2013/ 2014	2014/ 2015	Year-To-Year Change
Number of Unemployed	1.348 Million	1.317 Million	-2.3%
Number of Job Vacancies	214,000	235,300	+10%
Unemployment-to-Vacancy Ratio	6.3	5.6	-11.1%

At the subnational level, the largest drop in the U/V ratio was observed in Prince Edward Island, sliding from 17.3 to 8.8 year-over-year. Moderate U/V ratio drops were also registered in Nova Scotia (from 10 to 8.4), Ontario (from 8.5 to 6.7) and British Columbia (from 5.3 to 4.3), pointing to a tightening labour market year-over-year. New Brunswick, Manitoba and Alberta recorded modest increases (0.3, 0.5 and 0.5, respectively) in their U/V ratios, suggesting greater slack in the labour market compared to 2013/2014. Nonetheless, Alberta and Manitoba continued to register among the lowest U/V ratios in Canada (2.7 and 4.1, respectively) pointing to tight labour markets.

Since 2011/2012, the national U/V ratio decreased modestly, from 5.8 to 5.6 as the number of unemployed persons has been on a steady decline (-5.4%). This suggests an overall tightening of the Canadian labour market over this period.[7] The trend is expected to continue in the coming years as large cohorts of workers begin to retire, with fewer younger workers to replace them.

Chart 2

Number of Unemployed to Job Vacancies in Canada (2011/2012 - 2014/2015)

[6] However, no single labour market indicator can provide clear and consistent signals of labour market conditions. A thorough assessment of labour market conditions relies on several complementary labour market indicators.

[7] This can also suggest better skills matches in the labour market.

Share of Job Vacancies by Industry

Of the annual average of 235,300 BPS job vacancies reported in 2014/2015, the following industries showed the most vacancies:

- health care and social assistance (39,800; 16.9%);
- accommodation and food services (31,100; 13.2%);
- retail trade (26,700; 11.3%);
- manufacturing (17,000; 7.2%); and
- construction (16,000, 6.8%).

Compared against their employment growth[8] in 2014/2015, these industries were among the strongest to record employment gains: health care and social assistance employment grew by 2.0%; accommodation and food services increased by 1.9%; retail trade was up 0.7%, and construction employment increased by 3.5%. Manufacturing employment dropped by 0.3%, despite being ranked as the 4th highest Canadian industry in terms of job vacancies over the same period.

Across all industries, finance and insurance (1.6), as well as health care and social assistance (1.3), posted the lowest U/V ratios. This suggests tighter labour market conditions in those industries than all others. Conversely, the highest U/V ratios were recorded in arts, entertainment and recreation (8.6), mining, quarrying, and oil and gas (7.6) and educational services (7.6). The high ratio points to more unemployed persons relative to job vacancies in those industries across Canada.

Job vacancy rates and unemployment rates by province

Among all provinces, Western Canada registered the highest job vacancy rates (i.e., the share of jobs that are unfilled out of all payroll jobs available) and lowest unemployment rates. Despite the recent downturn in Alberta's and Saskatchewan's resource sector, the two provinces posted the highest job vacancy rates and lowest unemployment rates as both goods and service-producing sectors of the two economies recorded employment growth. Manitoba's growth in key sectors like manufacturing, agriculture and construction had a positive impact on the labour market. The province registered an unemployment rate of 5.4%, which is well below the Canadian average. In Quebec and Ontario, slow growth in the provinces' trade sectors triggered some slack in the labour markets. Atlantic Canada's relatively high unemployment rates and low job vacancy rates suggested a significant mismatch between available job seekers and job vacancies.

Chart 3

Job Vacancy & Unemployment Rates by Province, 2014/2015

Sources: Statistics Canada; Labour Force Survey, and Business and Payroll Survey.

[8] Using the Survey of Employment, Payroll and Hours for employment estimates.

Skills in Demand – Employment Growth by Skill Type[9]

In 2014/2015, employment in Canada grew by 103,000, to a total of 17.8 million; an increase of 0.6% compared to the previous year. By skill type, the largest proportional employment growth occurred in:

- Sales and Service Occupations (+59,300 or +1.4%)
- Natural and Applied Sciences and related occupations (+47,400 or +3.6%)
- Education, Law and Social, Community and Government Services (+23,600 or 1.2%)
- Art, Culture, Recreation and Sport (+13,300 or +2.5%)
- Health Occupations (+10,000 or +0.8%).

Employment declines were recorded in: management (-65,300 or -4.0%) and natural resources, agriculture, and related production occupations (-3,200 or -0.8%).

1.3 Client Profile and Participation

The number of EBSM clients decreased by 3.0% in 2014/2015, reaching a total of 689,459 as a result of improving labour market conditions in the Canadian economy. All three client type counts dropped: active claimants (-2.6%), former (-5.6%) and non-insured (-2.7%).

1.3.1 Client Types

Three client types can access EBSMs: active claimants, former claimants and non-insured clients. In 2014/2015, the distribution of client types continued to reveal an upward trend from the non-insured clients among provinces and territories. Their share of all clients increased to an all-time high of 38.2% (increase of 0.2 percentage points), while active clients increased by 0.2 percentage points to a total of 49.3% and former clients saw their share decrease to 12.5% from 12.9% in the previous year.

Since 2005/2006, the number of non-insured clients has increased by 50.9%, while those of active and former claimants have declined by 6.1% and 3.3%, respectively. The rising numbers in non-insured clients can be attributed to the increasing reliance of provinces and territories on using Support Measures for quicker, short-term interventions to support the unemployed in finding jobs when they may otherwise face challenges in searching for employment on their own.

Chart 4

Volumes by EBSM Client Types, (2005/2006 - 2014/2015)

[9] Labour Force Survey, table 282-0141.

Active claimants are those who had an active EI Part I regular claim when they requested assistance under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act*. Typically, they have stronger recent labour force attachment and tend to be able to return to work more quickly than those with weaker ties to the labour market. Active claimants who are job ready often seek out short-term interventions under EI Part II to find their next employment opportunity. Others require longer-term Employment Benefits to upgrade their skills, establish certification or refine their job search strategies.

In total, the number of active claimants served in Canada declined to 339,795, a year-over-year decrease of 2.6%. Their share of all clients increased slightly (+0.2 percentage points) to 49.3% year over year. The proportion of active claimants returning to work after participating in an EBSM-similar programming was 45.8%, compared to 43.6% in 2013/2014.

Former claimants are those who completed an EI claim in the past three years, or who began a parental or maternity claim in the preceding five years. They are no longer eligible for EI Part I; however, they remain eligible for EI Part II under certain criteria.[10] Former claimants do not receive income support under Part I of the *Employment Insurance Act* while they complete an Employment Benefit intervention; however, they may receive Part II support while completing their return-to-work action plan.

During the 2014/2015 reporting period, the number of former claimants fell to 91,999 (-5.6%) year over year. In addition, their share of all EBSM clients declined to 12.5% (-0.4 percentage points). The number of former claimants returning to work decreased moderately (-3.0%), to a total of 22,424, which represents 24.4% of the 91,999 former claimants served.

Non-insured clients are unemployed individuals who are neither active nor former EI claimants and usually have little substantive or recent labour force attachment. They include new labour force participants and individuals who were formerly self-employed. While these clients are not eligible for Employment Benefits under EI Part II, they may access interventions similar to EAS.

In 2014/2015, the numbers of non-insured clients dropped by 2.7%, to reach 257,665. However, their share among all client types increased to 37.4% (+0.2 percentage points). Since the 2004/2005 reporting period, the share of non-insured clients has jumped by 13.2 percentage points, whereas the other two client types witnessed their share of total clients decline over the same time. Overall, 41,954 non-insured clients returned to work in 2014/2015 following their EBSM participation, a 6.5% increase from the previous year.[11]

1.3.2 Age Distribution[12]

Consistent with the growth of Canada's senior population, the older workers category (55+ years) was the only age group to experience growth in EBSM usage. This category increased by 5% with 73,170 clients served. Its share of the total age distribution increased by 0.9 percentage points, reaching 12.5%. In the last decade, older workers have consistently increased their share among all EBSM clients, reflecting greater use of active employment programs to improve their employability. Older workers' participation in the labour market reflects these trends; a cohort that now represents 35% of Canada's labour population.

Chart 5

Age Distribution, 2014/2015

[10] A detailed definition of former claimants can be found in section 58 of the *Employment Insurance Act*.

[11] Returns to work for non-insured clients depend on confirmation by a case manager. The level of follow-up may vary significantly by jurisdiction.

[12] Date of birth is not collected for clients in Skills Development-Apprentices and Group Services. As a result, client data in Chart 5 do not match the client total in Annex 3.5.

In 2014/2015, the labour population of older workers surpassed 10 million, on the strength of rapid growth in the last 10 years that added 1.5 million older workers into the workforce. This represents a 66% growth in this age group, which is significantly higher than any other age group. Consistent with these trends, older workers are increasingly reliant on employment supports, consistent with their growing share of Canada's labour force.

The total number for the core-aged workers (25-54 years old) dropped by 3.7% year over year to 399,428. The share of the core-aged workers, as a proportion of all age groups, decreased by 0.9 percentage points to 68.1% in 2014/2015. Among core-aged workers, all the subgroups experienced drops with the largest declines among the 50-54 year olds (-4,462 or -7.1%). This trend among core-aged workers is consistent with labour market indicators: the total number of the unemployed among the core-aged workers declined by 20,000 (-2.7%) year over year. As well, the group's unemployment rate (5.7% in 2014/2015) has also continued on a downward trend since the recent high of 7.2% in 2009/2010.

Following two years of growth, youth (15-24 year olds) participation decreased by 3,359 or -2.9% year-over-year, for a total of 113,492 youth clients. Its relative share remained unchanged at 19.4% year-over-year. Although youth continue to face struggles in the labour market, their employment prospects are beginning to improve. In 2014/2015, the youth unemployment rate dropped to 13.3%. This is a general downward trend observed in the last five years, since the youth unemployment rate hit a generational high of 15.6% in 2009/2010. Other indicators of improved conditions for youth in 2014/2015 include employment being up by 14,400 year-over-year and unemployment being down by 8,000 in the same period. The Youth employment rate and participation rate are up for the second straight year, reaching 55.7% and 64.3%, respectively.

1.3.3 Designated Groups[13]

ESDC collects information on the EBSM participation of women, Indigenous people, members of visible minorities and persons with a disability in support of employment equity principles.

- Women participated in a total of 471,765 EBSM interventions in 2014/2015, a 2.9% decrease year over year. Women represented 44.1% of all participants, slightly lower than their share in 2013/2014. Similar to the previous year, the vast majority of women (92.1%) accessed EAS interventions, while their male counterparts had a lower rate of EAS participation (81.8%). This trend is explained by the lower participation of women in the Skills Development Apprentice program, and by the fact that women are more likely to work in part-time occupations, which results in lower EI eligibility rates and, therefore, less access to Employment Benefits. Overall, 47.7% of female EBSM participants were non-insured this year, compared with 37.4% of male EBSM participants.
- A total of 104,063 EBSM participants self-identified as persons with a disability. The share of persons with a disability increased 0.6 percentage points to 9.7%. Non-insured clients represented 57% of this client segment, a slight increase of 0.1 percentage points, year over year.
- Indigenous people participated in 79,687 EBSM interventions. This represented 5.1% more than the previous year. Indigenous people participated in 7.5% of all EBSM interventions delivered in 2014/2015, including programming delivered through ASETS. A total of 38.3% of Indigenous clients participated as non-insured clients. As a share of participation in all interventions delivered to Indigenous clients, Employment Benefits increased from 3.8% to 3.9% year over year.
- Members of visible minority groups participated in 42,788 interventions, a significant drop of 23.1% over year. Corresponding with this decline, visible minorities' share of total EBSM participants dropped to 4%, a 1.1 percentage point slide year-over-year. It is worth noting that representation rates may be influenced by changes in self-identification behaviour and recent demographic trends.

[13] This information is collected at the intervention level and comes from the participant dataset for EBSM programming. Participants voluntarily self-identify, so year-over-year fluctuations may be due in some degree to changes in self-identification.

1.3.4 Official Languages

ESDC furthers the commitment of the Government of Canada to foster the full recognition and use of both English and French in Canadian society by ensuring that labour market programs and services are delivered in both official languages. In this context, all LMDAs contain commitments by provinces and territories to have programs and services delivered in both official languages where there is sufficient demand.

LMDA programming continues to evolve, with provinces and territories adapting program design and service delivery to meet local needs. ESDC is working with provinces and territories to improve the capture of official languages related data, in order to better assess how official languages requirements are being met.

Chart 6

Employment Benefits Expenditures by Intervention, 2014/2015 ($ Millions)

1.4 Interventions: Employment Benefits

Employment Benefits are available only to insured clients (active and former claimants). Historically, Employment Benefits have consisted of longer-term interventions focused on providing skills or work experience required to regain employment. Under LMDAs, provinces and territories provide employment benefits similar to the following six benefits types: Skills Development-Regular (SD-R); Skills Development-Apprentices (SD-A); Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS); Self-Employment (SE); Job Creation Partnerships (JCPs); and Targeted Earnings Supplements (TES).

Total Employment Benefits interventions declined for a fourth consecutive year, reaching 142,389. In addition, Employment Benefits interventions lasted an average of 2 days longer, a 1.9% increase compared with the previous reporting period. At 13.2% of all EBSMs, the share of Employment Benefits continues to decline year over year, reflecting a focus on shorter-term interventions to help unemployed people return to work quickly. Employment Benefits expenditures totalled $1.15 billion, a decline of 2.4% from the previous year.

1.4.1 Skills Development

Skills Development (SD) is the most common Employment Benefit delivered under LMDAs. This benefit helps insured clients cover the cost of gaining the new skills they often need when facing a career change. In 2014/2015, the use of SD-Regular (SD-R) interventions fell significantly by 10.1% year over year, to 49,091. Also, the share of SD-R of all benefits trended downwards for a fifth consecutive year, dropping to 34.5%. In comparison, the number of SD-Apprentice (SD-A) interventions increased by 4.1%, to 68,437. Corresponding with this increase, the share of SD-A edged up to 48.1%, due to steady demand for skilled trades across Canada. SD expenditures saw a decline of $46.3M (-4.9%) for a total of $908 million.

EBSMs in Action: Skills Development-Regular

Yukon

Yukon uses the SD-R program to assist eligible participants obtaining skills for employment, ranging from basic to advanced skills, through direct assistance to individuals to cover certain costs associated with taking a course/program or instruction or training. Eligible participants are those individuals who meet the 'Insured Participant' definition as per the Employment Insurance Act and who have been identified by a case manager as having insufficient employment or marketable skills to successfully obtain employment. The key principles of the program include: reinforcement that if participants plan their future development, commit to an action plan and contribute to the implementation of the plan are most likely to succeed; the action plan identifies lack of marketable skills as an employment barrier, and demonstrates that a SD-R intervention will support re-entry into employment; the level of assistance accorded to an eligible participant to take a course, program of instruction or training is negotiated; providing a mechanism that allows participants to make an appropriate financial contribution to the costs of the intervention where required; and, demonstrating that training activity supports the participants' ability to enhance their skills to obtain and maintain a job.

EBSMs in Action: Skills Development-Apprentices

Ontario

Ontario's SD-Apprentices program provides temporary financial assistance to eligible apprentices who participate in full-time classroom training. As apprentices do not work for the duration of their in-class training, they may experience a significant financial impact during this portion of their apprenticeship training program. Participants include individuals currently eligible for Employment Insurance benefits or who were in receipt of Employment Insurance benefits in the past three to five years. Although the majority of training occurs in the workplace, the in-classroom training component is critical to apprentices' success as it provides them with the theoretical training that supports the practical on-the-job training. Full-time classroom training can be up to eight weeks in length and typically occurs two to three times during an apprenticeship training program. Along with basic living costs, this program provides personal supports, which includes dependent care allowance, travel allowance, living-away-from-home assistance and disability allowance.

EBSMs in Action: Skills Development-Apprentices

Alberta

Skills Development-Apprentices benefits provide financial assistance to individuals to make their own arrangements to obtain skills for employment, including apprenticeship training. Alberta's apprenticeship and industry training is an industry-driven system that ensures Alberta has a highly skilled, professional and internationally competitive workforce in more than 50 designated trades and occupations. The Alberta Apprenticeship and Industry Training Board works with industry to set training and certification standards. The Board makes recommendations to the government to meet the needs of Alberta's labour market for skilled and trained workers, and the designation of trades and occupations. The Government of Alberta's priority is to ensure that the over 60,000 apprentices currently engaged at various stages in their learning career successfully meet the requirements for journeyman certification, and are therefore able to contribute to the continued growth of Alberta.

Nunavut

The Adult Learning and Training Supports (ALTS) program remains the flagship labour market program for skills development for apprentices and non-apprentices in the territory. Under ALTS, apprentices access support for technical training. Other non-apprentice clientele access ALTS to pursue training that responds to labour market demand and opportunity.

1.4.2 Subventions salariales ciblées

Targeted Wage Subsidies encourage employers to hire individuals they would not normally hire, giving them a chance to complete a successful career transition. In 2014/2015, TWS interventions decreased considerably by 7.2% year over year, to 11,643. The share of TWS of all Employment Benefits interventions dropped to 8.2%. While total expenditures for TWS increased by 28.3% to $103.7 million, reflecting rising average cost per intervention in most jurisdictions, the duration of TWS interventions decreased, on average, by 0.6% year over year.

EBSMs in Action: Targeted Wage Subsidies

Yukon

Yukon supports the Targeted Wage Subsidy (TWS) program, which assists individuals who lack work experience by enhancing their skills through employment. A wage subsidy is provided to the employer to hire someone they would not normally hire in the absence of a subsidy. Individuals who are approved for TWS may include individuals who do not have recent work experience, who may require substantial employer training, and/or who might have difficulty getting their "foot in the door" for other reasons. Employment offered under the TWS provides individuals with full-time (may be part-time for persons with disabilities) on-the-job work experience. Wages earned by the individual are insurable and provided directly by the employer. The employer is then reimbursed with a subsidy for a specified percentage of the wage. Financial assistance may be provided to employers to cover the costs associated with employment related costs (including workers' compensation actual costs). However, in most cases, employers are encouraged to cover such costs. The duration and level of subsidy are based on the needs of the participant. The TWS is intended to off-set costs related to hiring the individual and is not intended to resolve an employer's human resource or cash-flow problem. The expectation is that normally the subsidy will lead to permanent employment with the TWS employer.

1.4.3 Self-Employment

The Self-Employment intervention helps insured clients start their own businesses, through counselling and development related to launching a new business. In 2014/2015, participation in SE decreased by 8.3%, to 7,361 interventions. SE's share of total benefits interventions edged down slightly to 5.2% (-0.2 percentage points). Corresponding with these trends, SE total expenditures decreased by $8.5 million (-7.7%) for total of $102.5 million in 2014/2015.

EBSMs in Action: Self-Employment

New Brunswick

The Self-Employment (SE) program helps insured clients start their own businesses, through counselling and development related to launching a new business or becoming a self-employed worker. New Brunswick's Workforce Expansion Self-Employment Benefit Program helps unemployed individuals create a job for themselves by starting a new business. The program provides various types of support during the initial development phase of the business including financial assistance, coaching and ongoing technical advice. Coaching is tailored to meet individual needs and can include subjects such as business plan development, accounting, and marketing. This program is delivered in partnership with non-profit, private and/or public organizations.

1.4.4 Job Creation Partnerships

Job Creation Partnerships provide EI-insured clients with work experience while helping the community and local economy. Provinces and territories delivered a significant increase (+9.5%) of JCP interventions, totalling 3,165. JCPs' share of total benefits interventions edged up by 0.3 percentage points for a total 2.2%. JCP expenditures reached $33.6 million (+19.4%), an increase of $5.5 million.

EBSMs in Action:
Job Creation Partnership

British Columbia

Job Creation Partnerships (JCP) provides EI-insured clients with work experience while helping the community and local economy. In British Columbia, a number of JCP projects were funded to provide individuals with opportunities to gain work experience leading to ongoing employment. These include:

- **Qatuwas 2014:** Participants were members of the Heiltsuk First Nations community, who worked on the preparation, production, and post-production of the cultural celebration of canoe culture of Coastal First Nations. Their activities include building bleachers, kiosks, signage, harvesting and preparing traditional cuisine and making ceremonial gifts. Participants gained skills in event preparation while also connecting to their cultural legacy.
- **Lake Babine Timber:** Participants took part in a 47-week project to build firewood storage sheds and two timber bridges, as well as to perform general timber cutting. The Lake Babine First Nation plans to build a biomass plant for heating homes in the area. Participants gained skills in forestry and carpentry that should prepare them for participating in building the biomass plant.
- **Plan@t:** Participants with disabilities assessed and provided accessibility ratings for various Lower Mainland business for the Rick Hansen Foundation Plan@t website. People can use this site to search and review the accessibility of places worldwide.

1.4.5 Targeted Earnings Supplements

Targeting Earning Supplements provide insured clients with incentives to accept employment. In 2014/2015, Quebec offered TES-similar programming through its Return to Work Supplement program. This TES-similar benefit supported 2,692 participants in 2014/2015, a significant drop of 53.3% decrease year over year. In line with the drop in the number of interventions delivered, Quebec's total expenditure for this benefit fell 54.4% to $1.3 million.

1.5 Interventions: Support Measures

Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* authorizes three support measures: Employment Assistance Services (EAS), Labour Market Partnerships (LMPs), and Research and Innovation (R&I). Through LMDAs, provinces and territories deliver these measures at the regional and local levels, while ESDC retains responsibility for pan-Canadian delivery of LMPs and R&I (see section 4 of this chapter). Support Measures are available to all unemployed individuals in Canada, including non-insured clients; however, LMPs and R&I are generally not associated with direct client service and therefore do not have participants or interventions. Delivered by the provinces and territories, the EAS component of the Support Measures provides a full range of self-help and assisted services, such as help with determining career objectives through employment counselling; improving job search techniques; completing a return-to-work action plan; and accessing labour market information in support of career choices.

1.5.1 EAS Interventions

Provinces and territories design and deliver interventions similar to EAS, which are available to all unemployed people in Canada. In addition to helping EI-insured clients, EAS interventions provide crucial support to those who have been absent from the labour market for an extensive period or who have low labour market attachment. They may also support new immigrants or young people who are entering the Canadian labour market. These interventions are reported in one of the three following categories: Employment Services, Group Services, and Individual Counselling. In 2014/2015, a total of 936,144 EAS interventions were delivered, a notable year-over-year decrease of 2.7%. This decline reflects improving labour market conditions and less reliance by unemployed workers to require short-term active employment measures. However, its relative share of all EBSM interventions increased to 86.8% in 2014/2015; an increase of 0.3 percentage points year over year. Total expenditures on EAS increased to 629.9 million (+6.1%) in 2014/2015.

1.5.1.1 Employment Services

Interventions similar to Employment Services continued to be the most common EAS intervention type at 61.8% of all EAS interventions in 2014/2015. A total of 578,292 Employment Services interventions were provided to unemployed individuals in Canada, which represents a decline of 2.7% compared to 2013/2014. Compared to 2009/2010, a year during which provinces and territories were addressing unemployment peaks stemming from the recession, the number of Employment Services interventions is down by 44,652 or 7.2% in 2014/2015.

EBSMs in Action: Employment Assistance Services

Manitoba

The Employment Assistance Service (EAS) program provides employment assistance to unemployed and underemployed Manitobans to help with career counselling and job search. Manitoba delivers EAS directly through 13 provincially operated Manitoba Jobs and Skills Development Centres, as well as indirectly through a vast network of third party service providers. In addition to supporting mainstream service providers that deliver services to all Manitobans, the province partners with a select number of specialized agencies to assist immigrants and refugees in various communities with large newcomer communities, including Winnipeg, Brandon, Steinbach, Winkler and Morden. These agencies provide tailored supports to address the employment needs of newcomers, such as offering multilingual services. In 2014/2015, these agencies assisted nearly 1,000 newcomers.

Yukon

Yukon's EAS program assists eligible participants to find and obtain employment, or to develop the skills necessary to maintain employment. Eligible recipients are individuals from businesses (including crown corporations), organizations (formal, ad hoc or partnerships), municipalities, First Nation organizations, governments and councils, public health and post-secondary educational institutions. Eligible participants are those who are unemployed, legally entitled to work in Canada and available for and actively seeking employment. Clients work with their case manager in a collaborative process in order to assess, plan, and facilitate activities and services that will meet the employment needs of the Participant. Each step in the case management process is important in developing an action plan that accurately reflects the participant's circumstances, existing skills, employment barriers and the related interventions. An action plan must be developed with the active input and agreement of both the participant and the case manager.

EBSMs in Action: Employment Assistance Services

Newfoundland and Labrador

Fiscal 2014/2015 was the first full year in which Newfoundland and Labrador delivered EAS through its internal service delivery network for the majority of its clients, following the decision in 2013 to internalize the supports and services previously offered through third-party contracts for EAS. In an effort to improve access for clients, Newfoundland and Labrador has enhanced and promoted the use of on-line application for service, and on-line courses and workshops. In 2013, the Employment and Training Assessment (ETA) was introduced to allow clients to complete an on-line guided self-assessment of employment readiness and apply for employment and training supports. As well, a series of on-line workshops are available to assist individuals in their career and employment planning process, and to assist employers with a host of human resource related needs were developed in conjunction with the Bluedrop CoursePark Learning Management System (CPLMS). In 2014/2015, 3,570 workshops were accessed by individuals and employers.

Nunavut

Clients in Nunavut can receive face-to-face Employment Assistance Services through Career Development Officers (CDO) located in one of three regional offices in Pangnirtung, Rankin Inlet and Cambridge Bay, or in the communities of Arviat, Baker Lake, Igloolik, Iqaluit, and Kugluktuk. Career Development Officers are responsible for conducting community visits to locales where a CDO is not physically located. Clients can also contact the regional offices via a toll-free number.

1.5.1.2 Group Services

Group Services dropped significantly by 19.5% for a total of 37,849 interventions delivered in 2014/2015. In this context, the share of Group Services of all EAS-type interventions decreased by 0.9 percentage points for a total 4.0%.

1.5.1.3 Individual Counselling

In addition to being the initial intervention for establishing action plans and potential access to Employment Benefits, Individual Counselling can be an important measure for multi-barriered clients. A total of 320,003 Individual Counselling interventions were supported in 2014/2015. This represented a drop of 0.4% year over year. Individual Counselling accounted for 34.2% of all EAS interventions, edging up from its 33.4% share in 2013/2014. The use of Individual Counselling is consistent with the increased numbers of multi-barriered clients, who access EBSM-similar programming following short-term unemployment, as well as an indication of the participation of displaced workers.[14]

1.5.2 Labour Market Partnerships

The Labour Market Partnership (LMP) initiative facilitates the collaboration of employers, employee and employer associations, community groups, and communities to develop solutions to labour force imbalances such as persistent high unemployment or skill shortages. LMP expenditures contracted for a second consecutive year, dropping significantly to a total of $128.6 million in 2014/2015 (-10.5%). Almost all jurisdictions made noticeable investments in LMP initiatives in 2014/2015, with strongest commitments made by Quebec, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, British Columbia and Manitoba.

EBSMs in Action: Labour Market Partnerships

Ontario

Ontario's LMP funding provides financial assistance to local communities, employers, sector groups and employee and employer associations to aid the development and implementation of strategies that address and respond to labour force adjustments, local economic development and human resource planning needs. For example, funding was provided to an Employment Ontario service provider in Windsor that is seeking to better understand the challenges that employers face in recruiting, hiring and retaining women in the skilled trades. This funding allowed them to identify strategies that increase employment and also identify potential policy strategies that promote women's employment in the trades. Funding was also provided to a community stakeholder with a background in addressing labour market issues to determine common success factors for people who were able to find a job match and begin an apprenticeship. In addition, the project explored whether there are differences in success factors between industries or specific trades based on considerations such as level of education, related training, and willingness to travel.

[14] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *OECD Employment Outlook 2013–How Does Canada Compare?* (Paris: OECD, July 2013). http://www.oecd.org/els/emp/oecdemploymentoutlook.htm.

EBSMs in Action:
Labour Market Partnerships

Nova Scotia

In 2014/2015, LMP funding in Nova Scotia was used exclusively for the Sector Council Program—a cooperative partnership between Labour and Advanced Education and various industry sector organisations to support human resource development, attraction and retention, and training. The purpose of the Sector Council Program is to support an industry-led approach to human resource development tailored to meet the labour market needs of industry sectors. The program focuses on ensuring that small- and medium-sized enterprises in Nova Scotia have increased access to expertise, resources and support in the area of human resource planning. The three priority areas of the program include human resource planning; attraction and retention; and, training. The sector council program was created as a 3 year pilot program, and an evaluation was competed in the final year of the pilot. Results from the evaluation have shown that the objectives laid out in the program were the correct ones, and that the 3 year funding model allowed for strategic planning and investments, and for the ability to reach the employer community. The program received a great deal of support and is planned to continue.

Northwest Territories

In the Northwest Territories, LMP funding supports Skills Canada-NWT to assist with their mission to promote careers in skilled trades and technology for northern youth. The organization pursues this mission through community-based skills clubs, youth conferences, regional skills competitions, and a territorial skills competition, as well as taking a team to the annual Skills Canada National Competition. The organization also hosts career expos with its competitions and offers presentations about careers in skilled trades. Skills Canada-NWT is well positioned to link youth, employers, and educators. The organization works with stakeholders in many sectors including education, government, and industry.

Saskatchewan

In partnership with New Brunswick, Community Based Organizations, and the Canadian Career Development Foundation, Saskatchewan contributed to evidence-based research for the Career Development field of practice. Launched in July 2014 and concluded in 2015, Transforming the Culture of Evaluation in Career and Employment Services, Common Indicators Project-Phase II, was conducted by the Canadian Career Development Foundation. It focused on determining changes job seekers experience as a result of career and employment programs and services. The study identified the types of interventions and delivery methods best suited to achieve outcomes with EI eligible job seekers. In Saskatchewan, 31 career practitioners and 249 job seekers participated. The project provided a model and incremental resources to enhance career practitioners' skills and professional competence to better serve Saskatchewan job seekers. Furthermore, the project served to enhance Saskatchewan's evaluation of how career and employment programs and services respond to the needs of diverse job seekers, help job seekers make meaningful progress in the employability dimensions and connect to employment.

1.5.3 Research and Innovation

Research and Innovation (R&I) initiatives identify better ways of helping people prepare for, return to or maintain employment, and participate productively in the labour force. In 2014/2015, all jurisdictions with R&I programs increased investments in this area, more than doubling expenditures from $15.1 million to $32.1 year over year. Five provinces and territories[15] used $21 million in LMDA funding through R&I projects to test the reach and impact of the Canada Job Grant (CJG). The CJG encourages employer involvement and investment in training by providing financial assistance to employers on a cost-shared basis to help Canadians develop the skills needed for available jobs.

[15] New Brunswick, Ontario, Manitoba, British Columbia and Northwest Territories used LMDA as a funding source to advance their respective CJG R&I Initiatives.

EBSMs in Action: Research and Innovation (R&I) Activities

Prince Edward Island

Prince Edward Island continues to support R & I projects to identify creative ways of helping Islanders prepare for, return to or keep employment and become productive participants in the labour force. In the context of higher rates of youth unemployment, the province continues to develop strategies to ensure youth are well informed about future career opportunities and have the support to make successful transitions to training and employment. In 2014/2015, collaboration between the province's secondary and post-secondary systems resulted in the development of the Student Graduation and Transition Planner. This pilot project is designed to assist all secondary students with planning their graduation pathways, post-secondary transitions and labour market attachment. The Student Graduation and Transition Planner will include career planning tools that focus on pertinent labour force information. The objective is to permit more informed career pathway choices and a foundation to empower secondary students to engage in a comprehensive, personalized three-year planning process of personal and career goals during their secondary school years. Teachers, students, parents/guardians, and post-secondary partners will work together to ensure informed educational and career transition goals are developed and articulated.

Ontario

Using R&I funding, in 2014/2015, Ontario launched the Canada-Ontario Job Grant, working with small, medium and large enterprises to establish pilot approaches that encourage employers to take a greater role in skills training and workforce development investments. The three pilots were:

- **Canada-Ontario Job Grant:** the program helps businesses purchase short-term training for new or existing workers that will help meet workforce performance needs.
- **Canada–Ontario Job Grant:** Customized Training Pilot: supports partnerships between employers and training institutions to develop and implement new-firm-specific technical or essential skills where no such training exists.
- **Canada–Ontario Job Grant:** UpSkill Pilot: supports partnerships between employers and training providers to develop and deliver sector-specific integrated and technical skills training to meet employers' needs, specifically targeting low and medium skilled occupations.

Following the launch, Ontario estimated approximately 2,500 clients would benefit from training under this new program in the first year.

1.6 Expenditures

In 2014/2015, total expenditures under Part II of the Employment Insurance Act increased by 0.5% to $2.06 billion.[16] Of that amount, Employment Benefits remained the largest category of expenditures, representing 55.9% of the total, while its relative share decreased by 1.6 percentage points from last year. LMPs and R&I increased by 1.2% to a total of $160.1 million. EAS expenditures increased 6.1%, representing a greater share of overall expenditures (30.6%, or an increase of +1.6 percentage points). Pan-Canadian expenditures remained unchanged with a slight drop of $242,000 for a total of $116.7 million (-0.2%).

Chart 7

EBSM Expenditures, 2014/2015 ($ Millions)

[16] Additional EI Part II funds were made available to Quebec in 2014/2015 through a one-time limited amendment to its LMDA, to support workers affected by the July 2013 train derailment in Lac Mégantic

Chart 8

Key Performance Indicators, 2003/2004 to 2013/2014

Important: in response to the 2008-2009 recession, the Government of Canada invested an additional $1.0 billion over two years—2009/2010 and 2010/2011—in the delivery of EI Part II programming.

1.7 Key Performance Indicators[17]

ESDC monitors the results of EBSM-similar programming delivered by provinces and territories through three key performance indicators:

- the number of active EI claimants served;[18]
- the number of EI clients (active and former) who return to employment following an intervention;[19] and
- the amount of unpaid EI Part I benefits resulting from the returns to employment.

In 2014/2015, the three main performance indicators overall reflected Canada's labour market performance. The number of clients (173,593) employed increased by 1.0% year over year, while number of active claimants served (332,099) dropped by 2.7%. As a result, unpaid benefits ($1,122 million) increased by 5.7%. That said, the average length of an Employment Benefits intervention increased by 2 days (106 days), stemming from duration increases for all benefits.

1.8 Early Interventions with EI clients

The Government of Canada is committed to working with interested provinces and territories to make active employment supports available to EI claimants earlier in their claim, and to study the impacts of such measures. In 2013/2014, this included Collaboration Projects with British Columbia and Manitoba, which tested the impact of early interventions in the delivery of active measures on EI claimants. Results suggest that the Collaboration Projects were most effective when early interventions focused on clients with relatively high re-employment potential.

These results complement internal evaluation work, previously mentioned in the *2013/2014 EI MAR*, on the timing of participation in EAS. This study showed that participants who started their intervention within four weeks after initiating an EI claim achieved quicker returns to employment and had earnings gains in both the short and medium term after participation.

[17] Data completeness issues in newly implemented information management systems could affect year-over-year comparisons at the provincial, territorial and national levels.

[18] Quebec includes former claimants in its key performance indicator for clients served.

[19] EI clients include both active claimants and former claimants.

Such evidence provided the rationale for the development of a national Targeting, Referral and Feedback (TRF) tool to help provinces and territories identify and target EI applicants for employment programming based on local labour market needs. Similar tools for targeted interventions have been implemented in the United States, Australia and Denmark to support unemployed individuals with active employment services. The Province of Québec pioneered the development of the TRF with the Government of Canada, and in 2014 implemented an improved national TRF system. British Columbia also implemented the TRF system in the fall of 2015 to promote early interventions with clients.

2. Provincial and Territorial EBSM Activities

This section analyzes the provincial and territorial economic environment and EBSM-similar activities in 2014/2015, linking trends in clients served, interventions and expenditures to local labour market conditions, as well as employment programming priorities.

2.1 Context

To address their unique labour market challenges, provinces and territories deliver employment programming under LMDAs, which were individually negotiated with the Government of Canada. Under the LMDAs, provinces and territories receive funding to support the delivery of programs and services that are similar to the EBSMs established in Part II of the EI Act.[20] Provinces and territories design and deliver virtually all EI-funded employment programming, with the exception of pan-Canadian activities, which are discussed in Section 4 of this chapter.

In 2014/2015, most provinces and territories recorded modest to moderate economic growth. In this context, the demand for EBSM-similar programming in most jurisdictions decreased, as observed in declining numbers of all client types (active, former, and non-insured), stemming from somewhat improving labour market conditions. In terms of interventions, all Employment Benefits declined, with the exception of Skills Development-Apprentices and Job Creation Partnerships, which saw a moderate increase. For provinces and territories, apprentice training remains an integral component as a means of preparing their workforce for skilled trades.

Provinces and territories continued to identify an aging workforce, and skills and labour shortages, as the key labour market challenges they planned to address with EBSM-similar programming. They also focused on developing and delivering skills training to meet current and future skills requirements, and on optimizing the existing labour supply, by working to increase the participation of underrepresented groups in the labour force, such as immigrants, Indigenous people, persons with disabilities and youth.

To support EI clients with programming earlier in their EI claims, some jurisdictions have implemented mechanisms to support targeted early interventions aimed at quicker returns to employment. Some of the strategies are discussed in this section under the provincial and territorial summaries. In addition, all jurisdictions set targets for the three key performance indicators: clients served, clients employed and unpaid benefits to the EI Account.

[20] While data and analysis are presented according to the traditional EBSM intervention categories, provinces and territories may deliver EBSM-similar programming under different names. A list of these names, together with the corresponding EBSM intervention category, is included in the summary for each jurisdiction. Inter-jurisdictional comparisons may be misleading due to differences in programming and labour market conditions. EBSM administrative data presented in this section do not include pan-Canadian activities.

2.2 Newfoundland and Labrador[21]

In 2014, Newfoundland and Labrador experienced negative growth as real GDP shrank by 3.0%. In 2015, real GDP is poised to decline by roughly 2.0% as well. The weakness in commodity prices presented significant challenges for the Newfoundland and Labrador economy. However, the weaker Canadian dollar had a positive impact on the provincial manufacturing sector.

In 2014/2015, Newfoundland and Labrador registered an average of 2,200 (+100 year over year) job vacancies, with the strongest labour demand observed in health care, construction and retail trade. The province's job vacancy rate of 1.1% was below the national average of 1.6%, suggesting a relatively loose labour market, which is consistent with the decline in the province's real GDP for 2014.

In this economic context, the unemployment rate in Newfoundland and Labrador edged up by 0.6 percentage points to 12.2%. Employment decreased to 237,100 (-4,800), with full-time employment declining by 6,000 and part-time employment increasing by 1,200. The province's unemployment totals increased by 3% (+1,000). Newfoundland and Labrador's labour market participation rate stood at 60.8%, a downward slide of 0.7 percentage points year over year.

Employment in the goods-producing industries edged down by 1,800, reaching a total of 54,300 in 2014/2015. The biggest losses were experienced in the manufacturing (-1,200) and forestry, fishing, mining, oil and gas (-900) industries. Employment in the services-producing sector dropped to 182,800 (-3,000 or -1.6%). Employment losses were concentrated in: other services (-2,300 or -16.3%); public administration (-2,200 or -11.5%); educational services (-1,300 or -6.8%); as well as in health care and social assistance (-1,300 or -3.3%). Solid employment gains were recorded in professional, scientific, and technical services (+1,400 or +14.6%) and trade (+3.3% or +1,300).

Skill shortages and mismatches continued to be among the main labour market challenges in Newfoundland and Labrador. Other issues include population aging combined with declining population growth, and a relatively large proportion of the labour force in rural areas of the province (47% versus 16% in Canada). The province identified a number of labour market priorities in 2014/2015 to address labour and skill shortages and mismatches. To ensure a sufficient supply of skilled workforce is available, Newfoundland and Labrador focused its efforts on recruitment and retention and skills development strategies, investing significantly in employment and training programs, as well as in working closely and collaboratively with stakeholders, including with its recently established network of 27 employment centres to implement education and employment training objectives.

Newfoundland and Labrador:
EBSM Key Facts

Total Clients Served: 12,489	
EI Clients	**Non-Insured Clients**
11,363 ⬆	1,126 ⬇

Total Interventions: 24,336		
Interventions Type	**2014/2015**	**Year-over-Year Change**
Employment Benefits	8,591	15.5% ⬆
Support Measures: EAS	15,745	43.1% ⬆

Relative Share of Interventions		
Interventions Type	**2014/2015**	**Year-over-Year Change (p.p.)**
Employment Benefits	35.3%	5.0 ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	64.7%	5.0 ⬆

Total Allocation: $ 128.0 Million		
Total Expenditures	**2014/2015 ($ Million)**	**Year-over-Year Change**
Employment Benefits	$115.7	7.0% ⬆
Support Measures: EAS	$5.0	9.1% ⬆
LMPs and R&I	$1.5	49.9% ⬇
Total Expenditures[1]	**$122.2**	**5.6% ⬆**

Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)		
2013/2014	**2014/2015**	**Year-over-Year Change**
$25.69	$25.35	1.3% ⬇

[1] Totals may not add up due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

[21] In 2013/2014, Newfoundland and Labrador implemented a one-stop employment services delivery model, which included the introduction of a new case management system and ending contracts with third-party providers of employment services. Due to this transition, the 2014/2015 administrative data on clients and interventions presented in this report for the province are estimates, based on partial counts and other sources of information, such as the audited financial statements and temporary transitional data capturing processes for that period. The province has undertaken a supplementary analysis and is adjusting the data collection process of its new system to ensure the data counts for the 2015/2016 MAR are complete.

Table 2

Newfoundland and Labrador : EBSM-Similar Programming (2014/2015)

		Interventions	Year-over-Year Change	Expenditures ($ 000s)
Employment Benefits				
TWS	Newfoundland and Labrador Wage Subsidies	880	+22.1%	7,860
SE	Newfoundland and Labrador Self-Employment Assistance	179	-5.8%	5,382
JCPs	Newfoundland and Labrador Job Creation Partnerships	1,196	+42.6%	8,156
SD-R	Newfoundland and Labrador Skills Development	3,609	+7.3%	94,319
SD-A	Newfoundland and Labrador Skills Development	2,727	+17.1%	
Support Measures				
EAS	Newfoundland and Labrador Employment Assistance Services	15,745	+43.1%	4,973
LMPs	Newfoundland and Labrador Labour Market Partnerships	N/A	N/A	1,521
R&I	Research and Innovation	N/A	N/A	–

In 2014/2015, Newfoundland and Labrador served a decreasing numbers of clients, totaling 12,489 (-2.0%), compared to 12,739 in 2013/2014. This is recorded in the context of a downward trend over the last five years. Two of the three client types expanded, with the numbers of active (8,850) and former (2,513) claimants both rising, though at different pace (+0.2% and +30.3%, respectively). Similarly, the shares of active (70.9%) and former (20.1%) claimants both rose, the first by 1.6 percentage points, and the second more significantly (+5.0 percentage points), consistent with the shift in their respective numbers. In contrast, the non-insured clients fell considerably from the 2013/2014 total of 1,980, down to 1,126, influencing the overall total in terms of clients served. Similarly, its share of all clients served also contracted significantly to 9.0% (-6.5 percentages points).

Chart 9

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 10

Client Distribution by Age

Newfoundland and Labrador's clients accessed a growing number (24,336) of EBSM-similar interventions in 2014/2015, a sharp year-over-year increase of 32.0%, largely attributed to the province resuming its Group Services support measure. Employment Benefits accounted for a declining share of 35.3%, while the numbers of its interventions expanded to a total of 8,591 (+15.5%), compared to 7,441 in the previous year. Consistent with the shift in the numbers of the EAS interventions, its share of all interventions increased, up to 64.7% from last year's 59.6%. A significantly declining total (3,298) of EI clients returned to employment following participation in the program (-44.3% year-over-year). Expenditures for EBSM-similar programming totalled $122.2 million of the $128.0 million allocated.

Chart 11

Clients, Year-over-Year

2.2.1 Employment Benefits

In 2014/2015, the province delivered significantly more Employment Benefit interventions, totaling 8,591 (+15.5% year over year increase). The use for Skill Development interventions rose, with SD-R (3,609) and SD-A (2,727) both expanding significantly by 7.3% and 17.1%, respectively. JCP (1,196) is another benefit intervention that experienced considerable growth (+42.6%). In addition, TWS (880) grew for a second consecutive year, edging up significantly in 2014/2015 by 22.1%, while SE (179) fell (-5.8%) this year, after expanding in 2013/2014. As for the shares of the benefit types, SD-R accounted for a decreasing proportion of all benefits at 42.0%, but the share of SD-A edged up slightly to 31.7% (+0.4 percentage points). Combined SD-R and SD-A accounted for a 73.8% share of all benefits, compared to 76.5% in the previous year, reflecting a continued focus on skills development and enhancement. Employment Benefits total expenditures rose significantly to a total of $115.7 million (+7.0%), consistent with the increase in the number of benefit interventions delivered.

2.2.2 Support Measures: EAS

After four consecutive years of decline, the use of EAS in Newfoundland and Labrador increased considerably in 2014/2015, with total numbers reaching a five-year high of 15,745 (+43.1). The EAS types delivered in the province all recorded noticeable gains, though at different paces. Employment Services—the most widely used EAS—grew significantly to a total of 8,238 (+5.6%), and Individual Counselling (4,500) edged up sharply (+40.6%). Additionally, Group Services—an intervention that was last used in 2009/2010—resumed in 2014/2015, with a total number of interventions delivered reaching 3,007. The noticeable increase in the EAS numbers can be attributed to a growing demand for employment programming due to weakening labour market conditions. EAS expenditures reached a total of $5.0 million (+9.1%), consistent with the increase in the total numbers of EAS interventions.

2.2.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs

After expanding significantly to $6.4 million in 2012/2013, expenditures for Newfoundland and Labrador's LMPs contracted over the past two years, with total expenditures dropping to $1.5 million in 2014/2015. This represented almost half of last year's value and a 10-year low. LMP expenditures accounted for a smaller share of 1.2%, compared to 2.6% in 2013/2014.

2.2.4 Managing for Results

Newfoundland and Labrador manages for results through its new management information system, the Labour Market Programs Support System (LaMPSS), which has been operational as of 2014/2015. The LaMPSS is expected to maximize efficiency and improve service delivery for labour market programs and services. Data on interventions delivered in 2014/2015 are estimates based on the results generated through Newfoundland and Labrador's regional service delivery network. However, the province is undertaking supplementary data analysis in order to improve data quality for 2015/2016.

2.3 Prince Edward Island

Prince Edward Island's real GDP rose by 1.2% in 2014 and is forecasted to have increased by 1.5% in 2015. The strength of the Island's construction, manufacturing, as well as surging exports, contributed to this growth. Strong demand for lobster in the United States and Europe is expected to boost the fishing industry, which makes up nearly one-third of the Island's primary sector. Coming off a strong year for tourism in 2014, the low Canadian dollar will continue to attract visitors from the United States, as well as Canadian-based traffic. However, weak growth in non-commercial services such as education as well as health and social services was observed in a period of government spending restraints.

In 2014/2015, Prince Edward Island recorded an average of 1,000 job vacancies (+500 year over year) with labour demand strongest in health care and social assistance, retail trade, and manufacturing. PEI's job vacancy rate (1.8%) surpassed the national average of 1.6% suggesting a relatively tight labour market.

In line with its moderate economic growth, Prince Edward Island's labour market reacted accordingly. Unemployment rate was down a full percentage point, going from 11.5% to 10.5%. Employment remained unchanged at 73,900, as full-time employment grew slightly by 1,000 while part-time employment declined marginally by 900. Participation rate dropped to 68.4%, a drop of a full percentage point year-over-year.

Prince Edward Island:

EBSM Key Facts

Total Clients Served: 4,800	
EI Clients	Non-Insured Clients
3,330 ⬇	1,470 ⬆

Total Interventions: 7,588		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	1,991	6.8% ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	5,597	6.1% ⬆

Relative Share of Interventions		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	26.2%	2.6 ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	73.8%	2.6 ⬆

Total Allocation: $ 25.7 Million		
Total Expenditures	2014/2015 ($ Million)	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	$18.6	6.3% ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	$4.7	3.7% ⬆
LMPs and R&I	$2.4	38.0% ⬆
Total Expenditures[1]	**$25.7**	**1.6% ⬇**

Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)		
2013/2014	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
$7.19	$60.8	15.4% ⬇

[1] Totals may not add up due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

Employment in the goods-producing sector edged up by 3.3% to 17,900, boosted by growth in the manufacturing industry (+19.2% or +1,000). Following several years of increases in the services-producing sector, employment dropped by 0.8% to 56,100. Employment declines were concentrated in information, culture and recreation (-11.6%); health care and social assistance (-6.6%); as well as in educational services (-5.0%). Some of the losses were offset with gains in transportation and warehousing (+18%); business, building and other support services (+10.3%); and, in other services (+10.2%).

Prince Edward Island continued to face the following labour market challenges in 2014/2015: skill shortages; short-term job attachment of some groups, mainly associated with a dominant seasonal economy; an aging population; as well as interprovincial migration and out-migration. To ensure its workforce gains the required skills for a successful transition to sustainable employment, the province continued to support skill training and skill enhancement for all Islanders. Prince Edward Island has invested in establishing a network to help private sector employers connect with job seekers by continuing to provide targeted employment services and programs. The province identified key labour market priorities aimed at advancing skills enhancement, economic growth and development, including supporting small and medium-size enterprises (SMEs) and participating in joint stakeholder tables, diversifying its economy through innovation and supporting collaboration among government, business and post-secondary institutions. In addition, the province continued to work collaboratively with the other Atlantic jurisdictions on active employment programming.

Prince Edward Island served a total of 4,800 clients in 2014/2015, a moderate year-over-year decline of 3.0%. The province served fewer EI clients, with active (2,709) and former (621) claimants both declining significantly, by 8.6% and 11.7% respectively. The non-insured clients, on the other hand, expanded significantly, to a total number of 1,470 (+14.4%). As for the shares of these client types, the proportions of active (56.4%) and former (12.9%) claimants both edged down (-3.4 and -1.3 percentage points, respectively), while the share of the non-insured rose notably, consistent with its respective numbers, to 30.6%, compared to last year's 26.0%.

Table 3

Prince Edward Island : EBSM-Similar Programming (2014/2015)

		Interventions	Year-over-Year Change	Expenditures ($ 000s)
Employment Benefits				
TWS	Employ PEI	437	+8.7%	2,135
SE	Self-Employ PEI	118	-19.7%	1,579
JCPs	Work Experience PEI	108	-36.1%	1,381
SD-R	Training PEI—Individual	1,013	-9.2%	13,487*
SD-A	Training PEI—Apprentice	315	+4.3%	
Support Measures				
EAS	Employment Assistance Services	5,597	+6.1%	4,686
LMPs	Labour Market Partnerships	N/A	N/A	2,143
R&I	Research & Innovation	N/A	N/A	245

*Combined investment for SD-A and SD-R

Chart 12

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 13

Client Distribution by Age

Following a decline in the previous year, Prince Edward Island delivered a growing number of interventions, totalling 7,588 (+2.4%) in 2014/2015. Overall, the number of Employment Benefits (1,991) decreased (-6.8%), in contrast to last year's growth. On the other hand, EAS numbers (5,597) increased by 6.1%, after a decline in the previous year. A significantly lower number of active and former claimants (1,934; -11.9%) returned to work after participation in an EBSM-similar intervention. At $25.7 million, Prince Edward Island's total expenditures for its EBSM-similar programming represented 100% of the allocated funding.

2.3.1 Employment Benefits

After a moderate expansion in the previous year, Prince Edward Island delivered a lower number of Employment Benefits interventions (1,991) in 2014/2015. This represented a significant year-over-year decline of 6.8%. TWS (437) and SD-A (315) both expanded (+8.7% and +4.3% year over year), while the other three benefit types all contracted, with JCP (108) declining by 36.1%, followed by SE (118), which dropped by 19.7%, and SD-R (1,013)—the most frequently used benefit intervention in the province—was down 9.2%. At 66.7%, combined SD-R and SD-A continued to account for the greatest share of all employment benefits, indicating a continued focus in the province on addressing pressing skills shortages. Employment Benefits expenditures fell down to $18.6 million (-6.3%), consistent with the decline in the numbers of most benefit types.

Chart 14

Clients, Year-over-Year

2.3.2 Support Measures: EAS

Prince Edward Island delivered a significantly higher number of EAS interventions (5,597) in 2014/2015 (+6.1%). Employment Services (4,252) and Individual Counselling (1,345)—the province's two EAS types—shifted differently, with the first expanding considerably (+11.3%), after a decline in the previous year, while the latter contracted notably (-7.6%), which constitutes the third consecutive yearly decline. Consistent with the increase in EAS numbers, the total expenditures of EAS rose to $4.7 million (+3.7%) in 2014/2015.

2.3.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&I

In 2014/2015, LMPs and R&I funding increased considerably to $2.4 million (+38.0%), compared to last year's $1.7 million. LMPs total expenditures grew significantly (+25.0%), to a total of $2.1 million. Similarly, R&I's expenditures expanded, though at a remarkably faster pace, reaching $245,000 (+1,431%). LMPs and R&I funding supported initiatives led by industries and communities to identify and address labour market challenges.

2.3.4 Managing for Results

In an effort to measure the effectiveness of programming, SkillsPEI implemented adjustments to its database management system to analyze the employability of clients participating in paid interventions. New functionality and modifications were implemented in phases. As of the end of fiscal year, all database requirements were deployed including the logic model to manage and survey completed interventions.

2.4 Nova Scotia

Nova Scotia's real GDP expanded by 0.6% in 2014 and is expected to have increased closer to 1% in 2015, thanks to gains in manufacturing and construction. The stronger growth in the U.S. and the weaker Canadian dollar is helping Nova Scotia-produced goods compete in international markets. As well, military shipbuilding projects are providing an additional boost to the province's manufacturers. Nova Scotia's tourism sector continues to perform thanks to an influx of U.S. travellers, as well a rise in visitors from other parts Canada. The sharp drop in natural gas production had a negative impact on the economy.

In 2014/2015, Nova Scotia posted an average of 5,200 job vacancies (+800 year over year), with the strongest labour demand originating in health care and social assistance, retail trade, as well as in accommodation and food services. The province's annual job vacancy rate of 1.4% was below the national average of 1.6%.

Nova Scotia:

EBSM Key Facts

Total Clients Served: 15,959	
EI Clients	Non-Insured Clients
11,562 ⬇	4,397 ⬇

Total Interventions: 31,220		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	4,252	10.3% ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	26,968	5.1% ⬇

Relative Share of Interventions		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	13.6%	0.7 ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	86.4%	0.7 ⬆

Total Allocation: $ 78.9 Million		
Total Expenditures	2014/2015 ($ Million)	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	$47.8	10.8% ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	$29.1	23.7% ⬆
LMPs and R&I	$2.0	2.4% ⬆
Total Expenditures[1]	**$78.9**	**0.2% ⬇**

Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)		
2013/2014	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
$28.60	$28.41	0.7% ⬇

[1] Totals may not add up due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

Due to its modest economic growth, Nova Scotia's labour market had a tepid performance in 2014/2015. The labour force shrunk by 0.7% year over year, settling at 491,600. Overall, employment was down (-0.6% or -2,900). However, there were gains in full-time employment (+0.4% or +1,400). Unemployment decreased by 1.4% to a total of 43,700. In this context, the unemployment rate edged down to 8.9%, compared to 9% in 2013/2014.

Following an increase in the previous year, employment in the goods-producing sector dropped noticeably to 82,400 (-4,700 or -5.4%) in 2014/2015. Employment losses were registered in all industries, except in forestry, finishing, mining, oil and gas (+300 or +2.9%). The largest employment losses were concentrated in construction (-2,100 or -6.0%) and manufacturing (-1,700 or -5.5%). Employment gains were registered in the services-producing industries (+1,800 or +0.5%), led by transportation and warehousing (+1,800 or +9.4%); finance, insurance, real estate and leasing (+1,000 or +4.8%); as well as in accommodation and food services (+1,100 or +3.5%). Offsetting these gains were employment losses concentrated in business, building and other support services (-2,300 or -10.3%), as well as in other services (-1,400 or -7.4%).

Labour and skill shortages in select industries and relatively low labour productivity continued to be among the main labour market challenges in Nova Scotia in 2014/2015. Specifically, some individuals are experiencing difficulty in transitioning smoothly to the knowledge-based economy, due to low education and employable skills. To ensure a skilled and sustainable workforce is available to meet employers' needs, the province oriented its strategic investments toward attracting and retaining skilled and talented workers; providing training opportunities for workers and employers; as well as supporting workers in building the required skills for the new technologies.

Going forward, job openings in Nova Scotia are expected to be largely driven by the need to replace workers retiring from the labour force. The largest source of new entrants to the workforce will continue to be youth, complemented by immigration and other workforce adjustments (i.e. delayed retirements). This demographic shift could result in new and/or different skills and training needs to ensure new entrants have the skills to meet the demands of the labour market.

For a second consecutive year, Nova Scotia served a lower number of clients (15,959), down by 4.1% in 2014/2015. Two out of the three client types declined, with former claimants (2,202) decreasing significantly (-20.8%) and the non-insured clients (4,397) falling moderately (-3.3%). Active claimants, on the other hand, grew slightly (+0.5%), reaching 9,360 in 2014/2015, after experiencing a downward trend over the past four years. Their shares shifted in the same direction as their respective totals: active claimants' share rose (+2.7 percentage points) to 58.7%, and former claimants dropped by 2.9 percentage points to 13.8%. The share of the non-insured clients edged up slightly, to 27.6% (+0.3 percentage points year over year).

Table 4

Nova Scotia : EBSM-Similar Programming (2014/2015)

		Interventions	Year-over-Year Change	Expenditures ($ 000s)
Employment Benefits				
TWS	START	362	-32.0%	3,181
SE	Nova Scotia Self-Employment Benefit	422	-9.8%	5,626
JCPs	Nova Scotia Job Creation Partnerships	118	-25.8%	1,341
SD-R	Nova Scotia Skills Development	1,790	-13.9%	37,624
SD-A	Nova Scotia Skills Development	1,560	+3.8%	
Support Measures				
EAS	Nova Scotia Employment Assistance Services	26,968	-5.1%	29,070
LMPs	Nova Scotia Labour Market Partnerships	N/A	N/A	2,027
R&I	Research and Innovation	N/A	N/A	–

Chart 15

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 16

Client Distribution by Age

Nova Scotia delivered a declining number of EBSM interventions for a second year in a row, totaling 31,220 (-5.9%) in 2014/2015. The share of Employment Benefits of the total interventions delivered in the province dropped slightly by 0.7 percentage points, to 13.6%. Conversely, EAS accounted for a greater share of 86.4%, compared to last year's 85.7%. A total of 5,608 of EI clients returned to employment after participating in Nova Scotia's EBSM-similar programming (-1.3%). At $78.9 million, Nova Scotia's total expenditures for its EBSM-similar programming represented 100% of the allocated funding.

2.4.1 Employment Benefits

For a second consecutive year, Nova Scotia delivered fewer Employment Benefits interventions, totalling 4,252 (-10.3%) in 2014/2015. With the exception of SD-A, which grew moderately to a total of 1,560 (+3.8%), all the other Employment Benefits contracted significantly. TWS declined the most (-32.0%) to a total of 362; followed by JCP (-25.8%) down to 118; SD-R (-13.9%), to a total of 1,790; and SE (-9.8%) with 422 total interventions. The shares of the benefit types shifted consistently with their levels, except for SE which remained stable at 9.9%. Despite the significant decrease in SD-R, the combined shares of both SD-A (36.7%) and SD-R (42.1%) continued to be the most used benefit intervention in the province at 78.8% compared to 75.5% in 2013/2014, reflecting a continued focus on clients' long-term job attachment and reduction in the reliance on government support. Employment Benefits expenditures totaled $47.8 million in 2014/2015, a significant decrease of 10.8% from 2013/2014 levels.

2.4.2 Support Measures: EAS

For a fourth consecutive year, Nova Scotia delivered a decreasing number of EAS interventions (26,968) in 2014/2015, compared to last year's 28,423. Group Services was the sole EAS intervention expanding in 2014/2015, reaching a total of 1,852 (+100%). Conversely, Employment Services (20,603) and Individual Counselling (4,513) both declined by 8.4% and 9.9%, respectively. The shares of the three EAS types shifted in the same directions, with Group Services rising to 6.9% of all EAS interventions, while Employment Services (76.4%) and Individual Counselling (16.7%) both edging down (-2.7 and -0.9 percentage points, respectively). Despite the decline in the numbers of EAS, it accounted for a growing share (86.4%) of all interventions delivered in the province (+0.7 percentage points), signalling a continued demand for EAS in the province. Nova Scotia uses EAS to help job-ready clients meet the growing demand for skilled labour and increase the job attachment of vulnerable groups. EAS total expenditures increased significantly to $29.1 million (+23.7%).

Chart 17

Clients, Year-over-Year

2.4.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs

The total expenditures for LMPs continued to rise for a third consecutive year, reaching $2.0 million in 2014/2015 (+2.4%). Through investing in LMPs, the province supports employers, employer/employee associations, community groups and communities in developing and implementing strategies for dealing with changes in the labour force and meeting human resource requirements. LMP investment supports partnerships in key business/industry sectors, strengthens stakeholder engagement and fosters collaboration in identifying the right labour market priorities and strategies.

2.4.4 Managing for Results

To improve assessment and monitoring of EBSM programming, Employment Nova Scotia uses the provincially developed Labour Market Programs Support System (LaMPSS) for the documentation and administration of LMDA organisation and individual funding agreements and for tracking participant case management information. In 2014/2015, an extensive review of case management data was undertaken to determine how each External Service Provider was performing. The review included comparative analysis to identify areas that need improvement, with the overarching objective to ensure quality service delivery and achieving client outcomes. The review also provides input for further development as the Province undertakes an employment services transformation.

2.5 New Brunswick

Real GDP in New Brunswick fell 0.3% in 2014 after increasing by 0.4% in 2013. The province is expected to post real GDP closer to 1.0% in 2015. New Brunswick's forestry sector is experiencing robust growth with increasing lumber and softwood shipments stemming from a steady rise in U.S. demand. Other primary industries like agriculture and fishing experienced decent growth. Construction will weigh down on the economy as residential investment spending has declined.

In 2014/2015, New Brunswick recorded an average of 3,700 job vacancies, unchanged year over year. The strongest labour demand was concentrated in retail trade, manufacturing, as well as in accommodations and food services. Over the course of the entire fiscal year, the provincial job vacancy rate stood at 1.3%, which was 0.3 percentage points below the national average.

In 2014/2015, the labour market experienced some weakness. The size of the labour force declined (-2,700 or -0.7%), settling at 392,500. Overall, employment was down by 0.8%, totalling 352,900, with net losses of 1,400 in both full-time and part-time jobs. New Brunswick's participation rate declined 0.4 percentage points to 63.1%. In this context, the unemployment rate reached 10.1%, edging up by 0.1 percentage points.

The goods-producing industries registered a loss of (-4,200 or -5.3%) in employment. The losses were mainly concentrated in construction (-3,300 or -10.9%), as well as in forestry, fishing, mining, oil and gas (-800 or -6.1%). Services-producing industries delivered a modest gain of 1,500 net jobs. Employment increases were mainly in professional, scientific and technical services (+2,600 or +17.2%); business, building and other support services (+1,800 or +9.9%); as well as in public administration (+1,400 or +6.5%). Offsetting some these gains, employment losses were registered in: health care and social assistance (-2,000 or -3.7%); trade (-1,400 or -2.4%); as well as in information, culture, and recreation (-700 or -6.1%).

A sluggish economy and a small and aging population are currently the main labour market challenges in New Brunswick. The province established a number of priorities to help its workforce secure and maintain employment. These included: investing in innovative programs and services, as well as strengthening partnerships with stakeholders and employers in order to address skills shortages and training needs; promoting adult literacy and continuous learning; and assisting workers through creating opportunities for job matching. Additionally, New Brunswick continued to invest in all levels of skills training from literacy and academic upgrading to apprentices in an effort to respond to the training needs of employers and job seekers. An example is an investment in the One Job Pledge component of the Workforce Expansion program, launched in 2013, which connects employers with recent post-secondary graduates.

New Brunswick:
EBSM Key Facts

Total Clients Served: 15,827	
EI Clients	Non-Insured Clients
10,989 ⬇	4,838 ⬇

Total Interventions: 33,854		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	8,093	4.9% ⬆
Support Measures: EAS	25,761	0.2% ⬇

Relative Share of Interventions		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	23.9%	0.9 ⬆
Support Measures: EAS	76.1%	0.9 ⬇

Total Allocation: $ 89.8 Million		
Total Expenditures	2014/2015 ($ Million)	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	$69.9	2.4% ⬆
Support Measures: EAS	$11.7	3.3% ⬆
LMPs and R&I	$8.3	14.6% ⬇
Total Expenditures[1]	**$89.8**	**0.7% ⬆**

Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)		
2013/2014	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
$28.67	$27.27	4.9% ⬇

[1] Totals may not add up due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

Table 5

New Brunswick : EBSM-Similar Programming (2014/2015)

		Interventions	Year-over-Year Change	Expenditures ($ 000s)
Employment Benefits				
TWS	Workforce Expansion—Employer Wage Subsidy	1,632	+12.2%	9,586
SE	Workforce Expansion—Self-Employment Benefit	286	-9.5%	5,152
SD-R	Training and Skills Development Program	3,983	+8.2%	55,142
SD-A	Training and Skills Development Program	2,192	-3.0%	
Support Measures				
EAS	Employment Assistance Services	25,761	-0.2%	11,651
LMPs	Adjustment Services	N/A	N/A	7,636
R&I	Research and Innovation	N/A	N/A	673

Following a notable increase in the numbers of clients (+6.4%) served in 2013/2014, a moderate decline of 4.3% was observed in 2014/2015, resulting in the total number of clients dropping (15,827). All the three client types also decreased, with active claimants (8,596) and former claimants (2,393) both declined significantly (-5.2% and -7.7% year over year, respectively), and the non-insured clients (4,838) slightly shrinking (-0.8%). An increased focus on providing more comprehensive assistance to clients facing particular barriers to employment has likely contributed to the observed contraction in the numbers of these client types. Similarly, the shares of these client types followed suit their respective numbers, with the shares of active (54.3%) and former claimants (15.1%) both edging down from last year's 54.8% and 15.7%, respectively. As for the proportion of the non-insured clients of all clients, it grew to 30.6% (+1.1% percentage points year over year).

Chart 18

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 19

Client Distribution by Age

Chart 20

Clients, Year-over-Year

The total number of interventions delivered in New Brunswick has grown for two years in a row, reaching 33,854 in 2014/2015 (+0.9%). Despite a slight decrease (-0.2%) in Support Measures (25,761), a notable increase (+4.9%) in the numbers of Employment Benefits lifted its total number to 8,093 in 2014/2015, which pushed up the total number of interventions. The share of Employment Benefits of all interventions rose (+0.9 percentage points) to 23.9%, while that of EAS dropped slightly from last year's 77.0%, down to 76.1% in 2014/2015, consistent with the decline in total numbers. A smaller total of 7,471 active and former claimants returned to work after participation in an EBSM-similar intervention, compared to 7,927 in 2013/2014. At $89.8 million, New Brunswick's total expenditures for its EBSM-similar programming represented 100% of the allocated funding.

2.5.1 Employment Benefits

After delivering a smaller number of Employment Benefits (7,712) interventions last year, New Brunswick served a total of 8,093 in 2014/2015 (+4.9%). The two Skills Development types shifted differently, with the total number of SD-R expanding significantly (+8.2%), to a total of 3,983. In contrast, SD-A (2,192) declined for a second consecutive year, dropping moderately (-3.0%) in 2014/2015. Consistent with the change in the numbers of these two benefit types, their respective shares shifted similarly, with the share of SD-R rising by 1.5 percentage points to 49.2%, while that of SD-A declined at a faster pace (-2.2 percentage points to 27.1%). The combined SD share declined slightly, but continued to represent the greatest proportion of all interventions at 76.3%, reflecting New Brunswick's continued support for new skills acquisition. TWS expanded significantly (+12.2%) to a total of 1,632, while SE (286) declined noticeably (-9.5%). The substantial increase in TWS could be attributed to a continued investment in the province's One Job Pledge component of Workforce Expansion—a program that saw its first full year of delivery in 2013/2014. This program offers up to 52 weeks of wage subsidy for recent post-secondary graduates. Employment Benefits total expenditures increased to $69.9 million (+2.4%) in 2014/2015.

2.5.2 Support Measures: EAS

With a total of 25,761, New Brunswick delivered a slightly smaller number of EAS interventions (-0.2%). Consistent with the decline in the total numbers of EAS, its share of all interventions delivered edged down slightly (-0.9%), to 76.1% in 2014/2015. The two EAS types delivered in the province shifted differently, with Individual Counselling edging up by 0.7% to a total of 16,667, while Employment Services dropped to a total of 9,094 (-1.9%). The demand for EAS reflects a continued focus in the province on assisting job-ready individuals and supporting vulnerable clients. Additionally, the province continued to strengthen its efforts in targeting specific groups including persons with disabilities and social assistance recipients. New Brunswick clients participated in an increasing average of 2.14 interventions per client in 2014/2015, compared to 2.03 in 2013/2014. Total expenditures for EAS increased to $11.7 million (+3.3%).

2.5.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&I

After a considerable growth (+22.7%) in LMPs and R&I total expenditures of $9.7 million last year, this total dropped significantly to $8.3 million (-14.6%) in 2014/2015, mainly due to a sharp decline (-19.2%) in LMP funding. LMP total expenditures fell to $7.6 million, compared to $9.5 million in 2013/2014. Conversely, R&I total expenditures expanded dramatically (+145.6%) in 2014/2015, reaching $673,000, more than double last year's value of $274,000. Investment in R&I increased, as New Brunswick used R&I funds ($347,149) to support the Canada-New Brunswick Job Grant initiatives. Compared to last year's 10.9%, combined LMP and R&I total expenditures represented a declining share of 9.2% of EBSM total expenditures.

2.5.4 Managing for Results

To support EI clients with active employment programming earlier in their EI claim, New Brunswick works closely with local Service Canada partners to reach clients as early as possible. Some regions have made arrangements with their local Service Canada partners to include the coordinates of the local offices and as well as information regarding the programs and services offered by the Department of Post-Secondary Education Training and Labour.

2.6 Quebec

In 2014, Quebec's real GDP expanded by 1.5%. A slightly weaker growth rate of 1.4% is expected for 2015 due to sluggish conditions in the first half of the year. Quebec's trade sector was weaker than expected, due to low final demand from U.S. businesses and consumers for its goods and services. A pull-back in the province's construction sector has also weighed on its real GDP growth. However, the lower dollar bodes well for Quebec's manufacturing sector, which recorded strong performance in the machinery and aerospace industries. As the U.S. economy picks up, Quebec's trade sector is projected to improve.

In 2014/2015, Quebec's job vacancies were at 45,600 (+4,700 year over year), with the strongest labour demand recorded in retail trade, heath care and social assistance, as well as in manufacturing. The province's job vacancy rate stood at 1.3%, which was 0.3 percentage points below the national average. This points to a labour market that was slightly looser than Canada's overall labour market.

Quebec's labour force remained unchanged at 4.4 million, with weak employment growth (+3,200) while unemployment edged down slightly (-2,800). The province's unemployment rate declined by 0.1 percentage points, reaching 7.6% in 2014/2015.

In the goods-producing industries, employment declined by 2.9%, shedding 26,000 net jobs with the greatest losses concentrated in construction (-13,900 or -5.2%) and manufacturing (-8,900 or -1.8%). Offsetting these losses, the services-producing industries added 29,200 net jobs, an increase of 0.9 year over year. The strongest employment jobs were registered in accommodations and food services (+16,600 or 6.4%), health care and social assistance (+10,600 or 1.9%), public administration (+10,300 or 4.8%) and trade (+4,100 or 0.6%). At the same time, the strongest employment declines were observed in other services (-11,100 or 6.1%), professional, scientific and technical services (-8,300 or -2.7%), as well as in educational services (-1,800 or 0.6%).

In the context of an aging population, misalignment between skills and available jobs continued to pose challenges in Quebec's labour market. Through working in concert with its labour market partners, the province advanced a number of key priorities, including improving its labour market performance and providing timely labour market information services in order to help the unemployed quickly return to work. Specific actions to achieve identified labour market priorities included: engaging employers and supporting their employment and skills development training initiatives; identifying and analyzing structural measures negatively impacting current and future integration and attachments of its workforce; and clarifying issues and possible solutions to consider in improving the match between skills and available jobs. The province also focused on increasing labour market participation, improving productivity, reinforcing the business community's capacity to adapt to structural changes, and supporting underrepresented groups in the labour market.

Quebec:
EBSM Key Facts

Total Clients Served: 229,781	
EI Clients	Non-Insured Clients
165,012 ↓	64,769 ↑

Total Interventions: 281,152		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	32,474	19.4% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	248,678	2.0% ↑

Relative Share of Interventions		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	11.6%	2.6 ↓
Support Measures: EAS	88.4%	2.6 ↑

Total Allocation: $ 579.1 Million (An additional $750,000 in EI Part II funds were made available to Quebec in response to the Lac Mégantic train derailment, for a grand total of $579.8 Million)		
Total Expenditures	2014/2015 ($ Million)	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	$337.8	2.8% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	$157.3	12.5% ↑
LMPs and R&I	$84.8	9.7% ↓
Total Expenditures[1]	**$579.8**	**0.2% ↓**

Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)		
2013/2014	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
$252.38	$290.84	15.2% ↑

[1] Totals may not add up due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

Table 6

Quebec : EBSM-Similar Programming (2014/2015)

		Interventions	Year-over-Year Change	Expenditures ($ 000s)
Employment Benefits				
TWS	Wage Subsidies	5,052	-17.1%	69,792
SE	Support for Self-Employment Measure	1,680	-12.3%	25,236
TES	Return to Work Supplement	2,692	-53.3%	1,302
DC	Manpower Training Measure Job Readiness	23,050	-13.1%	241,446
Support Measures				
EEAS	Labour Market Information Job Placement Job Research and Assistance Services	248,678	+2.0%	157,270
LMPs	Job Cooperation Services Manpower Training Measure for Enterprises	N/A	N/A	84,546
R&I	Research and Innovation Strategy	N/A	N/A	253

Following three years of consecutive growth, the number of clients who participated in Quebec's EBSM-similar programming fell moderately (-3.2%) in 2014/2015 to a total of 229,781, down from last year's 237,337. Two out of the three client types followed suit, while the third maintained an upward trend. The numbers of active (140,026) and former (24,986) claimants both declined significantly by 5.0% and 6.7%, respectively. Non-insured clients, on the other hand, increased moderately (+2.5%), lifting total numbers to a ten-year high of 64,769. The increase in this client type also softened the pace at which the overall total number of all clients declined.

Chart 21

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 22

Client Distribution by Age

Consistent with the decline in the numbers of clients served, the total number of interventions delivered in Quebec in 2014/2015 fell to 281,152 (-1.1%). The share of Employment Benefits (11.6%) of the total number of interventions delivered remained on a downward trend for a fifth consecutive year. This number also represented the lowest share since 2005/2006. Conversely, the proportion of EAS continued to increase, reaching a 10-year high of 88.4%, which is also a moderate year-over-year growth of 2.6 percentage points.

A total number of 59,949 EI clients returned to work following participation in EBSM-similar interventions in 2014/2015, a significant year-over-year increase of 8.9%. This figure constituted a third consecutive year of growth and a 10-year high. As a result of the increased returns to employment by active claimants, it was estimated that $290.84 million of unpaid benefits from the EI Operating Account were generated in 2014/2015, compared to $252.38 million last year. Quebec's total expenditures for its EBSM-similar programming reached $579.4 million. This amount includes additional expenditures of $331,627 taken from the $750,000 envelope made available to Quebec, following the July 2013 Lac Mégantic train derailment incident, which is above the province's initial LMDA allocation.

To support workers affected by the July 2013 train derailment in Lac Mégantic, $1.5 million in EI Part II funds were made available to Quebec in 2014/2015 through a time-limited amendment to its LMDA. As per the terms of the agreement, an initial payment of $750,000 was provided to Quebec in September 2014 (with the remaining sum to be provided to Quebec upon their request). In December 2014, Quebec indicated that they did not require the remaining funds. Ultimately, Quebec used $331,627 of the funding and returned the remaining $418,373 to the GC early in the 2015/2016 fiscal year. This additional funding was used to provide active measures programming and income support to help unemployed workers maintain their workforce attachment, gain relevant skills, and meet community needs. Specifically, the province provided programming through Job Cooperation Services and their Manpower Training Measures. All active employment measures were delivered in the EI Region of South Central Quebec where Lac-Mégantic is located.

2.6.1 Employment Benefits

The number of Employment Benefits interventions fell significantly to a total of 32,474 (-19.4%) in 2014/2015. All the four benefit types also declined at a similar rate, except for TES which declined considerably (-53.3%), down to 2,692 due to a closure of this program. TWS (5,052), SD-R (23,050) and SE (1,680) all dropped by 17.1%, 13.1% and 12.3%, respectively. Despite the noticeable decline in SD-R, it continued to account for a greater share (71.0%) of all benefits delivered in the province, signalling a continued priority in Quebec. As for TWS, it accounted for a greater share (15.6%) despite the drop in its total numbers. The Employment Benefits total expenditures fell to $337.8 million (-2.8%) in 2014/2015, consistent with recorded decline in intervention numbers.

2.6.2 Support Measures: Employment Assistance Services (EAS)

In 2014/2015, the increased EAS share (88.4%) of all interventions served in the province reflects a continued demand in the use of Support Measures. The number of EAS interventions grew to a total of 248,678, compared to 243,873 in 2013/2014, representing the highest level in 10 years. It also reflects the continued increase in the number of non-insured clients served. Significantly increased numbers of Employment Services were delivered in Quebec in 2014/2015, reaching a total of 146,501 (+6.5%). The share of this EAS type also rose to 58.9% (+2.5 percentage points year over year). Similarly, Quebec served a growing number of Individual Counselling interventions (70,349), an increase of 15.7%. Conversely, the province delivered a significantly lower number of Group Services interventions, totaling 31,828 in 2014/2015 (-30.1%), with the share of this EAS type dropping also significantly to 12.8% from last year's 18.7%. The total expenditures of EAS rose notably to $157.3 million (+12.5%).

2.6.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&I

For a second consecutive year, Quebec's total LMP and R&I expenditures fell, dropping to $84.8 million in 2014/2015 (-9.7%). The total expenditures for LMPs was $84.5 million, a significant decline of 9.7%, while R&I expenditures expanded considerably, (+21.1%) to a total of $253,000. However, total LMPs and R&I funding represented a declining share of the total expenditures of EBSM-similar programming, down from last year's 16.2% to 14.6% in 2014/2015.

Chart 23

Clients, Year-over-Year

2.6.4 Managing for Results

Quebec uses an evidence based approach to identify and address the main challenges of its labour market. To manage for results, the province also uses a decentralized approach, and allocates budgets and outcome targets based on factors pertaining to local labour markets, as well as personal characteristics of EI applicants. A key component of this approach is an effective targeting and referral (TRF) system, which supports and advances the acceleration of employment integration of those ready to enter the job market. A continued focus on increasing awareness as well as adapting and facilitating the use of labour market information is also a key aspect of its effective practices in managing for results effective practices. It is also worth noting also is that Quebec is responsible for assessing the effectiveness of its EBSM-similar programming.

2.7 Ontario

Ontario's real GDP grew by 2.7% in 2014 and by around 2.4% in 2015. Household spending, investments, and exports remain the main drivers of growth. Furthermore, lower oil prices, a more competitive Canadian dollar and solid US economic growth present opportunities for further growth in Ontario

In 2014/2015, Ontario averaged 79,500 job vacancies, an increase of 14,200 year over year. The province recorded its highest labour demand in retail trade, manufacturing, as well as in health care and social assistance. Despite a relatively solid economic performance, the province's job vacancy rate of 1.4% was just below the national average of 1.6%.

Ontario's improving economic conditions are reflected in its 2014/2015 labour market aggregates. The labour forced expanded by 0.3% (+19,800) to a total of 7.42 million. Employment was up 0.6% (+43,700) to a total of 6.89 million, with full-time and part-time employment edging up by 0.5% (+26,600) and 1.3% (+17,100) respectively. Unemployment was down by 23,900 (-4.3%). In this context, the province's unemployment rate decreased to 7.2% (-0.3 percentage points).

In the goods-producing industries, overall employment edged down by 1.0% (-14,400), with notable losses recorded in manufacturing (-18,900 or -2.5%); agriculture (-3,700 or -4.4%); as well as in forestry, fishing, mining, oil and gas (-2,500 or -7.0%). The construction sector recorded a growth of 12,400 net jobs (+2.7%). Ontario's overall employment growth was sustained with an additional 58,000 net jobs (+1.1%) in the services-producing industries. Notable gains were observed in trade (+25,100 or +2.5%); educational services (+24,000 or +5.0%); health care and social assistance (+15,300 or +1.9); as well as in professional, scientific and technical services (+14,300 or +2.6%). Offsetting these gains on a net basis were notable employment losses observed in: transportation and warehousing (-15,300 or -4.5%); other services (-9,200 or -3.2%); and, public administration (-6,600 or -1.8%).

Ontario continues to face a number of labour market challenges, including an aging workforce and growing departures from the labour force (e.g. retirements from the baby-boom cohort). Recent immigrants (landed 10 years or less) with international qualifications still face a number of challenges, such as getting their foreign credentials and experience recognized. In addition, indigenous people, persons with disabilities, youth, and older workers experience unique labour market challenges compared to the rest of the labour force. To address these challenges, the province continued to focus on supporting its workforce through investments in skills development and training, as well as on enhancing employment programs to support quick returns to work. Specific activities included the launch of the Canada-Ontario Job Grant in 2014. In addition, the province continued to engage extensively with key stakeholders to build awareness and solicit feedback on Ontario's employment and training programs, as well as on its labour market priorities.

Ontario:
EBSM Key Facts

Total Clients Served: 154,073	
EI Clients	Non-Insured Clients
82,795 ⬇	71,278 ⬇

Total Interventions: 172,667		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	28,656	4.6% ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	144,011	3.3% ⬇

Relative Share of Interventions		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	16.6%	0.2 ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	83.4%	0.2 ⬆

Total Allocation: $ 570.5 Million		
Total Expenditures	2014/2015 ($ Million)	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	$251.00	10.0% ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	$290.00	6.7% ⬆
LMPs and R&I	$29.50	101.0% ⬆
Total Expenditures[1]	**$570.5**	**0.9% ⬆**

Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)		
2013/2014	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
$237.59	$240.96	1.4% ⬆

[1] Totals may not add up due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

Table 7

Ontario : EBSM-Similar Programming (2014/2015)

		Interventions	Year-over-Year Change	Expenditures ($ 000s)
Employment Benefits				
TWS	Employment Service - Job Placement with Incentive	1,806	-8.2%	3,619
SE	Ontario Self-Employment Benefit	2,406	-2.8%	46,160
JCPs	Ontario Job Creation Partnerships	512	-1.7%	7,417
SD-R	Second Career	8,049	-12.8%	193,770
SD-A	Skills Development-Apprenticeship	15,883	+0.3%	
Support Measures				
EAS	Ontario Employment Assistance Services/ Employment Service	144,011	-3.3%	290,022
LMPs	Ontario Labour Market Partnerships	N/A	N/A	13,658
R&I	Research and Innovation (including Canada Job Grant)	N/A	N/A	15,843

Ontario served a total of 154,073 clients in 2014/2015, compared to 159,367 in 2013/2014, a decrease of 3.3%. All the three client types contracted moderately, with the number of the non-insured clients (71,278) decreasing by 4.4%; followed by active claimants dropping down by 2.5% to 63,061; and, former claimants (19,734), edging down by 2.0%. The respective share of active and former EI insured clients rose to 40.9% and to 12.8% (up by +0.3 and +0.2 percentage points, respectively). On the other hand, the share of the non-insured clients declined to 46.3%, compared to 46.8% in 2013/2014, consistent with its drop in total number of clients.

Chart 24

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 25

Client Distribution by Age

After an increase over the past two years, the total number of EBSM-similar interventions delivered in the province declined to 172,667 in 2014/2015 (-3.6%). Both intervention types contracted, with Employment Benefits decreasing by 4.6% to total of 28,656 and EAS dropping moderately by 3.3% to a total of 144,011 interventions. Nonetheless, EAS interventions accounted for a greater share of 83.4% of all interventions delivered in the province (+0.2 percentage points). Returns to employment rose slightly (+0.4%) to total of 36,166 EI clients returning to work following participation in EBSM programing in 2014/2015. At $570.5 million, Ontario's total expenditures for its EBSM-similar programming represented 100% of the allocated funding.

Chart 26

Clients, Year-over-Year

2.7.1 Employment Benefits

Ontario delivered 28,656 Employment Benefits interventions in 2014/2015, a year-over-year decline of 4.6%. Skills Development (SD-R) decreased by 12.8%, to a total of 8,049. SD-A grew slightly by 0.3% to 15,883. The other three benefit types all contracted, with TWS (1,806), SE (2,406) and JCPs (512) declining by 8.2%, 2.8% and 1.7%, respectively. Employment Benefits expenditures totalled $251.0 million in 2014/2015, compared to $279.0 million in 2013/2014.

2.7.2 Support Measures: EAS

Following a notable growth in the previous two years, Ontario delivered a smaller number (144,011) of EAS interventions in 2014/2015 (-3.3%)—all delivered as Individual Counselling interventions.[22] EAS expenditures totalled $290 million (+6.7%).

2.7.3 Other Support Measures

Ontario's expenditures for LMPs and R&I more than doubled in 2014/2015, to a total $29.5 million (+101%). A dramatic increase (+1,797%) in the R&I total expenditures to $15.9 million compared to $840,000 in 2013/2014 lifted this year's overall total of LMPs and R&I. This is the result of launching the Canada-Ontario Job Grant in September 2014. Ontario used R&I funds ($15,974,503) to support the Canada Job Grant initiatives. LMP decreased moderately (-1.3%) this year, to a total of $13.7 million in 2014/2015, compared to $13.8 million last year. The considerable growth in overall total investment reflects the province's support and commitment to workforce innovation and improving knowledge of trends in local labour markets to better target resources to meet Ontarians' needs.

2.7.4 Managing for Results

To support clients with active employment programming, Ontario's Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities, Service Canada and employment service providers conduct joint client information sessions with EI claimants. These sessions provide clients with information on programs and services offered by the province and support them in re-entering the workforce. These services are available to all clients, regardless of where they are in their EI claim.

To improve assessment and monitoring of EBSM programming, Ontario has a performance management system for Employment Services that focuses on core measures and standards for the Service Quality Standard (SQS). The SQS allows the province to effectively monitor the progress and performance of its service providers according to their: effectiveness, efficiency, and quality of customer service. The system ensures funded service providers understand what is expected of them by setting out clear and consistent expectations. This allows Ontario to evaluate program and service provider performance in a consistent, transparent and evidence-based manner.

2.8 Manitoba

All key sectors of Manitoba's economy have been expanding, pushing the province's real GDP growth to 2.3% in 2014, and it is projected to grow at 1.8% in 2015. Led by solid gains in manufacturing, construction, and agriculture, Manitoba's goods sector is driving growth. With an improving U.S. economy and a lower Canadian dollar, export-orientated industries are well-positioned to capitalize on this context. The healthy growth in the goods-producing industries will be mirrored in the services sector.

Manitoba:

EBSM Key Facts

Total Clients Served: 28,842	
EI Clients	**Non-Insured Clients**
13,668 ⬇	15,174 ⬆

Total Interventions: 60,587		
Interventions Type	**2014/2015**	**Year-over-Year Change**
Employment Benefits	6,206	4.2% ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	54,381	15.1% ⬆

Relative Share of Interventions		
Interventions Type	**2014/2015**	**Year-over-Year Change (p.p.)**
Employment Benefits	10.2%	1.8 ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	89.8%	1.8 ⬆

Total Allocation: $ 43.1 Million		
Total Expenditures	**2014/2015 ($ Million)**	**Year-over-Year Change**
Employment Benefits	$27.6	6.7% ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	$7.8	4.7% ⬆
LMPs and R&I	$7.6	18.9% ⬆
Total Expenditures[1]	**$43.1**	**1.0% ⬇**

Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)		
2013/2014	**2014/2015**	**Year-over-Year Change**
$44.28	$43.09	2.7% ⬇

[1] Totals may not add up due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

[22] In addition to Individual Counselling, interventions can include case management, assessment, action planning, job matching, placement and incentives, job shadowing, coaching and retention support, life skills development, and access to labour market information. Ontario counts only one Individual Counselling intervention per EAS client.

In 2014/2015, Manitoba posted a significantly lower number of job vacancies (8,725) than in the previous year (10,000). The strongest labour demand was seen in health care and social services, retail trade and manufacturing. Manitoba's job vacancy rate was 1.7%, slightly higher than the national average 1.6%.

Aligned with Manitoba's economic performance, the labour force in the province expanded (+5,400 or +0.8%) to a total of 665,900. On a net basis, employment increased by 1% (+6,100), with full-time jobs up by 7,900 while part-time employment shrunk by 1,900. Unemployment dropped by 600 (-1.6%) finishing the year at 36,000. In this context, the unemployment rate edged down to 5.4%, a decrease of 0.1 percentage points year over year.

Both goods-producing and services-producing industries recorded net employment gains, increasing by 2,100 and 3,900 respectively. Across goods-producing industries, construction (+1,500 or +3.4) and manufacturing (+1,300 or +2%) recorded the strongest gains. The agriculture saw the biggest decline, shedding 1,300 net jobs compared to the previous year. Among services-producing industries, health care and social assistance (+4,500 or +4.7%), as well as educational services (+3,200 or +6.9%) saw the biggest employment gains. Business, building and other support services (-3,100 or -15.5%), as well as professional, scientific and technical services (-2,100 or -8.1%) recorded the largest losses.

Strong economic conditions, growth and expansions of businesses and aging population coupled with an exodus of retirees from the workforce have increased the demand for skilled workers in Manitoba. In 2014/2015, the province continued to advance its Skills Strategy to address reported skilled labour shortages.

Labour market priorities included ensuring foreign credentials align well with employer-demand for skills, especially among occupations with the most vacancies, and addressing gaps in language and essential skills to move towards a greater degree of labour market integration. Additional labour market priorities are: supporting pathways to employment, primarily through improving coordination among and fostering partnerships with service providers, training institutions and community agencies; placing emphasis on employer needs in order to ensure that long term employment outcomes are realized; and supporting Indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities and those detached from the labour market, who continue to be an important priority for the province's economic and social development goals.

After a decline in 2013/2014, the number of clients served increased moderately by 2.6% year over year, to a total of 28,842. The numbers of former (3,672) claimants and non-insured clients (15,174) both expanded (+2.6% and +12.1%, respectively). Active claimants' numbers (9,996), on the other hand, decreased significantly (-9.0%). As a result, the share of former claimants remained stable at 12.7%, while the share of non-insured clients grew notably to 52.6% (+4.4 percentage points) and that of active claimants fell to 34.7%, compared to 39.1% in 2013/2014.

Table 8

Manitoba : EBSM-Similar Programming (2014/2015)

		Interventions	Year-over-Year Change	Expenditures ($ 000s)
Employment Benefits				
TWS	Wage Subsidies	53	-3.6%	317
SE	Self-Employment	120	-14.9%	1,077
JCPs	Employment Partnerships	135	+6.3%	989
SD-R	Skills Development	1,966	-15.8%	25,224
SD-A	Skills Development-Apprenticeship	3,932	+2.9%	
Support Measures				
EAS	Employment Assistance Services	54,381	+15.1%	7,838
LMPs	Labour Market Partnerships	N/A	N/A	5,635
R&I	Research and Innovation	N/A	N/A	2,003

Chart 27

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 28

Client Distribution by Age

Manitoba delivered a total of 60,587 interventions in 2014/2015, a significant year-over-year increase of 12.8% (+6,864), possibly due to slow economic growth in 2014. The Support Measures accounted for an increasing share of 89.8% of all interventions, compared to 87.9% in the previous year. Overall, the EAS share has remained on an upward trend over the last several years, reaching a 10-year high. Conversely, the share of Employment Benefits continued to decline, reaching 10.2% (-1.8 percentage points year over year). At $43.1 million, Manitoba's total expenditures for its EBSM-similar programming represented 100% of the allocated funding.

Chart 29

Clients, Year-over-Year

2.8.1 Employment Benefits

Manitoba delivered a smaller number of Employment Benefits interventions in 2014/2015 totaling 6,206, a 4.2% year-over-year drop, consistent with the significant decline in active clients served. SD-A (3,932) and JCP (135) both increased, by 2.9% and 6.3% respectively. The other three benefit types all decreased, with SD-R (1,966) declining the most at 15.8%; followed by SE (120) at 14.9% and TWS (53) at 3.6%. Consequently, SD-R's share of all benefits declined, from 36.0% in the previous year to 31.7% in 2014/2015. Overall, the shares of SD-R and SD-A combined continued to account for an increasing proportion of all benefits (95.1%). Consistent with the decline in the numbers of Employment Benefits, its total expenditures also dropped significantly (-6.7%), to $27.6 million in 2014/2015.

2.8.2 Support Measures: EAS

An increasing number of EAS interventions (54,381) were delivered in Manitoba in 2014/2015, a significant increase of 15.1% (+7,138) year over year, reflecting a continued support to employment-ready clients for quick returns to work. The share of EAS of all EBSM interventions also grew to 89.8%, compared to 87.9% in the previous year. The increase in the number and share of EAS is largely due to the increase in the number of non-insured clients, which grew from 48.2% in 2013/2014 to 52.6% of all clients served in 2014/2015. Conversely, the share of active claimants dropped from 39.1% to 34.7%, while that of former claimants remained unchanged at 12.7%. For a second consecutive year, the province delivered a greater number of Employment Services interventions, reaching 39,241 in 2014/2015, a considerable year-over-year growth of 26.4% (+8,195). In contrast, Individual Counselling has declined significantly, dropping from 16,197 in 2013/2014 to 15,140 this year (-6.5%). EAS expenditures rose to $7.8 million (+4.7%), consistent with the expansion in those of Employment Services.

2.8.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&I

After a noticeable decline in 2013/2014, Manitoba's total expenditures for LMPs and R&I increased significantly to $7.6 million this year (+18.9%). Expansion in total expenditures was mainly driven by a sharp growth in R&I to $2.0 million (+61.5%), of which $1.4 million supported the Canada-Manitoba Job Grant initiatives. A significant increase (+8.7%) in LMPs expenditures lifted its total to $5.6 million. Together, the overall growth of LMPs and R&I expenditures represented an increasing share (17.7%) of EBSM-similar programming, as compared to last year's (14.8%).

2.8.4 Managing for Results

To support clients with active employment programming, Manitoba has developed and implemented an Employment and Training Assessment (ETA) tool as part of the intake process for all clients. The tool is used to assess an individual's employability and work readiness to determine appropriate interventions based on the assessment results. Manitoba is updating existing information systems (i.e. the Integrated Case Management System and the Service Provider Reporting System) to support implementation of the ETA across the external service provider network and ensure a level of standardization of client assessment.

2.9 Saskatchewan

After expanding at a rate of 1.9% in 2014, Saskatchewan's real GDP is estimated to have contracted by around 1% in 2015. The drop in oil prices, as well as drought conditions that led to a decline in agriculture output had a negative impact on the province's economy. In addition, Saskatchewan's construction sector slowed down in 2015, as major mine expansion projects were completed or postponed. The housing market exhibited weakness reflecting slowing demand, as well as, a multi-year period of overbuilding. However, the mining sector has been a bright spot in the economy, driven by continued strength in potash and uranium production.

In 2014/2015, Saskatchewan recorded an average of 9,100 job vacancies, an increase of 600 job vacancies over the previous fiscal year. The strongest labour demand in the province came from health care and social assistance, retail trade, and educational services. The provincial job vacancy rate of 2% was higher than the national average of 1.6%, making Saskatchewan one of the tightest labour markets in Canada.

Despite a slowing economy, Saskatchewan's labour market posted generally positive indicators. In 2014/2015, the labour force grew (+0.7%) to a total of 595,100. Employment increased by 1%, totalling 571,400 jobs, with full-time employment increasing (+5,600), while part-time work decreased slightly (-300). Unemployment edged down by 1,100 (-4.3%) from last year's level of 24,900. In this context, the provincial unemployment rate dipped to 4%, the lowest of any Canadian province.

Both goods-producing and services-producing industries recorded employment gains, increasing by 4,400 and 1,000, respectively. Among goods-producing industries, construction (+3,400 or +6.3%) and forestry, fishing, mining, oil and gas (+1,600 or +5.9%) posted the strongest employment gains. The services-producing industries added a total of 1,000 net jobs (+0.2%), with employment gains mainly observed in finance, insurance, real estate and leasing (+2,700 or +9.6%); accommodation and food services (+2,000 or +5.7%); as well as in educational services (+2,000 or +4.7%). The largest declines came in trade (-2,500 or -2.9%), as well as in information, culture and recreation (-1,200 or -6.7%).

Skills shortages, competition for skilled workers and an aging population continued to pose challenges for Saskatchewan's labour market in 2014/2015 despite a slower economy. The province highlighted a number of priorities to address these challenges, including: increasing future labour supply through developing the knowledge and skills of its workforce (especially under-represented groups); pursuing five new training initiatives in partnerships with employers, First Nations and post-secondary institutions; improving employment outcomes and skills matching for adults, through an expansion of demand driven labour market programs that address the needs of employers; attracting skilled workers from across Canada and the world, and continuing to offer a "Talent Team" approach to address the short-term and long-term workforce needs for large capital infrastructure projects.

Saskatchewan:
EBSM Key Facts

Total Clients Served: 13,881	
EI Clients	**Non-Insured Clients**
13,068 ↑	813 ↑

Total Interventions: 18,409		
Interventions Type	**2014/2015**	**Year-over-Year Change**
Employment Benefits	7,570	7.7% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	10,839	4.2% ↑

Relative Share of Interventions		
Interventions Type	**2014/2015**	**Year-over-Year Change (p.p.)**
Employment Benefits	41.1%	3.0 ↓
Support Measures: EAS	58.9%	3.0 ↑

Total Allocation: $ 35.9 Million		
Total Expenditures	**2014/2015 ($ Million)**	**Year-over-Year Change**
Employment Benefits	$28.6	2.7% ↑
Support Measures: EAS	$4.7	15.7% ↓
LMPs and R&I	$2.6	14.5% ↓
Total Expenditures[1]	**$35.9**	**1.6% ↓**

Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)		
2013/2014	**2014/2015**	**Year-over-Year Change**
$60.81	$61.60	1.3% ↑

[1] Totals may not add up due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

Table 9

Saskatchewan : EBSM-Similar Programming (2014/2015)

		Interventions	Year-over-Year Change	Expenditures ($ 000s)
Employment Benefits				
TWS	Skills Training Allocation	-	N/A	-
SE	Self-Employment Program	66	-14.3%	301
JCPs	Employment Programs	-	N/A	-
SD-R	Skills Training Benefit Provincial Training Allowance	938	-11.7%	28,278
SD-A	Apprenticeship Training	6,566	-7.0%	
Support Measures				
EAS	Workforce Development	10,839	+4.2%	4,692
LMPs	Regional and Sectoral Partnerships	N/A	N/A	2,401
R&I	Research and Innovation	N/A	N/A	184

For a second consecutive year, Saskatchewan served an increased number of clients, reaching a total of 13,881 in 2014/2015 (+0.6%). The numbers of active claimants (10,503) and the non-insured clients (813) each expanded at an equal pace of 1.9% year over year. In addition, these two client types accounted for a greater share of all clients served (75.7%, and 5.9%, respectively), compared to 74.7% and 5.8% in 2013/2014. On the other hand, the total number (2,565) and share (18.5%) of former claimants both declined (-4.5% and -1.0 percentage points, respectively).

Chart 30

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 31

Client Distribution by Age

Saskatchewan delivered a lower number of interventions in 2014/2015, totaling 18,409, compared to 18,603 last year. The share of Employment Benefits of this total dropped to 41.1% (-3.0 percentage points), while that of EAS grew to 58.9% (+3.0 percentage points), after dipping slightly in 2013/2014. The growth in the share of EAS reflects the notable increase in the number of the support measures, which reached a total of 10,839 (+4.2%). As the case was in 2013/2014, a total of 6,038 EI clients returned to employment following participation in the program. At $35.9 million, Saskatchewan's total expenditures for its EBSM-similar programming represented 100% of the allocated funding. At the same time, with stable returns to work over recent years, unpaid benefits rose to $61.6 million (+1.3% year over year).

2.9.1 Employment Benefits

A significantly smaller total number of Employment Benefits (7,570) were delivered in Saskatchewan in 2014/2015, compared to 8,200 in the previous year, with the three benefit types all declining. SD-A, the most commonly used benefit intervention in the province, decreased (-7.0%) to 6,566. Similarly, the numbers of SD-R (938) and SE (66) both declined significantly, by 11.7% and 14.3%, respectively. Consistent with growth in its numbers, SD-A accounted for a growing share of 86.7% of total benefits, compared to 86.1% in the previous year, reflecting a continued emphasis on meeting rising demand for skilled trades in the province. Overall, expenditures for Employment Benefits rose to $28.6 million (+2.7%).

Chart 32

Clients, Year-over-Year

2.9.2 Support Measures (EAS)

The numbers of EAS delivered in Saskatchewan in 2014/2015 expanded to a total of 10,839 (+4.2%), consistent with increased demand by clients ready for quick returns to employment in the province's robust labour market. Saskatchewan delivered more Individual Counselling (4,785) and Group Services (560) interventions (+9.1% and +18.9%, respectively), while the use of Employment Services dropped slightly to 5,494 (-0.9%). For a second consecutive year, EAS expenditures declined significantly, down to $4.7 million in 2014/2015 (a year-over-year decrease of 15.7%), another indication of a strong labour market.

2.9.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&I

Saskatchewan's total expenditures for LMPs and R&I fell significantly to $2.6 million, compared to $3.0 million in 2013/2014. LMP's funding ($2.4 million) recorded a notable decline of 8.0%. At a drop rate of 55.6%, R&I's declined sharply to a total of $0.2 million, almost half the value recorded in 2013/2014.

2.9.4 Managing for Results

Saskatchewan's Outcomes-Based Contract Management (OBCM) is developed in collaboration with community-based organizations to support shared commitments to positive results for job seekers and employers. It also improves client outcomes. The province has negotiated specific outcomes directly into contracts with third party suppliers, so that they understand what they are responsible for achieving and how their performance will be measured.

2.10 Alberta

After a solid growth of 4.8% in its real GDP for 2014, Alberta's economy is forecasted to contract by 2.0% in 2015, stemming from the slide in oil prices since mid-2014. This drop is rippling through the entire economy as construction output is down by 20%; and housing starts, by 10%. In this context, consumer confidence also dropped.

In 2014/2015, Alberta posted an average of 44,900 job vacancies (-2,800 year over year). The strongest labour demand in the province is concentrated in retail trade, construction, and in accommodation and food services. With a job vacancy rate of 2.3%, Alberta's rate was considerably higher than the national average of 1.6%. In this context, at the sub-national level, the province's labour market remains the tightest in Canada.

Employment in the province increased by 2.1%, adding 46,500 jobs on a net basis: 28,200 were full-time and 18,200 were part-time. Unemployment increased by 9,500 (+8.8%), finishing the year at 117,300. The provincial unemployment rate went up by 0.3 percentage points, to a total of 4.9%. The labour participation rate decreased (-0.3 percentage points) to 72.8%, dropping below 73% for the first time since 2010/2011.

Alberta:
EBSM Key Facts

Total Clients Served: 119,562	
EI Clients	Non-Insured Clients
59,218 ↓	60,344 ↓

Total Interventions: 236,476		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	24,288	6.5% ↑
Support Measures: EAS	212,188	9.3% ↓

Relative Share of Interventions		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	10.3%	1.4 ↑
Support Measures: EAS	89.7%	1.4 ↓

Total Allocation: $ 109.1 Million		
Total Expenditures	2014/2015 ($ Million)	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	$84.0	4.9% ↑
Support Measures: EAS	$23.2	14.4% ↓
LMPs and R&I	$2.0	0.3% ↓
Total Expenditures[1]	**$109.1**	**0.0%** –

Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)		
2013/2014	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
$249.34	$266.99	7.1% ↑

[1] Totals may not add up due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

Employment in the province increased by 2.1%, adding 46,500 jobs on a net basis: 28,200 were full-time and 18,200 were part-time. Unemployment increased by 9,500 (+8.8%), finishing the year at 117,300. The provincial unemployment rate went up by 0.3 percentage points, to a total of 4.9%. The labour participation rate decreased (-0.3 percentage points) to 72.8%, dropping below 73% for the first time since 2010/2011.

The goods-producing industries added 13,200 net jobs, mainly concentrated in construction (+11,900 or +4.8%). The services-producing industries added 33,300 net jobs, with the majority of the gains focused in transportation and warehousing (+14,800 or +12.2%); health care and social assistance (+14,300 or +6.1%); as well as accommodation and food services (+5,800 or +3.9%). Offsetting some of these gains were net employment losses in: trade (-12,200 or -3.7%); information, culture, and recreation (-2,400 or -3.2%); and public administration (-1,300 or -1.5%).

Alberta continues to face labour and skill shortages associated with a relatively strong long term economic growth trend, and an increased need to meet operating requirements in a knowledge-based economy. In this context, the province established a number of priorities to address key labour force pressures stemming from an aging workforce, combined with internal and external competition for talents of skilled and experienced workers.

A smaller number of clients (119,562) participated in EBSM-similar programming in Alberta in 2014/2015, signaling yet again a continued low demand for employment programming. This represented a drop of 2.6% year-over-year, and the lowest recorded over the last seven years. Despite the decline in the total number of clients, the number of active claimants served continued to increase, reaching 43,398 (2.2%). Conversely, former claimants (15,820) and non-insured clients (60,344) both declined, with their numbers falling significantly by 5.9% and 5.0%, respectively. As a result, active claimants' share increased to 36.3% of the total clients served, while the shares of former claimants (13.2%) and non-insured clients (50.5%) both dropped (-0.5 and -1.2 percentage points, respectively).

In 2014/2015, Alberta delivered a decreasing total number of interventions of 236,476 (-7.9%) compared to 256,692 in the previous year. This total also represented the lowest count over the last seven years. Changes in the shares of employment benefits (10.3%) and support measures (89.7%) both mirrored their respective interventions, with the proportion of employment benefits trending upwards, while that of support measures trending downwards. For a second consecutive year, the number of returns to employment increased, with a total of 25,745 EI clients returning to employment following participation in EBSM-similar programming, a moderate year-over-year increase of 2.6% (+653). The number of returns to employment is also 10.5% higher than in 2005/2006. At $109.1 million, Alberta's total expenditures for its EBSM-similar programming represented 100% of the allocated funding.

Table 10

Alberta : EBSM-Similar Programming (2014/2015)

		Interventions	Year-over-Year Change	Expenditures ($ 000s)
Employment Benefits				
TWS	Workplace Training	49	+19.5%	733
SE	Self-Employment	120	-42.0%	1,318
JCPs	Integrated Training	598	-7.9%	7,463
SD-R	Occupational Training Work Foundations	1,029	-39.0%	74,452
SD-A	Skills Development-Apprenticeship	22,492	+11.2%	
Support Measures				
EAS	Career Information	222,188	-9.3%	23,177
LMPs	Workforce Partnerships	N/A	N/A	1,995

Chart 33

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 34

Client Distribution by Age

2.10.1 Employment Benefits

Alberta delivered more Employment Benefits (24,288) interventions in 2014/2015, a significant year-over-year growth of 6.5% and a four-year high. SD-A (+11.2%) and TWS (+19.5%) both expanded by reaching 22,492 and 49, respectively. In contrast, the numbers of the other three benefit types all declined significantly, with SD-R dropping to 1,029 (-39.0%), SE falling by 42.0% to 120 and JCP down by 7.9% to 598 interventions. SD-A continued to account for a growing share (92.6%) of all benefits, compared to 88.7% in the previous year. Furthermore, the share of SD-A and SD-R combined represented 96.8% of all benefits. The expenditures of Employment Benefits totalled $84.0 million, a year-over-year increase of 4.9%.

2.10.2 Support Measures: EAS

The number of EAS interventions delivered in Alberta declined for a fifth consecutive year, reflecting Alberta's strong long-term economic growth trend and its robust labour market. The province delivered a total of 212,188 Employment Services interventions in 2014/2015, a significant year-over-year drop of 9.3%. Similarly, the EAS expenditures also fell notably (-14.4%) in 2014/2015, its lowest value since 2005/2006, at $23.2 million.

2.10.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs

After a significant increase of 12.3% in 2013/2014, Alberta's investment in LMPs remained stable at $2.0 million in 2014/2015. In addition, LMPs funding's share of the total EBSM's expenditures stayed unchanged at 1.8%. Alberta's continued investment in LMPs reflects a collaborative labour force partnership focused on the labour force needs of business and industry, support of employers hiring underrepresented workers and the promotion of workplace essential skills.

2.10.4 Managing for Results

To support EI clients with active employment programming, Alberta is engaged in the Citizen Centred Integrated Service Delivery (CCISD) planning stage. One component is to identify Career and Employment programming for those closer to the labour market while also building more supportive programming for those who are farther from the labour market.

2.11 British Columbia

In 2014, British Columbia's real GDP expanded by 3.2% and is poised to have grown closer to 2.4% in 2015. Strong growth in manufacturing and gains in the services-sector is propelling the province's economy. British Columbia's export received a large boost from growing momentum in the U.S. economy. Exports of aircraft products and services; motor vehicles; as well as of machinery and equipment were strong. In addition, a strong resale housing market supported consumer spending activities, and retail sales were higher in British Columbia than in any other provinces and territories.

In 2014/2015, British Columbia averaged 34,300 job vacancies, an increase of 4,400 year over year. The greatest labour demand was recorded in retail trade, health care and social assistance, as well as in accommodation and food services. With a job vacancy rate of 1.7%, British Columbia's average was slightly higher than the 1.6% national average.

The labour force (2,424,000) remained relatively stable (-0.1%) while employment edged up by 0.4% (+8,500). On a net basis, gains in full-time employment (+20,600) more than offset part-time job (-12,100) losses. Unemployment was down by 11,200 year over year. In this context, the unemployment rate dropped from 6.5% to 6% since 2013/2014.

British Columbia:

EBSM Key Facts

Total Clients Served: 76,804	
EI Clients	Non-Insured Clients
44,439 ↓	32,365 ↓

Total Interventions: 209,646		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	19,505	2.7% ↑
Support Measures: EAS	190,141	7.6% ↓

Relative Share of Interventions		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	9.3%	0.9 ↑
Support Measures: EAS	90.7%	0.9 ↓

Total Allocation: $ 280.5 Million		
Total Expenditures	2014/2015 ($ Million)	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	$163.7	3.3% ↑
Support Measures: EAS	$$92.9	3.2% ↓
LMPs and R&I	$19.8	9.7% ↓
Total Expenditures[1]	**$276.4**	**0.0%** –

Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)		
2013/2014	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
$121.85	$126.68	4.0% ↑

[1] Totals may not add up due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

Employment in the goods-producing industries increased by 5,800 (+1.3) with the strongest gains observed in manufacturing (+12,100 or +7.9%); forestry, fishing, mining, oil and gas (+2,200 or +4.6); and utilities (+2,000 or +16.8%). The biggest net losses were registered in construction (-6,700 or -3.2%) and agriculture (-3,900 or -14.2%). The services-producing industries experienced a moderate employment growth rate of 0.2%, to a total of 1,827,000. Notable net gains were registered in: transportation and warehousing (+9,000 or +7.1%); other services (+6,400 or +6.5%) and professional, scientific and technical services (+3,700 or +2%). Employment decreases were concentrated in: business, building and other support services (-7,000 or -7.4%); finance, insurance, real estate and leasing (-6,200 or -4.4%); and trade (-4,600 or -1.3%).

With a continued focus on sustaining job opportunities that meet employer needs, the province advanced its commitments to strengthening the labour market through delivering responsive programs and services and by better aligning skills training with local labour market needs and priorities. Key labour market priorities for 2014/2015 included: investing in training to better align British Columbians with sustainable job opportunities and to meet employer needs; developing strategies to engage all British Columbians in the activation of the unemployed; continuing to partner with local communities and organizations to further develop and increase community-based partnerships across the province; and enhancing support for its Employment Program British Columbia (EPBC) through continued improvement of research and innovation, measurement, and reporting capabilities.

Table 11

British Columbia : EBSM-Similar Programming (2014/2015)

		Interventions	Year-over-Year Change	Expenditures ($ 000s)
Employment Benefits				
TWS	Wage Subsidies	1,295	+11.7%	5,893
SE	Self-Employment	1,946	-5.7%	10,483
JCPs	Job Creation Partnerships	498	+16.9%	6,853
SD-R	Skills Development Employment Benefit	3,367	+0.7%	140,459
SD-A	Skills Development Employment Benefit - Apprenticeship	12,399	+3.3%	
Support Measures				
EAS	Employment Assistance Services	190,141	-7.6%	92,890
LMPs	Labour Market Partnerships Employer-Sponsored Training	N/A	N/A	6,887
R&I	Research and Innovation	N/A	N/A	12,909

With a total number of 76,804 clients in 2014/2015, British Columbia's count was 5.9% below the total of 81,628 recorded a year earlier. Active claimants total numbers increased slightly (+0.9%), to 34,937. Conversely, the other two client types decreased, with former claimants declining the most (-16.2%), to 9,502, and non-insured clients dropping significantly (-9.3%), down to a total number of 32,365. The shares of the three client types also shifted similarly to their respective intervention's numbers with that of active claimants growing to 45.5%, up from the 42.4% in the previous year, and the shares of former claimants (12.4 %) and non-insured clients (42.1%), both declining compared to 13.9% and 43.7%, respectively, in 2013/2014.

Chart 36

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 37

Client Distribution by Age

With respect to client distribution by age, the share of the core age of all clients remained stable (69.9%), while the proportion of older workers edged up to 15.1% from 14.6% in 2013/2014. Conversely, the share of youth dropped down to 15.0% from a high of 15.5%, another sign of an aging population.

British Columbia delivered a smaller number (209,646) of EBSM-similar interventions in 2014/2015, a year-over-year significant decrease of 6.8% Despite this decline, a greater number of Employment Benefits (19,505) were served, compared to (18,993) in the previous year. A noticeable decline in Support Measures (-7.6%), resulted in a total of 190,141. However, with 90.7%, its share of all interventions delivered in the province, Support Measures continued to be the most used intervention in the province.

A total of 19,818 active and former claimants returned to work after participation in an EBSM-similar intervention in 2014/2015, representing a 1.1% year over year decline. In 2014/2015, the total expenditures for British Columbia's EBSM-similar programming totaled $276.4 million of $280.5 million allocated.

Chart 38

Clients, Year-over-Year

2.11.1 Employment Benefits

A total number of 19,505 Employment Benefit interventions were delivered in 2014/2015 (+2.7%). All the benefit types expanded, with the exception of Self Employment, which fell significantly (-5.7%) to 1,946; reflecting that unemployed participants are more likely to opt for employment over starting a business in a context of a robust economy. JCP (+16.9%) and TWS (+11.7%) expanded at the fastest pace, reaching 498 and 1,295, respectively. SD-A (+3.3%) and SD-R (+0.7%) both experienced growth, though at a slower pace, reaching a total of 12,399 and 3,367, respectively. Consistent with the growth in the numbers of Employment benefit interventions, their respective total expenditures also increased, reaching $163.7 million in 2014/2015 compared to $158.5 million in the previous year (+3.3%).

2.11.2 Employment Assistance Services

Following a notable increase in the total number (205,855) of EAS interventions delivered in 2013/2014, the province served a smaller number of 190,141 interventions (-7.6%) in 2014/2015. Despite the decline in the total EAS numbers, Group Services (602) experienced a phenomenal growth, increasing sharply from the 88 total of 2013/2014. The other two EAS types declined, with Individual Counselling (57,829) and Employment Services (13,710) both decreasing significantly by 9.3% and 7.3%, respectively, year over year.

2.11.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&I

Following a continued increase in terms of investments in LMP and R&I over the last several years, with total investment reaching a peak of $21.9 million in 2013/2014 (+47.8%), funding for these two initiatives dropped significantly (-9.7%) in 2014/2015, down to $19.8 million. Investment in R&I continued to increase (+6.5%) reaching $12.9 million, which can be attributed to British Columbia using R&I funds ($3.3 million) to support the Canada-British Columbia Job Grant initiatives. LMP expenditures dropped sharply (-29.7%) down to $6.9 million, compared to $9.8 million in the previous year.

2.11.4 Managing for Results

In 2014/2015, British Columbia planned the implementation of the Targeting, Referral and Feedback (TRF) initiative to support EI clients with active employment programming earlier in their EI claim (launched in fall 2015). This tool is anticipated to improve early client interventions; better job matching for the unemployed or those who need earlier assistance to enable quicker returns to work; and an overall increase in EI clients served by the province's Employment Program of British Columbia (EPBC). Additionally, British Columbia launched a formal evaluation of its EPBC in 2014/2015 to gain practical insights into the success and impacts of the program and the relevance and effectiveness of its design and delivery.

2.12 Northwest Territories

After advancing significantly by 5.8% in 2014, the territory's real GDP is poised to have shrunk by 2% in 2015. The territory's diamond production, which represents almost 18% of the entire GDP, is declining, contributing to the economy's contraction. The oil and gas sector also saw a slowdown, due in part to low prices. The weak commodity prices and uncertain mining conditions are translating to weakness in the construction industry as well.

The recent evolutions in these economic aggregates are spilling over into the labour market. The labour force decreased to a total of 24,000 (-1,000 or -4.1%), while employment was down by 1,000 (-4.2%), finishing the year at 22,100. The unemployment rate increased by 0.2 percentage points year over year, reaching 8.1%. After a strong performance in recent years, the participation rate dropped by 2.7 percentage points (74.2%). In 2014/2015, the Northwest Territories registered an average of 400 job vacancies. This represents a drop of 100 vacancies noted in the previous fiscal year.

In 2014/2015, skills shortages, barriers to workforce mobility and the relative stability in employment, related to a shift away from the provision of services towards the production of goods, continued to be the main labour market challenges in the Northwest Territories. The territory focused on a number of priorities to improve its labour market conditions. These included supporting local labour market partnerships and collaboration with stakeholders on enhancing skill development and training programs for work-readiness skills, and fostering opportunities for gaining work experience. Building workforce capacity through LMDA programs and services and by working closely with Indigenous governments also continues to be a priority.

Northwest Territories:

EBSM Key Facts

Total Clients Served: 932	
EI Clients	Non-Insured Clients
432 ↓	500 ↓

Total Interventions: 1,144		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	280	13.0% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	864	11.2% ↓

Relative Share of Interventions		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	24.5%	0.4 ↓
Support Measures: EAS	75.5%	0.4 ↑

Total Allocation: $ 3.1 Million		
Total Expenditures	2014/2015 ($ Million)	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	$1.5	11.5% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	$1.3	19.2% ↑
LMPs and R&I	$0.2	55.5% ↓
Total Expenditures[1]	**$2.9**	**5.6% ↓**

Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)		
2013/2014	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
$2.33	$2.35	0.9% ↑

[1] Totals may not add up due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

Table 12

Northwest Territories : EBSM-Similar Programming (2014/2015)

		Interventions	Year-over-Year Change	Expenditures ($ 000s)
Employment Benefits				
TWS	Apprenticeship Training on the Job Youth Employment	67	-13.0%	140
SE	Self-Employment Option	14	-36.4%	145
SD-R	Building Essential Skills	44	+4.8%	1,164
SD-A	Building Essential Skills-Apprenticeship	155	-14.4%	
Support Measures				
EAS	Employment Assistance Services Career Development Service	864	-11.2%	1,281
LMPs	Labour Market Partnerships	N/A	N/A	133
R&I	Research and Innovation	N/A	N/A	18

The Northwest Territories served a declining number of clients (932) in 2014/2015, representing a significant year-over-year drop of 9.5%, attributable to changes to EI Part I eligibility in the territory. The three client types all decreased, with active claimants (294) experiencing the largest decline of 15.3%, followed by former claimants (138), which dropped by 8.6%, and non-insured clients down by 6.0% to a small total number (500). With respect to the shares of these clients, the non-insured clients accounted for a growing share at 53.6% (+1.9 percentage points). Similarly, the proportion of former claimants of all clients served also edged up, reaching 14.8% (+0.1 percentage points). Consistent with its numbers, the share of active claimants slid (-2.2 percentage points) to 31.5%, compared to 33.7% in 2013/2014.

Chart 39

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 40

Client Distribution by Age

The Northwest Territories delivered 1,144 EBSM-similar interventions in 2014/2015, a significant decrease of 11.7% year over year. The share of Employment Benefits accounted for 24.5% of this total, lower than last year's 24.9%. Accordingly, the proportion of EAS interventions increased slightly, reaching 75.5%, compared to 75.1% in 2014/2015. A total of 193 EI clients returned to employment following participation in EBSM-similar programming, representing a decline of 3.5% year over year. EBSM expenditures totalled $2.9 million of the $3.1 million allocated.

Chart 41

Clients, Year-over-Year

2.12.1 Employment Benefits

The number of Employment Benefits interventions delivered in the territory declined, for a fifth consecutive year, to 280 in 2014/2015 (-13%). Decreases were observed across most benefit types, with a substantial drop in SE (-36.4%); SD-A (-14.4%); and TWS (-13.0%). The decline can be attributed to the lower numbers of active and former claimants who participated in the program, and also the territory's strong economic performance in 2014. However, SD-R saw an increase of 4.8%, in line with the territory's focus on building human capital through skills development. Employment Benefits total expenditures fell to $1.4 million (-11.5%) in 2014/2015.

2.12.2 Support Measures: EAS

The Northwest Territories delivered fewer (864) Individual Counselling interventions in 2014/2015, representing a significant drop of 11.2% year over year. The total expenditures of EAS increased, reaching $1.3 million in 2014/2015, compared with $1.1 million in the previous year.

2.12.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&Is

Expenditures for LMPs fell significantly in 2014/2015, to $133,000, representing a drop of 60.8% year over year. In addition, the Northwest Territories used R&I ($27,318) as a funding source to support the newly launched Canada-Northwest Territories Job Grant initiatives.

2.12.4 Managing for Results

To support EI clients with active employment programming earlier in their EI claim, Northwest Territories is reviewing the Information Sharing Agreement (ISA) for the LMDA, putting procedures in place to utilize the Targeting, Referral and Feedback (TRF) component to engage with EI claimants. This will ensure that these clients are fully informed regarding any and all employment opportunities that may exist in their field.

To strengthen the capture and the use of data, Northwest Territories government implemented a new approach for all unemployed clients (EI- and non-eligible clients alike) accessing services. A Skills Inventory database is being created to allow potential employers to contact clients, if there are jobs available that match their skill set. This initiative will be a valuable resource for all employers seeking to employ local labour.

2.13 Yukon

In 2014, Yukon's real GDP shrank by 0.7% and is poised to have dropped by another 3.4% in 2015. Mining exploration spending bottomed out in 2013, and no new mines are planned in the near future. Existing mines are facing difficulties due to low commodity prices. The weakness of the mining industry is having a spillover effect on the construction industry, with limited development projects. On a positive note, Yukon's tourism sector is posting record numbers of visitors, stemming from the weakened Canadian dollar and Yukon becoming an increasingly popular destination for domestic travellers. Public investments into health facilities, schools, and other infrastructure projects are at a record high in terms of capital budgets, correcting for some of the downturn in the territory's mining industry.

Despite the weakened economy, Yukon's labour market posted moderate improvements in 2014/2015. The labour force grew (+0.8%) and employment increased (+2.0%) to an annual total of 19,800, while unemployment dropped substantially (-18.2%). As a result, the unemployment rate stood at 4.4%, a full percentage point lower than in the previous year, while the participation rate increased by 0.1 percentage points to 74.4%. In 2014/2015, Yukon's number of job vacancies stood at 400, an increase of 25% year over year.

In 2014/2015, Yukon identified a number of priorities for improving its labour market. These included increasing participation of its underrepresented and vulnerable groups; enhancing the quality of training and skills development, particularly in the growing sectors of the economy; attracting skilled workers; facilitating workforce mobility; and improving labour market information. The territory also continued to engage employers and support ongoing community-driven initiatives, to stimulate economic growth.

Yukon:
EBSM Key Facts

Total Clients Served: 435	
EI Clients	Non-Insured Clients
304 ⬇	131 ⬆

Total Interventions: 520		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	227	6.6% ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	293	10.9% ⬇

Relative Share of Interventions		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	43.7%	1.2 ⬆
Support Measures: EAS	56.3%	1.2 ⬇

Total Allocation: $ 3.5 Million		
Total Expenditures	2014/2015 ($ Million)	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	$1.9	4.6% ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	$1.3	3.3% ⬆
LMPs and R&I	$0	0%
Total Expenditures[1]	**$3.3**	**1.7% ⬇**

Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)		
2013/2014	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
$2.40	$1.85	22.8% ⬇

[1] Totals may not add up due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

Table 13
Yukon : EBSM-Similar Programming (2014/2015)

	Interventions	Year-over-Year Change	Expenditures ($ 000s)
Employment Benefits			
TWS Targeted Wage Subsidies	3	+50.0%	8
SE Self-Employment	2	-66.7%	58
SD-R Skills Development Employment Benefit	45	+12.5%	1,871
SD-A Skills Development Employment Benefit - Apprenticeship	177	-9.2%	
Support Measures			
EAS Employment Assistance Services	293	-10.9%	1,314
LMPs Labour Market Partnerships Employer-Sponsored Training	N/A	N/A	N/A

Yukon served a growing number of clients (435), a significant year-over-year increase of 5.6%. In contrast, EBSM-similar programming interventions (520) declined by a notable 9.1%. Active claimants (259) decreased slightly by 4.4% while former claimants (45) remained unchanged and non-insured clients (131) increased considerably, by 36.5% compared to 2013/2014. The share of non-insured (30.1%) clients increased by 6.8 percentage points while the shares of active claimants (59.5%) and former claimants (10.3%) both dropped by 6.3 and 0.6 percentage points, respectively.

Chart 42

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 43

Client Distribution by Age

Yukon delivered a total of 520 EBSM-similar intervention in 2014/2015, a significantly year-over-year decline of 9.1%. This total also represented the lowest over the last nine years.

Employment Benefits accounted for a slightly growing share of 43.7% of the total interventions delivered in Yukon compared to last year's 42.5% despite the decline in its numbers, which dropped significantly to 227 (-6.6%). In contrast, the numbers (293) and share (56.3%) of EAS of all interventions delivered in the territory both dropped, with the first declining notably (-10.9%) and the latter, by a modest 1.2 percentage points. A total of 170 EI clients returned to employment following participation in EBSM-similar programming, a considerable year-over-year decrease of 26.1%. Consistent with the decline in the total interventions served in Yukon. At $3.3 million, Yukon's total expenditures for its EBSM-similar programming represented 100% of the allocated funding.

Chart 44

Clients, Year-over-Year

2.13.1 Employment Benefits

In 2014/2015, Yukon delivered a total of 227 Employment Benefits interventions (-6.6%). SD-A, the most used employment benefit, dropped by 9.2%, totalling 177 interventions. Its share of all benefits slid from 80.2% to 78%. SD-R edged up by 12.5% to a total of 45 interventions, as its share of all benefits increased to 19.8%. SE contracted by 67% year over year. Employment Benefits expenditures totalled $1.9 million (-4.6%).

2.13.2 Support Measures: EAS

Consistent with Yukon's labour market performance, the territory delivered fewer Employment Services interventions (293) in 2014/2015, a substantial decrease of 10.9% year over year. For a second consecutive year, no Individual Counselling interventions were delivered in the territory, reflecting a pattern of decreased usage over recent years. Total EAS expenditures were $1.3 million (+3.3%).

2.13.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs

In 2014/2015, Yukon did not report any expenditure on LMPs, a measure that has seen a steady decline since 2012/2013. In the previous year, only $5,000 was spent on LMPs.

2.13.4 Managing for Results

In Yukon, the capture and use of data to improve program results is through the new Labour Market Information (LMI) Portal. This website gathers Yukon specific LMI from a variety of sources such as Statistics Canada, Yukon Bureau of Statistics, Canada Job Bank, Yukon WorkFutures, Yukon Occupational Modeling System and others. In doing so, the Portal provides relevant labour market data, supporting LMDA evidence-based investments and improving program results.

2.14 Nunavut

After expanding at a rate of 3.3% in 2014, Nunavut's real GDP is forecasted to have grown at a faster pace of 3.8% in 2015, which is still solid. In recent years, the territory's construction industry has been recording strong growth rates, which are expected to continue beyond 2015. The public sector is making significant contributions to the construction industry, with federal government investments in arctic research stations, the City of Iqaluit's plan to build a new aquatic centre, as well as public-private partnerships between the private sector, the federal government and the territorial government in upgrades to the Iqaluit airport. The fishing industry, while a small part of the economy, is rapidly expanding, with Government of Nunavut partnering with the federal government in three fisheries and science projects. Mining output continues to grow, further contributing to Nunavut's strong economic expansion.

In 2014/2015, Nunavut's labour market posted mixed results. The labour force shrunk by 4% (14,300) and employment by 3.1%. Unemployment declined from 2,100 to 1,900 (-9.5%). The participation rate dropped considerably year over year,

Nunavut:

EBSM Key Facts

Total Clients Served: 696	
EI Clients	Non-Insured Clients
236 ⬆	460 ⬆

Total Interventions: 934		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	256	52.4% ⬆
Support Measures: EAS	678	78.9% ⬆

Relative Share of Interventions		
Interventions Type	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	27.4%	3.3 ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	72.6%	3.3 ⬆

Total Allocation: $ 2.8 Million		
Total Expenditures	2014/2015 ($ Million)	Year-over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	$1.3	2.0% ⬇
Support Measures: EAS	$1.0	0%
LMPs and R&I	$0	0%
Total Expenditures[1]	**$2.4**	**74.3% ⬆**

Unpaid Benefits ($ Million)		
2013/2014	2014/2015	Year-over-Year Change
$0.38	$0.52	38.3% ⬆

[1] Totals may not add up due to rounding; does not include accounting adjustments.

sliding from 65.8% to 61.3%. In this context of a shrinking labour market, the unemployment rate (13.3%) actually declined, a decrease of 0.9 percentage points compared to 2013/2014. The territory recorded an average of 100 job vacancies in 2014/2015, relative to the 150 noted in the previous year. This represents a decline of 33% year over year.

A number of labour market challenges continued to surface in Nunavut in 2014/2015. These included: seasonal employment; a high unemployment rate despite skills shortages; issues related to literacy and educational attainment; and capacity pressures related to delivering active employment programming. To address these challenges, the territory supported its workforce through skills development and literacy upgrading, in addition to providing career development through educational training and employability services to new and young workers.

A focus on improving its service delivery capacity continues to be a key priority. In 2014/2015, the territory focused on a number of actions to advance identified priorities, including:

- preparing the labour force to meet the needs of a growing economy;
- managing the ongoing transition from a traditional to an industrial economy;
- increasing the participation of underrepresented groups; and
- connecting Nunavummiut job seekers with available jobs through increased employer participation and labour market information.

Table 14

Nunavut : EBSM-Similar Programming (2014/2015)

		Interventions	Year-over-Year Change	Expenditures ($ 000s)
Employment Benefits				
TWS	Training on the Job	7	-83.7%	406
SE	Nunavut Entrepreneurship Incentive	2	-33.3%	33
SD-R	Adult Learning and Training Supports	208	+114.4%	886
SD-A	Adult Learning and Training Supports - Apprenticeship	39	+56.0%	
Support Measures				
EAS	Employment Assistance Services	678	+78.9%	1,033
LMPs	Target Training Initiatives	N/A	N/A	N/A
R&I	Research and Innovation	N/A	N/A	N/A

After a notable decline in the previous year, the total number of clients served in Nunavut for 2014/2015 increased significantly, to a total of 696 (+74.4%). The non-insured clients and the active claimants both expanded considerably, with the total number of the non-insured (460) more than doubling (+166%) from last year's 173. As for the active claimants (110), their numbers also grew significantly, though at a slower pace (+12.2%). Conversely, the former claimants' total number (126) edged down moderately (-1.6%). The expansion in the numbers of the non-insured clients resulted in its share making up 66.1% of the total share of all clients served, an increase of 22.7 percentage points. On the other hand, the share of active claimants (15.8%) actually dropped, despite a significant increase in its numbers. Consistent with the shift in its total numbers, the share of former claimants declined from last year's 32.1% to 18.1% in 2014/2015.

Nunavut served its clients with an increasing number of EBSM-similar programming. Clients participated in 934 interventions, a significant year-over-year growth of 70.7%. For a fourth consecutive year, Employment Benefits represented a declining share (27.4%) of total interventions, a decrease of 3.3 percentage points year-over-year. A total of 47 EI clients returned to employment after participating in the program (-6.0%). Expenditures for EBSM-similar programming totalled $2.4 million of the $2.8 million allocated funding.

Chart 45

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 46

Client Distribution by Type

Chart 47

Clients, Year-over-Year

2.14.1 Employment Benefits

Nunavut delivered a total of 256 Employment Benefit interventions, a significant jump of 52.4% year over year. SD-R contributed to this increase by a staggering 114.4%. SD-A increased as well, by a rate of 56%. TWS fell significantly by 83.7%, down from last year's 43 to only 7 in 2014/2015. Given the large increase in SD-R, its share of Employment Benefits grew significantly, from 57.7% to 81.3%. TWS lost a large chunk of its share, going from 25.6% to 2.7%. Employment Benefits total expenditures remained stable at $1.33 million in 2014/2015, compared to $1.35 million the previous fiscal year.

2.14.2 Support Measures: EAS

For a fourth consecutive year, EAS interventions increased significantly. The territory delivered a total of 678 Employment Services interventions, a remarkable year-over-year increase of (+78.9%)—signalling a greater demand for this intervention type as the gateway to all programs. EAS total expenditures reached $1.0 million in 2014/2015.

2.14.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&I

As has been the case in the previous year, Nunavut made no new investments in LMPs and R&I.

2.14.4 Managing for Results

Nunavut is closely monitoring its results to better understand how best to engage with EI claimants to promote early interventions. Through increased community and employer engagement, the territory continues to inform potential clients about the programs and services available to them. New promotional material has been developed for this purpose, and distributed.

Increased capacity for the collection and collation of labour market information continues to better inform the unemployed about current and future labour market demands, and opportunities for (re) training.

3. National Evaluation of Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSM): Incremental Impacts for the "Long-Tenured Workers" EI Claimant Category and Cost-Benefit Analysis of EBSMs

This section presents results from recent studies conducted as part of the second cycle of LMDA evaluations. The first part of the section presents incremental impacts from EBSM participation for unemployed individuals that qualified under the "Long-Tenured Workers" EI claimant category. The second part discusses the results of a cost-benefit analysis of EBSMs for all active and former claimants.

3.1 Incremental Impacts for the "Long-Tenured Workers" EI Claimant Category

The incremental impact analysis represents the foundation of LMDA evaluations. The *2012/2013 EI Monitoring and Assessment Report* presented incremental impacts over five years post-program for all active and former EI claimants who started their EBSM participation between 2002 and 2005[23]. This study measured impacts over five consecutive years that occurred between 2002 and 2011. The *2013/2014 EI Monitoring and Assessment Report* reported incremental impacts over three years post-program for all active and former claimants who started participation in 2007-2008[24]. This analysis assessed impacts over three consecutive years that occurred between 2002 and 2012. This year's edition discusses incremental impacts for active and former claimants who met the criteria defined under the "long-tenured workers" EI claimant category.

The "long-tenured worker" EI claimant category was introduced with the 2013 modifications to the *EI Regulations* under the Connecting Canadians with Available Jobs initiative. Individuals who correspond to this new category are EI regular or fishing benefit claimants who had paid at least 30% of the annual maximum employee's EI premiums in seven of the ten years preceding their EI claim and who had collected 35 or fewer weeks of EI regular or fishing benefits in the five years preceding their claim.

3.1.1 Methodological Approach

The role of the incremental impact analysis is to isolate the effects of EBSM participation on participant's key labour market indicators (e.g., earnings, employment and EI use) from other factors such as inflation, economic cycles, etc. As shown in Diagram 1 below, this is achieved by comparing key labour market indicators (e.g., earnings) for participants before and after their participation, with those for non-participants before and after the same period.

The study reported in this year's edition of the *EI Monitoring and Assessment Report* examined incremental impacts for active and former claimants who met the criteria of the EI claimant category "long-tenured workers". These individuals are referred to as active and former claimants who were "long-tenured workers" in the remaining parts of this section. The study focused on individuals who started their EBSM participation across all 13 provinces and territories between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2009 and measured impacts over three years after participation (i.e., three consecutive years between 2007 and 2013).

Example Of Incremental Impact Calculation

A different comparison group was used for active and former claimants. The comparison group for active claimants was composed of active claimants who were "long-tenured workers" but did not participate in EBSMs. It was not possible to create a comparison group of nonparticipants

[23] http://www.esdc.gc.ca/en/reports/ei/monitoring2013/chapter3.page#h2.3

[24] http://www.esdc.gc.ca/en/reports/ei/monitoring2014/chapter3.page#h2.30

for former claimants using administrative data, because available data do not identify whether former claimants who did not participate in EBSMs were motivated to find employment. Therefore, for former claimants, the impacts of Skills Development (SD), Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS), Self-Employment (SE) and Job Creation Partnerships (JCP) were measured relative to former claimants who were "longtenured workers" and who received only Employment Assistance Services (EAS-only). As two different comparison groups were used, the results for active claimants are not directly comparable to those for former claimants.

Since participants usually receive a continuum of services (e.g., EAS plus SD), results were measured for all EBSMs received by a participant as long as there was no more than a 6 month gap between each EBSM. The results were attributed to the longest EBSM each person received (e.g., SD). This means that the impacts of providing EAS along with SD, TWS, SE or JCP were accounted for in the calculations; however, it was not possible to identify what proportion of those impacts is attributable to EAS. Results for EAS were measured for active claimants who only received EAS without receiving another EBSM (referred to as EAS-only).

The analysis relied solely on administrative data from the EI part I and II databank and taxation files from the Canada Revenue Agency. The following sections reports incremental impacts of EBSMs for the following indicators:

- **Average earnings from employment and/or self-employment:** An increase in earnings indicates that participants improved their employment situation by either working more hours and/or by having a better paying job than they did before participation and relative to the experience of the comparison group.
- **Incidence of employment** (i.e., incidence of having earnings from employment and/or selfemployment): Measures whether participants were more likely to be employed after participation and relative to the comparison group.
- **Amount of EI benefits received:** Measures the changes in the average amount of EI benefits collected from before to after participation and relative to the comparison group.
- **Average number of weeks in receipt of EI:** Measures the change in the average number of weeks during which participants were in receipt of EI relative to the comparison group.

3.1.2 Caveats about the Study

The criteria used to define the EI claimant category "long-tenured workers" do not consider the number of years the worker remained employed with the same employer. Therefore, the results of this analysis do not pertain to long-tenured workers as commonly defined in the literature. Instead, the results pertain to a larger category of workers who had regular employment or long-term attachment to the workforce but not necessarily with the same employer.

The process for matching participants and the comparison group aimed to ensure that participants and the comparison group were similar in terms of age, sex, location, skills level required by the last major occupation held prior to participation, reason for separation from employment, industry in which they were previously employed as well as employment earnings and use of EI and Social Assistance before participation. As well, the comparison group is composed of individuals who met the criteria set out in the EI claimant category "long-tenured workers".

Overall, the matching process used all relevant data available to capture factors that could affect the decision to participate in EBSMs or the outcomes from EBSM participation. However, it is possible that some other factors were not reflected in the data available. For example, workers who were employed in the same workplace for a long period accumulated job-specific human capital and may suffer from large wage loss following their re-employment if this new employment does not require their skills.

This factor is not accounted for in the matching process. As a result, it is not possible to know whether participants and the comparison groups were similar in terms of level of job-specific human capital accumulation and in their likelihood of being re-employed in a job that would require their skills. This may not be a major consideration since the study is not focusing strictly on individuals who had a long tenure with the same employer. However, when interpreting the results, readers should be aware that incremental impacts may be affected by factors not captured by the matching process.

3.1.3 Incremental Impacts for Active Claimants

The following description focuses on discussing impacts that are statistically significant at a 95% confidence level or above. Table 15 below provides details on incremental impacts measured in each of the three post-program years as well as the annual average impacts and the total impacts over the total

post-program period. The description in section 3.1.3 and 3.1.4 focuses on discussing the average annual impact over the post-program period (i.e., average of the impacts measured over the first, second and third year after participation).

Overall, incremental impacts presented in Table 15 show that participating in SD, JCP and EAS-only helped active claimants who were "long-tenured workers" reduce their use of EI after participation. Participating in SD, TWS and JCP also helped them improve their incidence of employment. However, those gains in employment and reductions in EI use were often accompanied by reductions in earnings.

Skills Development (SD): Active claimants improved their incidence of employment and reduced their use of EI in all three years after participation. Their incidence of employment increased, on average, by 3.6 percentage points per year relative to the comparison group. Their use of EI benefits decreased, on average, by $206 per year. Although they increased their employment and reduced their use of EI, these individuals earned $2,854 less from employment in the first year after participation. Their earnings started to increase in the second ($254) and third years ($1,548) after participation. As shown in Table 15, those increases could not compensate for the decrease in the first year after participation.

Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS): Active claimants were more likely to be employed after participating in TWS. On average, their incidence of employment increased by 2.3 percentage points per year. The employment gains, however, were accompanied by decreases in earnings averaging $960 per year. Results suggest that TWS did not have much of an impact on EI use as EI usage increased by 0.2 weeks per year on average after their TWS participation. Impacts on EI benefits were not statistically significant.

Self-Employment (SE): Following their SE participation, active claimants decreased their earnings by an average of $14,338 per year. They also decreased their incidence of employment by an average of 21.7 percentage points per year. These results should be interpreted with caution, as they may not be fully reflective of the financial situation of participants.[25] Active claimants also decreased their use of EI following participation in SE. Such results should be interpreted with caution, as self-employed individuals are not entitled to EI regular benefits. Therefore, the decreases in EI use could be partly due to EI eligibility effects.

Job Creation Partnership (JCP): Participating in JCP improved the incidence of employment of active claimants. These individuals increased their incidence of employment by 5.6 percentage points annually, on average. Their use of EI benefits also decreased after participation by an average of $244 per year. While those results show that active claimants were more likely to be employed and had lower use of EI after participation, no clear conclusion can be drawn about their earnings, as most results were not statistically significant.

Employment Assistance Services (EAS)-only: Active claimants reduced their use of EI benefits after their EAS-only participation by an average of $214 per year. However, they were less likely to be employed as their incidence of employment decreased by an average of 1.1 percentage points per year. They also earned less from employment as their earnings decreased by an average of $1,588 per year. Overall, along with SE, EAS-only had the least favorable result of all EBSMs examined for active claimants.

3.1.4 Incremental Impacts for Former Claimants

The results for former claimants who were "long-tenured workers" are presented in Table 15. With the exception of those who took part in SE, former claimants increased their use of EI after participation. For those who participated in SD and TWS, the increases in EI use were accompanied by gains in earnings and incidence of employment. The results were less favourable for former claimants who participated in JCP since they reduced their employment earnings after participation.

Skills Development (SD): Former claimants who were "long-tenured workers" experienced a decrease in employment earnings in the first year after participation (-$914) and increases in the second ($674) and third years ($1,155). However, they improved their incidence of employment in all years after participation by an average of 3.9 percentage points per year. Their use of EI benefits decreased only in the first year after participation (-$166) but increased in the second ($203) and third years ($276).

[25] According to a study from Statistics Canada, self-employed individuals in Canada have a lower average annual income than paid employees ($46,200 versus $52,400 in 2009), but the average net worth of their households is 2.7 times that of the paid employee households, which indicates that some self-employed individuals may leave funds within their business for reinvestment purposes. Since the incremental impacts of SE were measured relative to a comparison group that also included paid employees and did not take the net worth of participants and comparison cases into account, the results may not be fully reflective of the financial wellbeing of SE participants after their participation.

Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS): Participation in TWS resulted in increasing both the earnings and incidence of employment of former claimants. The gains averaged $3,203 and 5.7 percentage points per year, respectively. Those gains were accompanied by increases in EI use averaging $272 per year.

Self-Employment (SE): As observed among active claimants, former claimants decreased their earnings, incidence of employment and use of EI after participating in SE. The decreases in earnings and incidence of employment should be interpreted with caution due to methodological reasons while the reductions in EI use should also be interpreted with caution due to the fact that self-employed individuals are not entitled to EI regular benefits.

Job Creation Partnerships (JCP): Following their participation in JCP, former claimants increased their use of EI benefits by an average of $401 per year relative to the comparison group. They also reduced their employment earnings in all years after participation by an annual average of $2,389. It is not possible to draw conclusions about their incidence of employment as results were not statistically significant.

3.1.5 Lessons Learned from the Incremental Impacts

Incremental impact analyses reported in the 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 *EI Monitoring and Assessment Report* showed that EBSMs, except SE and EAS-only, are generally effective at improving the earnings of all active claimants. EBSMs are also generally effective at increasing the incidence of employment and reducing the EI use by all active claimants. The results presented for active claimants who were "long-tenured workers" depict a mixed portrait. They indicate that participation in SD, TWS and JCP increased the incidence of employment for these individuals. They also indicate that participation in SD, JCP and EAS reduced the use of EI. However, there were decreases in employment earnings in the short-term for SD, and in all three years following participation for TWS and EAS-only.

Overall, the results suggest that some EBSMs may be effective at returning active claimants who were "long-tenured workers" to employment, but they may have a limited effect, at least in the short-term, in terms of offsetting the earnings loss they experienced following their job separation. As explained in section 3.1.2 above, there is a possibility that the results could have been affected by factors (i.e., differences between participants and the comparison group) that were not accounted for in the matching process. In particular, controlling for the earnings loss incurred by workers who had a high level of job-specific human capital is challenging.

It is also important to note that other studies have shown that individuals who worked for the same employer for a long period of time suffered a wage loss after losing their employment.[26] Although the present study covered a larger group of individuals who had long term employment; this group included workers who had a long tenure with one employer. In this context, the incremental decreases in earnings found for active claimants in the "long-tenured worker" EI claimant category are not totally unexpected.

Finally, as shown in Table 15, earnings impacts for active and former claimants in SD and active claimants in TWS and EAS-only improved over time. This suggests that EBSMs may have a more positive impact on earnings of these participants in the medium-term as compared to the short-term.

The results for former claimants who were "long-tenured workers" are in the same direction as those reported in the 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 *EI Monitoring and Assessment Report* for all former claimants. Similar to the results for all former claimants, the results for former claimants who were "long-tenured workers" show that they improved their earnings and incidence of employment following SD and TWS participation as well as increased their EI use following participation in any EBSM, except SE.

[26] Jacobson, L. LaLonde, R and Sullivan, D. 1993. "Earnings losses of displaced workers." *American Economic Review.* 83(4): 685-709. Farber, H.1998. Mobility and Stability: The Dynamics of Job Change in Labor Markets (Working Paper). June 6, 1998.

Table 15

Incremental Impacts for Long Tenured Workers

Indicators	Post-program period			Total impact	Average annual impact
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year		
Active Claimants					
Skills Development Plus EAS and Other EBSMs (n=41,714)					
Earnings ($)	-$2,854*	$254*	$1,548*	-$1,052*	-$350*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	2.5*	4.2*	4.7*	n/a	3.6*
EI benefits ($)	-$348*	-$196*	-$72*	-$617*	-$206*
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.1*	-0.5*	-0.3*	-1.9*	-0.6*
Targeted Wage Subsidies Plus EAS and Other EBSMs (n=9,471)					
Earnings ($)	-$1,727*	-$959*	-$225	-$2,879*	-$960*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	2.1*	2.3*	2.6*	n/a	2.3*
EI benefits ($)	$13	-$3	$28	$37	$12
EI weeks (weeks)	0.3*	0.2	0.2*	0.6*	0.2*
Self-Employment Plus EAS and Other EBSMs (n=6,352)					
Earnings ($)	-$15,787*	-$14,217*	-$13,010*	-$43,014*	-$14,338*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	-25.1*	-21.5*	-18.6*	n/a	-21.7*
EI benefits ($)	-$1,370*	-$959*	-$673*	-$3,002*	-$1,001*
EI weeks (weeks)	-3.6*	-2.5*	-1.7*	-7.8*	-2.6*
Job Creation Partnerships Plus EAS and Other EBSMs (n=872)					
Earnings ($)	$368	$1,668	$947	$2,983	$994
Incidence of employment(percentage points)	5.6*	6.2*	5.0*	n/a	5.6*
EI benefits ($)	-$506*	-$157	-$70	-$733*	-$244*
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.0*	-0.1	0.0	-1.0	-0.3
Employment Assistance Services (EAS)-only (n=45,182)[1]					
Earnings ($)	-$2,659*	-$1,281*	-$822*	-$4,763*	-$1,588*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	-1.4*	-1.1*	-1.0*	n/a	-1.1*
EI benefits ($)	-$8	-$374*	-$263*	-$644*	-$214*
EI weeks (weeks)	-0.5*	-1.0*	-0.7*	-2.2*	-0.7*
Former Claimants					
Skills Development Plus EAS and Other EBSMs (n=8,647)					
Earnings ($)	-$914*	$674*	$1,155*	$917	$306
Incidence of employment(percentage points)	2.8*	4.5*	4.5*	n/a	3.9*
EI benefits ($)	-$166*	$203*	$276*	$312*	$104*
EI weeks (weeks)	-0.6*	0.4*	0.6*	0.3	0.1
Targeted Wage Subsidies Plus EAS and Other EBSMs (n=4,883)					
Earnings ($)	$3,704*	$2,956*	$2,958*	$9,608*	$3,203*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	6.5*	5.5*	5.0*	n/a	5.7*
EI benefits ($)	$454*	$214*	$148*	$816*	$272*
EI weeks (weeks)	1.2*	0.4*	0.1*	1.7*	0.6*
Self-Employment Plus EAS and Other EBSMs (n=1,835)					
Earnings ($)	-$9,933*	-$8,552*	-$8,694*	-$27,177*	-$9,059*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	-20.4*	-16.5*	-16.0*	n/a	-17.6*
EI benefits ($)	-$1,066*	-$713*	-$589*	-$2,367*	-$789*
EI weeks (weeks)	-2.8*	-1.7*	-1.2*	-5.7*	-1.9*
Job Creation Partnerships Plus EAS and Other EBSMs (n=532)					
Earnings ($)	-$2,229*	-$2,682*	-$2,257*	-$7,168*	-$2,389*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	3.1	3.2	2.8	n/a	3.0
EI benefits ($)	$39	$667*	$497*	$1,204*	$401*
EI weeks (weeks)	0.7	2.4*	2.1*	5.2*	1.7*

* Statistically significant results at the 95% confidence level or higher

[1] Random sample of 40% of participants

3.2. Cost-Benefit Analysis for all Active and Former Claimants

A cost-benefit analysis was recently conducted to complement the incremental impact analyses for all active and all former claimants. This cost-benefit analysis assessed how the costs of EBSMs compare to the benefits from the social perspective. The social perspective represents the sum of the costs and benefits experienced by program participants and the government. As shown in Tables 16 and 17 below, the analysis addressed three different questions:

- By how much do the benefits exceed the costs within six years after end of participation? **(net present value)**
- How much does it cost in EI part II funds to achieve one dollar in benefit within six years after end of participation? **(cost-benefit ratio)**
- How many years from the end of participation would it take for the benefits to recover the costs? **(payback period)**[27]

This recent study represents the second attempt at measuring costs and benefits for EBSMs. A cost-benefit analysis was previously conducted in most provinces and territories during the first cycle of LMDA summative evaluations. Those evaluations used different methodologies across provinces and territories. In most cases, the analysis accounted for impacts on earnings observed within one to three years after participation. This recent analysis is the first to measure costs and benefits at the national level. As well, the study included all possible costs and benefits that could be measured using available administrative data. As well, both experts and the literature highlighted the importance of assessing costs and benefits over the medium-term since impacts from employment programs often grow over time. Consequently, the study considered costs and benefits over six years after participation.

3.2.1 Methodological Approach

This recent analysis was conducted for all active and former claimants who started SD, TWS, JCP and EAS-only between 2002 and 2005 (results reported in the *2012/2013 EI Monitoring and Assessment Report*). This was the most recent cohort of participants possible considering that 2012 was the most recent year of Canada Revenue Agency data available at the time of undertaking the study. Overall, the study compared costs and benefits over the participation period of one or two years, and six years after participation, representing up to eight consecutive years that occurred between 2002 and 2012.

SE was not examined because of the methodological limitations surrounding the incremental impacts analysis (see explanation provided in section 3.1 about incremental impacts of SE for active claimants who were long tenured workers).

Costs and benefits from a social perspective are as follows:[28]

- **Program cost:** consists of the administrative costs and the direct cost paid by the government for delivering the program.
- **Marginal social costs of public funds** (MSCPF): represents the loss incurred by society when raising additional revenues such as taxes to fund government spending. The value was estimated as 20% of the program cost, sales taxes, income taxes, impacts on EI and impacts on SA paid or collected by the government.
- **Employment earnings:** consists of incremental impacts on participants' earnings during and after participation.
- **Fringe benefits:** are the employer-paid health and life insurance as well as pension contributions. They were estimated as 15% of the incremental impact on earnings.

Although this analysis is more sophisticated than any of the previous EBSM cost-benefit analyses, it is still limited. While it accounts for all quantifiable costs and benefits that are directly attributable to EBSMs, it does not account for non-quantifiable benefits such as improvements in a participant's wellbeing or for the multiplier effect on the economy. When interpreting the results, readers should keep in mind that many public programs may not result in a direct return on investment for the government. For example, a government would not make direct financial gains from building a bridge, but this bridge would result in significant economic benefits for society.

3.2.2 Results for Active Claimants

Skills Development (SD): Incremental impacts showed that SD is effective at improving the earnings and incidence of employment, as well as reducing the use of EI by active claimants. As indicated in Table 16 below, the cost-benefit analysis revealed that the benefits of SD were $4,600 lower than the costs six

[27] When the benefits were still lower than the costs six years after program end, the payback period was calculated by projecting over time the average benefit or cost for the fifth and six years after participation.

[28] EI and Social Assistance (SA) benefits and sale and income tax revenues are not included since these costs and benefits net out from the social perspective by definition. For example, while EI and SA are benefits received by participants, they represent a cost for government.

Table 16

Cost-Benefit Results from the Social Perspective for Active Claimants

Total Costs and Benefits Over Participation (1 to 2 years) and 6 Years Post-program	Results for SD, TWS, JCP Plus EAS and Other EBSMs			Results for EAS-only (n=38,564)
	SD (n=64,283)	**TWS** (n=18,767)	**JCP** (n=5,055)	
Program cost	-$8,500	-$6,259	-$9,834	-$692
Marginal Social Costs of Public Fund	-$1,707	-$1,166	-$1,605	-$197
Employment earnings	$4,875	$6,601	$10,265	-$2,079
Fringe benefit	$731	$990	$1,540	-$312
Net Present Value *(By how much do the benefits exceed the costs within 6 years after participation?)*	-$4,600	$167	$366	-$3,280
Cost-Benefit Ratio *(How much does it cost in EI part II funds to achieve $1 in benefit within 6 years after participation?)*	$2.20	$1.00	$1.00	Negative benefits
Payback period *(How many years from the end of participation would it take for the benefits to recover the costs?)*	7.4 years after participation	5.9 years after participation	5.9 years after participation	10.9 years after participation

years after participation. Those results are partly explained by the substantial earnings loss experienced by active claimants while on training. The benefits of SD would have to persist over 7.4 years after participation in order to recover the costs. Since SD focuses on human capital development, it is reasonable to expect the benefits from this intervention to last and even increase over a lifetime.

Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS): As demonstrated by the incremental impact analyses, active claimants who participated in TWS had better earnings and incidence of employment following participation but also used more EI. The cost-benefit analysis showed that the total benefits of TWS six years after participation exceeded the costs by $167. The costs of this program were recovered within 5.9 years after the end of participation.

Job Creation Partnerships (JCP): The incremental impact analyses revealed that JCP is effective at improving active claimants' earnings and incidence of employment as well as at reducing their use of EI in the short-term after participation. The cost-benefit analysis showed that six years after participation, the benefits of JCP exceeded the costs by $366. The benefits equalled the costs within 5.9 years after participation.

Employment Assistance Services (EAS)-only: The incremental impact analysis indicated that EAS-only is effective at achieving its objective of helping unemployed individuals to return to employment as it improved active claimant's incidence of employment and reduced their use of EI after participation. However, the cost-benefit analysis showed that the benefits of EAS-only were $3,280 lower than the costs six years after the end of participation. The benefits from EAS-only would need to persist over 10.9 years in order to recover the costs.

Readers should note that the cost-benefit result is partly due to the decreases in earnings experienced by active claimants during and immediately after participation. The main expected outcome from EAS-only is the return to employment itself, and not necessarily an improvement in earnings as EAS-only does not focus on skill acquisition. The value of the return to employment was not accounted for in this analysis since it is difficult to attribute a dollar figure to such an event. The decrease in EI use was also not considered, because it represents a benefit for the government and a cost to the individual – both of them cancel each other out.

3.2.3 Results for Former Claimants

Skills Development (SD): The incremental impact analyses showed that SD improved former claimants' earnings and incidence of employment. However, they generally increased their use of EI after participation. As shown in Table 17, the benefits from SD were $5,176 lower than the costs six years after participation. The benefits would have to persist over 8.6 years after participation in order to equal the costs. As explained for active claimants, it is reasonable to expect the benefits of SD to persist over a longer period since the effects from skill acquisition may last and even increase over a lifetime.

Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS): As demonstrated in the incremental impact analyses, TWS was effective at improving former claimants' earnings and incidence of employment but they used more EI after participation. From a cost-benefit stand point, TWS had the most positive results of all EBSMs for former claimants. Six years after the end of participation, its benefits exceeded the costs by $12,452. The costs of this Employment Benefit were recovered within the second participation year.

Table 17

Cost-Benefit Results from the Social Perspective for Former Claimants

Total Costs and Benefits Over Participation (1 to 2 years) and 6 Years Post-program	Results for SD, TWS, JCP Plus EAS and Other EBSMs		
	SD (n=42,513)	**TWS** (n=24,523)	**JCP** (n=5,013)
Program cost	-$8,766	-$6,102	-$9,376
Marginal social costs of public funds	-$1,471	-$812	-$1,512
Employment earnings	$4,333	$16,839	$1,348
Fringe benefit	$728	$2,526	$202
Net Present Value (By how much do the benefits exceed the costs within 6 years after participation?)	-$5,176	$12,452	-$9,338
Cost-Benefit Ratio *(How much does it cost in EI part II funds to achieve $1 in benefit within 6 years after participation?)*	$2.40	$0.30	$248.30
Payback period *(How many years from the end of participation would it take for the benefits to recover the costs?)*	8.6 years after participation	Within the 2nd participation year	Cost may never be recovered

Job Creation Partnerships (JCP): Incremental impacts for former claimants who participated in JCP showed that this program is effective at increasing their earnings and incidence of employment but also increased their use of EI after participation. As shown in Table 17 below, the benefits of JCP from the social perspective were $9,338 lower than the costs six years after participation. The benefits from JCP may never recover the costs.

3.2.4 Lessons Learned from the Cost-Benefit Analysis

The incremental impact analyses reported in the previous two *EI Monitoring and Assessment Reports* showed that EBSMs, except SE, are generally fulfilling their objective of helping unemployed individuals find employment. The cost-benefit analysis provides some insights about how the direct quantifiable benefits from EBSMs compare to the quantifiable costs of those programs.

Results show that, from a social perspective, the costs of TWS for both active and former claimants and of JCP for active claimants can be recovered within less than six years after participation. The costs of SD may be recovered within seven to nine years after participation. In this regard, it should be acknowledged that SD requires a significant investment from the government since its costs are relatively high compared to other EBSMs. It also requires a significant investment from the participants whom experience earnings loss while on training. However, since SD focuses on skill acquisition and human capital development, its benefits can last many years, if not a life time.

The benefits from JCP, when offered to former claimants, may never match the costs of this program. However, JCP funds help develop the community and the local economy, but none of those benefits were taken into account in the cost-benefit analysis.

The benefits from EAS-only would need to persist over more than 10 years to recover the costs. EAS-only participants had reductions in their employment earnings in the short-term after participation, even though these interventions are effective at helping unemployed individuals return to employment. In addition, evidence from another recent evaluation study[29], conducted by ESDC showed that participating in EAS-only early during an EI benefit period leads to higher earnings and employment impacts as compared to participating later. This suggests that reaching unemployed individuals soon after they open an EI claim may improve the program success. Further analysis would be required to determine if this could also improve the cost-benefit results. In addition, there are significant benefits associated with EAS-only that are not quantifiable.

[29] ESDC, Draft Report on the National Results on the Effects of the Timing of Participation in Employment Assistance Services (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2014).

4. Pan-Canadian Activities and the National Employment Service

This section analyzes pan-Canadian activities that ESDC supports and delivers using EI Part II funds.

4.1 Context

In addition to objectives established with provinces and territories through the LMDAs, the Government of Canada plays a leadership role in EI Part II by ensuring accountability and evaluation of LMDA programming, and by developing labour market policy. In addition, the federal government plays a primary role in responding to challenges that extend beyond local and regional labour markets by delivering pan-Canadian activities.

Pan-Canadian activities fulfill three primary objectives:

- promoting an efficient and integrated national labour market, and preserving and enhancing the Canadian economic union;
- helping address common labour market challenges and priorities of international or national scope that transcend provincial borders; and
- promoting equality of opportunity for all Canadians with a focus on helping underrepresented groups reach their full potential in the Canadian labour market.

Pan-Canadian funding is focused on four streams of investment:

1. Programming for Indigenous People;
2. Enhancing Investments in Workplace Skills;
3. Supporting Agreements with Provinces, Territories and Indigenous Peoples; and
4. Labour Market Information and National Employment Service Initiatives.

In 2014/2015, pan-Canadian program expenditures remained stable, totalling $117.4 million compared to $117 million in the previous year. Pan-Canadian programming delivered through ASETS totalled $93.2 million, while expenditures on LMPs were $20.7 million and $3.5 million was spent through R&I.

Chart 48

Pan-Canadian Expenditures, 2014/2015 ($ Million)*

* Total of percentages may not add up exactly to 100% due to rounding.

4.2 Programming for Indigenous People[30]

Pan-Canadian funding is delivered through ASETS and its objective is to improve Indigenous peoples' participation in the Canadian workforce, ensuring that First Nations, Inuit and Métis people have the skills and training for sustainable, meaningful employment. It also supports the development of a skilled Indigenous pool of workers, which is one of the objectives of the Federal Framework for Aboriginal Economic Development.

ASETS constitutes an investment of $1.68 billion over five years (2010-2015). The program was set to end on March 31, 2015, but was extended to March 31, 2017.

ASETS supports a network of over 80 Indigenous service delivery organizations (agreement holders), with over 600 points of service across Canada. These organizations help develop and deliver training and employment programs, as well as services that are designed for the unique needs of their clients. These programs and services help Indigenous clients prepare for, obtain and maintain sustainable employment, and assist Indigenous youth in making a successful transition from school to work or to support their return to school.

[30] The ASETS program results provided for 2014/2015 have been funded under EI Part II and the Consolidated Revenue Fund (CRF). Statistics for clients funded through EI Part II can be found in Annex 3.9 under "Indigenous Pan-Canadian."

Pan-Canadian Programming in Action: The Aboriginal Community Career Employment Services Society (ACCESS)

ACCESS was formed in 1999 as a non-profit society, mandated to serve the Indigenous community in the field of human resource development across 21 municipalities and one electoral area in the Greater Vancouver Regional District: Anmore, Belcarra, Bowen Island, Burnaby, Coquitlam, Delta, Electoral Area A, Langley City, Langley Township, Lions Bay, Maple Ridge, New Westminster, North Vancouver City, North Vancouver District, Pitt Meadows, Port Coquitlam, Port Moody, Richmond, Surrey, Vancouver, West Vancouver and White Rock.

Guided by a group of six Indigenous service delivery organizations, ACCESS, which is a member of the ASETS network, works collaboratively with its partners, such as Native Education College, Helping Spirit Lodge and Fraserworks, to develop skills and increase the labour market participation of Indigenous people in today's economy.

ACCESS provides labour market services to Indigenous people in the Greater Vancouver Area including such programming as literacy and essential skills upgrading, career counseling and training-to-employment activities, including job specific skills training, job retention counseling, on-the-job training, wage subsidies, etc.

In 2014-2015, ACCESS training programs assisted over 1,500 clients, placed over 540 Indigenous people in employment and supported over 90 returning to school.

Specific attention under ASETS is given to the development of service provider partnerships with the private sector, educational institutions and other levels of government in demand-driven labour markets. In addition, ASETS is linked to the First Nations and Inuit Child Care Initiative (FNICCI), which provides child care support to assist Indigenous parents/caregivers accessing labour market programs. ASETS also supports labour market obligations specified in treaty and self-government agreements that are in place with some Indigenous groups.

The 2014/2015 investment in ASETS totalled $347.6 million, which included expenditures of $93.2 million from EI Part II funds. In 2014/2015, ASETS resulted in 20,274 clients becoming employed (a cumulative total of 89,266 since 2010) and 9,767 clients returning to school (a cumulative total of 42,695 since 2010).

4.3 Enhancing Investments in Workplace Skills

This investment stream helps the federal government ensure that Canada's labour market functions as an integrated national system by:

- removing barriers and impediments to labour mobility;
- building capacity among workplace partners to improve skills development as a key factor in increasing productivity;
- leveraging investment in and ownership of skills issues, especially in addressing skills and labour shortages; as well as
- supporting efforts to ensure Canada's learning system responds to employers' skills requirements.

4.3.1 Sectoral Initiatives Program (SIP)

Launched on April 1, 2013, the Sectoral Initiatives Program (SIP) aims to address current and future skills shortages by supporting the development and distribution of sector-specific labour market intelligence (LMI), national occupational standards (NOS), and skills certification and accreditation systems.

The SIP's mandate is to help industries identify, forecast, and address their human resources as well as their skills issues. The SIP funds partnership-based projects for key sectors of the Canadian economy from both the federal Consolidated Revenue Fund and EI Part II. These projects are developed and implemented by such industry partners as workplace organizations; employer associations; education and training bodies; professional associations; unions; and, Indigenous organizations.

Through its LMI business line, the SIP supports the development, validation and distribution of timely, national, sectoral and cross-sectoral LMI. SIP also plays an important role within the Department, in engaging with employers and industry stakeholders, facilitating deeper sectoral analysis and informing government policy and program issues.

In funding the development of NOS, the SIP aims to helping the different industry sectors document and communicate sector-specific skills requirements to educators, trainers, employers and workers.

By supporting employee certification and learning program accreditation, the SIP provides a key solution for integrating a formal quality control framework for education and training, founded on employer-validated NOS, to help ease labour mobility and labour market adjustment.

The SIP funds 33 multi-year agreements that exist for projects currently being implemented with various stakeholders representing different industry sectors for the development of the following products: labour market information and/or forecasting systems (42%), NOS (12%), certification and accreditation (10% combined) and multiple activities (36%). For example, in 2014/2015, the SIP was funding several cross-sectoral projects as well as projects for the: environment, tourism, mining, transportation, oil and gas, manufacturing, agriculture, forestry, information technology, aerospace, supply chain, and construction sectors.

Pan-Canadian Programming in Action: BuildForce Canada (BFC)

In 2014/2015, through the project entitled "Labour Market Intelligence: Construction Sector Forecasts", SIP supported Buildforce Canada's Labour Market Information (LMI) program. It provides an annual forecast by province for 34 trades and occupations, a national summary, provincial highlights, and a database website. The reports are bilingual, and available in print and online at www.constructionforecasts.ca.

Using the BuildForce Canada database and reports:

- improves the functioning of the construction labour market;
- enables all construction stakeholders to plan for and mitigate human resource issues;
- assists owners in planning and addressing skilled labour requirements to meet demand;
- facilitates labour mobility for construction tradespeople;
- informs training and apprenticeship planning and decision making;
- helps education and training communities plan construction skills development offerings;
- provides jobseekers valuable information to assist them in making better informed career and training decisions; and,
- provides information useful to government policy making.

In 2014/2015, 85 new labour market research reports and 12 forecasting systems were developed and released through SIP agreements in sectors such as construction, environment, oil and gas, as well as mining. More than 5,000 people used these reports and forecasting tools. Fifty NOS were created or updated, and the SIP contributed to the development of 36 certification programs and 22 accreditation programs. Furthermore, the program succeeded in leveraging almost $10M from the private sector and other stakeholders. Many of the projects have not yet achieved their ultimate objectives as they are multi-year projects. The following is an example of a project that involved developing or updating an LMI and/or forecasting program/system.

4.3.2 National Occupation Classification (NOC)

The National Occupational Classification (NOC) provides a standard taxonomy for dialogue on the world of work and a national framework for collecting, analyzing and disseminating occupational data for Labour Market Information (LMI), as well as employment-related program administration. It comprises more than 40,000 occupational titles grouped into 500 Unit Groups ("NOC codes"), organized according to skill levels and skill types. Each Unit Group describes Main Duties and Employment Requirements, in addition to providing examples of occupational titles.

The NOC is used by students; workers; employers; educational and training organizations; as well as career and vocational counsellors, to support career exploration and informed career decision-making. It is also used by researchers and to support policy and program design, as well as service delivery. It is the foundation for capturing occupation-related LMI in Canada.

Managed jointly by ESDC and Statistics Canada since 1966, the NOC is revised every five years, in line with Census and National Household Survey cycles, to reflect labour market dynamics. The most recent NOC 2011 was released in January 2012, and NOC users are in the process of moving to the NOC 2011 structure. Work is continuing on migrating ESDC systems and programs to the NOC 2011. Work is also well underway with Statistics Canada on revisions to the NOC for the next release in 2016.

4.3.3 Skilled Trades and Apprenticeship, and the Red Seal Program

Apprenticeships are essential to building a highly skilled and mobile trades workforce that supports Canadian competitiveness. The Interprovincial Standards Red Seal Program is Canada's standard of excellence for training and certification in the skilled trades and provides a vehicle to promote harmonization. The program is well-established at developing common interprovincial standards for trades. In most provinces and territories, the Red Seal examination is used as the certification exam for Red Seal trades. Under this program, experienced tradespeople and apprentices, who have completed

their training, may take the interprovincial Red Seal examination. If successful, they receive a Red Seal endorsement on their provincial or territorial certificate of qualification.

The Red Seal endorsement is widely recognized and respected by industry as a standard of excellence in the skilled trades. Each year, approximately 44,000 completing apprentices and qualified uncertified tradespeople from across Canada write Red Seal examinations, and over 25,000 Red Seals are issued.

- **Red Seal Program Fast Facts:** More than 20,000 Red Seal endorsements were issued to apprenticeship completers and 7,000 to trade qualifiers in 2014.
- Key Red Seal trades by endorsements include: Construction Electrician, Welder, Plumber, Automotive Service Technician and Carpenter.
- Red Seals issued in 2014 increased by 30%. In the last decade, there has been a 52% increase in Red Seals issued.
- More than 350 industry representatives have participated in ESDC organized workshops to develop Red Seal products.
- 47,486 Red Seal examinations were written. 78% of apprentices successfully challenged the exam.
- The Red Seal Program's website has counted 345,000 visitors.

Source: Canadian Council of Directors of Apprenticeship, 2014. Statistics are compiled on a calendar year basis.

The Canadian Council of Directors of Apprenticeship (CCDA), comprised of the apprenticeship authorities from each province and territory and representatives from ESDC, administers the Red Seal program. In addition to functioning as the national secretariat—providing administrative, operational and strategic support—ESDC provides significant funding for the Red Seal Program.

The Red Seal program currently covers 57 skilled trades, which encompass 77% of registered apprentices.[31] ESDC works closely with industry experts and apprenticeship authorities to coordinate the development of high-quality Red Seal products, including National Occupational Analyses (NOAs) and interprovincial examinations. These products are updated periodically to reflect evolving labour market needs. Because each province and territory needs standards and examinations to certify thousands of apprentices and trade qualifiers each year, the collaboration involved in developing interprovincial Red Seal standards and examinations results in significant economies of scale for governments.

The core of the Red Seal Program lies in quality interprovincial standards for industry, against which tradespeople can be trained and assessed. With ESDC support, the CCDA collaborates to build these standards with industry from across Canada. The program also encourages the harmonization of apprenticeship training outcomes through common standards, which provinces and territories use to inform the in-school portion of apprenticeship programs. In 2014/2015, ten new National Occupational Analyses and two Interprovincial Program Guides were published.

In 2014/2015, significant work was done to develop enhanced standards for the Construction Electrician and Steamfitter/Pipefitter trades under the Strengthening the Red Seal (SRS) initiative. Continuous improvement is essential to ensure that the Red Seal Program and its standards remain rigorous, relevant to industry and labour market demands and is nationally recognized. New occupational standards were developed through national workshops and were piloted to include industry-defined performance expectations, evidence of skills attainment and learning outcomes. The project established industry advisory committees for each pilot trade which give industry a more direct role in guiding the process of standards development. Evaluation of the pilot was carried out and the final evaluation will be used to inform enhancements to the development processes going forward.

To further reduce barriers to accreditation in the skilled trades in Canada and increase opportunities for apprentices, the Government of Canada continues to work closely with provinces and territories through the CCDA to facilitate the harmonization of apprenticeship training requirements in targeted Red Seal trades. Harmonization will encourage labour mobility across the country and help more apprentices complete their training. In July 2014, the Forum of Labour Market Ministers (FLMM) endorsed the CCDA's Harmonization initiative as a top priority with a focus on harmonizing the first ten Red Seal trades[32]. As part of this work, the CCDA identified four

[31] Statistics Canada, 2013 Registered Apprenticeship Information System.

[32] Carpenter, Mobile Crane Operator, Mobile Crane Operator (Hydraulic), Heavy Duty Equipment Technician, Metal Fabricator (Fitter), Tower Crane Operator, Welder, Ironworker (Generalist), Ironworker (Structural/Ornamental), Ironworker (Reinforcing).

harmonization priorities in consultation with industry and training stakeholders: use of the Red Seal trade name; consistent total training hours (in-school and on-the-job); same number of training levels; and more consistent sequencing of training content using the most recent National Occupational Analyses. In 2014/2015, the CCDA developed proposed harmonization recommendations for the first 10 Red Seal trades and consultations with industry and training stakeholders were held for seven of the 10 trades. The CCDA also hosted pan-Canadian webinars with stakeholders to reach consensus on harmonization recommendations for the Carpenter, Welder and Metal Fabricator (Fitter) trades.

With ESDC support, CCDA representatives meet annually with national apprenticeship stakeholder groups to provide updates and seek input on key initiatives. At the CCDA's 2015 meeting, 30 national stakeholders confirmed their support for the work underway on the CCDA's strategic priorities with respect to the Red Seal Program, such as work to strengthen the Red Seal Program, employer engagement and promote the harmonization of apprenticeship training and trade certification requirements in targeted trades.

ESDC continues to work with provinces and territories to increase employer engagement in apprenticeship. In 2014/2015, ESDC, on behalf of the CCDA, commissioned a research report[33] to inform the development of new collaborative efforts by the FLMM to encourage employer participation. In addition, ESDC, working with Public Works and Government Services Canada and Defence Construction Canada, launched the Apprentice Procurement Initiative in June 2014 to support the use of apprentices through federal construction and maintenance contracts.

The Red Seal website (www.red-seal.ca) is the communications portal for the Red Seal Program. In 2014/2015, the CCDA, with ESDC funding, undertook to improve awareness of apprenticeship and the Red Seal Program through an enhanced and user-friendly website. Communications and outreach resulted in more than 210,000 visitors on the Red Seal Program's website, for a total of 1,164,862 page views, over the course of the year. The Red Seal kiosk and promotional materials informed Canadians about the value of the Program and apprenticeships at nine public events across Canada. As the National Secretariat for the program, in 2014, ESDC responded to more than 2,000 e-mails and 750 Red Seal Info Line messages.

Through the Red Seal Program, essential skills tools are developed to help apprentices build their essential skills such as numeracy, document use and problem solving. In 2014/2015, there were a total of 67,352 visitors to the Essential Skills tools on the ESDC website.

The Government of Canada introduced new measures to support apprentices and improve the apprenticeship system. The Canada Apprenticeship Loan (CAL) was launched in January 2015 to provide apprenticeships in Red Seal trades up to $4,000 in interest-free loans per period of technical training. The CAL is expected to assist at least 26,000 apprentices per year with over $100 million in loans. In addition, the Government of Canada introduced the Flexibility and Innovation in Apprenticeship Technical Training (FIATT) pilot project to explore the use of innovative approaches to the technical training of apprentices. Further to the first call for proposals launched in January 2015, 37 project proposals were received. Projects are expected to roll out in 2015/2016.

Research

The Registered Apprenticeship Information System (RAIS) is an annual survey conducted by Statistics Canada with ESDC funding support. The RAIS obtains information from provinces and territories on individuals who receive training or certification within a trade where apprenticeship training is being offered by at least one province or territory.

According to Statistics Canada[34], there were 349,806 apprentices in 2013. Of the 95,058 new registrations, 69,783 (73%) were in Red Seal trades.

- New registrations in the top 10 Red Seal trades were led by construction electricians (10,173); carpenters (8,043); automotive service technicians (6,054); welders (4,461); and steamfitter/pipefitters (3,762).
- The fastest growth was in the automotive service trade (+69.7%) and ironworker trade (+37.6%).

In March 2015, ESDC, working with Statistics Canada finalized the questionnaire for the National Apprenticeship Survey (NAS). The NAS is designed to understand the factors that affect apprentices' completion and certification; examine the perceptions of apprentices in all aspects of their programs; and, assess the potential influence of recent federal supports to apprentices. The survey will be administered from August 2015 to February 2016.

[33] *Analysis of Initiatives to Encourage Employer Engagement in Apprenticeship*, Canadian Apprenticeship Forum, February 2015.

[34] The 2013 Registered Apprenticeship Information System was released by Statistics Canada on October 26, 2015.

Pan-Canadian Programming in Action: Youth Awareness

In organizing skills competitions, Skills/Compétences Canada (a non-governmental organization) and its regional counterparts work in partnership with local organizations, educators and governments to make skilled trade occupations more visible to youth, teachers, students, parents and the general public. The philosophy of the skills competitions is to recognize student excellence; to directly involve industry in evaluating student performance; to keep training relevant to employers' needs; and to promote the skilled trades.

The 20th Skills Canada National Competition was held in Toronto, Ontario, in June 2014. More than 500 skilled trade and technology students and apprentices from all regions of Canada competed in 43 contest areas. The competition highlighted the importance of Essential Skills within the skilled trade and technology occupations. Over 65 employers, associations, labour groups, training institutes and government partners hosted exhibitor booths and interactive activities for all attendees. They all worked in partnership to profile the valuable career opportunities in trades and technologies, as well as provide information about the educational requirements and supports for these occupations. The four-day event attracted over 7,500 visitors. According to an on-site survey, 75% of young visitors said they would consider a career in skilled trade and technology fields after attending the event, and 88% of spectators felt they learned about new career options in skilled trade and technology fields as a result of visiting the event.

The Apprenticeship Incentive Grant, the Apprenticeship Completion Grant and the Apprenticeship Job Creation Tax Credit for employers are tied to designated Red Seal trades to promote interprovincial mobility and national standards.

4.3.4 Youth Awareness

The national Youth Awareness program provides financial assistance for projects designed to address community labour market issues. Through job fairs and promotional events, this program aims to raise awareness among employers and communities of the fact that young people are the labour force of the future.

In 2014/2015, program priorities included raising awareness of skilled trades and technologies among youth. Delivered at the national and regional levels, Youth Awareness also leverages funds from many sources, including provinces and territories. In 2014/2015, Youth Awareness expenditures totalling over $2 million, supported two projects.

In 2014/2015, the Youth Awareness program received its last year of funding through the pan-Canadian envelope. Starting in 2015/2016, awareness activities such as skills competitions will be funded through the Career Focus program, as part of the Youth Employment Strategy, allowing for increased program efficiencies.

4.3.5 National Essential Skills Initiative

The National Essential Skills Initiative (NESI) helps support the mandate of ESDC's Office of Literacy and Essential Skills (OLES), in supporting all Canadians to improve their essential skills (ES) to better prepare for, get and keep a job, and adapt and succeed at work. This is aligned with the Government of Canada's commitment to building a highly skilled, adaptable and inclusive labour force and efficient labour market.

Given that employment and training programs are predominantly delivered through provincial and territorial governments, non-profit organizations, unions and private firms, ESDC helps these entities integrate ES interventions into their programming, services and policies. This enhances opportunities and resources for Canadian workers and employers, supporting the development of a more skilled workforce. ESDC helps improve awareness and application of ES knowledge and information among partners, stakeholders and employers; develops tools to support ES in and for the workplace; and reduces non-financial barriers to skills development. The program supports the development of innovative approaches to strengthen the capacity of employment and training service providers to help improve the ES of adult Canadians.

Project funding is provided through NESI, which includes both the Research and Innovations and Labour Market Partnerships of EI Part II funds. Complementary initiatives are supported through Consolidated Revenue Funds (CRF) and delivered under the Terms and Conditions of the Adult Learning, Literacy and Essential Skills Program (ALLESP).

[35] Gyarmati, Leckie, Dowie, Palameta, Hui, Dunn, and Hebert. *UPSKILL: A Credible Test of Workplace Literacy and Essential Skills Training.* Ottawa: Social Research and Demonstration Corporation. (2014)

Since 2010, OLES has collaborated with over 4,000 employers and industry stakeholders, 41 post-secondary institutions, as well as with all 13 provinces and territories, in the design and delivery of projects. Beneficiaries of these projects include over 30,000 Canadians, including skills development for over 7,000 job seekers and workers.

The OLES places an emphasis on essential skills for work, including skills associated with literacy (i.e. reading, writing, document use and numeracy), thinking skills, oral communication, computer use, working with others and commitment to continuous learning. It has been demonstrated that improving these skills helps adult Canadians get a job, adapt and succeed in the labour market while responding to employers' need to find skilled workers.

A recent NESI-funded project was the UPSKILL project[35] with the Social Research and Demonstration Corporation (SRDC), a non-profit social policy research organization. The UPSKILL project delivered by SRDC used a random assignment design to provide the most reliable measures of impacts of ES training on workers' skills and job performance in the Accommodations sector of the Tourism industry. The project provided a credible test of the effectiveness of workplace and essential skills training by measuring its impacts on workers and firms and estimating the return on investment for all those engaged. The project provided a cost-benefit analysis of workplace essential skills training and determined that firms are estimated to earn an average return of 23% on their investment in the first year after providing training to employees, as measured by reduced error rates, increased retention, improved productivity and customer service. Workers experienced higher success in industry performance certification, greater earnings and lower levels of periods of unemployment.

Another recently funded project was dedicated to helping instructors and trainers in the construction industry improve their instructional practice and increase their apprentices' success by integrating ES into their technical training. The Sustainable Essential Skills in Construction website,[36] developed by BuildForce Canada, helps technical instructors in the skilled trades help their apprentices successfully complete their apprenticeship training, evolve with their jobs and adapt to workplace change.

Other projects funded through ALLESP provided further evidence of the benefits of investing in ES. Key findings from a survey of employers in the skilled trades,[37] has also demonstrated that investing in essential skills training is a sound business decision. When both direct and indirect costs are considered, employers experience a return of $3.08 for every $1 invested on training. In another research study,[38] the Canadian Apprenticeship Forum created a statistical measure of the relationship between ES and labour market outcomes with a particular focus on apprentices and vulnerable populations including Indigenous peoples, immigrants and persons with disabilities. For all groups, it was statistically demonstrated that improved ES fosters higher pay, emphasizing their importance in today's knowledge economy.

A Call for Concepts was closed on February 18, 2015, in which projects were sought that would replicate and scale up proven approaches to skills upgrading, as well as to improve the quality of employment and training supports that are responsive to both worker and employer needs. Projects would support workers to be better prepared to meet on-the-job demands by engaging employers through the development of models targeted to specific industries or occupations that are of national significance. Submitted concepts are being reviewed and it is anticipated that the projects will be funded over the next three fiscal years with funds from both NESI and ALLESP.

4.3.6 Research Project: Respecting Financial Assistance to Internationally Trained Workers

Launched in February 2012, the Foreign Credential Recognition (FCR) Loans Pilot Project provided funding to internationally trained individuals (ITIs) who experienced difficulty in accessing traditional lending sources to finance costs associated with the FCR process in Canada.

The Government of Canada allocated $18 million for the pilot over a four year period, ending on March 31, 2015. The pilot was funded through the Research and Innovation support measure of EI Part II, and took place in nine communities across nine provinces.

The FCR Loans Pilot Project delivered over 1,800 loans with an average amount of $7,200. Loan recipients were typically seeking credential recognition in high-demand occupations, including

[36] http://www.constructionessentialskills.ca/en BuildForce Canada (2014)

[37] *The BUSINESS CASE for Essential Skills Training in the Skilled Trades*, Canadian Apprenticeship Forum-Forum canadien sur l'apprentissage (CAF-FCA) (2014)

[38] The Effect of Literacy and Essential Skills on Labour Market Outcomes for Canadian Workers, Canadian Apprenticeship Forum-Forum canadien sur l'apprentissage (CAF-FCA) (2014)

Immigrants Face Unique Financial Barriers

A number of financial barriers can discourage internationally trained individuals from pursuing the assessment and recognition of their credentials for a regulated occupation in Canada, such as costs related to application fees, language and credential assessment, exam fees, bridge training tuition, travel, child care and lost income opportunities while preparing and undertaking FCR activities.

According to Statistics Canada's Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants of Canada (2003), 52% of immigrants in need of financial assistance for education or training were unable to find support. And 36% of immigrants encountered financial barriers in trying to get their credentials recognized.

In 2009, 70% of skilled immigrants arrived in Canada with dependents leading to a greater urgency to find work and satisfy family needs.

- To complement their first income, more than half of skilled immigrants held two or more jobs.
- Forgone income is a major barrier for immigrants in deciding whether or not to continue their licensure process.
- Income support during up-skilling activities is rare.

those targeted in other federal government initiatives such as the Pan-Canadian Framework[39] for the Assessment and Recognition of Foreign Qualifications (e.g.: physicians, engineers, nurses, accountants, and trades).

SRDC, which was contracted to undertake the research and monitor pilot site activities, demonstrated the program's potential to alleviate the financial burden of having one's foreign credentials recognized in Canada and subsequently gaining employment in one's field. In addition, SRDC findings confirmed the demand for financial assistance among newcomers, the capacity of organizations to work together and the key role government plays in facilitating partnerships and leveraging private investment.

Specifically, the SRDC survey of 210 loan recipients indicated the following pilot outcomes:

- *Increased employment:* 47% increase in the full-time employment of survey participants after receiving the loan;
- *Faster progress:* The majority of loan recipients surveyed were able to accelerate their FCR process and 2/3 would have either taken more time to complete FCR or postponed it;
- *Higher Income:* Survey results indicate an upward shift in the distribution of income, with fewer loan recipients in the survey sample in the bottom income categories and more in the top within a year;
- *Greater Self-Sufficiency:* After one year, survey participants were less reliant on government transfers (i.e. EI); and
- *High Loan Repayment:* Of the loans that had entered their repayment period at the end of the Pilot, less than 1% were in default.

4.4 Supporting Agreements with Provinces, Territories and Indigenous Peoples

This investment stream supports existing LMDAs with province and territories and agreements with Indigenous peoples through ASETS. These agreements require Canada to fund activities that support service delivery and labour market development, such as activities that provide EI systems connectivity, ensure timely access to EI Part II for EI claimants and effective reporting by provinces and territories.

4.4.1 LMDA Systems Connectivity

The secure electronic exchange of program data between Canada and provinces and territories sustains the delivery of EBSM-similar programming under the LMDAs. Provinces and territories exchange data with ESDC to verify EI eligibility; understand the characteristics of EI claimants; identify applicants who can benefit from EBSM-similar programming; report on service delivery; and, refer claimants to benefit programming while on claim. ESDC uses the data received from provinces and territories to monitor, assess and evaluate their programs. The systems and applications involved in these data exchanges require ongoing maintenance and improvements to maintain high quality service delivery standards. Some of the systems also support programming to Indigenous communities through the ASETS and a Federal/Provincial data exchange called the Assignment of Benefits that helps to coordinate social assistance payments while EI claims are adjudicated.

[39] The Framework is a public commitment by federal, provincial and territorial governments to work together, through a common vision, to improve and streamline the assessment and recognition of foreign qualifications to ensure foreign qualifications recognition (FQR) processes are fair, timely, transparent and consistent in order to better integrate internationally trained professionals into the Canadian labour market.

Demographics of loan recipients

Year 2 Implementation Report

Selection of loan recipients' characteristics

- Comparable number of men and women with 79% aged between 25 and 44 years.
- High levels of educational attainment – 58% undergraduate degree, 22% master's degree and 11% doctorate.
- 60% having lived in Canada less than five years.
- Top 3 Source Countries:30% Philippines, 12% India and,10% Iran
- Most popular intended occupations: 15% nurses, 11% doctors and, 9% accountant.
- Average monthly income of $1,859 before receiving loans.
- Most common use for loan:40% tuition, 28% living expenses and, 26% exam fees.

4.4.2 LMDA IT Systems Modernization

ESDC continued to modernize many components of the systems and applications that enable secure electronic data exchange and the management of data related to LMDA programming. In 2014/2015, ESDC introduced: new functions such as Alerts for changes in EI status to improve efficiency and the ability to flag the intent to recommend training for pending EI claimants; expanded the Targeting, Referral and Feedback component to enable provinces and territories to target EI clients for early interventions; and EI data for provinces and territories to inform strategic planning.

4.5 Labour Market Information

ESDC implements a National Work Plan for labour market information (LMI) services in support of the National Employment Service. In doing so, ESDC delivers accurate and reliable labour market information to individuals and employers to help them make informed labour market decisions.

LMI helps workers manage their careers and search for jobs by providing occupational and skills information. It assists employers in recruiting, training and retaining workers, and supports business and investment decisions by providing information on wages, labour supply and demand, as well as influencing educational programs.

LMI also strengthens Canada's economic and social union by helping the labour market function as an integrated national system by. In addition, it contributes to:

- aligning human capital investments with the needs of the economy;
- facilitating job searches and improving job fit for individuals;
- helping employers find or train required staff; and,
- improving the effectiveness of public policies at all levels of government.

ESDC assesses the employment outlooks and wages for 520 occupations (NOC 4-digit level), at the provincial and economic region level, where data permits. ESDC's latest outlooks and wages were disseminated on Job Bank in May 2015 and wages were updated in November 2015.

Weekly Labour Market News, monthly Labour Market Bulletins, and semi-annual Environmental Scans were also made available on the Job Bank website for all regions of the country. Additional LMI products, such as Sectoral Outlooks and Client Segment Profiles, were made available for some regions on Job Bank.

4.6 National Employment Service Initiatives

Departmental operating funds also support online national employment services administered by ESDC to help Canadians find suitable employment and help employers find suitable workers. These free, bilingual online services connect job seekers and employers, and help individuals prepare and carry out their return-to-work action plans. The Job Bank is designed to improve the way information about jobs and the labour market is disseminated by reducing duplication, improving the quality of information, and making online information more accessible and easier to use.

4.6.1 Job Bank

ESDC maintains this electronic labour exchange in partnership with provinces and territories, which fosters efficient and inclusive labour markets by connecting job seekers and employers. In addition to job postings and labour market information, the site provides basic information on how to acquire the skills needed for specific careers. Job Bank also launched the Career Tool in March 2015 to help youth make informed decisions on their education and career paths.

Job Bank also provides tools such as Job Match, which was modernized in 2014/2015 to help job seekers find jobs that match their skills and experience, and provide employers with better tools to look for qualified Canadians. Additionally, job seekers can subscribe to Job Alerts to receive daily email notifications including new jobs postings corresponding to the job seeker's search criteria, local job market information and more. 1,250,000 Job Alerts are sent to 600,000 subscribers daily.

In 2014/2015, Job Bank received more than 66 million visits and provided access to about 1.3 million job postings. The top five NOC advertised on Job Bank were: 1) retail salespersons and sales clerks; 2) material handlers 3) customer service, information and related clerks; 4) truck drivers; and 5) cooks.

The website provides job market information from over 30 sources, including private sector job boards, and can generate more than 34,000 unique job market reports based on a client's occupation and location. The reports provide targeted and comprehensive information on job postings, wage rates, employment trends and outlooks, licensing and certification requirements, job skills, and relevant educational and training programs for occupations at the regional, provincial and national levels.

Chapter IV

Program Administration

This chapter provides an overview of the delivery of Employment Insurance (EI) services to Canadians in 2014/2015. Section 1 briefly examines the context in which EI benefits were delivered. Section 2 provides an overview of the service delivery channels through which Canadians can obtain general information on the EI program. Section 3 focuses on claims processing and specialized services including Specialized Call Centres, services for employers, and appeals of EI decisions. Section 4 explores the quality of EI services, including the accuracy of payments. Lastly, Section 5 assesses the integrity of the delivery of the EI program.

1. Context

Service Canada's role is to provide timely and accurate Employment Insurance (EI) benefit payments and services, and to support EI clients through each stage of the service delivery process by providing benefit information, responding to enquiries, assisting employers, processing claims and providing the means to appeal decisions.

EI benefits are delivered through a multi-channel service delivery model – online, by phone or in-person – designed to meet the day-to-day demands of clients. The processing and payment of EI benefits occurs through a national network of processing sites and EI Specialized Call Centres located across the country. The EI service delivery network's workload varies considerably from week to week and month to month as client enquiries and claim volumes fluctuate dramatically based on seasonal patterns, key dates and unanticipated spikes due to economic conditions.

While the Canadian economy continued to experience GDP growth in 2014/2015, and the economy displayed moderate labour force and employment growth outpacing some other Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and G7 countries, the reported average duration of unemployment was 20.6 weeks in 2014/2015, and there were 1.31 million unemployed individuals on average in a given month.

In 2014/2015, Service Canada received 2.8 million EI applications and made $15.7 billion in payments to claimants. Claims volume increased slightly compared to 2013/2014 (0.80%). Furthermore, clients made over 4.0 million EI-related in-person service requests while 3.8 million enquiries were answered by the EI Specialized Call Centres[1] and over 556,000 EI-related enquiries were received by 1 800 O-Canada[2]. The Employer Contact Centre (ECC)[3] answered a total of 610,952 calls in 2014/2015.

---

[1] For more information on EI Specialized Call Centres, see Section 3.2.

[2] For more information on 1800 O-Canada, see Section 2.2.1.

[3] For more information on Employer Contact Centre, see Section 3.3.4.

In addition to delivering EI benefits, transforming and modernizing business operations remained a key priority for the Department in 2014/2015. Over the past decade, as a result of modernization and automation, EI service delivery was transformed from a manual paper-based process (where 100% of claims required agent intervention) into a partially automated network where claimants can apply online; paper is almost eliminated; and processing activities are distributed across the national processing network to where capacity exists. To improve the delivery of EI, efforts continued through 2014/2015 to increase claims processing automation and optimize the electronic services available to individuals and businesses. Even with the steps taken by Service Canada to make it easier for Canadians to receive their EI benefits through a range of processing modernization and automation efforts, EI claim volumes have continued to exceed the funded capacity.

2. General Information and Enquiries

Canadians can access Employment Insurance (EI) related information through a multi-channel service delivery model available on the Internet, by telephone or in person. Service Canada conducted a recent study on findings from the Canadians Out of Employment Panel (COEP) survey, to evaluate the service experience of Canadians who contacted Service Canada on Employment Insurance. Results show that overall, the majority of respondents were satisfied with their Service Canada experience, and satisfaction increased over time (62.7% in the 2012 COEP survey, 67.6% in the 2013 COEP survey, and 71.2% in the 2014 COEP survey). According to the 2014 COEP survey, the main reasons for satisfaction included receiving the right information, good service, and claim approval. The main reasons for dissatisfaction included delays in processing requests, repetitive asks for the same information, and difficulty accessing the service.

2.1 On the Internet (Click)

2.1.1 Service Canada Website

The Service Canada website contains key information on a wide variety of government programs and services, including the EI program. In 2014/2015, visits to the site increased 1% over the previous fiscal year, bringing the total annual visits to approximately 82.3 million.[4]

On average, visitors viewed 3.7 pages on the Service Canada website, with 1 in 10 visits (10.5%) associated with eight or more pages viewed. In 2013/2014, visitors viewed 3.8 pages on the Service Canada website, with 1 in 10 visits (11.4%) associated with eight or more pages viewed. In 2014/2015, four of the top five Web pages accessed through the Service Canada website were related to EI:

- Internet Reporting Service
  - 17.3% of homepage traffic
- Use My Service Canada Account to access your Employment Insurance information
  - 7.76% of homepage traffic
- Applying for Employment Insurance benefits online
  - 5.39% of homepage traffic
- Employment Insurance (EI index page)
  - 2.72% of homepage traffic

This shows a general decrease in traffic directly from the homepage to EI related pages from the previous fiscal year. The top five pages accessed from the Service Canada homepage remained unchanged in the previous fiscal year, 2013/2014; however the traffic to the EI related pages was marginally higher:

- Internet Reporting Service
  - 18.6% of homepage traffic
- Use My Service Canada Account (MSCA) to access your Employment Insurance information
  - 9.39% of homepage traffic
- Applying for Employment Insurance benefits online
  - 4.76% of homepage traffic
- Employment Insurance (EI index page)
  - 3.54% of homepage traffic

In 2014/2015, the top page viewed directly from the Service Canada homepage was the “My Service Canada Account” page: this page received 28.8% of all homepage traffic which is a substantial increase from the 19.5% recorded in 2013/2014.

Web videos are also a cost-effective way to help clients understand the available program and resources and enable them to use self-serve options and complete transactions. Examples of EI videos added in 2014 include EI Specialized Benefits for Self-Employed People: Maternity and Parental; EI Specialized Benefits for Self-Employed People:

[4] For a regional breakdown of Service Canada website visits, see Annex 4.1.

Sickness and Compassionate Care, Connecting Canadians to Available Jobs (CCAJ) and Working While on Claim (WWC). In 2014/2015, videos pertaining to EI generated 1,874,682 views from the Service Canada website, as well as a further 9,217 downloads from the Service Canada YouTube site. This represents an increase of 35% over the previous fiscal year.

In 2014/2015, Service Canada launched a major redesign to streamline and rewrite the content of Web pages to make them more accessible and to reduce barriers for Service Canada clients who could face challenges in using e-service. In 2014/2015, this effort focused on the EI Web pages and was comprised of a Plain Language Review and Redundant, Outdated and Trivial review, as well as a revision to break down complex tasks. Some of the changes included: making access to MSCA more prominent; organizing the most popular links based on top tasks and top searches on the site; and, making content by service and life event accessible through the global navigation at the top of the pages on the site.

In 2015 Service Canada began planning, preparing, and moving its Web content to the single Canada.ca website as part of the Government's Web Renewal initiative. The move to Canada.ca provided an opportunity to rethink and improve the organization and design of EI Web content and how the program is presented to Canadians. To improve user friendliness, Service Canada is adopting a common content template for all services and benefits delivered online, including EI. This new template allows Service Canada to present available EI benefits in fewer and easier to read Web pages, while still giving potential applicants all the information they need to apply including who is eligible; how much they could receive; how to apply; what they need to know before applying; and what they need to know after applying.

2.1.2 My Service Canada Account

My Service Canada Account (MSCA) is a secure transactional portal on the Service Canada web site that provides online access for viewing and updating EI, Canada Pension Plan (CPP), and Old Age Security (OAS) information. The use of electronic services contributes to more accessible, accurate and timely services for Canadians.

MSCA enables clients to view information on their current and previous EI claims online. Through the EI section of MSCA, clients can:

- View their EI messages, payment information and claim information;
- View and change their EI direct deposit details, mailing address and telephone number;
- View and print their EI tax slips;
- View their electronic Record of Employment (E-ROE);
- Directly provide information regarding absences from Canada and/or training courses; and,
- Register for the EI program to access special benefits for self-employed persons.

MSCA also provides links to other electronic services, such as EI Application On-line also known as AppliWeb and the Internet Reporting Service. Each month, MSCA is accessed over 300,000 times by EI clients to get updates on their EI claims, submit new information, and sign up for or change their Direct Deposit service.

In 2014/2015, Canadians logged onto MSCA 22.8 million times, an increase of 7.4% over 2013/2014. Chart 1 demonstrates that MSCA logins have been trending upward since 2009/2010. In 2014/2015, there were 751,881 new registrations for MSCA. This represents an increase of 5.0% compared to 2013/2014, for a total estimated active user base of over 3.1 million.

Chart 1

My Service Canada Account Logins

Source: EI administrative data

Efforts continued throughout 2014/2015 to improve the stability and availability of MSCA through the implementation of a new secure platform in January 2015. In line with efforts to continuously improve user experience, an exit questionnaire[5], randomly presented to 1 out of 100 logouts, was implemented to validate that the user was able to accomplish what he or she had intended when logging onto MSCA. Between January 26, 2015 and March 31, 2015, a total of 27,098 invitations to complete the exit questionnaires were issued. Of these, 1,488 questionnaires were completed and submitted by MSCA users, for a participation rate of 5.5% and 82.6% reported that they were able to accomplish their intended task. Data collected will be analyzed and reported on in a future report. MSCA continues to invite users to complete feedback questionnaires to obtain user experience information; this feedback is reviewed on a regular basis and is being leveraged to further enhance the system including the design of an improved eAccount portal.

2.1.3 Employment Insurance Application On-line (AppliWeb)

Introduced nationally in April 2002, the EI Application On-line (AppliWeb) allows clients to file for EI benefits from anywhere they can access the Internet and is available seven days a week, 24 hours a day. Clients can also visit their local Service Canada Centre (SCC) to access the EI Application On-line.

In 2014/2015, EI Applications On-line continued to be the prevalent method of application for EI benefits with 98.4% of applications submitted via AppliWeb. Since 2007/08, AppliWeb usage has remained well above 95%.

2.1.4 Internet Reporting Service

To receive EI benefits, most claimants must complete and submit bi-weekly reports to demonstrate their continuing entitlement using the Telephone Reporting Service or the Internet Reporting Service. The Internet Reporting Service enables claimants to do so easily and securely over the Internet, resulting in faster processing of EI payments and ensuring availability of service to hearing-impaired claimants and claimants without access to a touch-tone telephone.

The Internet Reporting Service also allows claimants to directly provide information regarding absences from Canada and/or training courses, resulting in fewer calls to EI Specialized Call Centres and decreasing the workload for processing centres.

In 2014/2015, 73.1% of claimants used the Internet Reporting Service to submit biweekly reports. The percentage of claimants utilizing this service has increased from 61.9% in 2010/2011 to 73.1% in 2014/2015 (see Chart 2)

[5] http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/questionnaire/msca_questionnaire.shtml

Chart 2

Percentage of Claimants Using Internet Reporting Service

Source: EI administrative data

2.2 By Telephone (Call)

For general enquires, the public can call the 1 800 O-Canada line, whereas the EI Specialized Call Centres serve as the primary point of contact for client-specific enquiries about the EI program. In addition to answering specific client queries, the EI Specialized Call Centres are able to resolve issues relating to application process, status, and benefit eligibility and delivery. More information about EI Specialized Call Centres is available in Section 3, subsection 2, Claims Processing and Specialized Services, of this chapter. Employer Contact Centres (ECCs) provide support to employers for ROE Web, advice, guidance and ordering of ROEs as well as the Temporary Foreign Worker program. Additional information on the ECCs is available in Section 3, subsection 3.3.4.

2.2.1 1 800 O-Canada

Available in more than 60 countries, the 1 800 O-Canada[6] line is open Monday to Friday with service provided in English and French. For callers in Canada, service is available from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. in each time zone; for callers outside Canada, service is available from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Eastern time. The service delivery standard is to answer calls within 18 seconds (three rings), 85% of the time. In 2014/2015, 1 800 O-Canada answered 80% of the calls in 18 seconds.

1 800 O-Canada provides general information on the various EI programs in the context of its regular mandate to inform the public about all programs and services available and how to access them. The information that may be provided on the services includes:

- an overview of the benefits and eligibility criteria;
- application process and forms;
- general information on payment dates[7](not applicable for the EI benefits as payment information is case specific);
- direct deposit information; and
- referral of contacts to specific programs, including the pertinent EI web pages and links necessary to complete their service delivery journey.

Clients that have case-specific enquiries are advised to access the MSCA website, or contact the EI Specialized Call Centers or the Employer Contact Centre as required.

In 2014/2015, agents of 1 800 O-Canada answered 1.96 million calls, a 2.5% increase compared to 2013/2014. The total call volume from callers in and outside of Canada included more than 556,228 general enquiries related to EI a 5% decrease from 2013/2014. It continues to evolve with the degree of accessibility of the EI Specialized Call Centres. 90.8% of the enquiries handled by the service also included

[6] 1800 O-Canada call center agents respond to general enquiries on a number of Government of Canada programs. Call center agents can provide general information on the Employment Insurance program such as providing websites for specific issues relating to the program. Questions pertaining to recipient's or applicant's EI file are referred to the EI Specialized Call Centres by providing the number to reach them.

[7] 1800 O-Canada cannot provide claimant specific payment information. This information can be obtained through MSCA or through the EI Specialized Call Centre.

a further referral to the program for more specific questions. Across the country, 9.6% of EI-related calls continued to originate in the Atlantic, 24.4% from Quebec, 33.6% from Ontario, and 32.5% from the Western provinces and the territories. Overall, EI enquiries peaked in April (with 12.6% of annual enquiries), and again in May and June (10.1% and 11.2% of annual enquiries respectively).

2.3 In Person (Visit)

2.3.1 Points of Service

As of March 31, 2015, there were 556 Service Canada sites (321 full-time and part-time Service Canada Centres (SCC) and 235 Scheduled Outreach sites), where citizens could access general information on the EI application process and eligibility criteria. Service Canada employees in these locations help clients complete benefit applications, which entails identifying the client, validating supporting documents and verifying information for completeness.

The in-person points of service fall under two categories:

- SCC are full-time or part-time offices, open up to five days a week, managed and occupied by Service Canada staff, offering general information and transactional services. SCCs may be stand alone or co-located with other organizations; and,
- Scheduled Outreach sites are points of service that are physically located outside an SCC but offer similar services. Service Canada employees (from a nearby SCC) travel to a pre-determined location regularly (e.g., one day per week) to deliver services. Scheduled outreach is typically offered in rural or remote locations, offered at partner premises (such as band councils, provincial or territorial offices), and managed through service contracts and/or memoranda of understanding.

Service Canada aims to ensure that 90% of Canadians have access to a Service Canada point of service (SCC or Scheduled Outreach site) within a 50-kilometre driving distance from where they live. The number or network of offices can fluctuate and is adjusted based on needs and demand for service. In the last five years, this target has been met, with a result of 96.07% in 2014/2015.

In 2014/2015, clients made over 4.0 million EI-related service requests[8] to an in-person point of service, which represents 32% of all interactions handled at in-person offices.

Of these, EI-related visits to Scheduled Outreach sites across the country accounted for more than 66,600 service requests.

Types of EI assistance provided by in-person services in 2014/2015 consisted of the following interactions: 56.4% for follow-up assistance; 40.4% to provide general information; and 3.2% to accept or provide assistance with applications.

A recent survey conducted in January 2015 was done based on MSCA Feedback forms from Service Canada Centres. It helped identify what users wanted to accomplish at the Centres and determined if they were able to accomplish their desired tasks. These tasks included activities such as: appealing an EI decision, changing their EI information, and viewing EI information, among other tasks. There were over 1,600 respondents. Results show that the top activity users wanted to accomplish at the Service Canada Centre (SCC) was to view EI information. Over 56% of respondents accessed the site to view EI information, 89% of whom stated that they were able to complete this task, and 10% stated that they were unable to do so. One percent did not select an answer for this task. The next most frequent task users wanted to accomplish at the SCC was to view tax slips (10% of all respondents); 72% of these claimed they were able to complete the task, and the remaining 28% stated that they were unable to do so. Eleven percent of respondents visited the site for other tasks not part of the 12 listed in the survey.

2.3.2 Mobile Outreach Services

Service Canada also uses Mobile Outreach Services (MOS) to connect with communities across the country. MOS complement the services provided at SCCs and Scheduled Outreach sites. The service also increases awareness of Service Canada programs and service offerings by providing general information such as:

- EI information at mass layoff sites;
- Youth program information in locations such as schools;
- Senior programs (e.g., CPP, OAS) in retirement homes; and,
- Other Government of Canada programs and services to community service organizations.

[8] For a regional breakdown of the number of in-person EI requests, see Annex 4.1.

Chart 3

EI Information Sessions to Citizens by Service Canada Region

Source: Mobile Outreach Administrative data.

In 2014/2015, the following information sessions on EI were delivered through MOS[9]:

- 950 EI information sessions to citizens facing layoffs, with a total of 17,906 participants;
- 263 EI information sessions to workers on Work Sharing, with a total of 5,309 participants; and,
- 581 EI information sessions to employers, with 951companies and organizations participating[10].

Chart 3 breaks down by region the information sessions delivered to citizens, including workers facing layoffs and work sharing sessions.

Yearly targets are not set for MOS EI information sessions since these sessions are offered on demand. Since 2010/2011, there has been a steady decline at the national level in the number of MOS EI information sessions delivered to citizens. This decline is partly explained by: changes in the economy and local priorities; reduced need since more EI information is available on-line; and, people can now make changes directly to their EI personal information on-line. The number of sessions delivered was 19% lower in 2014/2015 compared to the previous year. It should be noted, however, that this decline in sessions was in part, due to a reduced incidence of mass lay-offs in the Ontario region, since all other regions recorded increases in sessions from the previous year.

When Service Canada receives news of a mass layoff, regional offices initiate contact with employers to organize an EI information session. Working with partners, the laid-off workers receive on-site workshops on resumé writing, job search techniques, interviewing skills, EI and available provincial support programs. Sessions are usually planned on very short notice and often in remote areas. An example of notable mass layoff sessions delivered in 2014/2015 included: the employees who lost their jobs following the closure of a major chain of stores across Canada.

Service Canada also delivers EI information sessions in times of disaster. During such an event, custom tools and partnerships can be created to more effectively meet citizens' needs, particularly with regard to EI. While some Service Canada employees make proactive calls to employers affected by a tragedy to establish their needs, others ensure workers who lose their jobs can get the information required to submit their EI application.

[9] For more detailed information on Mobile Outreach Services, see Annex 4.3.

[10] As per previous reports, this number includes occasions where employers were explained how to properly complete their ROE.

3. Claims Processing and Specialized Services

This section provides a snapshot of the 2014/2015 activities related to claims processing and specialized services including Employment Insurance (EI) Specialized Call Centres, services for employers and appeals of EI decisions.

3.1 Claims Processing

EI benefits are delivered through a national network of processing sites located across Canada. The network adjudicates new applications (referred to as initial claims), processes applications to renew or reactivate an existing claim (referred to as renewal claims) as well as revised claims that are created when updated or new information is received during the claim life cycle. There are also different levels of complexity (non-complex, Level 1 and Level 2) associated with the processing of claims. Non-complex tasks are related to data entry and claim preparation activities. Level 1 relates to straight forward fact-finding and claims calculation, while Level 2 processing involves complex fact-finding such as reason for separation issues.

3.1.1 Claim Volumes

In 2014/2015, Service Canada received 2.8 million EI applications, which represents a 0.80% increase from the previous fiscal year.[11] Table 1 provides the history of received claims over the last five fiscal years. Refer to Chapter 2, Section 1.1 for details on benefits paid by benefit type.

Table 1

Received Claims by Fiscal Years

Fiscal Year	EI Initial[12] and Renewal[13] Claims Received
2014/2015	2,800,865
2013/2014	2,778,769
2012/2013	2,759,570
2011/2012	2,854,168
2010/2011	2,917,508

3.1.2 Speed of Payment

There are a range of factors that affect EI processing performance, most notably seasonal fluctuations in workload demands. Speed of payment, a key performance indicator for EI claims processing, measures the percentage of initial and renewal claims[14] for which a payment or non-payment notification is given to the claimant within 28 days of the date of filing a claim. The national speed of payment target is 80% on a fiscal year average.

With continued high volumes of claims and limited resources, the Department achieved 72.3% speed of payment[15] in 2014/2015, up 3.0 percentage points from the previous fiscal year but below the 80% objective. Several factors can delay the payment of benefits within 28 days and affect speed of payment. These include: incomplete benefit applications requiring clarification of information, and complex applications requiring fact-finding with employers and third parties to render a fair and equitable decision. In addition, claim volumes fluctuate dramatically from week to week and peak periods occur when the Department experiences a higher than normal intake of claims throughout the country, in part due to seasonal/peak pattern. Further, the increased claim volume coupled with growing inventory levels affected the Department's ability to consistently meet service standards. To respond to the growing number of claims in the inventory, Service Canada implemented a 24-month Inventory Reduction Strategy in October 2014. The intent of the initiative is to reduce the accumulated inventory of EI claims to sustainable levels, while maintaining timely processing of new claims intake; the goal is to enhance service to Canadians by positioning the Department to meet the annual speed of payment target in fiscal year 2015/2016.

3.1.3 Modernization Agenda

As recently as 2003, the EI service delivery process was entirely paper-based and EI claims were processed manually and locally. Over the last 12 years, the EI service delivery model has been steadily transformed into a partially automated network where paper is almost eliminated, supporting documentation is imaged, and work is distributed across the national processing network to where capacity exists.

[11] For a regional breakdown of EI claims processed, see Annex 4.5.

[12] An Initial claim is an application for benefits received to establish a new claim (benefit period) for EI

[13] A Renewal claim is an application for benefits received to renew or reactivate an existing claim that has already been established and is still in effect, e.g. where a claimant stops claiming benefits for a period of time (returns to work) and wants to renew that claim.

[14] New applications are referred to as "initial claims". Processed applications to renew or reactivate an existing claim are referred to as "renewal claims".

[15] For a regional breakdown of speed of payment, see Annex 4.5.

Chart 4

Use of Electronic Services

Source: EI administrative data

In 2014/2015, Service Canada continued to invest in the design and use of technologies to support the automated processing of benefits. As a result of these automation efforts, 67.2% of EI claims were partially or fully automated in 2014/2015, compared to 66.2% in 2013/2014. As outlined in Chart 4, employers submitted 80.2% of Records of Employment (ROE) electronically and 93.4% of clients opted to receive their EI benefit payments via direct deposit[16]. In addition, nearly all claimants (over 98%) continue to submit their applications online and 100% of claimant reports are filed electronically either by phone or through the Internet.

In May 2014, the Employment Insurance Online Reference Tool (EI ORT) was rolled out nationally across the Service Canada processing network. The EI ORT is the single authoritative source of guidance and direction for Service Canada processing agents nationally. The tool provides up to date and timely procedures that reflect the current work environment, as well as improved search capabilities, and intuitive Web navigation. By extension, this tool translates into more efficient and consistent service delivery for clients ensuring that all processing agents have timely access to procedures that are clear, concise and easy to identify and understand.

Since 2005/2006, the cost per initial and renewal claim processed declined approximately 42%. The increase in electronic services and automation has reduced the volume of manual work related to claims processing, resulting in fewer resources required to process the claims and a lower unit cost.

The Department continues to promote the ability for EI recipients to receive their tax information slip (T4E) electronically through MSCA, which allows slips to be viewed and printed up to four weeks earlier compared to postal service. For the 2014 tax year, more than 520,000 EI recipients chose to receive their slip electronically.

[16] For further details on direct deposit, see Annex 4.6.

3.2 Employment Insurance Specialized Call Centres

Consisting of nine call centres, the EI Specialized Call Centre[17] network is the primary point of contact for EI client specific enquiries and resolutions relating to the application process and application status, as well as benefit eligibility and delivery. Calls are distributed across the network, based on availability of resources, regardless of where they originate.

3.2.1 Overview of Call Centre Performance

Call centres are equipped with an Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system, which enables clients to self-serve for transactions such as application status, obtaining payment details and completing bi-weekly declarations. Specialized agents are available to support clients for enquiries that cannot be resolved through a self-serve channel (e.g. declaring receipt of specific types of earnings, including wage loss insurance and severance pay). Requests that exceed the complexity and call centre agents' authorities (e.g. when a client reports having been dismissed from a job) are communicated to the processing area for appropriate follow-up.

As is the case for processing, call centre network demand fluctuates throughout the year based on seasonal patterns, key dates (e.g. renewal of benefits, monthly cheque distribution, claims processing speed of pay, and reporting requirements), as well as unanticipated spikes due to economic conditions. The call centre network makes every effort to meet the demand during these high call volume periods. However, there are instances when demand exceeds the network's call handling capacity.

In 2014/2015, the total EI call volume reached almost 37 million calls. More than 54% of these calls (20 million) were resolved in the IVR without the need to speak to an agent, compared to 56.4% the previous year. EI Specialized Call Centre agents handled 3.8 million client enquiries, which amounted to 377,197 fewer calls than in 2013/2014.

While efforts are made to handle as many calls as possible, blocked and abandoned calls do occur. Blocked calls occur when the queue is full and no agents are available. When this occurs, callers are given an option to return to the IVR to self-serve or to call back later. In 2014/2015, twelve million blocked calls accounted for one-third of call volume. Blocked calls to agents increased by 306,067 in 2014/2015. This figure represents the total number of unsuccessful attempts to contact a call centre agent, and not the number of individual callers. Further, 1.1 million calls were abandoned in 2014/2015, 8,950 fewer than in 2013/2014. An abandoned call occurs when a client waiting to speak with an agent hangs up in some cases to call back at a later time or to use a self-serve option.

In 2013/2014, EI call centre agents answered 31.6% of calls within 180 seconds. A review of service standards was conducted to better align the target with the available resources and manage client expectations. As a result, a new metric was introduced on April 1, 2014 to have 80% of calls answered within 10 minutes. In 2014/2015, EI call centres answered 45% of calls within the 10 minute timeframe. Calls can vary from simple issues, such as advising claimants about the number of weeks of benefits to which they are entitled, to more complex issues, such as adjudicating the reason for separation from the claimant's employment. The length of the call varies depending on the level of complexity.

Overall, the decreased call-handling capacity and the service level results are largely attributed to call volumes relative to resource levels and increases in average handle time. As agents handle more complex enquiries, average handle time increases.

Close to 83% of calls at the first point of contact were resolved by call centre agents with no additional follow-up required.

The top five reasons clients requested agent assisted service in 2014/2015 included:

- Client advised they must speak with an agent to ensure their bi-weekly declarations can be processed (e.g. client reported new self-employment or on full-time training during their reporting period);
- Enquiries regarding the status of an EI application submitted more than 28 days ago;
- Filing Instructions and Entitlement Information;
- Enquiries regarding the status of an EI application submitted less than 28 days ago; and,
- Assistance required to input a bi-weekly declaration and/or correct a declaration already accepted by the system.

[17] EI Specialized Call Centres agents respond to enquiries specific to recipients' or applicants' Employment Insurance files. Calls are triaged depending on the issue and level of complexity of the enquiry. EI call centre agents resolve enquiries by providing claim-specific information, performing administrative file maintenance (e.g. changing an address or direct deposit information), or adjudicating a wide variety of contentious and non-contentious issues (e.g. claim calculation, reason for separation).

Assessing the quality of calls is an important component of call centre performance. More information on the National Quality and Coaching Program for the EI Specialized Call Centres is available in Section 4, sub-section 2.

3.2.2 Modernization Agenda

In 2014/2015, the EI Specialized Call Centre network continued to move forward with its modernization agenda, which will introduce new technologies and service delivery strategies to improve client service, support staff and increase first contact resolution. The service vision for the Department focuses on implementing an integrated service delivery strategy that eliminates channel churn, and optimizes first contact resolution by resolving as many enquiries as possible.

Since the modernization agenda was developed in 2011/2012, EI Specialized Call Centres have implemented a series of key initiatives, including:

- Streamlining service delivery by training call centre agents to resolve client enquiries at the first point of contact;
- Implementing wait time functionality to advise callers of their expected wait time to speak with an agent;
- Reviewing hours of service to ensure correct balance between client demand and agent assisted hours;
- Creating flexible workload scheduling to more effectively meet anticipated call demand;
- Streamlining the New Hires Call Centre Curriculum to shorten the initial training time and facilitate staged training; and,
- Implementing a National Agent Assist Line to support call centre agents in resolving complex client enquiries.

Since 2011/2012, new business processes in the EI network allow call centre agents to complete selected complex transactions related primarily to claim calculation, which would have otherwise been forwarded to processing agents for future action. In 2014/2015, a select number of call centre agents resolved 184,951 such transactions, 10,624 more than had been resolved in 2013/2014.

In November 2013, Level 2 processing agents were integrated into the call centre network to resolve more complex enquiries at the client's first point of contact[18]. In 2014/2015, these agents completed 103,500 work items at first point of contact.

To further support the network, the National Agent Assist Line responded to and resolved 268,730 calls in 2014/2015 to support agents in responding to client enquiries. This represents an increase of 43,779 calls over 2013/2014.

With the current telephony system at end-of-life, a new telephony platform that enables the leveraging of new technologies is critical for continued call centre modernization. Since 2013/2014, ESDC has been working closely with Shared Services Canada, the department responsible for acquiring a government-wide, hosted, subscription-based call centre telephony platform.

3.3 Employment Insurance Services for Employers

Service Canada works with employers to ensure that the EI program is administered fairly and efficiently. Through the Employer Contact Centre (ECC) and the Service Canada website, employers can access up-to-date information regarding the EI program to help them understand their responsibilities and learn about the various services available to them which include Record of Employment on the Web (ROE Web), Record of Employment Secure Automated Transfer (ROE SAT) as well as guidance and user guides.

3.3.1 Record of Employment

The ROE is the key document used to process EI benefits, and to determine EI entitlement, rate and claim duration. Employers are required to issue ROEs within a legislated timeframe for each employee affected by a work interruption. Each year, more than 1 million Canadian employers fill out more than 9 million ROE forms for their employees.

Launched in 2003, the electronic ROE (eROE), including ROE Web and ROE SAT, continue to be a major factor in advancing the automation of the EI program and help minimize errors, improve service to claimants and avoid lengthy delays as a result of manual interventions required for paper ROEs. ROE Web is a secure Web-based application that enables

[18] According to the National Policy on Levels of Decision, Level 2 decisions require the use of judgment and discretion, because the facts presented do not lead to a decision that is readily apparent.

employers to create, submit, amend, save and print eROEs. Employers have three different options to submit ROEs using ROE Web: the Online form, which allows users to submit ROEs one by one; an XML file that allows users to import a file from their payroll system which can contain up to 1,200 ROEs at a time; and the ROE Web Assistant, which is a new user friendly step-by-step component that guides users through the ROE completion process. The other eROE application, ROE SAT, is a secure communication line designed to allow employers or Payroll Service Providers to submit large volumes of ROEs simultaneously.

In 2014/2015, Service Canada undertook a strategic marketing campaign targeted to employers not using eROE, and contributed to an increase of 5.2 percentage points in electronic submissions, from 75.0% to 80.2% of 9.3 million ROE's over the previous fiscal year.[19]

The eROE is also a key tool to reduce the administrative burden, as employers no longer need to order or store paper ROE forms, retain copies on file, or send copies to Service Canada or their employees. Employers can also issue eROEs in alignment with pay cycles, amend them more easily than paper ROEs and submit hundreds of them in one transaction.

Enhancements made to ROE Web in 2014/2015 include:

- Version 2.0 of the XML Payroll Extract File was implemented. This version increases the quality of ROEs and reduces the need for employers to input a comment on the ROE thereby allowing for the automation of more EI claims.
- The ROE Web Assistant was launched in November 2014. The Assistant is a user friendly, intuitive, interview-style tool that improves services to employers. This feature was developed to assist new and occasional ROE Web users to become familiar with electronic submissions of ROEs. It contains step-by-step screens, help text and glossary, page-by-page validations and a summary of the ROE information entered by the employer. From November 2014 to March 2015, many employers availed themselves of this new feature, which resulted in the submission of 13,435 eROEs using the Assistant.

Chart 5

ROEs Issued

Source: EI Administrative data

[19] For regional breakdowns related to ROEs and ROE Web registrations, see Annex 4.4.

3.3.2 My Service Canada Business Account

ROE Web was the first application to start using online registration in the fall of 2013. Online registration is a service that enables ESDC to centralize and standardize online registration procedures and tools for business facing programs.

This service removes burdensome paper processes and enables identity validation to be done online rather than visiting an in-person Service Canada Centre (SCC).

By the end of 2014/2015, a total of 426,560 organizations had registered online, of which 37,179[20] were new ROE Web registrants. Service Canada continues to actively promote its eServices tools to reduce paper-based processes by participating in various conferences and tradeshows across the country, providing informational webinars, and meeting on a regular basis with key partners such as the Canadian Payroll Association and the Federal Government Relations Advisory Council.

3.3.3 Record of Employment and Accuracy of Reported Earnings by Firms

A supplemental study was conducted in 2014/2015 to examine the quality of record of employment (ROE) from 2005 to 2012. The study examined the characteristics of jobs that end in separations (i.e. job separation with and without an ROE), and insured earnings reported on the ROE in comparison to T4 data. The study found that approximately 30% of earnings interruptions are without an ROE during the studied period; this percentage decreased slightly until about 2008, and then remained relatively stable between 27.8% and 28.9% until 2012.

Furthermore, results show the highest percentage of earnings interruptions without an ROE (28.7%) are observed in the service sector, which could be attributable to a higher rate of employee turnover within the sector. The majority of those experiencing an earnings interruption without an ROE are not represented by a union (including professional association). In other words, a much higher proportion of non-unionized earnings interruptions are without an ROE (33.1%) compared with unionized jobs (13.1%).

Finally, results related to the accuracy of earnings, where the hours worked are within a calendar year and are no more than 26 weeks long, indicated that between 80% and 83% of ROEs have insured earnings that are consistent (+/- $2) with earnings reported on the relevant T4, and that greater differences between the reported ROE and T4 were observed in ROEs produced by government, large firms, and unionized jobs. Further details on the study can be found in Annex 6.

3.3.4 Employer Contact Centre

Launched in June 2011, the Employer Contact Centre (ECC) enhances service to employers by providing employer service offerings through an accessible, national, single point of contact. The three ECC sites are located in Vancouver, Bathurst and Sudbury.

The ECC currently provides support to employers for 7 service offerings:

- ROE advice and guidance;
- Paper ROE orders;
- ROE Web and Grants and Contributions Online Services (technical support);
- Report on Hirings (Data Gateway support);
- Work-sharing (Data Gateway support);
- Automated Earnings Reporting System (Data Gateway support);
- General information on the Temporary Foreign Worker Program (excluding the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program and jobs in Quebec, but including Live-In Caregivers in Quebec).

The ECC plays a key role in promoting ROE Web to employers for submitting their ROEs electronically. ROE Web marketing targeted at the employer community is implemented in collaboration with the ECC. Promotional materials and relevant campaign information are shared with the ECC to assist them in answering enquiries from employers interested in submitting electronic ROEs by registering for ROE Web.

[20] Some employers are located in the United States with employees in Canada, resulting in the small variances found in the totals as their data are not captured in the regional breakdown.

In 2014/2015, the ECC answered a total of 610,952 calls, compared with 554,207 in 2013/2014. The increase in the ECC volume corresponds to ministerial announcement and reforms for the Temporary Foreign Worker Program (TFWP) and multi-system release for My Service Canada Business Account to ROE Web. The top five reasons employers called the ECC to speak to an agent for assistance with a service were the same as in 2013/2014: to order paper ROE forms; guidance on completing/submitting a ROE; referrals (e.g. misdirected calls from employees); enquiries related to ROE Web; and, the TFWP.

The ECC continues to assess its client service model and the best way to support additional service offerings. To expand further, ECC will need to leverage an interactive voice response system which will be available through the migration to the new government wide call centre telephony platform.

3.4 Employment Insurance Requests for Reconsideration

EI clients who disagree with a decision related to a claim for benefits have the right to request a reconsideration of that decision within 30 days from the date the decision was communicated or such further time that the EI Commission may allow. A formal request for reconsideration of a Commission decision provides clients with a review of the decision, including the opportunity to submit new or additional information. The Commission will review its decision to ensure that it is based on the accurate interpretation of legislation, program policies and jurisprudence, and is supported by complete and correct information. The review is performed by a different adjudicator than the one who made the initial decision.

In 2014/2015, the Commission received 49,205 requests for reconsideration. The Commission aims to complete requests for reconsideration reviews within 30 days from receipt of the request. In 2014/2015, the average time for completion was 39 days, with 45% of requests completed within the 30 day target.

Requests for Reconsideration – 2014/2015 Results	
Requests received from claimants	47,870
Requests received from employers	1,225
Requests received from other clients*	110
Total requests received	49,205
Requests completed	50,388
Percentage of requests completed within 30 days	45.4%
Average time for completion (days)	39
Percentage of initial decisions reversed or adjusted following review	45%

* Other client: is any person who is subject to the decision of the Commission that is not a claimant or an employer.

The EI legislation allows clients to seek recourse on almost any decision related to a claim for benefits. While there are over 50 types of decisions or issues that can be subject to recourse, there are six issues that are most frequently challenged as shown in Chart 6. These issues generally involve a complete denial of benefits, such as a disqualification for voluntarily leaving employment without just cause, or a financial sanction for misrepresentation.

Chart 6

Issues Challenged through formal reconsideration

Source: EI administrative data

The introduction of the formal request for reconsideration provision in the EI legislation has been beneficial for clients. As part of this provision, the Commission introduced a mandatory client contact policy under which Service Canada Benefits Officers are required to directly communicate with the requestor to explain the reason for the initial decision and to gather or clarify any information that may lead to a reversal or an adjustment to the decision. The benefits of this new approach are reflected in not only the number of decision reversals or adjustments (45%), but especially in the low number of clients that proceed with an appeal to the Social Security Tribunal (Tribunal) when the reconsideration outcome is not favourable to the client.

In 2014/2015, there were only 3,560 clients who chose to appeal the Commission's request for reconsideration decision to the first level of appeal at the Tribunal-General Division. In comparison, under the previous recourse system, an annual average of 24,000 client appeals proceeded on to the first level of appeal (the Board of Referees). This change represents an 85% reduction in the number of appeals proceeding on to the first level of appeal at an independent decision-making body, or administrative tribunal. This would seem to indicate that most clients with concerns about the Commission's initial decision have their concerns addressed through this new recourse process (i.e. formal reconsideration).

Chart 7

EI First-level Appeals Received, 2012/2013 to 2014/2015

Note: With the implementation of the new Request for Reconsideration process for EI, the number of decisions appealed to the Social Security Tribunal is approximately 82% lower than what proceeded to the previous tribunal, the Board of Referees in 2012/2013.

Source: EI Administrative Data and Tribunal Administrative Data

3.4.1 Social Security Tribunal of Canada

The Social Security Tribunal (Tribunal) is an independent administrative tribunal that provides the appeals process under the *Employment Insurance Act*, the *Canada Pension Plan* and the *Old Age Security Act*. It operates at arm's length from the Department and the Commission.

The Tribunal includes two levels of appeals:

- The **General Division** (first level of appeal for clients) includes an EI Section for EI appeals and an Income Security Section for Canada Pension Plan and Old Age Security appeals.
- The **Appeal Division** (second level of appeal for clients; first level of appeal for the EI Commission and the Minister) decides appeals of decisions made by the General Division.

3.4.1.1 General Division – EI Section

Clients who disagree with the Commission's reconsideration decision have the right to appeal to the Tribunal-General Division. To appeal a reconsideration decision issued by the Commission, appellants must ensure that the Tribunal receives their appeal within 30 calendar days of receipt of the reconsideration decision. The Commission is required to provide the Tribunal with a copy of the information it relied on to reach its decision. A General Division member will review the information the Commission provided to the Tribunal, and any new or additional information provided by the appellant and other parties to the appeal.

The member must summarily dismiss an appeal if the member is satisfied it has no reasonable chance of success. If the appeal is not summarily dismissed, the Tribunal will send a notice of hearing to the parties.

The Tribunal must conduct proceedings as informally and as quickly as the circumstances and the considerations of fairness and natural justice permit. Members decide on the form of hearing based on the following criteria:

- The complexity of the issues under appeal;
- The gaps in the information in the file;
- Whether credibility will be an issue;
- The number of parties attending the hearing;
- The ability to accommodate the parties and participants; and
- The availability of the technology (videoconference) within a reasonable distance of the area where the appellant lives.

The Commission generally does not attend the hearing.

EI Appeals to the Social Security Tribunal - General Division – 2014/2015 Results

Appeals received including group appeals	3,560
Group appeals	515
Appeals concluded*	3,120
Average time for completion (days)	154
Percentage of appeals allowed (favourable to appellants)*	24.3%
Percentage of appeals summarily dismissed (no reasonable chance of success)*	6.2%

* Includes appeals transferred from the Board of Referees

On April 1, 2014 the Tribunal - General Division had 1,980 active appeals in its inventory. During 2014/2015 it received 3,560 appeals from claimants, employers and other clients, of which 515 were group appeals. During the same period the Tribunal concluded 3,120 cases, which included 35 cases transferred from the Board of Referees leaving an active inventory of 2,420 on March 31, 2015, of which 1,095 were group appeals.

Of the total concluded cases, 24.3% were deemed in favour of the appellant (a claimant, employer or other client). The overall average time to render a decision was 154 days. This average time includes the time to render decisions on the 515 cases that were parts of group appeals. It also includes appeals where added parties were involved, appeals where parties requested adjournments and appeals where more complex questions were at issue such as Charter cases. Delays also resulted from the challenges the Tribunal had to overcome in its first two years of operations such as not having the staff, systems and procedures in place to process the inventory of appeals transferred from legacy tribunals in a timely manner.

Chart 8

Issues Appealed to the Tribunal - General Division

Source: EI administrative data

The percentage of issues most frequently appealed to the Tribunal was generally very similar to those challenged through the request for reconsideration process. However, when the Tribunal receives a large group of appeals, the percentage of appeals for a specific issue can vary considerably because the volume of appeals at the Tribunal is much lower than the number of requests for reconsideration at the Commission. That was the case in 2014/2015, when a large group of appeals related to a labour dispute was filed at the Tribunal.

The Tribunal – General Division concluded the cases before them in various forms of hearing, which are as follows:

- Summary dismissals and withdrawals:
  - If a Member is satisfied that an appeal has no reasonable chance of success the appeal will be dismissed without a hearing.
- In-Person Hearing:
  - An oral hearing by personal appearance is when the Member and the parties are physically in the same hearing room.
- Telephone Hearing
  - An oral hearing by teleconference means that the parties will take part in the hearing by telephone.
- Videoconference Hearing:
  - An oral hearing by videoconference means that the parties will appear by videoconference before the Member who is in another location. Videoconferencing allows the parties to interact with the Member via simultaneous video and audio transmissions.

The following chart presents the prevalence of the different forms of hearing at the Tribunal-General Division in 2014/2015.

3.4.1.2 Appeal Division – EI Section

A party (i.e. a claimant, the Commission or an added party) may appeal a decision of the General Division to the Appeal Division within 30 days after the day on which the decision is communicated to the appellant. With the exception of appeals from summary dismissals discussed below, the first step is to file an application for leave to appeal, which means asking the Appeal Division for permission to appeal when the appellant is of the view that:

- The General Division failed to observe a principle of natural justice or otherwise acted beyond or refused to exercise its jurisdiction;
- The General Division erred in law in making its decision, whether or not the error appears on the face of the record; or
- The General Division based its decision on an erroneous finding of fact that it made in a perverse or capricious manner or without regard for the material before it.

If, when reviewing the General Division's decision and the applicant's request for leave to appeal form, the member believes that at least one of the grounds for appeal has a reasonable chance of success, the member will give permission for the appeal to go forward and parties will have 45 days to provide submissions regarding the appeal following which the member will make a decision on the appeal or if the member decides that a further hearing is required, send a notice of hearing to the parties.

Chart 9

Forms of Hearing at the Social Security Tribunal - General Division 2014/2015

Note: includes cases transferred from the Board of Referees
Source: Social Security Tribunal administrative data

The application form for leave to appeal can be found on the Tribunal's website. The Tribunal must receive the completed application form for leave to appeal within 30 days after the day on which the decision of the General Division is communicated to the appellant otherwise the party will have to ask for an extension of time to appeal. In no case may an application be made more than one year after the day on which the decision is communicated to the appellant. A party does not have to file an application for leave to appeal when appealing a decision of the General Division to summarily dismiss an appeal.

On April 1, 2014, the Tribunal – Appeal Division had 1,326 active appeals in its inventory. During 2014/2015 it received 427 appeals and concluded 652 cases resulting in an active inventory of 1,101 on March 31, 2015, of which 646 were from a group appeal.

EI Appeals to the Social Security Tribunal – Appeal Division 2014/2015 Results	
Total applications for leave to appeal and appeals received*	427
Total applications for leave to appeal and appeals completed	284
Applications for leave to appeal denied	195
Appeals withdrawn, dismissed or concluded for other reason	39
Appeals allowed (decision favourable to appellant)**	50

* An application for leave to appeal is not required when appealing a General Division decision to summarily dismiss an appeal. In 2014-15, there were 14 of these appeals received by the SST Appeal Division.

** An appellant to the Appeal Division can include a claimant, employer, representative of a claimant or employer and the EI Commission

EI Appeals that transferred from the Office of the Umpire 2014/2015 Results	
Total transferred appeals completed	368
Appeals withdrawn, dismissed or concluded for other reason	222
Appeals allowed (decision favourable to appellant)**	146

** An appellant to the Appeal Division can include a claimant, employer, representative of a claimant or employer and the EI Commission

The appeals that the Tribunal concluded in 2014/2015, included 368 cases transferred from the Office of the Umpire, (which supported the previous tribunal that was replaced by the Tribunal - Appeal Division

Chart 10

EI Second-level Appeals Received 2012/2013 to 2014/2015

Note: With the implementation of the new recourse process for EI, the number of decisions appealed to the second level of appeal, the Social Security Tribunal is approximately 74 % lower than what proceeded to the Umpire.

Source: EI administrative data and Social Security Tribunal administrative data

Chart 11

Forms of Hearing at the Social Security Tribunal - Appeal Division

Note: includes cases transferred from the Office of the Umpire.
Source: Social Security Tribunal adminstrative data.

The Tribunal – Appeal Division also concluded the cases before them in various forms of hearing. The following chart presents the prevalence of the different forms of hearing at the Tribunal-Appeal Division in 2014/2015.

The percentage of 55% of appeals concluded without a hearing includes decisions on appeals of summary dismissals and decisions on applications for leave to appeal.

3.4.1.3 Social Security Tribunal Service Standards

As published on the Tribunal's website (Social Security Tribunal Service Standards) starting on September 1, 2015, the Tribunal will implement the following service standards for the General and Appeal Divisions:

- General Division – EI Section - 85% of final decisions will be made within 90 days of the appeal being filed.
- Appeal Division – EI
  - Decisions on Leave to Appeal – 85% of decisions on leave to appeal will be made within 60 days from filing of leave application.
  - Final Decisions – where leave has been granted – 85% of final decisions will be made within 7 months from the date leave to appeal was granted.

The standards are applicable to the general caseloads. The service standards do not apply to exceptional cases which generally take more time such as group appeals in EI, Charter cases, late appeals, cases in abeyance, those with potential added parties, etc. As well, there may be valid reasons for the Tribunal not to meet the proposed standards in every case such as when requests for extension of time are granted to ensure that natural justice is respected. The service standards may be revised if there are changes to the conditions that existed at the time of their development.

3.4.1.4 Publication of Decision

A selection of decisions rendered by the Social Security Tribunal can be retrieved via the following sites:

- The Social Security Tribunal website
- The Canadian Legal Information Institute (CanLII)

4. Quality

National payment and processing accuracy reviews are conducted to assess the quality of Employment Insurance (EI) claims processing in order to identify areas for improvement, and where necessary, take remedial action. While the EI Payment Accuracy Review (PAAR) and the EI Processing Accuracy Review (PRAR) have distinct objectives, taken together, the two reviews provide important business intelligence to improve the processing and payment of EI benefits. EI PAAR and PRAR quality reports are generated on a monthly and yearly basis.

4.1 Payment and Processing Accuracy

4.1.1 Employment Insurance Payment Accuracy Review

The EI Payment Accuracy Review (EI PAAR) measures the accuracy of EI benefit payments. Over the last 15 years, the payment accuracy rate has been consistently maintained around the established 95%[21] target (error rate of 5%).[22] In addition to estimating the accuracy of EI benefit payments, the EI PAAR also determines the estimated "most likely" value (MLV) of incorrectly paid benefits (overpayments and underpayments) through statistical extrapolation.

The EI PAAR, using Monetary Unit Sampling, draws a random sample of 500 EI claims per year that are reviewed sequentially by two separate reviewers. Results from both reviews are compared to ensure the accuracy and the consistency of results among reviewers. The reviews provide detailed information on the nature of errors and the dollar value of unidentified errors at the time of adjudication. EI PAAR yields statistically valid results 19 times out of 20 with a margin of error of ±5%. Payment errors include overpayments and underpayments attributable to three sources: claimants, employers and Service Canada. EI PAAR results are used to improve program delivery. In addition, the Office of the Auditor General (OAG) uses EI PAAR results in its annual financial audit of the EI Account, which is reported each year as part of the Public Accounts of Canada.

From 2013/2014 to 2014/2015, payment accuracy was stable, although there were some variations in the component sources of payment error (Service Canada, Employer and Claimant).

Table 2 provides an overall summary of the estimated MLV of errors identified in the EI PAAR review by error rate and source of error.[23]

Table 2

EI PAAR - Estimated Extrapolated MLV of Errors and Estimated Error Rate, by Source

	2013/2014		2014/2015	
Total EI Benefit Payout	$16.1 billion		$16.3 billion	
EI Payment Accuracy Rate	95.4%		95.5%	
Estimated Mispayments*/ Estimated Error Rate	**Most Likely Value ($M)**	**Error Rate**	**Most Likely Value ($M)**	**Error Rate**
	$745.9	4.6%	$738.0	4.5%
Errors by source				
Employer	$278.1	1.7%	$206.1	1.3%
Claimant	$381.0	2.4%	$361.9	2.2%
Service Canada	$86.9	0.5%	$170.0	1.0%

* Mispayments are the sum of overpayments and underpayments.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC)

[21] The EI PAAR was launched in 1983 at the recommendation of the Office of the Auditor General (OAG). The accuracy target was set at 95% based on the results of two previous "payment accuracy" reviews: the first one conducted by the OAG in 1981 and the second one conducted by the Department in 1983. The results of these studies, and of the consultation work performed by the firm Clarkson Gordon, led senior officials to set the payment accuracy rate at 95%. The setting of target rates is under review.

[22] For more information on past accuracy rates to fiscal year 2010/11, see Annex 4.5.

[23] Error rate by source may not add to total error rate due to rounding.

The EI payment accuracy rate remained approximately the same as the previous years, at 95.4% (or 4.6% error rate) in 2013/2014 and 95.5% (or 4.5% error rate) in 2014/2015. The error rate and MLV of error attributable to Service Canada increased from 2013/2014 to 2014/2015. However, this was balanced by improvements in the Employer and Claimant error rate. It should be noted that all PAAR errors are inventoried, analyzed to support continuous improvement and are corrected.

The increase in the Service Canada error rate in 2014/2015 was the first increase since 2010/2011. The increase in the error rate is mainly due to clerical and processing errors. Although the frequency of these errors did not increase much in 2014/2015, the average value of the errors was significantly higher than in the previous fiscal year. Other types of Service Canada errors remained stable or declined. The long-term stability of the Service Canada error rate suggests a stable and effective processing environment, to which increased automation has likely been a contributing factor. Since Automated Claims Processing (ACP) was introduced in 2007, the processing accuracy rate for fully automated claims and/or decisions has steadily increased from 96.5% in 2007/2008 to 100% in 2010/2011.[24] For partially automated claims, the automated portion also achieved a 100% accuracy rate between 2010/11 and 2014/2015.

The Claimant error rate decreased marginally from 2.4% in 2013/2014 to 2.2% in 2014/2015. 2014/2015 provides the first opportunity to conduct year-over-year detailed analysis of Claimant errors. From 2013/2014 to 2014/2015, the monetary impact of the claimant error "failure to report earnings while in receipt of benefits" declined significantly, even with a slight increase in the frequency of this error. However, this was offset somewhat by small increases in other errors attributable to Claimants (Table 3). Despite the overall MLV decline, "failure to report earnings" continues to represent a significant portion of claimant errors (from 69.5% to 55.1% of MLV), in both the number of occurrences and the MLV of overpayments and underpayments.[25] "Failure to correctly report monies paid or payable by former employers while in receipt of benefits" (i.e. vacation, pay in lieu of notice) accounts for 5.1% of the MLV of claimant errors in 2014/2015, up from 3.4% in 2013/2014, while "Failure to report the refusal of a job, quitting a job or being dismissed from a job while in receipt of benefits" accounts for 36.1% of the MLV of claimant errors, up from 25.3%.

Table 3

Claimant Errors in EI PAAR

Claimant errors	2013/2014			2014/2015		
	Total MLV ($M)	# of Times Error Occurred	Error as % of Monetary Value	Total MLV ($M)	# of Times Error Occurred	Error as % of Monetary Value
Failure to report earnings	$264.9	40	69.5%	$199.3	43	55.1%
Failure to correctly report monies paid or payable by former employer while in receipt of benefits	$12.9	5	3.4%	$18.4	6	5.1%
Failure to report refusal of a job, quitting a job or being dismissed from a job while in receipt of benefits	$96.6	3	25.3%	$130.5	4	36.1%
Failure to provide sufficient information when filing a renewal application	$6.6	1	1.7%	$13.6	4	3.8%
Totals	**$381.0**	**49**	**100.0%**	**$361.9**	**57**	**100.0%**

Mispayments are the sum of overpayments and underpayments.

[24] As of April 2011, fully automated claims were excluded from the sample of EI claims reviewed as part of the Processing Accuracy Review program. Consequently, the EI Processing Accuracy Rate reflects the quality of claims that are partially automated and/or manually processed. This information was previously reported to the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills Development, Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities (HUMA) on May 1, 2014.

[25] Overpayments are amounts paid in excess of the correct benefit entitlement and underpayments are amounts that should have been paid to meet the correct benefit entitlement. This is deduced by reassessing eligibility for the sampled files.

The rate of employer errors decreased from 1.7% in 2013/2014 to 1.3% in 2014/2015. More Record of Employment (ROE)s were validated for 2014/2015 compared to 2013/2014 as there were more ROEs per claimant file. Specifically, there was an increase in files with at least three ROEs (from 57 to 77). For 2014/2015, eROEs accounted for nearly three-quarters of ROEs in the sample, a significant increase over the previous year when nearly two-thirds of ROEs in the sample were eROEs. For 2014/2015, paper ROEs continued to be nearly twice as likely to contain a monetary error (Table 4).

There was a marginal increase in the number of claimant files that contained a monetary error attributable to employers (Table 5). However, as shown in Table 2, the monetary impact of employer errors declined slightly.

In 2014/2015, the three most frequently occurring employer errors identified on ROEs accounted for 57.7% of all employer errors, approximately the same as in 2013/2014 (57.6%). They were in the following ROE blocks: "15B – Total insurable earnings", 15C – Insurable earnings by pay period and "17A – Vacation pay" (highlighted in Table 6). Errors on these three blocks have the potential to directly affect the calculation of EI payments as they cover total earnings and additional monies received.

Table 4

Monetary Accuracy of ROEs Validated as Part of the EI PAAR

		2013/2014		2014/2015	
		Count	Percentage By ROE Type	Count	Percentage By ROE Type
# of ROEs validated in the PAAR review	E-ROEs	503	65.1%	589	73.3%
	Paper ROEs	270	34.9%	214	26.7%
	Total	**773**	**100.0%**	**803**	**100.0%**
Incorrect E-ROEs		37	7.4%	30	5.1%
Incorrect Paper ROEs		38	14.1%	21	9.8%

Source: ESDC

Table 5

Comparison of Number of EI PAAR Files Containing Incorrect ROEs

	2013/2014		2014/2015	
	Count	Percentage of Total	Count	Percentage of Total
PAAR Files which Contain Incorrect ROEs	72	14.4%	79	15.8%

Source: ESDC

Table 6

ROE Block Errors Resulting in Monetary Errors from EI PAAR

	2014/2015				
	Total Value	Total MLV ($Millions)	Error as % of Monetary Value	# of Times Error Occurred	Error as % of Total Occurances
Block 6 - Pay period type incorrect	$764	$16.7	8.1%	9	8.7%
Block 10 - First day worked incorrect	$362	$5.8	2.8%	6	5.8%
Block 11 - Last day for which paid incorrect	$399	$7.9	3.8%	10	9.6%
Block 12 - Final pay period ending date incorrect	$128	$3.8	1.8%	5	4.8%
Block 15A - Total insurable hours incorrect	$2,402	$64.4	31.2%	3	2.9%
Block 15B - Total insurable earnings incorrect	$1,998	$32.4	15.7%	18	17.3%
Block 15C - Insurable earnings by pay period incorrect	$2,562	$47.9	23.2%	30	28.8%
Block 17A - Vacation pay incorrect	$695	$12.4	6.0%	12	11.5%
Block 17C - Other monies incorrect	$879	$12.0	5.8%	8	7.7%
ER did not issue an amended ROE when necessary	$249	$3.0	1.4%	3	2.9%
Totals	**$16,081**	**$206.1**	**100.0%**	**104**	**100.0%**

Source: ESDC

The relative impact of an ROE error can be shown by assessing the estimated MLV of ROE error in relation to how frequently the error occurs. As noted in Table 6, “Total insurable earnings incorrect,” “Total insurable earnings by pay period incorrect,” and “Vacation pay incorrect” are the most frequent errors. However, despite their low frequency of occurrence, errors in block “15A – Total insurable hours incorrect” have a disproportionately high MLV and account for the largest share of the total MLV of errors (31.2%). The top three errors in 2014/2015 represent 70.2% of the total MLV of employer errors, up from 52.9% in 2013/2014.

Service Canada is working to ensure continuous improvement of program delivery and to strengthen the integrity of its programs. For instance, Service Canada continues to monitor and analyze employer errors and is working to raise awareness within the employer community regarding the nature and value of these errors. Service Canada continues to follow up on the recommendations from the 2013/2014 detailed assessment of EI overpayments to improve the analysis of EI payment accuracy. It also seeks to better establish the root cause of errors to identify areas where additional training could be required and clarify policies and procedures by providing feedback to appropriate stakeholders.

4.1.2 Employment Insurance Processing Accuracy Review

The EI Processing Accuracy Review (EI PRAR) comprises a review of a random sample of approximately 18,500 initial, renewed and revised decisions per year. PRAR verifies that applications for benefits are adjudicated and calculated in accordance with national operational policies and procedures and estimates the rate of conformity with them. The Department implemented the quality monitoring

program in 2000/2001 to measure the percentage of initial claims "in order" (a claim was considered to be "in order" when all criteria relevant to the review of the claim were met). In 2005/2006, Service Canada set a national EI PRAR target of 80%.[26]
In 2014/2015, the processing accuracy rate[27] increased to 88.5% from 87.9% in 2013/2014, meeting its target this year and every year since 2007/2008. The PRAR remains an important means of ensuring that EI claims are processed consistently and that Canadians applying for EI benefits are receiving equitable outcomes across the country.

4.2 National Quality and Coaching Program for Call Centres

Implemented in 2008, the EI Specialized Call Centre's National Quality Assurance Program (NQAP) was established to ensure consistent, high quality service to clients through the regular monitoring and coaching of agents. In 2010, the NQAP evolved and the monitoring report methodology adjusted based upon the lessons learned after two years of operation. The NQAP further evolved and subsequently was transitioned to the National Quality and Coaching Program (NQCP) in order to support the introduction of the National Agent Assist Line (NAAL) in 2013. The NAAL is a resource available to call centre agents in which Business Expertise Advisors (BEAs) support agents in responding to client enquiries by providing advice and guidance, when required. Prior to the NAAL, Business Expertise advice and guidance was managed locally.

Implementing a national solution in managing calls received on the agent assist line further supports the government's focus on service delivery to Canadians.

The NQCP ensures call centre agents are monitored in a consistent manner and that clients receive high-quality service. Agent calls are monitored on an ongoing basis and regular feedback is provided to agents. Coaching and training plans are tailored to individual agents' needs. Additional monitoring is then done to ensure that agents continue to improve their performance. A statistically valid sample of calls in the EI network is monitored as part of the NQCP to ensure that agents provide accurate and complete information.

In 2014/2015, a total of 4,653 calls were monitored resulting in an overall quality score of 84%, surpassing the target of 80%. The quality score is comprised of the following elements:

- Accuracy and completeness, including fact finding with the client, client authentication, providing accurate and complete information and taking appropriate measures;
- Professionalism, including displaying patience, demonstrating confidence, language and vocabulary, voice quality, guiding the conversation and providing information in an organized manner; and,
- Promotion of other services and channels, including electronic service delivery.

Although the quality tool does not currently provide a breakdown for each element of the score, efforts to improve business intelligence related to quality monitoring and the various sub-elements are ongoing.

In order to maintain the integrity of the NQCP, national calibration sessions are held on a regular basis. Calibration is a crucial component of the program as it ensures that calls are evaluated with uniformity. The calibration session process involves BEAs listening to a call centre agent as a group. Following the call, they proceed to rate the call individually using the NQCP scoring grid. Once everyone has completed their evaluation, a facilitator will ask each participant to share his or her score to determine if all participants fall within the ±5% target band. The call is then discussed among the group and the facilitator ensures that everyone has an opportunity to provide feedback. The intent is to identify the variance that exists in the BEA team, particularly with respect to the way the BEA hear what is in the call and the way they rate it. As such, it ensures consistency in the interpretation and application of the call scoring grid and the element definitions among Business Expertise Advisors.

[26] Prior to 2005/2006, regions set their own quality rates. In setting the national rate, a target of 80% was seen as challenging yet realistic and achievable. The appropriateness of the 80% target has been reinforced by PRAR results that continue to hover around this target.

[27] For a regional breakdown of the processing accuracy rate, see Annex 4.5.

In addition to the quality program, a statistically valid sample of processing transactions (including those performed by processing and call centre agents) is assessed via the PRAR program to ensure that transactions are processed properly. In 2014/2015, the processing accuracy for EI call centre agents was 91.1%, well surpassing the target of 80%.

4.3 Insurability of Employment

The Minister of National Revenue is responsible for the administration of Part IV (Insurable Earnings and Collection of Premiums) of the *Employment Insurance Act*. This responsibility includes the issuance of rulings regarding the insurability of employment, the number of insurable hours and the amount of insurable earnings.

Service Canada requests rulings from the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) when a claim for EI benefits has been filed and the insurability of employment, the amount of insurable earnings or the number of insurable hours, is in question. Rulings are requested whenever necessary to ensure that a claimant receives the amount of EI benefits to which he or she is entitled. The CRA aims to issue a ruling within 15 calendar days when payment of a claim is pending and within 31 calendar days when payment is not pending. In 2014/2015, Service Canada requested 8,213 rulings from the CRA, an 11% decrease from 2013/2014.

5. Integrity

Canadians expect sound stewardship and accountability of the Employment Insurance (EI) program. The Department has well-established activities, processes, frameworks and tools in place to prevent, detect and manage error, abuse and fraud. Together, these strengthen the integrity of its programs and ensure operational and service compliance. Service Canada also places significant emphasis on the importance of protecting the information entrusted to it by Canadians.

5.1 Integrity Activities

The Integrity program in Service Canada focuses on detection activities using a variety of approaches. These include the Computer Post Audit, the Report on Hirings Program and Automated Earnings Reporting Systems, which help identify errors, omissions, fraud and abuse.

As part of the Connecting Canadians with Available Jobs initiative, Service Canada also carries out outreach and prevention activities, such as Claimant Information (CI) Sessions, which inform claimants about EI requirements and the consequences of abusing the EI system (e.g., penalties or prosecutions). In 2014/2015, Service Canada held over 10,000 CI Sessions, to which over 168,000 EI claimants were directed to attend. Claimants in receipt of regular or fishing benefits are identified and directed to CI sessions based upon local job-demand in their previous occupation and availability of work. These claimants are compared to a random sample of claimants with similar attributes who are not directed to information sessions (e.g. control group), thereby helping to determine the effectiveness of being directed to a CCAJ session. Attendance at these sessions is mandatory; however, claimants have an opportunity to reschedule. Should claimants not attend, or fail to provide evidence of participating in active job search, their EI benefits could be stopped.

During these sessions, claimants were provided with information on programs and services available to help them find suitable employment, as well as reminded of their rights and obligations and the consequences of misuse of the EI program. EI claimants directed into CI information sessions had on average one fewer week of benefits paid than those not directed to report and were approximately 1.3 times more likely to report having found work.

During this same year, Service Canada conducted close to 290,000 investigations into suspected error and fraud. The most common type of client error involved incorrectly declaring work and earnings. The most common type of misrepresentation (when client knowingly or unknowingly misrepresenting facts) included failing to declare work, earnings, or self-employment income; failing to declare periods when unavailable to work; and, failing to report absences from Canada.

Combined, these activities resulted in a total of $351 million in savings for the EI Operating Account (see Chart 12). These savings consist of recovered overpayments and associated penalties, as well as the discontinuation of future ineligible payments, benefitting both employee and employer premium payers alike through the reduction in the total cost of the EI program.

Chart 12

EI Total Savings from Integrity Activities*

* The numbers have been rounded to the nearest hundred thousand. The national amounts (Nat) have been caculated using the raw data.

** NIS: Cases dealing with unreported absences from Canada while on EI, as well as the Report on Hirings program, are centrally managed through Integrity's National Investigative Services (NIS) centre in Miramachi, NB

Source: EI administrative data.

There are several methods that Service Canada uses to recover funds from EI recipients who have been overpaid. These include automatic recovery of active EI benefit claims (full or an agreed upon partial deduction), voluntary cash payments or collection of the debt by the CRA through an agreed upon repayment schedule. Where the client is capable of paying but collection efforts have failed, Service Canada can recover monies owing through an income tax refund or income tax reversal, as well as through a garnishment of wages, other income or bank deposits. As a last resort, Service Canada can seek federal court certification where the court converts the money owing from an EI overpayment into a civil judgement debt, recoverable by seizure of assets.

5.2 Integrity Quality Initiatives

To support the achievement of its mandate to prevent, detect and manage fraud and abuse of the EI program, a national quality team helps ensure consistency in integrity investigation activities. Its work includes ensuring that every region has quality advisors and coordinators, incorporates quality management plans in business planning, and conducts consistent monitoring based on the Employment Insurance Act and national integrity procedures.

Overall, the accuracy of the Social Insurance Registry (SIR) is fundamental to all Social Insurance Number (SIN)-enabled programs, including the EI program, as accurately identifying clients is crucial to ensuring that benefits are paid to the correct and eligible individuals. The Social Insurance Number (SIN) program supports this effort through the use of strict quality management practices designed to ensure that clients applying for a SIN or updating their SIN records are properly identified. A review of updates performed in 2014/2015 concluded that 99.99% of SIN updates performed were free of critical errors (i.e., no multiple SINs were issued and no date of birth errors were made), compared to 99.98% achieved in 2013/2014, thus maintaining a high level of quality.

5.3 Risk Management

Enhancing program integrity is fundamental to delivering citizen-centred service, meeting the expectations of Canadian citizens, maintaining public trust and confidence in government, preventing and identifying incorrect payments including both under and overpayments.

In 2014/2015, Service Canada continued to use risk-based strategies to improve the overall integrity of the EI program and to ensure that correct payments were made to eligible claimants. As part of this activity, the Department has a robust risk analysis function to quantitatively and qualitatively assess program integrity risks, to better understand the root cause of mispayments and to develop appropriate mitigation strategies, including implementing additional controls when required, to address any identified vulnerabilities.

In 2014/2015, EI integrity risk management activities focused on completing the root cause analysis component of the EI Stewardship Review, along with predictive risk modelling. The root cause analysis was undertaken to identify the root cause of issues leading to incorrect payments in the EI Program due to external error, abuse and fraud. Results will serve to focus Departmental efforts on developing further mitigations focused on prevention through the use of predictive analytics and by embedding integrity interventions within the program design. Where benefit claims have been identified for investigation, predictive risk modelling has proven successful in identifying which of those cases pose a higher risk. In turn, this allows the Department to allocate integrity resources to higher risk cases, thereby helping to prioritize investigation activities, and minimize the investigation of EI claimants.

Annex 1

Key Labour Market Statistics

Annex 1.1 Key Labour Market Statistics – Concepts and Definitions 302

Annex 1.2 Labour Force.....303

Annex 1.3 Employment (by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, Educational Attainment, Industry, Employment Type, Class of Workers and Job Permanency).....304

Annex 1.4 Unemployment (by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, Educational Attainment, Industry, Reason for Unemployment and Duration of Unemployment) 307

Annex 1.5 Unemployment Rate (by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, Educational Attainment and Industry) 310

Annex 1.6 Duration of Unemployment (by Province, Gender and Age) 312

Annex 1.1 Key Labour Market Statistics – Concepts and Definitions

Chapter I and Annex 1 provide information on the labour force, employment, unemployment, participation rate, employment rate and unemployment rate. These concepts are defined below.

Labour Force

The **labour force** is comprised of those members of the civilian non-institutional population 15 years of age and over who were employed or unemployed during the Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey reference week.

Persons who are not in the labour force include those who were either unable to work or unavailable for work. They also include persons who were without work and who had neither actively looked for work in the past four weeks nor had a job to start within four weeks of the reference week.

Employment

Employed persons are those who, during the Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey reference week:

a) did any work at all at a job or business, that is, paid work in the context of an employer-employee relationship, or self-employment (it also includes persons who did unpaid family work, which is defined as unpaid work contributing directly to the operation of a farm, business or professional practice owned and operated by a related member of the same household); or

b) had a job but were not at work due to factors such as their own illness or disability, personal or family responsibilities, vacation or a labour dispute (this excludes persons not at work because they were on layoff or between casual jobs, and those who did not then have a job even if they had a job to start at a future date).

Unemployment

Unemployed persons are those who, during the Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey reference week:

a) were without work but had looked for work in the past four weeks (ending with the reference week) and were available for work;

b) were on temporary layoff due to business conditions, with an expectation of recall (either because they have a definite date to return to work or because they have an indication from their employer that they will be recalled in the future) and were available for work; or

c) had not actively looked for work in the past four weeks but had a job to start within four weeks from the reference week and were available for work.

Participation Rate

The **participation rate** is defined as the labour force expressed as a percentage of the population 15 years of age and over.

The participation rate for a particular group (province, gender, age, etc.) is the labour force in that group expressed as a percentage of the population 15 years of age and over for that group.

Employment Rate

The **employment rate** is defined as the number of employed persons expressed as a percentage of the population 15 years of age and over.

The employment rate for a particular group (province, gender, age, etc.) is the number employed in that group expressed as a percentage of the population 15 years of age and over for that group.

Unemployment Rate

The **unemployment rate** is defined as the number of unemployed persons expressed as a percentage of the labour force.

The unemployment rate for a particular group (province, gender, age, etc.) is the number unemployed in that group expressed as a percentage of the labour force for that group.

Sources: Statistics Canada, *Guide to the Labour Force Survey*, catalogue no. 71-543-G (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, Labour Statistics Division, 2015); and Statistics Canada, *Labour Force Information: Friday, December 4, 2015*, Catalogue no. 71-001-X (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, Labour Statistics Division, 2015).

Annex 1.2 Labour Force

	Labour Force Characteristics[1,2,3]														
	(000s of people)														Change (%)[4]
	1982/1983	1987/1988	1990/1991	1995/1996	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Population[5]	19,169.6	20,413.8	21,297.8	22,734.6	25,845.7	26,203.4	26,548.9	26,918.8	27,295.9	27,662.0	28,002.2	28,374.8	28,735.3	29,056.9	1.1
Labour Force	12,344.0	13,597.0	14,276.4	14,715.2	17,330.2	17,593.6	17,923.4	18,161.9	18,288.4	18,502.7	18,646.5	18,884.0	19,070.0	19,142.3	0.4
Employment	10,860.5	12,455.8	13,019.7	13,324.2	16,181.1	16,494.2	16,852.5	16,956.5	16,744.0	17,039.7	17,259.1	17,521.6	17,726.6	17,829.6	0.6
Unemployment	1,483.5	1,141.2	1,256.7	1,391.0	1,149.1	1,099.4	1,071.0	1,205.4	1,544.4	1,463.0	1,387.4	1,362.4	1,343.3	1,312.7	-2.3
	(%)														Change (% points)[6]
	1982/1983	1987/1988	1990/1991	1995/1996	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Participation Rate	64.4	66.6	67.0	64.7	67.1	67.2	67.5	67.5	67.0	66.9	66.6	66.6	66.4	65.9	-0.5
Employment Rate	56.7	61.0	61.1	58.6	62.6	63.0	63.5	63.0	61.4	61.6	61.6	61.8	61.7	61.4	-0.3
Unemployment Rate	12.0	8.4	8.8	9.5	6.6	6.3	6.0	6.6	8.5	7.9	7.4	7.2	7.0	6.9	-0.1

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 The years reviewed in this annex prior to 2005/2006 correspond to the last year of periods of recession in Canada observed in recent history (1982/1983 and 1990/1991) and the fifth year of economic recovery following these periods of recession (1987/1988 and 1995/1996) in order to compare economic conditions.

2 Fiscal year data in this annex are the annual average of unadjusted monthly estimates produced by Statistics Canada. Data are rounded by Statistics Canada (in CANSIM) using the round-to-nearest-even method. When the number being rounded is followed by a number larger than five, the number being rounded is increased by one unit (e.g. 4.46 rounded to one decimal equals 4.5); when the number being rounded is followed by a number less than five, the number being rounded is left unchanged (e.g. 4.44 rounded to one decimal equals 4.4); when the number being rounded is followed by the number five, the number being rounded is increased by one unit if it is odd (e.g. 4.15 rounded to one decimal equals 4.2) and left unchanged if it is even (e.g. 4.45 rounded to one decimal equals 4.4).

3 In January 2016, Statistics Canada made a revision to its Labour Force Survey estimates. As a result, key labour market statistics for years prior to 2014/2015 reported in previous *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Reports* have been restated to reflect this change.

4 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

5 Number of working-age persons, 15 years of age and older.

6 Percentage point difference between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0087.

Annex 1.3 Employment (by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, Educational Attainment, Industry, Employment Type, Class of Workers and Job Permanency)

	Employment[1,2,3] (000s of people)														Change (%)[4]
	1982/1983	1987/1988	1990/1991	1995/1996	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory															
Newfoundland and Labrador	180.0	192.8	206.9	192.9	211.9	215.7	218.6	219.7	215.9	226.3	233.6	243.0	241.8	237.1	-1.9
Prince Edward Island	46.9	53.5	54.7	57.8	67.7	68.4	68.5	68.4	68.9	69.8	72.1	74.0	73.9	73.9	0.0
Nova Scotia	320.0	363.2	385.8	376.5	441.7	443.2	447.7	452.2	448.8	452.2	454.5	456.6	450.8	447.9	-0.6
New Brunswick	247.4	283.5	300.4	307.3	348.6	350.8	359.4	360.8	359.5	357.6	354.4	353.4	355.6	352.9	-0.8
Quebec	2,619.0	3,044.2	3,128.7	3,140.7	3,711.8	3,760.6	3,862.7	3,871.6	3,866.8	3,955.2	3,970.2	4,034.2	4,062.3	4,065.5	0.1
Ontario	4,169.6	4,953.9	5,137.9	5,111.6	6,397.6	6,477.8	6,569.4	6,574.8	6,436.1	6,574.4	6,669.9	6,729.1	6,842.3	6,886.0	0.6
Manitoba	459.4	506.2	510.9	517.2	577.7	585.0	594.9	602.1	601.3	611.3	612.8	625.4	623.9	630.0	1.0
Saskatchewan	429.6	462.5	453.6	456.1	480.5	497.1	506.8	521.2	526.6	532.4	537.2	554.4	566.0	571.4	1.0
Alberta	1,149.5	1,198.2	1,279.4	1,373.6	1,837.9	1,936.0	2,007.1	2,056.7	2,022.1	2,037.5	2,117.1	2,187.5	2,239.5	2,286.0	2.1
British Columbia	1,239.0	1,398.0	1,561.4	1,790.5	2,105.6	2,159.5	2,217.3	2,229.1	2,198.2	2,223.0	2,237.3	2,264.0	2,270.5	2,279.0	0.4
Yukon[5]	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	17.1	17.2	17.5	17.8	17.1	18.2	19.4	19.3	19.4	19.8	2.1
Northwest Territories[5]	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	22.8	23.2	23.0	22.3	20.8	22.0	23.0	23.1	23.1	22.0	-4.8
Nunavut[5]	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	7.9	9.0	10.1	10.7	10.9	11.6	11.8	12.2	12.7	12.4	-2.4
Gender															
Men	6,359.5	7,084.2	7,217.3	7,275.0	8,607.4	8,720.8	8,887.0	8,911.4	8,699.7	8,906.8	9,046.0	9,159.0	9,272.8	9,344.7	0.8
Women	4,501.0	5,371.7	5,802.4	6,049.2	7,573.7	7,773.4	7,965.4	8,045.2	8,044.3	8,132.9	8,213.1	8,362.6	8,453.9	8,485.0	0.4
Age															
15 to 24 Years (Youth)	2,527.5	2,585.2	2,353.9	2,086.0	2,498.2	2,556.7	2,614.3	2,591.6	2,431.3	2,446.0	2,461.8	2,452.2	2,474.2	2,488.6	0.6
25 to 54 Years	7,116.4	8,615.9	9,388.0	9,978.7	11,433.9	11,564.1	11,690.3	11,700.9	11,522.9	11,628.8	11,707.8	11,819.8	11,847.5	11,832.7	-0.1
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	1,216.6	1,254.8	1,277.8	1,259.5	2,249.0	2,373.3	2,547.9	2,664.0	2,789.8	2,965.0	3,089.5	3,249.6	3,405.0	3,508.3	3.0
Educational Attainment															
Less than High School[6]	Not available	Not available	3,439.0	2,689.8	2,221.0	2,237.1	2,180.7	2,125.8	1,950.6	1,864.0	1,847.6	1,818.3	1,747.9	1,676.2	-4.1
High School Diploma[7]	Not available	Not available	4,239.3	4,135.3	4,733.2	4,719.2	4,834.0	4,822.3	4,733.6	4,725.0	4,774.9	4,722.8	4,808.5	4,809.5	0.0
Post-secondary Certificate or Diploma[8]	Not available	Not available	3,434.1	4,080.9	5,575.9	5,709.8	5,911.2	5,927.1	5,918.9	6,112.8	6,185.3	6,296.0	6,332.7	6,396.7	1.0
University Degree[9]	Not available	Not available	1,907.2	2,418.3	3,651.0	3,828.0	3,926.6	4,081.3	4,140.9	4,337.9	4,451.3	4,684.6	4,837.5	4,947.2	2.3
Industry															
Goods-producing Industries	**3,311.5**	**3,671.1**	**3,683.5**	**3,460.1**	**3,988.2**	**3,980.4**	**3,964.2**	**3,932.2**	**3,701.5**	**3,747.2**	**3,809.2**	**3,892.7**	**3,913.8**	**3,888.8**	**-0.6**
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	Not available	566.0	550.2	535.6	440.8	431.6	418.4	402.3	391.3	377.7	372.7	378.6	381.2	368.4	-3.4
Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction	Not available	187.4	190.0	174.4	221.4	252.6	258.9	264.1	245.1	257.2	279.3	295.8	304.0	302.3	-0.6
Utilities	122.1	116.8	142.7	123.8	123.3	123.3	141.2	147.1	142.5	140.7	135.6	133.1	137.5	136.2	-0.9
Construction	629.2	742.3	796.4	720.4	1,039.2	1,076.8	1,152.6	1,232.4	1,190.3	1,256.4	1,304.0	1,334.2	1,372.2	1,376.1	0.3
Manufacturing	1,827.1	2,058.7	2,004.2	1,905.9	2,163.5	2,096.1	1,993.0	1,886.3	1,732.3	1,715.1	1,717.6	1,751.0	1,718.8	1,705.9	-0.8

Continued on next page...

Annex 1.3 Employment (by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, Educational Attainment, Industry, Employment Type, Class of Workers and Job Permanency) *(Continued)*

	Employment[1,2,3]														
	(000s of people)														Change (%)[4]
	1982/1983	1987/1988	1990/1991	1995/1996	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Industry															
Services-producing Industries	**7,549.0**	**8,784.8**	**9,336.2**	**9,864.2**	**12,192.9**	**12,513.8**	**12,888.3**	**13,024.3**	**13,042.5**	**13,292.5**	**13,449.8**	**13,628.9**	**13,812.9**	**13,940.8**	**0.9**
Wholesale Trade	Not available	420.6	420.0	437.5	606.4	603.5	626.0	630.2	618.1	631.6	619.6	612.9	603.5	634.9	5.2
Retail Trade	Not available	1,589.0	1,661.2	1,648.5	1,978.8	2,024.5	2,052.1	2,041.6	2,026.1	2,057.7	2,050.5	2,058.3	2,115.3	2,094.2	-1.0
Transportation and Warehousing	588.7	641.0	641.2	664.4	799.8	801.7	830.6	847.3	814.8	823.6	850.9	865.6	888.1	899.2	1.2
Finance and Insurance	Not available	543.0	596.2	594.3	704.6	736.6	747.7	762.4	754.4	761.6	747.9	755.6	770.3	785.4	2.0
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	Not available	231.8	259.7	257.1	283.6	302.8	304.2	296.5	317.4	310.2	323.3	310.4	313.0	299.1	-4.4
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	384.0	501.8	586.3	680.5	1,055.3	1,080.3	1,143.0	1,168.2	1,158.3	1,232.0	1,273.7	1,269.2	1,323.5	1,337.2	1.0
Business, Building and Other Support Services[10]	213.6	271.3	315.0	405.1	656.1	688.0	701.1	696.7	684.6	694.6	691.6	712.2	741.7	740.1	-0.2
Educational Services	697.6	791.2	843.3	923.7	1,125.8	1,160.1	1,172.0	1,155.5	1,158.8	1,164.3	1,178.6	1,218.9	1,223.5	1,253.7	2.5
Health Care and Social Assistance	973.0	1,168.8	1,293.5	1,393.9	1,726.0	1,797.9	1,849.3	1,909.7	1,979.6	2,054.8	2,096.8	2,158.3	2,192.9	2,235.3	1.9
Information, Culture and Recreation[11]	438.3	510.5	509.0	571.9	730.2	745.3	775.3	740.1	752.1	769.7	767.1	758.3	759.0	754.2	-0.6
Accommodation and Food Services	612.1	719.1	764.7	825.9	999.8	1,035.4	1,070.2	1,098.0	1,073.5	1,102.6	1,152.2	1,174.0	1,177.2	1,212.7	3.0
Other Services (except Public Administration)	518.9	626.8	602.2	650.2	690.8	702.4	733.5	767.2	780.8	771.0	778.9	803.0	796.6	784.4	-1.5
Public Administration	718.0	769.7	844.0	811.2	835.7	835.2	883.4	910.8	924.1	918.9	918.6	932.2	908.4	910.3	0.2

Continued on next page...

Annex 1.3 Employment (by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, Educational Attainment, Industry, Employment Type, Class of Workers and Job Permanency) *(Continued)*

	Employment[1,2,3]														
	(000s of people)														Change (%)[4]
	1982/1983	1987/1988	1990/1991	1995/1996	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Employment Type															
Full-time Employment[12]	9,093.2	10,379.8	10,780.1	10,802.1	13,207.0	13,493.5	13,772.5	13,778.4	13,515.2	13,693.1	13,953.7	14,201.8	14,335.2	14,398.0	0.4
Part-time Employment[13]	1,767.2	2,076.0	2,239.6	2,522.1	2,974.1	3,000.7	3,080.0	3,178.2	3,228.8	3,346.6	3,305.4	3,319.8	3,391.4	3,431.7	1.2
Class of workers															
Employees	**9,362.4**	**10,737.4**	**11,169.9**	**11,217.3**	**13,653.0**	**13,983.2**	**14,238.6**	**14,295.8**	**14,042.1**	**14,369.7**	**14,595.7**	**14,830.6**	**14,998.9**	**15,091.6**	**0.6**
Public Sector Employees	2,493.2	2,646.9	2,759.0	2,737.4	3,134.2	3,181.6	3,314.7	3,364.8	3,389.7	3,441.5	3,472.4	3,526.7	3,542.5	3,555.3	0.4
Private Sector Employees	6,869.2	8,090.5	8,410.8	8,479.9	10,518.8	10,801.6	10,924.0	10,931.1	10,652.4	10,928.1	11,123.3	11,303.9	11,456.4	11,536.4	0.7
Self-employed	**1,498.1**	**1,718.5**	**1,849.8**	**2,106.9**	**2,528.0**	**2,511.0**	**2,613.8**	**2,660.7**	**2,701.9**	**2,670.0**	**2,663.4**	**2,691.1**	**2,727.7**	**2,738.0**	**0.4**
Job Permanency															
Employees	**9,362.4**	**10,737.4**	**11,169.9**	**11,217.3**	**13,653.0**	**13,983.2**	**14,238.6**	**14,295.8**	**14,042.1**	**14,369.7**	**14,595.7**	**14,830.6**	**14,998.9**	**15,091.6**	**0.6**
Permanent Employees[14]	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	11,847.7	12,153.3	12,419.3	12,548.9	12,245.8	12,444.1	12,593.3	12,804.8	12,997.8	13,067.2	0.5
Temporary Employees[15]	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	1,805.3	1,829.9	1,819.3	1,746.9	1,796.3	1,925.6	2,002.4	2,025.7	2,001.2	2,024.4	1.2
Canada	**10,860.5**	**12,455.8**	**13,019.7**	**13,324.2**	**16,181.1**	**16,494.2**	**16,852.5**	**16,956.5**	**16,744.0**	**17,039.7**	**17,259.1**	**17,521.6**	**17,726.6**	**17,829.6**	**0.6**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 The years reviewed in this annex prior to 2005/2006 correspond to the last year of periods of recession in Canada observed in recent history (1982/1983 and 1990/1991) and the fifth year of economic recovery following these periods of recession (1987/1988 and 1995/1996) in order to compare economic conditions.

2 Fiscal year data in this annex are the annual average of unadjusted monthly estimates produced by Statistics Canada. Data are rounded by Statistics Canada (in CANSIM) using the round-to-nearest-even method. When the number being rounded is followed by a number larger than five, the number being rounded is increased by one unit (e.g. 4.46 rounded to one decimal equals 4.5); when the number being rounded is followed by a number less than five, the number being rounded is left unchanged (e.g. 4.44 rounded to one decimal equals 4.4); when the number being rounded is followed by the number five, the number being rounded is increased by one unit if it is odd (e.g. 4.15 rounded to one decimal equals 4.2) and left unchanged if it is even (e.g. 4.45 rounded to one decimal equals 4.4).

3 In January 2016, Statistics Canada made a revision to its Labour Force Survey estimates. As a result, key labour market statistics for years prior to 2014/2015 reported in previous *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Reports* have been restated to reflect this change.

4 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

5 Data specific to territories come from special tabulations provided by Statistics Canada and therefore are not included in the official total for Canada. Data in other categories (i.e. data by gender, age, educational attainment, industry, employment type, class of workers and job permanency) also excludes territorial data.

6 Includes zero to eight years of education and some high school.

7 Includes high school graduation and some post-secondary education (not completed).

8 Includes certificates (including trade certificates) or diplomas from an educational institution beyond the secondary level, which comprise certificates from a vocational school, apprenticeship training, community college, collège d'enseignement général et professionnel (cégep) and school of nursing. Also included are certificates below a bachelor's degree obtained at a university.

9 Includes at least a university bachelor's degree.

10 This industry combines codes 55 (management of companies and enterprises) and 56 (administrative and support, waste management and remediation services) from the North American Industry Classification System.

11 This industry combines codes 51 (information and cultural industries) and 71 (arts, entertainment and recreation) from the North American Industry Classification System.

12 Full-time employment consists of persons who usually work 30 hours or more per week at their main or only job.

13 Part-time employment consists of persons who usually work less than 30 hours per week at their main or only job.

14 A permanent job is one that is expected to last as long as the employee wants it, if business conditions permit—that is, there is no predetermined end date.

15 A temporary job has a predetermined end date or will end as soon as a specified project is completed. This category includes seasonal jobs; temporary, term or contract jobs, including work done through a temporary help agency; casual jobs; and other temporary work.

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Tables 282-0003 (for data by educational attainment), 282-0007 (for data by industry), 282-0011 (for data by class of workers), 282-0079 (for data by job permanency) and 282-0087 (for data specific to provinces, by gender, age and employment type), and special tabulations (for data specific to territories).

Annex 1.4 Unemployment (by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, Educational Attainment, Industry, Reason for Unemployment and Duration of Unemployment)

	Unemployment[1,2,3]														
	(000s of people)														Change (%)[4]
	1982/1983	1987/1988	1990/1991	1995/1996	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory															
Newfoundland and Labrador	37.3	40.6	43.7	42.8	38.5	36.7	32.8	35.7	40.1	36.4	33.6	33.4	31.8	32.7	2.8
Prince Edward Island	7.0	7.7	9.6	10.0	8.5	8.2	7.7	8.9	8.8	9.2	9.0	9.3	9.6	8.6	-10.4
Nova Scotia	49.9	46.4	47.3	51.2	39.2	37.7	38.7	38.9	46.6	48.1	43.6	47.3	44.3	43.7	-1.4
New Brunswick	42.4	41.8	41.2	38.6	36.7	31.4	30.2	34.1	34.2	37.2	37.6	41.3	39.6	39.5	-0.3
Quebec	453.7	327.8	386.9	399.8	335.0	323.6	294.6	319.4	359.7	339.1	344.8	329.8	337.2	334.5	-0.8
Ontario	505.7	303.4	397.6	493.0	446.4	438.8	445.1	505.6	655.9	606.9	564.5	575.0	555.0	531.1	-4.3
Manitoba	47.1	40.6	42.7	40.2	27.5	26.7	27.0	27.6	33.8	35.0	35.8	34.0	36.6	36.0	-1.6
Saskatchewan	32.4	36.9	34.7	34.4	25.9	22.6	22.4	22.8	27.3	30.2	27.2	25.9	24.9	23.8	-4.4
Alberta	116.6	118.4	98.5	114.9	72.0	70.2	73.3	87.4	149.7	135.5	117.9	102.2	107.8	117.3	8.8
British Columbia	191.4	177.7	154.5	166.1	119.4	103.5	99.1	124.9	188.3	185.5	173.6	164.1	156.7	145.5	-7.1
Yukon[5]	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	0.9	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.5	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.1	0.9	-18.2
Northwest Territories[5]	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.3	1.6	1.7	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9	-5.0
Nunavut[5]	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.5	1.7	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.1	1.9	-9.5
Gender															
Men	896.5	620.4	712.6	790.0	631.6	607.1	598.8	700.7	926.1	829.0	769.3	756.5	753.5	740.2	-1.8
Women	587.0	520.8	544.1	601.0	517.5	492.3	472.2	504.6	618.3	634.0	618.1	605.9	589.8	572.5	-2.9
Age															
15 to 24 Years (Youth)	610.9	367.4	363.7	369.1	346.9	332.8	327.8	366.2	449.6	419.6	409.1	409.6	391.9	383.9	-2.0
25 to 54 Years	778.0	688.5	811.6	921.0	682.1	638.3	616.0	686.2	898.0	840.9	774.2	750.0	735.8	716.0	-2.7
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	94.6	85.4	81.5	100.8	120.1	128.3	127.2	153.0	196.8	202.5	204.0	202.8	215.6	212.8	-1.3
Educational Attainment															
Less than High School[6]	Not available	Not available	528.1	477.1	312.1	313.4	297.2	314.0	373.9	348.8	329.3	315.4	296.7	264.4	-10.9
High School Diploma[7]	Not available	Not available	392.0	436.1	353.3	329.2	323.2	377.1	498.2	464.1	433.1	421.7	426.4	431.0	1.1
Post-secondary Certificate or Diploma[8]	Not available	Not available	258.4	351.1	312.4	304.4	300.0	330.4	442.1	414.1	393.8	379.6	381.3	366.2	-4.0
University Degree[9]	Not available	Not available	78.2	126.8	171.4	152.4	150.6	183.9	230.1	235.9	231.2	245.7	238.9	251.1	5.1
Industry[10]															
Goods-producing Industries	**515.1**	**315.2**	**415.2**	**325.0**	**259.7**	**262.0**	**249.5**	**308.8**	**389.6**	**293.6**	**256.5**	**253.5**	**262.6**	**253.2**	**-3.6**
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	Not available	49.4	46.1	45.5	38.6	33.6	32.4	34.2	35.4	34.3	31.4	31.9	30.2	28.0	-7.4
Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction	Not available	14.1	14.3	12.8	9.1	10.4	11.0	16.1	24.0	12.4	11.5	15.4	15.3	19.5	27.5
Utilities[11]	5.5	3.0	3.7	4.3	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.7	4.1	2.9	3.2	3.5	2.4	3.3	37.5
Construction	153.3	102.9	160.5	125.5	80.1	86.7	80.6	106.6	146.0	128.4	111.9	108.5	122.1	118.2	-3.2
Manufacturing	268.3	146.0	190.7	136.9	129.7	129.2	123.3	149.4	180.4	115.6	98.7	94.4	92.9	84.4	-9.1

Continued on next page...

Annex 1.4 Unemployment (by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, Educational Attainment, Industry, Reason for Unemployment and Duration of Unemployment) *(Continued)*

	Unemployment[1,2,3]														
	(000s of people)														Change (%)[4]
	1982/1983	1987/1988	1990/1991	1995/1996	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Industry[10]															
Services-producing Industries	**641.1**	**555.9**	**602.3**	**598.1**	**517.2**	**490.5**	**498.8**	**547.3**	**685.9**	**628.1**	**584.6**	**581.5**	**566.3**	**562.7**	**-0.6**
Wholesale Trade	Not available	22.0	31.1	26.6	23.8	21.7	21.0	24.5	29.6	25.3	23.6	24.6	22.7	20.7	-8.8
Retail Trade	Not available	109.1	126.4	112.4	95.8	85.2	94.2	105.0	135.5	120.9	113.4	105.1	101.9	99.2	-2.6
Transportation and Warehousing	54.6	39.3	44.3	41.6	27.3	30.9	28.7	34.5	48.4	40.0	33.8	33.7	38.2	33.1	-13.4
Finance and Insurance	Not available	16.5	19.3	17.8	15.2	12.0	12.4	12.4	21.6	16.9	15.3	15.6	14.7	16.8	14.3
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	Not available	12.2	14.6	11.5	9.9	8.6	8.8	9.7	13.4	11.2	12.2	9.3	9.4	9.3	-1.1
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	31.7	24.0	30.4	36.2	33.3	32.0	31.7	35.6	52.3	41.4	40.9	41.3	46.5	44.4	-4.5
Business, Building and Other Support Services[12]	36.4	37.5	45.7	48.9	61.4	59.0	59.1	69.0	80.7	75.0	63.9	63.1	63.9	69.3	8.5
Educational Services	30.1	32.5	32.2	40.4	38.0	39.4	44.1	40.5	49.0	49.6	46.7	49.8	47.0	45.3	-3.6
Health Care and Social Assistance	46.2	46.1	42.5	50.0	35.8	32.5	33.0	34.0	40.8	47.1	40.3	45.3	43.2	46.8	8.3
Information, Culture and Recreation[13]	39.6	34.0	37.6	44.1	42.8	40.9	39.1	45.2	49.4	53.6	51.2	50.2	44.8	43.7	-2.5
Accommodation and Food Services	101.0	89.3	92.1	83.8	81.9	77.0	79.0	86.7	100.1	91.6	86.3	87.4	81.6	80.9	-0.9
Other Services (except Public Administration)	53.7	47.4	47.8	46.6	28.6	28.8	27.1	31.9	42.6	33.1	31.9	32.8	31.2	32.3	3.5
Public Administration	46.2	45.9	38.4	38.2	23.4	22.6	20.5	18.3	22.4	22.5	25.1	23.4	21.2	20.6	-2.8
Unclassified Industries[14]	**327.4**	**270.2**	**239.3**	**467.8**	**372.2**	**347.0**	**322.7**	**349.3**	**468.9**	**541.3**	**546.2**	**527.4**	**514.4**	**496.9**	**-3.4**

Continued on next page...

Annex 1.4 Unemployment (by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, Educational Attainment, Industry, Reason for Unemployment and Duration of Unemployment) *(Continued)*

	Unemployment[1,2,3]														
	(000s of people)														Change (%)[4]
	1982/1983	1987/1988	1990/1991	1995/1996	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Reason for Unemployment															
People who have left their job	261.8	275.2	294.0	221.8	254.8	253.5	258.9	266.6	277.4	257.9	253.2	250.9	240.5	244.2	1.5
People who have lost their job	894.4	595.9	723.5	701.3	522.1	499.0	489.3	589.5	798.1	663.8	588.0	584.1	588.4	571.6	-2.9
People who have not worked in the last year or who have never worked	327.4	270.2	239.2	467.8	372.2	346.9	322.7	349.3	468.9	541.3	546.2	527.4	514.4	496.9	-3.4
Duration of Unemployment[15]															
1 to 4 Weeks	367.5	331.8	375.0	362.6	434.0	435.9	431.1	479.7	493.1	466.4	464.2	459.9	440.8	443.4	0.6
5 to 13 Weeks	418.0	306.9	363.8	364.4	318.5	304.7	292.3	337.4	428.6	386.1	362.0	359.9	361.5	355.5	-1.7
14 to 26 Weeks	332.7	218.4	255.1	257.4	169.7	148.9	149.7	174.2	284.4	239.9	213.9	219.6	214.6	204.6	-4.7
27 to 51 Weeks	216.0	142.0	145.2	150.5	72.0	63.8	67.2	74.1	146.8	133.2	109.2	98.7	105.4	98.5	-6.5
52 Weeks or More	120.0	113.0	88.8	221.2	101.0	88.3	75.0	82.0	133.5	177.5	181.7	165.8	164.1	158.8	-3.2
Duration Unknown[16]	29.2	29.0	28.9	34.7	54.0	57.9	55.6	58.1	57.9	59.9	56.4	58.4	56.9	52.0	-8.6
Canada	**1,483.5**	**1,141.2**	**1,256.7**	**1,391.0**	**1,149.1**	**1,099.4**	**1,071.0**	**1,205.4**	**1,544.4**	**1,463.0**	**1,387.4**	**1,362.4**	**1,343.3**	**1,312.7**	**-2.3**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 The years reviewed in this annex prior to 2005/2006 correspond to the last year of periods of recession in Canada observed in recent history (1982/1983 and 1990/1991) and the fifth year of economic recovery following these periods of recession (1987/1988 and 1995/1996) in order to compare economic conditions.

2 Fiscal year data in this annex are the annual average of unadjusted monthly estimates produced by Statistics Canada. Data are rounded by Statistics Canada (in CANSIM) using the round-to-nearest-even method. When the number being rounded is followed by a number larger than five, the number being rounded is increased by one unit (e.g. 4.46 rounded to one decimal equals 4.5); when the number being rounded is followed by a number less than five, the number being rounded is left unchanged (e.g. 4.44 rounded to one decimal equals 4.4); when the number being rounded is followed by the number five, the number being rounded is increased by one unit if it is odd (e.g. 4.15 rounded to one decimal equals 4.2) and left unchanged if it is even (e.g. 4.45 rounded to one decimal equals 4.4).

3 In January 2016, Statistics Canada made a revision to its Labour Force Survey estimates. As a result, key labour market statistics for years prior to 2014/2015 reported in previous *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Reports* have been restated to reflect this change.

4 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

5 Data specific to territories come from special tabulations provided by Statistics Canada and therefore are not included in the official total for Canada. Data in other categories (i.e. data by gender, age, educational attainment, industry, reason for unemployment and duration of unemployment) also excludes territorial data.

6 Includes zero to eight years of education and some high school.

7 Includes high school graduation and some post-secondary education (not completed).

8 Includes certificates (including trade certificates) or diplomas from an educational institution beyond the secondary level, which comprise certificates from a vocational school, apprenticeship training, community college, collège d'enseignement général et professionnel (cégep) and school of nursing. Also included are certificates below a bachelor's degree obtained at a university.

9 Includes at least a university bachelor's degree.

10 Information is provided for the last job held, providing the person worked within the previous twelve months.

11 Monthly data that are confidential under the *Statistics Act* are excluded from the calculation of the annual average.

12 This industry combines codes 55 (management of companies and enterprises) and 56 (administrative and support, waste management and remediation services) from the North American Industry Classification System.

13 This industry combines codes 51 (information and cultural industries) and 71 (arts, entertainment and recreation) from the North American Industry Classification System.

14 People who have not worked in the last year or who have never worked are not classified in any industry.

15 Duration of unemployment is the number of continuous weeks during which a person has been without work and is looking for work, or is on temporary layoff.

16 Duration of unemployment is not known for unemployed people who had a job to start in the next four weeks.

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Tables 282-0003 (for data by educational attainment), 282-0007 (for data by industry), 282-0047 (for data by duration of unemployment), 282-0087 (for data specific to provinces, by gender and age) and 282-0216 (for data by reason for unemployment), and special tabulations (for data specific to territories).

Annex 1.5 Unemployment Rate (by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, Educational Attainment and Industry)

	Unemployment Rate[1,2,3]														
	(%)														Change (% Points)[4]
	1982/1983	1987/1988	1990/1991	1995/1996	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory															
Newfoundland and Labrador	17.2	17.4	17.5	18.2	15.4	14.6	13.1	14.0	15.7	13.9	12.6	12.1	11.6	12.2	0.6
Prince Edward Island	13.1	12.7	15.1	14.8	11.2	10.8	10.1	11.6	11.4	11.7	11.2	11.2	11.5	10.5	-1.0
Nova Scotia	13.5	11.3	10.9	12.0	8.2	7.8	8.0	7.9	9.4	9.6	8.8	9.4	9.0	8.9	-0.1
New Brunswick	14.7	12.9	12.1	11.2	9.5	8.2	7.8	8.6	8.7	9.4	9.6	10.5	10.0	10.1	0.1
Quebec	14.8	9.7	11.0	11.3	8.3	7.9	7.1	7.6	8.5	7.9	8.0	7.6	7.7	7.6	-0.1
Ontario	10.8	5.8	7.2	8.8	6.5	6.3	6.3	7.1	9.3	8.5	7.8	7.9	7.5	7.2	-0.3
Manitoba	9.3	7.4	7.7	7.2	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.4	5.3	5.4	5.5	5.2	5.5	5.4	-0.1
Saskatchewan	7.0	7.4	7.1	7.0	5.1	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.9	5.4	4.8	4.5	4.2	4.0	-0.2
Alberta	9.2	9.0	7.2	7.7	3.8	3.5	3.5	4.1	6.9	6.2	5.3	4.5	4.6	4.9	0.3
British Columbia	13.4	11.3	9.0	8.5	5.4	4.6	4.3	5.3	7.9	7.7	7.2	6.8	6.5	6.0	-0.5
Yukon[5]	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	5.0	3.9	5.0	5.6	7.9	5.9	6.3	6.8	5.1	4.6	-0.5
Northwest Territories[5]	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	5.1	5.1	6.1	5.5	7.0	7.0	7.9	8.0	7.8	8.1	0.3
Nunavut[5]	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	12.4	10.5	9.4	12.5	13.6	16.9	16.6	14.7	14.2	13.4	-0.8
Gender															
Men	12.4	8.1	9.0	9.8	6.8	6.5	6.3	7.3	9.6	8.5	7.9	7.6	7.5	7.4	-0.1
Women	11.5	8.8	8.6	9.0	6.4	5.9	5.6	5.9	7.1	7.2	7.0	6.7	6.5	6.3	-0.2
Age															
15 to 24 Years (Youth)	19.5	12.5	13.5	15.0	12.2	11.5	11.2	12.4	15.6	14.6	14.2	14.3	13.6	13.3	-0.3
25 to 54 Years	9.8	7.4	7.9	8.4	5.6	5.2	5.0	5.5	7.2	6.7	6.2	6.0	5.8	5.7	-0.1
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	7.2	6.4	6.0	7.4	5.1	5.1	4.8	5.4	6.6	6.4	6.2	5.9	6.0	5.7	-0.3
Educational Attainment															
Less than High School[6]	Not available	Not available	13.4	15.1	12.3	12.3	12.0	12.9	16.1	15.8	15.1	14.8	14.5	13.6	-0.9
High School Diploma[7]	Not available	Not available	8.5	9.5	6.9	6.5	6.3	7.3	9.5	8.9	8.3	8.2	8.1	8.2	0.1
Post-secondary Certificate or Diploma[8]	Not available	Not available	7.0	7.9	5.3	5.0	4.8	5.3	7.0	6.4	6.0	5.7	5.7	5.4	-0.3
University Degree[9]	Not available	Not available	3.9	5.0	4.5	3.8	3.7	4.3	5.3	5.2	4.9	5.0	4.7	4.8	0.1
Industry															
Goods-producing Industries	**13.5**	**8.0**	**10.2**	**8.6**	**6.2**	**6.2**	**6.0**	**7.4**	**9.6**	**7.3**	**6.3**	**6.1**	**6.3**	**6.2**	**-0.1**
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	Not available	8.2	7.8	7.9	8.2	7.3	7.3	7.9	8.4	8.4	7.9	7.8	7.5	7.1	-0.4
Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction	Not available	7.0	7.0	6.8	4.0	4.0	4.1	5.8	8.9	4.6	4.0	4.9	4.8	6.1	1.3
Utilities[10]	4.4	2.5	2.5	3.4	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.8	2.8	2.0	2.3	2.5	1.7	2.3	0.6
Construction	19.8	12.3	17.0	15.0	7.2	7.5	6.6	8.1	11.0	9.3	8.0	7.6	8.3	8.0	-0.3
Manufacturing	12.8	6.6	8.8	6.7	5.7	5.8	5.8	7.4	9.4	6.3	5.4	5.1	5.1	4.7	-0.4

Continued on next page...

Annex 1.5 Unemployment Rate (by Province and Territory, Gender, Age, Educational Attainment and Industry) *(Continued)*

	Unemployment Rate[1,2,3]														
	(%)														Change (% Points)[4]
	1982/1983	1987/1988	1990/1991	1995/1996	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Industry															
Services-producing Industries	**7.8**	**6.0**	**6.1**	**5.7**	**4.1**	**3.8**	**3.7**	**4.0**	**5.0**	**4.5**	**4.2**	**4.1**	**3.9**	**3.9**	**0.0**
Wholesale Trade	Not available	5.0	6.9	5.7	3.8	3.5	3.2	3.7	4.6	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.2	-0.4
Retail Trade	Not available	6.4	7.0	6.4	4.6	4.0	4.4	4.9	6.3	5.6	5.2	4.8	4.6	4.5	-0.1
Transportation and Warehousing	8.5	5.8	6.5	5.9	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.9	5.6	4.6	3.8	3.7	4.1	3.6	-0.5
Finance and Insurance	Not available	3.0	3.1	2.9	2.1	1.6	1.6	1.6	2.8	2.2	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.1	0.2
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	Not available	5.0	5.3	4.3	3.4	2.8	2.8	3.2	4.1	3.5	3.6	2.9	2.9	3.0	0.1
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	7.6	4.6	4.9	5.0	3.1	2.9	2.7	3.0	4.3	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.2	-0.2
Business, Building and Other Support Services[11]	14.5	12.1	12.7	10.8	8.6	7.9	7.8	9.0	10.6	9.8	8.5	8.2	8.0	8.6	0.6
Educational Services	4.2	4.0	3.7	4.3	3.4	3.4	3.8	3.5	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.6	-0.2
Health Care and Social Assistance	4.5	3.8	3.2	3.5	2.0	1.8	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.3	1.9	2.1	1.9	2.0	0.1
Information, Culture and Recreation[12]	8.3	6.2	6.9	7.2	5.6	5.2	4.8	5.8	6.2	6.5	6.3	6.2	5.6	5.5	-0.1
Accommodation and Food Services	14.2	11.0	10.8	9.2	7.6	6.9	6.9	7.3	8.5	7.7	7.0	6.9	6.5	6.3	-0.2
Other Services (except Public Administration)	9.4	7.0	7.4	6.7	4.0	3.9	3.6	4.0	5.2	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.8	4.0	0.2
Public Administration	6.1	5.6	4.4	4.5	2.7	2.6	2.3	2.0	2.4	2.4	2.7	2.4	2.3	2.2	-0.1
Canada	**12.0**	**8.4**	**8.8**	**9.5**	**6.6**	**6.3**	**6.0**	**6.6**	**8.5**	**7.9**	**7.4**	**7.2**	**7.0**	**6.9**	**-0.1**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 The years reviewed in this annex prior to 2005/2006 correspond to the last year of periods of recession in Canada observed in recent history (1982/1983 and 1990/1991) and the fifth year of economic recovery following these periods of recession (1987/1988 and 1995/1996) in order to compare economic conditions.

2 Fiscal year data in this annex are the annual average of unadjusted monthly estimates produced by Statistics Canada. Data are rounded by Statistics Canada (in CANSIM) using the round-to-nearest-even method. When the number being rounded is followed by a number larger than five, the number being rounded is increased by one unit (e.g. 4.46 rounded to one decimal equals 4.5); when the number being rounded is followed by a number less than five, the number being rounded is left unchanged (e.g. 4.44 rounded to one decimal equals 4.4); when the number being rounded is followed by the number five, the number being rounded is increased by one unit if it is odd (e.g. 4.15 rounded to one decimal equals 4.2) and left unchanged if it is even (e.g. 4.45 rounded to one decimal equals 4.4).

3 In January 2016, Statistics Canada made a revision to its Labour Force Survey estimates. As a result, key labour market statistics for years prior to 2014/2015 reported in previous *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Reports* have been restated to reflect this change.

4 Percentage point difference between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

5 Data specific to territories come from special tabulations provided by Statistics Canada and therefore are not included in the official total for Canada. Data in other categories (i.e. data by gender, age, educational attainment and industry) also excludes territorial data.

6 Includes zero to eight years of education and some high school.

7 Includes high school graduation and some post-secondary education (not completed).

8 Includes certificates (including trade certificates) or diplomas from an educational institution beyond the secondary level, which comprise certificates from a vocational school, apprenticeship training, community college, collège d'enseignement général et professionnel (cégep) and school of nursing. Also included are certificates below a bachelor's degree obtained at a university.

9 Includes at least a university bachelor's degree.

10 Monthly data that are confidential under the *Statistics Act* are excluded from the calculation of the annual average.

11 This industry combines codes 55 (management of companies and enterprises) and 56 (administrative and support, waste management and remediation services) from the North American Industry Classification System.

12 This industry combines codes 51 (information and cultural industries) and 71 (arts, entertainment and recreation) from the North American Industry Classification System.

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Tables 282-0003 (for data by educational attainment), 282-0007 (for data by industry) and 282-0087 (for data specific to provinces, by gender and age), and special tabulations (for data specific to territories).

Annex 1.6 Duration of Unemployment (by Province, Gender and Age)

	Average Duration of Unemployment[1,2,3,4] (Number of Weeks)										Change[5]
	2005/2006	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province											
Newfoundland and Labrador	19.1	19.1	16.4	17.3	17.3	16.8	17.6	16.9	16.8	17.2	0.4
Prince Edward Island	13.2	14.0	12.2	14.0	14.7	14.4	12.5	13.7	15.9	16.2	0.3
Nova Scotia	14.9	13.7	14.8	13.8	16.5	19.2	17.3	17.2	19.9	19.3	-0.6
New Brunswick	14.2	13.6	11.6	15.1	14.9	18.0	17.2	16.5	19.4	19.6	0.2
Quebec	20.2	20.8	19.1	18.1	19.4	20.8	22.8	23.3	23.9	23.5	-0.4
Ontario	15.9	15.4	14.8	14.9	20.1	22.5	22.6	22.0	22.0	21.6	-0.4
Manitoba	14.5	12.9	12.6	11.3	12.7	14.9	15.0	16.3	17.2	16.2	-1.0
Saskatchewan	14.3	10.7	10.6	9.7	12.1	15.8	15.5	15.2	14.3	13.3	-1.0
Alberta	12.3	9.4	9.1	8.5	14.9	17.9	15.8	13.1	14.3	14.1	-0.2
British Columbia	18.1	14.3	13.8	12.2	16.7	18.7	21.7	19.4	20.7	19.8	-0.9
Gender											
Men	17.8	16.9	16.8	15.8	19.3	21.6	22.6	21.2	21.9	21.5	-0.4
Women	16.3	15.7	13.5	13.6	17.0	19.0	19.2	19.9	20.2	19.5	-0.7
Age											
15 to 24 Years (Youth)	9.0	8.0	7.8	7.9	10.4	11.0	11.3	11.4	12.1	12.1	0.0
25 to 54 Years	19.3	18.6	18.0	16.9	20.0	22.7	22.9	23.2	23.1	22.6	-0.5
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	28.0	27.2	22.1	23.1	29.6	30.6	34.2	29.9	31.0	29.9	-1.1
Canada	**17.1**	**16.4**	**15.3**	**14.9**	**18.4**	**20.4**	**21.1**	**20.6**	**21.1**	**20.6**	**-0.5**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Duration of unemployment is the number of continuous weeks during which a person has been without work and is looking for work, or is on temporary layoff.

2 Prior to 1997, Statistics Canada top-coded data on duration of unemployment on the Labour Force Survey (LFS) to 99 weeks. This restriction no longer applies with the questionnaire of the 1997 LFS. As a result, Statistics Canada provides two sets of statistics for the average duration of unemployment: a) one set with no upper limit to length of unemployment that begins in 1997; and b) one set top-coded to 99 weeks that begins in 1976. Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, figures on the average duration of employment is based on data with no upper limit regarding duration of unemployment; data from previous years have been restated to reflect this change. The previous reporting methodology was based on data with an upper limit of 99 weeks.

3 Fiscal year data in this annex are the annual average of unadjusted monthly estimates produced by Statistics Canada. Data are rounded by Statistics Canada (in CANSIM) using the round-to-nearest-even method. When the number being rounded is followed by a number larger than five, the number being rounded is increased by one unit (e.g. 4.46 rounded to one decimal equals 4.5); when the number being rounded is followed by a number less than five, the number being rounded is left unchanged (e.g. 4.44 rounded to one decimal equals 4.4); when the number being rounded is followed by the number five, the number being rounded is increased by one unit if it is odd (e.g. 4.15 rounded to one decimal equals 4.2) and left unchanged if it is even (e.g. 4.45 rounded to one decimal equals 4.4).

4 In January 2016, Statistics Canada made a revision to its Labour Force Survey estimates. As a result, key labour market statistics for years prior to 2014/2015 reported in previous *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Reports* have been restated to reflect this change.

5 Difference in number of weeks between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, CANSIM Table 282-0047.

Annex 2

Employment Insurance Benefits Data Tables

Annex 2.1 Employment Insurance Benefits – Concepts and Definitions 314
Annex 2.2 Employment Insurance Benefits 315
Annex 2.3 Employment Insurance Benefits (by Employment Insurance Economic Region) 316
Annex 2.4 Regular Benefits 319
Annex 2.5 Regular Benefits (by Industry) 320
Annex 2.6 Regular Benefits (by Regional Unemployment Rate and Hours of Insurable Employment from Previous Employment) 321
Annex 2.7 Regular Benefits (by Employment Insurance Economic Region) 322
Annex 2.8 Seasonal Regular Claimants 325
Annex 2.9 Fishing Benefits 326
Annex 2.10 Special Benefits 327
Annex 2.11 Special Benefits (by Employment Insurance Economic Region) 328
Annex 2.12 Maternity Benefits 331
Annex 2.13 Parental Benefits (Biological) 332
Annex 2.14 Parental Benefits (Adoptive) 333
Annex 2.15 Sickness Benefits 334
Annex 2.16 Compassionate Care Benefits 335
Annex 2.17 Benefits for Parents of Critically Ill Children 336
Annex 2.18 Work-sharing Benefits 337
Annex 2.19 Family Supplement 338
Annex 2.20 Working While on Regular Claim 339
Annex 2.21 Employment Insurance Benefit Repayment 340
Annex 2.22 Contributors to the Employment Insurance Program 341
Annex 2.23 Benefits-to-Contributions Ratios 343
Annex 2.24 Unemployment Rates Used for the Purposes of the Employment Insurance Program (by Employment Insurance Economic Region) 345
Annex 2.25 Employment Insurance Economic Regions, 2014/2015 248
Annex 2.26 Employment Insurance Economic Regions: Unemployment Rates, 2014/2015 349

Annex 2.1 Employment Insurance Benefits – Concepts and Definitions

Chapter II and Annex 2 provide information on the number of new claims established, the average actual duration, the average weekly benefit rate and the amount paid in benefits. These concepts are defined below.

New Claims Established

New claims established refer to new Employment Insurance claims that have been received, processed and approved by Employment and Social Development Canada (via Service Canada) for which at least $1 in benefits was paid to an Employment Insurance claimant.

To avoid double counting, each claim established is counted only once. Thus, a claim that was established, for example, in November 2013 (i.e. in 2013/2014) and for which benefits paid to an Employment Insurance claimant began in December 2013 (i.e. in 2013/2014) and ended in June 2014 (i.e. in 2014/2015) is included in the 2013/2014 statistics, but is not counted in the 2014/2015 statistics.

New claims established designate a different concept from new applications submitted to Employment and Social Development Canada (and received by the organization). An application may be submitted, but not necessarily established. This is the case, for example, when the application is rejected because not all of the eligibility requirements are met.

It should be noted that the number of new claims established during a fiscal year does not necessarily correspond to the number of new Employment Insurance claimants because a claimant can have more than one Employment Insurance claim established annually.

New claims established are also referred to under other names such as: new claims established, benefits claims and claims established. The terms "new," "benefits" and "established" are sometimes omitted so as not to complicate the text. In all cases, these terms refer to the same concept.

Average Actual Duration

The **average actual duration** of Employment Insurance claims refers, in regard to these claims, to the average number of weeks of benefits per claim during which at least one dollar in benefits was paid to an Employment Insurance claimant.

The average actual duration is calculated by dividing the number of weeks of benefits during which at least one dollar was paid to a claimant by the number of claims that were established.

The actual duration is a different concept than the maximum duration: the latter is the maximum number of weeks during which benefits may be paid (under sections 12 and 152.14 of the *Employment Insurance Act*, and Section 8 of the *Employment Insurance (Fishing) Regulations)*, while the former is the number of weeks for which benefits are actually paid.

Average Weekly Benefit Rate

The **average weekly benefit rate** refers to the rate of weekly benefits payable on average through an Employment Insurance claim.

The average weekly benefit rate is calculated by dividing the sum of the weekly benefit rate of each claim by the number of claims that were established.

The family supplement is always included in the calculation of the benefit rate, unless otherwise specified.

The average weekly benefit rate is not necessarily equal to the amount of benefits actually paid on average per claim established. The amount paid may be less than the benefit rate, especially if the weekly benefits are reduced because the claimant worked while on claim (for more information, see Section 2.3.3 of Chapter II relating to the working while on claim provision).

Amount Paid

The **amount paid** refers to the sum of benefit payments that claimants who have had an Employment Insurance claim established have received. In other words, it is the value of Employment Insurance benefits that were paid to Employment Insurance claimants.

The amount paid is always reported on a cash basis, meaning that they are reported in the year in which they were paid. Thus, the amount paid in benefits to an Employment Insurance claimant who, for example, had a claim established in November 2013 (i.e. in 2013/2014) and received payment starting in December 2013 (i.e. 2013/2014) and ending in June 2014 (i.e. 2014/2015) are included in the fiscal year statistics for 2013/2014 and 2014/2015. If this claimant received $200 per week for 17 weeks between December 2013 and March 2014, and $200 per week for 12 weeks between April and June 2014, an amount of $3,400 will be allocated to the 2013/2014 fiscal year and $2,400 will be allocated to the 2014/2015 fiscal year.

About claims that include more than one type of benefits

A **claim that includes more than one type of benefits** refers to an Employment Insurance claim for which the claimant receives more than one type of benefits during its benefit period. The eight types of benefits available under the Employment Insurance program that are reported in Chapter II and Annex 2 are: regular benefits, fishing benefits, maternity benefits, parental benefits, sickness benefits, compassionate care benefits, benefits for parents of critically ill children, and work-sharing benefits.

A claim that includes more than one type of benefits is treated as several different claims, namely one claim per type of benefits, unless aggregated information is presented, in which case the claim that includes more than one type of benefits is considered to be a single claim. For example, a claim for which a claimant receives both regular benefits and maternity benefits during its benefit period is treated as two separate claims in cases where information on regular benefits or maternity benefits is reported separately (as in the case of Annexes 2.4 and 2.12, which report data on the two types of benefits separately; in this example, each of the two annexes would add one claim to its statistics). Conversely, if aggregated information is presented, the claim is considered a single claim (as in the case of Annex 2.2, which presents data on all Employment Insurance benefits).

Annex 2.2 Employment Insurance Benefits

	New Claims Established[1]							Average Weekly Benefit Rate[2]							Amount Paid[3]						
							Change (%)[4]	($)						Change (%)[4]	($ Million)						Change (%)[4]
	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory[5]																					
Newfoundland and Labrador	92,300	85,430	86,870	81,130	82,050[r]	81,260	-1.0	363	377	394	407	422	435	3.1	960.3	884.9	894.0	840.8	837.9[r]	863.1	3.0
Prince Edward Island	24,580	23,870	24,080	21,870	21,330	21,960	3.0	365	370	382	398	403	416	3.2	225.9	223.5	228.5	218.1	200.0	211.4	5.7
Nova Scotia	90,480	86,040	87,930	82,000	78,650[r]	79,610	1.2	355	363	377	388	404	419	3.7	821.3	785.6	804.6	773.4	738.9[r]	748.5	1.3
New Brunswick	94,030	91,220	91,990	90,170	85,650[r]	85,090	-0.7	352	359	370	385[r]	402[r]	412	2.5	855.7	832.1	847.1	838.9	828.2[r]	824.4	-0.5
Quebec	579,760	507,190	526,110	505,500	493,130[r]	491,800	-0.3	359[r]	364	378	390	409	420	2.7	4,186.9	3,900.9	3,570.0	3,453.2	3,375.6[r]	3,511.1	4.0
Ontario	699,450	564,590	592,030	575,250	573,450[r]	562,090	-2.0	369	371	382	393	419	431	2.9	6,898.2	5,857.5	5,188.2	5,051.7	5,244.6[r]	5,276.5	0.6
Manitoba	66,450	58,160	58,170	58,320	56,660[r]	57,080	0.7	351	358	368	381	408	422	3.4	511.7	486.7	451.8	463.3	483.1[r]	498.7	3.2
Saskatchewan	51,540	45,300	44,700	44,400	44,430[r]	47,890	7.8	370	377	393	409	432	452	4.6	447.2	424.0	389.3	393.3	414.0[r]	437.8	5.7
Alberta	196,630	150,810	142,560	143,280	146,220[r]	170,190	16.4	396	400	411	424	453	472	4.2	2,011.4	1,618.0	1,333.5	1,283.6	1,384.5[r]	1,509.4	9.0
British Columbia	263,570	227,520	222,610	211,540	205,440[r]	208,630	1.6	367	367	377	389	416	429	3.1	2,427.5	2,231.7	1,908.6	1,815.2	1,798.8[r]	1,864.9	3.7
Yukon	2,750	2,580	2,710	2,720	2,560	2,450	-4.3	420	434	444	453	472	474	0.4	32.6	28.3	29.2	31.8	29.5	30.4	3.1
Northwest Territories	2,550	2,530	2,520	2,400	2,310	2,250	-2.6	427	440	450	465	489	495	1.2	33.5	31.8	33.8	32.7	31.4	29.3	-6.7
Nunavut	1,370	1,550	1,340	1,360	1,260	990	-21.4	424	431	439	466	464	469	1.1	17.6	18.4	17.6	17.7	18.1	15.1	-16.6
Missing Data	0	0	0	0	280	70	-75.0	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.4	-66.7
Gender																					
Men	1,228,500	1,010,210	1,024,820	982,220	977,290[r]	994,760	1.8	391	395	408	421[r]	443	457	3.2	11,170.9	9,276.0	8,149.7	7,778.8	7,874.5[r]	8,092.0	2.8
Women	936,960	836,580	858,800	837,720	816,130[r]	816,600	0.1	334	340	351	363	387	398	2.8	8,258.8	8,047.5	7,546.6	7,435.1	7,511.3[r]	7,728.9	2.9
Age																					
24 Years and Under (Youth)	253,330	218,120	204,320	193,180	182, 430[r]	182,070	-0.2	326	331	342	354	380	394	3.7	1,962.7	1,595.3	1,426.0	1,347.9	1,320.0[r]	1,316.8	-0.2
25 to 44 Years	1,061,520	901,680	902,960	873,760	861,740[r]	873,760	1.4	377	381	393	406	429	442	3.0	10,323.4	9,057.2	8,268.2	8,128.4	8,288.2[r]	8,539.6	3.0
45 to 54 Years	508,860	417,440	434,420	410,090	399,180[r]	391,340	-2.0	372	374	387	399	420	434	3.3	4,249.1	3,793.9	3,298.5	3,091.6	3,051.5[r]	3,070.9	0.6
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	341,750	309,550	341,920	342,910	350,070[r]	364,190	4.0	356[r]	359[r]	373	384	405	417	3.0	2,894.5	2,877.1	2,703.4	2,645.9	2,726.1	2,893.6	6.1
Claimant Category[6]																					
Long-Tenured Workers	755,640	536,420	569,860	502,550	461,460	412,320	-10.6	401	405	415	428	453	468	3.3	7,288.3	6,501.2	5,252.4	4,937.8	4,424.0	3,919.7	-11.4
Occasional Claimants	1,079,240	971,600	961,970	967,260	991,310	1,063,380	7.3	338	344	355	370	397[r]	414	4.3	9,090.8	7,808.1	7,303.4	7,114.6	7,860.5	8,774.0	11.6
Frequent Claimants	330,580	338,770	351,790	350,130	339,180	333,100	-1.8	380	391	401	414	428	439	2.6	3,050.6	3,014.2	3,140.4	3,161.5	3,093.3	3,110.4	0.6
Missing Data	0	0	0	0	1,470	2,560	74.1	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	416	427	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.9	16.8	112.7
Canada	**2,165,460**	**1,846,790**	**1,883,620**	**1,819,940**	**1,793, 420[r]**	**1,811,360**	**1.0**	**366[r]**	**370**	**382**	**395**	**417[r]**	**431**	**3.4**	**19,429.7**	**17,323.5**	**15,696.2**	**15,213.9**	**15,385.8[r]**	**15,821.0**	**2.8**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits was paid.

2 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to Employment Insurance claimants.

3 Takes into account benefits paid under regular, fishing, special (maternity, parental, sickness, compassionate care and parents for critically ill children) and work-sharing benefits, as well as those paid under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for training purposes. Amount paid also includes family supplement top-ups.

4 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

5 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, provincial and territorial figures are based on the province or territory of residence where a claim was initially established; figures pertaining to years prior to 2013/2014 published in the previous *Reports* have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on the province or territory of residence where the claim ended.

6 Long-tenured workers are Employment Insurance (EI) claimants who have paid at least 30% of the maximum annual EI premiums in 7 of the past 10 years and who, over the last five years, have collected EI regular or fishing benefits for 35 weeks or less. Frequent claimants are EI claimants who have had three or more EI regular or fishing claims and have collected benefits for a total of more than 60 weeks in the past five years. Occasional claimants are EI claimants who do not meet the requirements for either long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.3 Employment Insurance Benefits (by Employment Insurance Economic Region)

	New Claims Established[1]							Average Weekly Benefit Rate[2]							Amount Paid[3]						
							Change (%)[4]	($)						Change (%)[4]	($ Million)						Change (%)[4]
	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Employment Insurance Economic Region																					
Newfoundland and Labrador																					
St. John's	15,570	14,030	14,640	13,530	13,990	14,810	5.9	371	384	400	422	430	441	2.6	141.6	134.5	129.3	121.9	120.1	130.5	8.7
Newfoundland/Labrador	76,730	71,400	72,230	67,600	68,050	66,420	-2.4	362	375	393	404	421	434	3.1	818.7	750.3	764.8	718.8	717.7	732.4	2.0
Prince Edward Island																					
Prince Edward Island *(until October 11, 2014)*[5]	24,580	23,870	24,080	21,870	21,330	9,530	Not applicable	365	370	382	398	403	409	Not applicable	225.9	223.5	228.5	218.1	200.0	153.1	Not applicable
Charlottetown *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	2,960	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	402	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	11.1	Not applicable
Prince Edward Island *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	9,460	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	428	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	47.1	Not applicable
Nova Scotia																					
Eastern Nova Scotia	28,270	28,030	28,950	27,060	27,010	27,660	2.4	366	376	388	401	419	435	3.8	294.5	283.4	290.8	289.2	286.6	286.4	-0.1
Western Nova Scotia	42,070	39,090	39,350	36,220	34,090	33,860	-0.7	352	359	375	385	392	407	3.8	355.9	338.3	350.3	329.5	300.1	298.5	-0.5
Halifax	20,140	18,920	19,630	18,720	17,510	18,030	3.0	347	350	364	375	405	415	2.5	170.8	163.9	163.4	154.8	151.9	163.1	7.4
New Brunswick																					
Fredericton–Moncton–Saint John	27,580	27,300	28,080	28,190	26,370	26,280	-0.3	337	344	353	366	392	403	2.8	209.0	217.9	216.3	219.8	222.1	225.5	1.5
Madawaska–Charlotte	16,970	15,730	16,120	15,710	14,520	14,250	-1.9	354	358	369	384	391	398	1.8	144.8	136.8	137.3	136.7	132.3	120.5	-8.9
Restigouche–Albert	49,480	48,190	47,790	46,270	44,730	44,490	-0.5	359	368	381	398	413	421	1.9	502.0	477.4	493.5	482.4	473.7	478.0	0.9
Quebec																					
Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine	30,320	28,950	28,810	27,920	27,240	26,520	-2.6	369	380	394	405	421	432	2.6	302.1	287.4	289.2	281.1	271.7	273.8	0.8
Quebec	45,560	40,790	41,600	39,570	39,040	40,290	3.2	358	361	377	387	417	427	2.4	251.1	262.6	228.1	209.4	221.6	240.7	8.6
Trois-Rivières	12,110	11,270	11,540	10,670	10,700	9,900	-7.5	365	373	383	404	400	409	2.3	83.5	88.7	83.8	76.8	69.3	65.3	-5.8
South Central Quebec	14,540	12,370	13,490	10,950	10,590	9,760	-7.8	350	352	368	378	406	419	3.2	86.3	71.6	63.9	57.9	53.1	57.6	8.5
Sherbrooke	12,170	10,210	11,430	9,730	9,690	10,850	12.0	355	349	362	377	403	412	2.2	73.1	64.4	59.4	54.3	54.2	67.2	24.0
Montérégie	42,810	35,300	37,840	32,470	31,260	30,970	-0.9	349	352	365	375	403	415	3.0	279.4	244.8	222.4	196.9	188.1	195.7	4.0
Montreal	206,450	174,190	180,820	181,210	176,260	176,270	0.0	350	354	366	378	407	419	2.9	1,493.8	1,399.7	1,183.5	1,192.1	1,211.3	1,289.1	6.4
Central Quebec	100,280	87,310	93,940	90,680	87,370	87,010	-0.4	367	370	384	399	401	412	2.7	706.2	645.1	632.8	624.2	566.1	569.7	0.6
North Western Quebec	27,530	24,310	23,840	22,830	22,690	23,260	2.5	375	384	400	413	417	428	2.6	238.0	202.6	189.4	185.4	178.1	176.5	-0.9
Lower Saint Lawrence and North Shore	59,990	56,040	55,500	53,890	52,600	49,550	-5.8	374	381	396	410	417	425	1.9	486.5	450.2	444.7	411.6	398.0	390.9	-1.8
Hull	12,960	13,020	14,110	12,820	12,860	13,420	4.4	372	375	384	394	422	431	2.1	80.9	87.3	82.7	82.4	80.0	89.7	12.1
Chicoutimi–Jonquière	15,040	13,430	13,190	12,760	12,540	13,360	6.5	369	375	386	404	408	422	3.4	105.8	96.5	90.1	81.2	82.7	91.0	10.0

Continued on the next page...

Annex 2.3 Employment Insurance Benefits (by Employment Insurance Economic Region) *(Continued)*

	New Claims Established[1]							Average Weekly Benefit Rate[2]							Amount Paid[3]						
							Change (%)[4]	($)						Change (%)[4]	($ Million)						Change (%)[4]
	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014-2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014-2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014-2014/2015
Ontario																					
Ottawa	34,860	31,760	34,090	33,650	33,380	33,180	-0.6	383	385	395	409	435	448	3.0	323.9	332.9	314.3	314.3	322.4	333.4	3.4
Eastern Ontario	26,960	24,060	25,790	26,240	26,590	26,590	0.0	351	359	369	380	409	424	3.7	204.1	203.8	196.0	202.2	207.6	217.3	4.7
Kingston	6,680	5,950	6,530	5,810	5,790	5,730	-1.0	363	361	372	385	409	425	3.9	55.0	54.0	47.7	47.7	48.4	51.4	6.2
Central Ontario	69,720	58,550	64,100	60,220	60,790	58,200	-4.3	353	357	371	382	407	419	2.9	586.7	521.0	482.8	458.0	485.5	487.6	0.4
Oshawa	19,060	16,120	17,290	16,700	17,820	17,890	0.4	390	394	407	421	429	449	4.7	211.2	179.5	158.6	152.5	159.0	162.7	2.3
Toronto	271,870	211,510	218,030	215,900	213,260	207,290	-2.8	369	371	381	392	422	433	2.6	2,857.9	2,457.8	2,127.2	2,060.0	2,149.4	2,161.6	0.6
Hamilton	34,670	30,010	29,870	28,730	29,520	29,230	-1.0	366	368	382	391	425	433	1.9	357.2	296.5	252.7	237.2	251.7	258.6	2.7
St. Catharines	26,490	21,060	21,910	22,290	22,220	19,580	-11.9	353	346	358	368	399	409	2.5	229.3	194.1	163.6	164.9	171.9	164.1	-4.5
London	24,960	19,330	21,460	20,190	20,550	19,400	-5.6	371	364	378	382	414	426	2.9	245.2	193.0	177.1	175.3	182.2	179.3	-1.6
Niagara	21,420	17,710	19,100	18,350	17,410	17,520	0.6	377	379	395	404	411	425	3.4	219.6	178.8	163.8	156.2	158.4	142.2	-10.2
Windsor	20,800	16,700	15,940	16,270	14,420	19,480	35.1	375	382	398	406	404	448	10.9	228.7	153.6	132.7	135.7	133.7	129.6	-3.1
Kitchener	26,930	21,270	22,080	21,730	22,420	20,450	-8.8	368	367	381	391	427	438	2.6	283.3	216.6	188.4	178.8	197.0	202.2	2.6
Huron	22,460	17,820	19,450	16,950	17,680	17,570	-0.6	375	383	392	406	414	421	1.7	225.9	171.0	162.3	143.9	133.9	142.4	6.3
South Central Ontario	28,800	21,660	24,100	21,100	19,740	18,560	-6.0	370	368	379	388	418	429	2.6	272.3	207.2	178.2	171.5	169.8	165.2	-2.7
Sudbury	13,440	8,650	8,050	7,840	8,150	7,870	-3.4	383	369	379	402	426	434	1.9	118.4	88.5	64.7	62.1	68.5	69.2	1.0
Thunder Bay	7,340	6,300	6,620	5,730	6,440	6,510	1.1	377	376	391	403	438	439	0.2	67.3	53.6	46.6	45.3	48.5	54.5	12.4
Northern Ontario	42,990	36,130	37,620	37,550	36,810	36,150	-1.8	377	384	397	410	424	432	1.9	412.4	355.6	331.3	345.9	354.1	349.1	-1.4
Manitoba																					
Winnipeg	37,610	32,570	32,120	32,640	31,920	31,990	0.2	348	357	368	381	411	425	3.4	274.0	272.3	248.3	247.1	271.3	272.4	0.4
Southern Manitoba	17,640	15,910	16,220	15,880	15,060	15,120	0.4	348	353	358	373	401	416	3.7	131.6	114.6	106.5	116.0	112.5	122.1	8.5
Northern Manitoba	11,200	9,680	9,830	9,800	9,640	9,890	2.6	366	368	381	395	410	417	1.7	106.0	99.8	96.9	100.3	99.0	103.6	4.6
Saskatchewan																					
Regina	8,660	7,530	7,530	7,870	7,800	8,510	9.1	373	380	399	412	448	457	2.0	69.2	70.0	64.9	68.2	71.1	76.8	8.0
Saskatoon	12,050	10,890	10,930	10,920	11,360	12,220	7.6	370	382	390	408	434	459	5.8	94.7	100.7	91.6	90.1	99.8	111.3	11.5
Southern Saskatchewan	14,930	12,860	12,450	12,470	11,660	13,080	12.2	360	364	381	398	421	444	5.5	117.7	106.2	96.3	98.2	99.0	106.2	7.3
Northern Saskatchewan	15,900	14,020	13,790	13,140	13,580	14,030	3.3	378	382	401	418	429	450	4.9	165.6	147.1	136.5	136.8	144.0	143.0	-0.7
Alberta																					
Calgary	63,930	46,960	43,440	46,090	46,710	54,040	15.7	397	401	410	424	456	473	3.7	706.2	549.8	446.0	432.4	474.1	510.1	7.6
Edmonton	63,070	51,540	47,970	47,760	50,510	57,710	14.3	399	406	417	428	458	474	3.5	613.2	529.1	443.6	416.7	466.9	515.4	10.4
Northern Alberta	15,720	12,910	12,600	11,890	12,180	14,890	22.2	412	415	434	448	462	484	4.8	170.4	146.7	124.6	124.4	122.6	139.3	13.6
Southern Alberta	53,910	39,400	38,550	37,540	36,670	43,200	17.8	386	385	397	410	440	465	5.7	521.6	392.4	319.3	310.2	320.0	342.3	7.0
British Columbia																					
Southern Interior British Columbia	49,120	43,850	42,100	38,370	38,040	38,600	1.5	363	365	377	389	422	434	2.8	447.8	404.5	346.7	298.6	302.7	321.9	6.3
Abbotsford	13,390	11,660	11,980	11,240	11,120	10,690	-3.9	334	327	334	353	366	383	4.6	108.8	97.6	94.7	92.1	86.9	86.7	-0.2
Vancouver	117,170	98,810	97,290	92,530	91,040	90,310	-0.8	367	364	375	385	413	424	2.7	1,084.2	1,032.7	862.2	816.5	834.7	852.0	2.1
Victoria	15,650	14,040	14,010	13,830	12,560	12,660	0.8	370	377	383	395	426	436	2.3	139.3	130.0	114.2	120.8	113.4	115.5	1.9
Southern Coastal British Columbia	36,580	33,920	32,490	31,860	30,310	30,380	0.2	363	364	372	384	419	433	3.3	323.8	300.1	262.0	250.7	250.2	258.9	3.5
Northern British Columbia	31,660	25,240	24,740	23,710	22,230	25,680	15.5	390	395	411	426	438	454	3.7	323.7	266.9	228.8	236.5	210.0	227.9	8.5

Continued on the next page...

Annex 2.3 Employment Insurance Benefits (by Employment Insurance Economic Region) *(Continued)*

	New Claims Established[1]							Average Weekly Benefit Rate[2]							Amount Paid[3]						
							Change (%)[4]	($)						Change (%)[4]	($ Million)						Change (%)[4]
	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Territories																					
Yukon *(until October 11, 2014)*[5]	2,750	2,580	2,710	2,720	2,560	1,120	Not applicable	420	434	444	453	472	471	Not applicable	32.6	28.3	29.2	31.8	29.5	24.0	Not applicable
Whitehorse *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	740	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	478	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	3.2	Not applicable
Not applicable *Yukon (starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	590	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	474	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	3.2	Not applicable
Northwest Territories *(until October 11, 2014)*[5]	2,550	2,530	2,520	2,400	2,310	1,330	Not applicable	427	440	450	465	489	488	Not applicable	33.5	31.8	33.8	32.7	31.4	24.8	Not applicable
Yellowkniffe *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	310	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	499	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	1.2	Not applicable
Northwest Territories *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	610	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	507	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	3.3	Not applicable
Nunavut *(until October 11, 2014)*[5]	1,370	1,550	1,340	1,360	1,260	510	Not applicable	424	431	439	466	464	464	Not applicable	17.6	18.4	17.6	17.7	18.1	12.8	Not applicable
Iqaluit *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	100	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	497	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.6	Not applicable
Nunavut *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	380	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	470	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	1.7	Not applicable
Missing Data	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,470**	**2,560**	**74.1**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**416**	**427**	**2.6**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**7.9**	**16.8**	**112.7**
Canada	**2,165,460**	**1,846,790**	**1,883,620**	**1,819,940**	**1,793,420**	**1,811,360**	**1.0**	**366**	**370**	**382**	**395**	**417**	**431**	**3.4**	**19,429.7**	**17,323.5**	**15,696.2**	**15,213.9**	**15,385.8**	**15,821.0**	**2.8**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits was paid.

2 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to Employment Insurance claimants.

3 Takes into account benefits paid under regular, fishing, special (maternity, parental, sickness, compassionate care and parents for critically ill children) and work-sharing benefits, as well as those paid under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for training purposes. Amount paid also includes family supplement top-ups.

4 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

5 As of October 12, 2014, there is a total of 62 Employment Insurance (EI) economic regions, instead of 58 regions. The EI economic regions of Prince Edward Island, Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut were each divided into two EI economic regions, one consisting of the capital area and the remaining consisting of the non-capital area.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.4 Regular Benefits

	New Claims Established[1]						Average Actual Duration[2,3] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[4] ($)						Amount Paid[4,5] ($ Million)					
						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory[7]																								
Newfoundland and Labrador	68,160	67,430	62,430	63,290	63,410	0.2	27.7	26.6	26.1	25.6	25.3[p]	-1.2	371	387	400[r]	417	430	3.1	710.8	702.3	647.2	644.3	666.5	3.4
Prince Edward Island	18,570	18,380	16,930	16,040	16,560	3.2	24.9	24.8	23.3	22.7	23.3[p]	2.6	362	373	389	395	407	3.0	170.7	170.6	163.0	144.3	147.6	2.3
Nova Scotia	66,590	68,370	62,160	59,530	60,730	2.0	24.8	24.0	23.9	23.1	23.5[p]	1.7	360	374	385	400	417	4.3	593.8	599.1	564.0	535.3	534.1	-0.2
New Brunswick	74,530	75,420	73,500	69,450	68,930	-0.7	24.1	23.7	23.5	23.8	23.4[p]	-1.7	359	371	386	403	413	2.5	666.4	672.0	660.0	643.7	640.9	-0.4
Quebec	441,710	460,360	436,760	424,230[r]	423,840	-0.1	20.1	18.7	18.4	18.6	18.7[p]	0.5	368	382	395	414	426	2.9	3,555.8	3,226.6	3,074.5	2,986.9	3,115.2	4.3
Ontario	397,260	416,250	404,250	401,030[r]	391,380	-2.4	21.8	19.6	19.8	19.1	18.7[p]	-2.1	371	383	395	421	435	3.3	3,904.1	3,241.4	3,049.0	3,128.8	3,093.2	-1.1
Manitoba	37,330	39,090	37,830	35,640	37,280	4.6	18.7	17.6	17.6	17.5	18.0[p]	2.9	360	370	382	412	424	2.9	308.7	271.1	270.2	267.7	277.2	3.5
Saskatchewan	29,470	29,280	27,920	27,390	31,500	15.0	19.6	18.6	18.1	17.9	18.6[p]	3.9	379	397	413	435	458	5.3	269.2	230.8	227.3	225.4	246.3	9.3
Alberta	96,060	86,670	83,160	84,000	105,780	25.9	19.4	16.5	16.0	16.3	17.4[p]	6.7	407	418	431	462	484	4.8	1,021.6	731.2	626.3	670.5	747.0	11.4
British Columbia	162,250	156,310	147,300	140,810[r]	139,040	-1.3	21.6	19.5	18.8	18.6	18.8[p]	1.1	367	380	392	419	434	3.6	1,547.4	1,221.5	1,111.8	1,067.1	1,081.5	1.3
Yukon	2,140	2,060	2,080	2,020	1,880	-6.9	22.6	22.8	24.0	24.0	22.5[p]	-6.3	432	445	457	477	478	0.2	21.6	22.0	22.1	21.3	22.7	6.6
Northwest Territories	1,680	1,720	1,590	1,530	1,680	9.8	27.4	26.3	26.2	25.9	25.7[p]	-0.8	440	448	463	487	498	2.3	22.2	21.4	22.3	20.3	20.5	1.0
Nunavut	1,110	930	900	850	600	-29.4	29.2	27.6	28.2	29.2	29.3[p]	0.3	430	433	462	460	472	2.6	12.9	11.7	12.9	11.9	9.5	-20.2
Gender																								
Men	847,490	855,990	814,090	808,040[r]	826,410	2.3	21.3	19.8	19.7	19.5	19.5[p]	0.0	395	408	422	443	458	3.4	8,320.8	7,207.9	6,793.2	6,851.0	7,032.8	2.7
Women	549,370	566,280	542,720	517,770[r]	516,200	-0.3	21.9	20.0	19.6	19.3	19.4[p]	0.5	333	347	358	382	395	3.4	4,484.2	3,913.6	3,657.3	3,516.6	3,569.3	1.5
Age																								
24 Years and Under (Youth)	161,610	149,370	138,910	129,400	129,700	0.2	19.1	18.3	17.6	17.6	17.9[p]	1.7	337	349	362	389	405	4.1	1,232.2	1,074.7	1,004.7	973.2	966.1	-0.7
25 to 44 Years	629,390	627,110	594,800	580,650[r]	592,390	2.0	20.7	19.2	18.9	18.6	18.7[p]	0.5	381	393	407	430	445	3.5	5,680.6	4,839.2	4,553.0	4,510.3	4,603.5	2.1
45 to 54 Years	349,010	362,420	339,570	330,230	323,840	-1.9	22.2	20.1	20.1	19.9	19.8[p]	-0.5	376	388	401	423	437	3.3	3,359.1	2,866.0	2,638.8	2,586.6	2,604.6	0.7
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	256,850	283,370	283,530	285,530	296,680	3.9	24.3	22.0	21.6	21.4	21.1[p]	-1.4	362	375	386	407	420	3.2	2,533.1	2,341.7	2,254.1	2,297.5	2,427.9	5.7
Claimant Category[8]																								
Long-Tenured Workers	335,410	363,840	316,420	285,000[r]	261,760	-8.2	22.1	18.3	18.3	17.9	17.5[p]	-2.2	405	416	429	454	472	4.0	4,425.4	3,155.7	2,719.2	2,377.2	2,136.9	-10.1
Occasional Claimants	752,220	737,390	720,810	731,030[r]	776,150	6.2	20.4	19.4	19.1	19.0	19.1[p]	0.5	349	361	375	403	420	4.2	5,699.0	5,184.7	4,950.3	5,278.5	5,735.6	8.7
Frequent Claimants	309,230	321,040	319,580	309,780	304,700	-1.6	23.6	22.8	22.2	22.0	22.0[p]	0.0	388	399	412	425	436	2.6	2,680.7	2,781.2	2,781.1	2,712.0	2,729.6	0.6
Canada	**1,396,860**	**1,422,270**	**1,356,810**	**1,325,810[r]**	**1,342,610**	**1.3**	**21.5**	**19.9**	**19.6**	**19.4**	**19.4[p]**	**0.0**	**371**	**384**	**396**	**419**	**434**	**3.6**	**12,805.0**	**11,121.5**	**10,450.5**	**10,367.6**	**10,602.1**	**2.3**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

2 In the past, data on the actual duration of regular benefits were reported with a lag of one year after the period covered by the *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report* to ensure that data would pertain to claims that had ended. Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, data on the actual duration of regular benefits are reported for the fiscal year covered by the Report in order to provide timely, relevant and consistent information. This change has been made possible by methodological improvements and the increased availability of historical data. However, data for the fiscal year covered by the *Report* are preliminary; data for 2014/2015 will be revised, if required, in the *2015/2016 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*.

3 Excludes benefits paid under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for training purposes.

4 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with regular benefits.

5 Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, amount paid in regular benefits include benefits under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for training purposes; prior years' figures have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology for regular benefits excluded these benefits, even though they were included in the total of amount paid in Employment Insurance benefits shown in Annex 2.2.

6 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

7 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, provincial and territorial figures are based on the province or territory of residence where a claim was initially established; figures pertaining to years prior to 2013/2014 published in the previous *Reports* have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on the province or territory of residence where the claim ended.

8 Long-tenured workers are Employment Insurance (EI) claimants who have paid at least 30% of the maximum annual EI premiums in 7 of the past 10 years and who, over the last five years, have collected EI regular or fishing benefits for 35 weeks or less. Frequent claimants are EI claimants who have had three or more EI regular or fishing claims and have collected benefits for a total of more than 60 weeks in the past five years. Occasional claimants are EI claimants who do not meet the requirements for either long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

p Preliminary.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.5 Regular Benefits (by Industry)

	New Claims Established[1]						Average Actual Duration[2,3] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[4] ($)						Amount Paid[4,5] ($ Million)					
						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Industry																								
Goods-producing Industries	**529,430**	**534,240**	**492,470**	**512,200[r]**	**511,030**	**-0.2**	**20.8**	**19.4**	**19.3**	**19.1**	**19.0[p]**	**-0.5**	**404[r]**	**416**	**431**	**451**	**467**	**3.5**	**5,211.3**	**4,521.2**	**4,157.8**	**4,349.4**	**4,379.8**	**0.7**
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	63,470	64,000	58,110	57,140	56,880	-0.5	23.6	22.6	21.6	21.4	21.9[p]	2.3	368	379	393	403	416	3.2	589.1	557.0	522.3	503.6	500.7	-0.6
Mining, and Oil and Gas Extraction	20,450	21,760	22,190	24,380[r]	28,900	18.5	21.1	20.0	20.3	20.4	19.7[p]	-3.4	448	462	476	495	510	3.0	228.6	200.0	211.8	253.1	238.9	-5.6
Utilities	5,010	4,530	4,300	4,680	4,420	-5.6	19.1	17.7	17.0	18.3	17.7[p]	-3.3	445	459	477	494	501	1.4	48.9	40.4	38.2	40.0	41.1	2.8
Construction	267,840	272,830	258,530	274,730[r]	274,140	-0.2	19.2	18.0	18.1	18.1	17.9[p]	-1.1	425	438	454	473[r]	487	3.0	2,413.3	2,248.2	2,125.8	2,324.7	2,376.8	2.2
Manufacturing	172,660	171,120	149,340	151,270	146,690	-3.0	22.2	20.4	20.4	19.9	19.7[p]	-1.0	377	388	398	423	439	3.8	1,931.3	1,475.5	1,259.8	1,228.0	1,222.4	-0.5
Services-producing Industries	**823,800**	**844,090**	**797,760**	**769,260**	**748,370**	**-2.7**	**21.9**	**20.1**	**19.8**	**19.5**	**19.5[p]**	**0.0**	**352[r]**	**365**	**377**	**399**	**413**	**3.5**	**7,242.5**	**6,264.2**	**5,841.1**	**5,734.3**	**5,656.9**	**-1.3**
Wholesale Trade	49,950	48,440	45,620	43,940	44,050	0.3	25.3	23.6	23.4	22.9	22.4[p]	-2.2	365	376	389	412	424	2.9	614.5	477.0	429.3	435.7	421.0	-3.4
Retail Trade	94,700	89,480	84,540	79,210	72,850	-8.0	24.6	23.0	22.7	22.2	22.1[p]	-0.5	313	323	324	352	368	4.5	847.4	732.2	641.8	630.3	607.0	-3.7
Transportation and Warehousing	61,280	62,960	58,950	56,690	56,270	-0.7	19.8	19.1	19.3	18.7	19.1[p]	2.1	358	367	373	390	403	3.3	529.6	431.9	435.7	412.9	400.3	-3.1
Finance and Insurance	16,630	16,060	15,870	14,750	13,820	-6.3	27.4	24.3	24.7	24.7	23.1[p]	-6.5	379	396	408[r]	436	445	2.1	228.3	176.2	161.2	167.0	155.9	-6.6
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	17,800	18,690	17,750	18,050	18,030	-0.1	24.9	23.3	21.7	22.2	21.6[p]	-2.7	353	370	382	407	421	3.4	191.6	165.7	152.8	155.3	163.7	5.4
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	53,900	53,530	53,600	53,800	54,690	1.7	23.3	22.0	21.3	21.3	20.8[p]	-2.3	391	406	426	448	463	3.3	591.5	493.7	476.0	510.6	505.4	-1.0
Business, Building and Other Support Services[7]	103,220	105,960	98,330	96,850	93,310	-3.7	23.7	21.8	21.5	21.3	21.4[p]	0.5	345	353	368	394	409	3.8	964.4	839.3	785.3	784.5	787.0	0.3
Educational Services	125,970	149,320	148,080	145,810	146,040	0.2	13.6	11.6	11.9	11.7	12.3[p]	5.1	387	400	415	438	449	2.5	674.8	623.1	616.8	605.8	634.6	4.8
Health Care and Social Assistance	54,260	55,510	50,440	48,840	47,160	-3.4	23.0	21.6	21.5	21.3	21.3[p]	0.0	343	353	363	384	394	2.6	446.4	416.5	388.7	360.2	362.2	0.6
Information, Culture and Recreation[8]	47,770	47,340	43,680	41,960	39,470	-5.9	22.6	21.3	20.7	20.4	20.6[p]	1.0	346	356	371	388	401	3.4	440.3	375.1	346.1	332.8	318.3	-4.4
Accommodation and Food Services	76,660	73,120	67,410	63,360	58,550	-7.6	24.4	23.0	22.4	22.2	22.3[p]	0.5	285	300	310	330	341	3.3	579.7	522.0	475.2	460.3	427.2	-7.2
Other Services (except Public Administration)	47,670	47,330	44,080	40,700	40,730	0.1	23.8	22.1	21.3	21.0	21.4[p]	1.9	337	349	362	380	394	3.7	461.1	389.7	357.6	336.6	334.4	-0.7
Public Administration	73,990	76,350	69,410	65,300	63,400	-2.9	21.6	20.5	19.9	20.5	20.6[p]	0.5	388	400	411	426	437	2.6	673.0	621.9	574.7	542.3	539.9	-0.4
Unclassified	**43,630**	**43,940**	**66,580**	**44,350**	**83,210**	**87.6**	**23.8**	**22.3**	**22.1**	**21.5**	**21.3[p]**	**-0.9**	**344**	**356**	**372**	**392**	**412**	**5.1**	**351.3**	**336.1**	**451.7**	**283.9**	**565.3**	**99.1**
Canada	**1,396,860**	**1,422,270**	**1,356,810**	**1,325,810[r]**	**1,342,610**	**1.3**	**21.5**	**19.9**	**19.6**	**19.4**	**19.4[p]**	**0.0**	**371**	**384**	**396**	**419**	**434**	**3.6**	**12,805.0**	**11,121.5**	**10,450.5**	**10,367.6**	**10,602.1**	**2.3**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

2 In the past, data on the actual duration of regular benefits were reported with a lag of one year after the period covered by the *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report* to ensure that data would pertain to claims that had ended. Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, data on the actual duration of regular benefits are reported for the fiscal year covered by the *Report* in order to provide timely, relevant and consistent information. This change has been made possible by methodological improvements and the increased availability of historical data. However, data for the fiscal year covered by the *Report* are preliminary; data for 2014/2015 will be revised, if required, in the *2015/2016 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*.

3 Excludes benefits paid under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for training purposes.

4 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with regular benefits.

5 Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, amount paid in regular benefits include benefits under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for training purposes; prior years' figures have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology for regular benefits excluded these benefits, even though they were included in the total of amount paid in Employment Insurance benefits shown in Annex 2.2.

6 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

7 This industry comprises the industries with codes 55 (management of companies and enterprises) and 56 (administrative and support, waste management and mediation services) from the North American Industry Classification System.

8 This industry comprises the industries with codes 51 (information and cultural industries) and 71 (arts, entertainment and recreation) from the North American Industry Classification System.

p Preliminary.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.6 Regular Benefits (by Regional Unemployment Rate and Hours of Insurable Employment from Previous Employment)

	New Claims Established[1]						Average Actual Duration[2,3] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[4] ($)						Amount Paid[4,5] ($ Million)					
						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Regional Unemployment Rate[7]																								
6.0% or Lower	109,660	182,290	199,610	187,910	273,380	45.5	16.8	15.9	15.7	16.0	16.9[p]	5.6	369	396	406	442	452	2.3	845.8	965.3	1,320.2	2,512.0	2,848.2	13.4
6.1%–7.0%	118,160	163,980	159,140	196,410	158,060	-19.5	18.9	18.0	17.7	17.7	17.2[p]	-2.8	384	379	393[r]	416	433	4.1	913.7	1,133.3	1,090.2	1,583.2	1,855.8	17.2
7.1%–8.0%	225,910	165,330	177,020	259,710	329,870	27.0	20.1	18.3	18.7	18.3	18.4[p]	0.5	368	375	384	417	428	2.6	1,972.5	1,318.2	1,039.3	2,957.8	2,661.5	-10.0
8.1%–9.0%	332,240	463,540	441,350	327,910[r]	236,460	-27.9	20.2	19.5	19.1	19.3	19.9[p]	3.1	368	379	395	415	426	2.7	1,942.8	3,198.4	3,220.7	406.5	461.9	13.6
9.1%–10.0%	209,390	138,570	100,260	45,870	78,450	71.0	23.6	20.4	20.8	19.8	18.8[p]	-5.1	364	388	397	412	436	5.8	3,074.2	1,196.2	1,048.6	573.1	534.0	-6.8
10.1%–11.0%	113,080	64,650	49,340	84,810[r]	55,950	-34.0	21.5	20.0	21.2	21.0	20.8[p]	-1.0	379	386	404	413	430	4.1	991.9	722.4	391.4	455.0	444.9	-2.2
11.1%–12.0%	81,070	48,980	43,320	52,390	44,380	-15.3	22.7	22.9	22.9	20.8	23.1[p]	11.1	379	393	393	411	419	1.9	778.9	560.8	469.1	108.1	112.5	4.1
12.1%–13.0%	40,240	26,520	19,890	10,030	7,660	-23.6	24.4	22.3	25.1	23.4	23.6[p]	0.9	371	398	403	429	434	1.2	484.7	251.0	214.2	164.0	24.8	-84.9
13.1%–14.0%	19,250	20,130	27,860	6,620	470	-92.9	27.8	26.0	23.8	23.9	22.2[p]	-7.1	365	392	409	429	506	17.9	272.9	192.6	220.8	150.0	227.4	51.6
14.1%–15.0%	20,540	20,290	17,740	20,030	25,870	29.2	26.3	25.7	26.1	26.7	28.3[p]	6.0	384	381	392	413	422	2.2	188.0	220.0	219.4	424.0	379.2	-10.6
15.1%–16.0%	28,850	30,080	21,730	57,470	25,100	-56.3	26.1	27.0	27.0	27.5	25.5[p]	-7.3	372	381	387	413	431	4.4	283.5	314.5	255.5	503.0	604.6	20.2
16.1% or Higher	98,470	97,910	99,550	76,650	106,960	39.5	27.9	27.3	26.3	25.2	25.3[p]	0.4	374	389	406	420	429	2.1	1,056.1	1,048.9	961.4	530.9	447.4	-15.7
Hours of Insurable Employment from Previous Employment																								
420–559 Hours	24,170	19,490	17,170	16,200	15,540	-4.1	28.3	28.9	27.1	25.5	27.0[p]	5.9	287	293	299	309	328	6.1	219.1	180.7	155.1	133.8	127.2	-4.9
560–699 Hours	72,650	67,530	57,610	52,690[r]	48,850	-7.3	22.9	22.3	21.4	20.7	21.7[p]	4.8	317	324	335	343	353	2.9	595.5	506.8	458.0	380.0	361.1	-5.0
700–839 Hours	102,090	101,820	91,410	88,590	88,530	-0.1	21.1	20.2	19.3	19.0	19.5[p]	2.6	329	334	342	356	367	3.1	783.0	708.3	646.5	592.3	592.6	0.1
840–979 Hours	134,560	129,930	119,280	112,690[r]	115,160	2.2	21.5	20.2	19.7	19.4	20.1[p]	3.6	337	346	354	374	387	3.5	1,064.1	937.1	861.4	795.4	829.4	4.3
980–1,119 Hours	138,760	140,840	130,690	125,430	127,920	2.0	20.6	19.6	19.2	19.5	19.7[p]	1.0	348	358	366	388	402	3.6	1,059.5	983.9	924.7	891.1	931.0	4.5
1,120–1,259 Hours	134,980	135,910	130,750	127,170	128,290	0.9	19.8	18.5	18.6	18.7	18.8[p]	0.5	361	371	381	403	417	3.5	1,005.7	925.8	880.8	871.5	903.0	3.6
1,260–1,399 Hours	123,770	129,260	120,050	116,850	117,920	0.9	19.3	17.8	18.4	18.2	18.2[p]	0.0	373	388	397	422	434	2.8	931.4	865.8	829.3	814.0	851.0	4.5
1,400–1,539 Hours	117,360	124,990	129,200	127,380	127,610	0.2	19.1	17.5	17.1	16.7	16.8[p]	0.6	382	398	414	438	452	3.2	916.5	842.4	836.4	853.0	872.5	2.3
1,540–1,679 Hours	108,980	115,720	110,650	109,630	109,360	-0.2	20.2	18.1	18.3	18.3	18.2[p]	-0.5	388	402	413	439	452	3.0	932.5	830.0	782.5	803.8	836.3	4.0
1,680–1,819 Hours	110,720	114,690	112,990	110,030[r]	109,480	-0.5	21.7	19.9	19.7	19.7	19.3[p]	-2.0	395	406	420	445	457	2.7	1,094.5	959.2	897.8	923.5	924.4	0.1
1,820 or More Hours	328,820	342,090	337,010	339,150	353,950	4.4	24.0	21.5	21.4	21.0	20.4[p]	-2.9	411	424	439	463	478	3.2	4,201.6	3,381.4	3,178.0	3,309.0	3,373.4	1.9
Missing Data	0	0	0	0	0	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	1.6	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	-50.0
Canada	**1,396,860**	**1,422,270**	**1,356,810**	**1,325,810[r]**	**1,342,610**	**1.3**	**21.5**	**19.9**	**19.6**	**19.4**	**19.4[p]**	**0.0**	**371**	**384**	**396**	**419**	**434**	**3.6**	**12,805.0**	**11,121.5**	**10,450.5**	**10,367.6**	**10,602.1**	**2.3**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

2 In the past, data on the actual duration of regular benefits were reported with a lag of one year after the period covered by the *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report* to ensure that data would pertain to claims that had ended. Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, data on the actual duration of regular benefits are reported for the fiscal year covered by the *Report* in order to provide timely, relevant and consistent information. This change has been made possible by methodological improvements and the increased availability of historical data. However, data for the fiscal year covered by the *Report* are preliminary; data for 2014/2015 will be revised, if required, in the *2015/2016 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*.

3 Excludes benefits paid under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for training purposes.

4 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with regular benefits.

5 Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, amount paid in regular benefits include benefits under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for training purposes; prior years' figures have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology for regular benefits excluded these benefits, even though they were included in the total of amount paid in Employment Insurance benefits shown in Annex 2.2.

6 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

7 Unemployment rates used for the Employment Insurance program are a moving average of seasonally adjusted monthly rates of unemployment produced by Statistics Canada, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.

p Preliminary.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.7 Regular Benefits (by Employment Insurance Economic Region)

	New Claims Established[1]						Average Actual Duration[2,3] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[4] ($)						Amount Paid[4,5] ($ Million)					
						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Employment Insurance Economic Region																								
Newfoundland and Labrador																								
St. John's	10,590	10,560	9,360	9,740	10,550	8.3	21.9	18.3	17.6	17.5	18.2[p]	4.0	387	403	422	434	447	3.0	93.2	86.6	73.0	71.0	82.0	15.5
Newfoundland/Labrador	57,570	56,870	53,070	53,550	52,860	-1.3	28.8	28.2	27.6	27.1	26.7[p]	-1.5	369	384	397	414	426	2.9	617.6	615.7	574.2	573.4	584.5	1.9
Prince Edward Island																								
Prince Edward Island *(until October 11, 2014)*[7]	18,570	18,380	16,930	16,040	6,940	Not applicable	24.9	24.8	23.3	22.7	25.1[p]	Not applicable	362	373	389	395	399	Not applicable	170.7	170.6	163.0	144.3	105.7	Not applicable
Charlottetown *(starting October 12, 2014)*[7]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	2,320	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	18.8[p]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	401	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	8.3	Not applicable
Prince Edward Island *(starting October 12, 2014)*[7]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	7,300	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	22.9[p]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	417	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	33.5	Not applicable
Nova Scotia																								
Eastern Nova Scotia	22,820	23,340	21,430	21,600	22,110	2.4	27.6	28.0	27.6	25.9	26.4[p]	1.9	371	384	394	413	432	4.6	230.4	236.0	230.8	225.8	222.4	-1.5
Western Nova Scotia	31,080	31,290	28,200	26,340	26,450	0.4	24.6	23.3	23.5	22.4	23.0[p]	2.7	355	371	382	388	404	4.1	264.1	266.2	247.8	224.1	219.8	-1.9
Halifax	12,690	13,740	12,530	11,590	12,170	5.0	20.4	19.0	18.5	19.3	19.2[p]	-0.5	352	366	375	405	417	3.0	99.3	97.0	85.4	85.3	91.9	7.7
New Brunswick																								
Fredericton–Moncton–Saint John	20,020	20,710	20,670	19,040	19,230	1.0	19.9	19.1	19.2	19.6	20.4[p]	4.1	343	356	368	393	407	3.6	149.3	142.6	145.2	142.0	146.2	3.0
Madawaska–Charlotte	12,760	13,500	12,990	11,830	11,370	-3.9	23.2	22.8	23.0	22.1	20.9[p]	-5.4	358	367	383	391	399	2.0	111.1	111.6	108.6	104.2	92.1	-11.6
Restigouche–Albert	41,750	41,210	39,840	38,580	38,330	-0.6	26.4	26.3	25.9	26.4	25.6[p]	-3.0	367	379	397	411	421	2.4	406.0	417.8	406.2	397.6	402.7	1.3
Quebec																								
Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine	26,590	26,490	25,250	24,670	23,830	-3.4	27.2	25.8	24.8	25.8	25.4[p]	-1.6	379	392	404	421	430	2.1	268.8	268.9	258.4	248.2	249.1	0.4
Quebec	34,530	35,740	33,530	32,840	34,200	4.1	16.3	15.0	14.8	15.4	15.9[p]	3.2	369	386	396	428	438	2.3	233.6	199.7	179.6	188.5	209.8	11.3
Trois-Rivières	9,950	10,220	9,420	8,870	8,620	-2.8	20.9	19.6	18.4	18.3	17.2[p]	-6.0	377	390	411	409	418	2.2	81.4	76.7	68.8	59.6	57.1	-4.2
South Central Quebec	10,420	11,480	9,220	8,930	8,160	-8.6	14.4	13.8	13.8	14.1	15.0[p]	6.4	356	372	386[r]	413[r]	426	3.1	60.3	54.5	47.5	44.1	47.5	7.7
Sherbrooke	8,580	9,400	8,250	8,070	9,210	14.1	18.0	15.9	15.9	17.2	17.4[p]	1.2	358	370	383	411	419	1.9	56.7	51.7	47.5	45.6	58.5	28.3
Montérégie	30,400	32,230	26,730	26,190	25,750	-1.7	18.0	17.0	16.3	17.0	16.7[p]	-1.8	356	370	380	408	420	2.9	218.3	194.7	169.8	161.5	168.6	4.4
Montreal	150,210	157,750	155,350	152,130	152,310	0.1	20.7	18.8	18.8	19.1	19.2[p]	0.5	357	370	382	412	424	2.9	1,289.1	1,077.4	1,071.5	1,090.8	1,166.0	6.9
Central Quebec	75,920	81,930	78,520	74,410	74,540	0.2	19.6	18.8	18.1	17.5	17.6[p]	0.6	374	389	403	407	418	2.7	580.1	570.2	552.0	495.5	496.5	0.2
North Western Quebec	22,040	21,390	20,390	19,970	20,300	1.7	21.2	20.2	20.1	19.3	20.0[p]	3.6	389	407	419	422	437	3.6	189.7	176.9	171.0	160.5	159.5	-0.6
Lower Saint Lawrence and North Shore	50,990	51,040	48,710	47,280[r]	44,590	-5.7	21.1	19.6	19.0	19.6	19.2[p]	-2.0	383	399	414	422	429	1.7	415.6	409.0	369.2	354.6	349.5	-1.4
Hull	10,540	11,520	10,310	10,340	10,750	4.0	17.7	17.1	17.0	17.0	18.2[p]	7.1	378	388	399	424	436	2.8	77.0	70.3	70.2	67.4	74.9	11.1
Chicoutimi–Jonquière	11,540	11,170	11,080	10,530	11,580	10.0	18.5	17.1	16.8	18.0	18.9[p]	5.0	380	395	410	413	427	3.4	85.2	76.6	68.9	70.5	78.1	10.8

Continued on the next page...

Annex 2.7 Regular Benefits (by Employment Insurance Economic Region) *(Continued)*

	New Claims Established[1]						Average Actual Duration[2,3] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[4] ($)						Amount Paid[4,5] ($ Million)					
						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Employment Insurance Economic Region																								
Ontario																								
Ottawa	18,840	21,380	20,740	19,950	20,180	1.2	19.6	18.0	17.9	17.3	17.8[p]	2.9	372	390[r]	399	429	443	3.3	171.4	148.6	145.8	147.4	151.4	2.7
Eastern Ontario	17,660	19,130	19,510	19,820	19,820	0.0	21.1	18.7	18.4	17.8	18.0[p]	1.1	358	372[r]	383	410	428	4.4	143.5	135.5	133.9	137.1	144.8	5.6
Kingston	3,990	4,420	3,820	3,820	3,770	-1.3	17.9	17.1	17.0	17.5	19.1[p]	9.1	358	376	390	411	429	4.4	31.5	27.5	24.6	26.1	27.9	6.9
Central Ontario	42,590	47,260	44,740	44,080	42,610	-3.3	20.7	18.3	18.6	17.8	17.7[p]	-0.6	359	373	387	412	425	3.2	366.2	331.2	307.9	316.3	310.7	-1.8
Oshawa	10,720	12,410	11,510	12,700	12,350	-2.8	21.5	17.7	19.5	16.6	16.1[p]	-3.0	395	407	422	432	453	4.9	114.9	92.6	86.5	89.9	89.9	0.0
Toronto	144,840	148,580	147,190	145,690	141,040	-3.2	23.6	21.1	21.1	20.2	20.0[p]	-1.0	370	379	392	424	435	2.6	1,586.7	1,265.7	1,178.7	1,218.5	1,215.2	-0.3
Hamilton	20,710	20,970	19,680	20,220	19,540	-3.4	20.8	17.6	17.8	17.1	17.0[p]	-0.6	371	381	392	431	437	1.4	192.5	149.7	133.9	141.1	137.5	-2.6
St. Catharines	16,150	16,880	16,870	16,770[r]	14,660	-12.6	20.9	19.4	19.2	18.6	18.5[p]	-0.5	349	363	369	405	412	1.7	144.4	116.9	115.3	117.2	109.2	-6.8
London	13,900	14,490	13,900	14,210	13,430	-5.5	20.6	20.4	19.6	19.6	18.7[p]	-4.6	361	377	383	416	423	1.7	127.9	108.5	105.3	109.1	104.9	-3.8
Niagara	12,850	13,940	13,260	12,610	12,330	-2.2	22.4	20.2	19.5	18.6	18.1[p]	-2.7	382	396	405	415	433	4.3	129.4	113.1	101.8	100.1	88.9	-11.2
Windsor	13,180	11,740	12,210	10,230	15,520	51.7	19.8	17.6	20.4	19.1	16.8[p]	-12.0	389	401[r]	408	408	456	11.8	113.6	93.2	89.8	85.3	83.8	-1.8
Kitchener	14,420	15,150	14,600	15,050	13,340	-11.4	20.7	18.9	18.2	18.5	17.1[p]	-7.6	368	383	391	429	443	3.3	139.9	114.9	103.2	111.9	108.9	-2.7
Huron	13,600	14,380	12,850	13,750	13,040	-5.2	21.0	18.1	18.8	18.5	17.1[p]	-7.6	390	396	412	419	431	2.9	129.3	113.7	94.0	94.1	95.3	1.3
South Central Ontario	14,580	15,010	14,050	13,040	11,590	-11.1	18.9	16.8	16.5	16.9	16.3[p]	-3.6	368	381	392	419	431	2.9	132.2	100.7	93.6	90.6	82.8	-8.6
Sudbury	5,930	5,710	5,740	5,780	5,540	-4.2	20.0	18.2	19.2	18.4	17.1[p]	-7.1	377	384	409	430	444	3.3	63.9	42.4	40.8	45.5	43.0	-5.5
Thunder Bay	4,310	4,840	4,320	4,520	4,580	1.3	15.9	16.2	16.5	17.5	16.6[p]	-5.1	386	396	412	446	456	2.2	35.5	28.1	29.3	31.4	33.9	8.0
Northern Ontario	28,990	29,960	29,260	28,790	28,040	-2.6	22.9	22.4	22.5	22.2	21.8[p]	-1.8	387	402	415	429	439	2.3	281.4	259.1	264.7	267.2	265.1	-0.8
Manitoba																								
Winnipeg	19,820	21,050	20,440	19,370	20,080	3.7	17.4	16.1	16.1	15.7	16.7[p]	6.4	359	370	380[r]	417	429	2.9	161.4	136.0	132.8	134.8	138.4	2.7
Southern Manitoba	10,270	10,550	10,130	9,260	9,750	5.3	16.0	14.7	15.2	15.4	15.9[p]	3.2	358	362	378	404	419	3.7	72.0	61.8	61.0	60.9	64.1	5.3
Northern Manitoba	7,240	7,490	7,260	7,010	7,450	6.3	26.3	26.1	25.2	25.3	24.0[p]	-5.1	364	382	396	409	417	2.0	75.3	73.2	76.4	72.0	74.7	3.8
Saskatchewan																								
Regina	3,910	4,110	3,920	3,970	4,470	12.6	16.2	14.7	15.3	14.5	14.5[p]	0.0	384	402	416	455	468	2.9	33.2	26.5	27.3	28.7	31.3	9.1
Saskatoon	6,540	6,560	6,310	6,100	7,510	23.1	17.2	16.5	14.7	15.4	16.2[p]	5.2	385	400	411	437	469	7.3	56.3	45.9	44.5	43.4	52.1	20.0
Southern Saskatchewan	8,480	8,210	8,020	7,500	8,550	14.0	17.4	15.9	16.0	15.9	17.2[p]	8.2	369	387	403	426	450	5.6	67.1	56.6	55.6	52.6	60.3	14.6
Northern Saskatchewan	10,540	10,400	9,670	9,820	10,970	11.7	24.2	23.7	23.2	22.5	23.1[p]	2.7	381	402	421	432	453	4.9	112.6	101.8	99.9	100.6	102.6	2.0
Alberta																								
Calgary	29,610	26,080	26,820	26,580	32,730	23.1	19.9	17.0[r]	17.0	16.7	17.7[p]	6.0	406	414	431	462	484	4.8	328.7	229.8	202.1	217.0	237.3	9.4
Edmonton	33,060	29,490	27,300	29,770	36,310	22.0	19.1	15.5	15.1	15.8	16.6[p]	5.1	414	425	437	470	487	3.6	338.5	245.3	198.3	227.7	260.7	14.5
Northern Alberta	8,670	8,310	7,060	7,320	10,290	40.6	20.9	18.6	17.1	18.3	19.6[p]	7.1	419	438	451	465	490	5.4	97.9	77.3	65.0	65.1	79.3	21.8
Southern Alberta	24,720	22,790	21,980	20,330	26,450	30.1	18.6	16.4	15.3	15.9	17.1[p]	7.5	394	406	418	450	477	6.0	256.5	178.8	160.9	160.8	169.6	5.5

Continued on the next page...

Annex 2.7 Regular Benefits (by Employment Insurance Economic Region) *(Continued)*

	New Claims Established[1]						Average Actual Duration[2,3] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[4] ($)						Amount Paid[4,5] ($ Million)					
						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Employment Insurance Economic Region																								
British Columbia																								
Southern Interior British Columbia	34,220	33,070	29,400	29,140[r]	28,630	-1.8	21.6	18.6	17.8	18.1	18.6[p]	2.8	368	383	395	428	442	3.3	311.7	257.8	212.2	207.9	221.2	6.4
Abbotsford	8,680	8,570	8,270	7,980	7,380	-7.5	20.8	20.0	18.4	18.6	18.9[p]	1.6	323[r]	335	348	359	374	4.2	64.6	60.5	55.6	51.8	48.9	-5.6
Vancouver	66,490	63,510	60,470	58,780	55,620	-5.4	22.2	19.7	19.2	18.6	18.2[p]	-2.2	362	374	384	412	424	2.9	670.9	494.6	446.9	449.4	435.8	-3.0
Victoria	9,180	9,190	8,830	7,790	7,520	-3.5	19.8	17.9	18.0	17.4	17.8[p]	2.3	381	379	398	428	437	2.1	79.2	66.1	64.5	57.1	57.4	0.5
Southern Coastal British Columbia	24,670	23,510	22,680	21,280	20,740	-2.5	20.1	19.3	18.4	19.1	19.0[p]	-0.5	368	379	394	427[r]	443	3.7	214.0	178.9	164.7	158.4	161.5	2.0
Northern British Columbia	19,010	18,460	17,650	15,840	19,150	20.9	22.5	21.4	20.6	19.7	20.7[p]	5.1	399	417	432	444	462	4.1	207.0	163.5	167.9	142.5	156.8	10.0
Territories																								
Yukon *(until October 11, 2014)*[7]	2,140	2,060	2,080	2,020	780	Not applicable	22.6	22.8	24.0	24.0	29.1[p]	Not applicable	432	445	457	477	476	Not applicable	21.6	22.0	22.1	21.3	17.0	Not applicable
Whitehorse *(starting October 12, 2014)*[7]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	560	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	16.8[p]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	485	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	2.6	Not applicable
Yukon *(starting October 12, 2014)*[7]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	540	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	18.9[p]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	473	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	3.1	Not applicable
Northwest Territories *(until October 11, 2014)*[7]	1,680	1,720	1,590	1,530	990	Not applicable	27.4	26.3	26.2	25.9	29.2[p]	Not applicable	440	448	463	487	492	Not applicable	22.2	21.4	22.3	20.3	17.2	Not applicable
Yellowknife *(starting October 12, 2014)*[7]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	170	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	18.0[p]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	511	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.7	Not applicable
Northwest Territories *(starting October 12, 2014)*[7]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	520	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	21.6[p]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	507	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	2.7	Not applicable
Nunavut *(until October 11, 2014)*[7]	1 110	930	900	850	280	Not applicable	29.2	27.6	28.2	29.2	30.8[p]	Not applicable	430	433	462	460	464	Not applicable	12.9	11.7	12.9	11.9	7.9	Not applicable
Iqaluit *(starting October 12, 2014)*[7]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	40	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	13.2[p]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	494	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.2	Not applicable
Nunavut *(starting October 12, 2014)*[7]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	280	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	30.1[p]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	477	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	1.4	Not applicable
Canada	**1,396,860**	**1,422,270**	**1,356,810**	**1,325,810[r]**	**1,342,610**	**1.3**	**21.5**	**19.9**	**19.6**	**19.4**	**19.4[p]**	**0.0**	**371**	**384**	**396**	**419**	**434**	**3.6**	**12,805.0**	**11,121.5**	**10,450.5**	**10,367.6**	**10,602.1**	**2.3**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

2 In the past, data on the actual duration of regular benefits were reported with a lag of one year after the period covered by the *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report* to ensure that data would pertain to claims that had ended. Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, data on the actual duration of regular benefits are reported for the fiscal year covered by the *Report* in order to provide timely, relevant and consistent information. This change has been made possible by methodological improvements and the increased availability of historical data. However, data for the fiscal year covered by the *Report* are preliminary; data for 2014/2015 will be revised, if required, in the *2015/2016 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*.

3 Excludes benefits paid under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for training purposes.

4 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with regular benefits.

5 Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, amount paid in regular benefits include benefits under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for training purposes; prior years' figures have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology for regular benefits excluded these benefits, even though they were included in the total of amount paid in Employment Insurance benefits shown in Annex 2.2.

6 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

7 As of October 12, 2014, there is a total of 62 Employment Insurance (EI) economic regions, instead of 58 regions. The EI economic regions of Prince Edward Island, Yukon, Northwest Territories and Nunavut were each divided in two EI economic regions, one consisting of the capital area and the remaining consisting of the non-capital area.

p Preliminary.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.8 Seasonal Regular Claimants[1,2]

	New Claims Established[3]						Average Actual Duration[4,5] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[6] ($)						Amount Paid[5,6] ($ Million)					
						Change (%)[7]						Change (%)[7]						Change (%)[7]						Change (%)[7]
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory[8]																								
Newfoundland and Labrador	35,300	33,980	32,450	32,100	30,720	-4.3	27.9	27.4	26.7	26.2	26.0[p]	-0.8	386	398	413	426	439	3.1	362.9	364.5	345.8	340.2	342.1	0.6
Prince Edward Island	9,510	9,610	9,390	8,750	8,580	-1.9	25.5	25.3	23.7	23.2	23.6[p]	1.7	379	385	400	404	413	2.2	86.8	89.5	86.9	79.1	75.8	-4.2
Nova Scotia	25,870	27,000	26,630	26,060	25,560	-1.9	24.5	23.8	24.0	22.7	23.1[p]	1.8	377	388	402	411	427	3.9	223.6	236.2	236.9	230.3	222.4	-3.4
New Brunswick	34,810	34,900	35,150	34,470	34,090	-1.1	24.6	24.5	24.4	24.7	23.9[p]	-3.2	380	387	404	417	426	2.2	309.0	320.2	324.2	322.5	330.4	2.4
Quebec	150,760	160,100	161,250	160,890	159,240	-1.0	18.6	17.3	16.9	17.0	17.0[p]	0.0	394	406	420	436	447	2.5	1,082.3	1,056.7	1,040.9	1,043.2	1,082.2	3.7
Ontario	75,730	87,160	91,820	95,870	97,110	1.3	15.9	14.5	14.8	14.6	14.5[p]	-0.7	398	410	425	443	456	2.9	490.6	483.6	499.3	547.9	572.0	4.4
Manitoba	8,580	10,380	10,670	10,520	10,820	2.9	16.1	14.8	14.4	14.6	14.6[p]	0.0	377	389	397	425	435	2.4	56.9	57.4	58.7	60.2	63.3	5.1
Saskatchewan	7,620	8,080	8,260	7,770	7,770	0.0	16.7	16.7	16.5	16.0	16.6[p]	3.8	392	406	418	441	451	2.3	53.1	52.0	54.7	53.1	53.5	0.8
Alberta	8,630	10,990	12,150	13,000	13,700	5.4	16.3	13.9	13.2	13.3	13.8[p]	3.8	424	433	446	468	478	2.1	66.0	64.2	68.2	73.7	78.4	6.4
British Columbia	24,040	29,000	31,160	32,100	31,370	-2.3	18.0	16.0	15.4	15.3	15.6[p]	2.0	383	394	403	422	431	2.1	178.6	168.5	178.1	180.4	188.9	4.7
Yukon	620	680	640	550	520	-5.5	22.0	23.3	21.9	21.7	20.2[p]	-6.9	442	449	469	489	497	1.6	5.7	6.2	6.5	5.4	6.0	11.1
Northwest Territories	280	270	280	280	210	-25.0	27.9	26.8	27.6	25.5	23.3[p]	-8.6	446	453	463	498	513	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.8	3.4	2.6	-23.5
Nunavut	60	80	80	50	30	-40.0	32.3	26.3	32.6	25.8	29.3[p]	13.6	451	453	463	501	431	-14.0	0.7	1.1	1.2	0.8	0.5	-37.5
Gender																								
Men	245,790	255,140	259,690	262,030	261,810	-0.1	20.4	19.4	19.0	18.9	18.6[p]	-1.6	418	429	443	458	470	2.6	2,055.5	2,050.0	2,045.5	2,097.6	2,162.1	3.1
Women	136,020	157,090	160,240	160,380	157,910	-1.5	19.0	17.1	16.7	16.4	16.8[p]	2.4	343	360	374	392	403	2.8	863.7	853.1	859.8	842.5	856.0	1.6
Age																								
24 Years and Under (Youth)	11,350	12,180	11,980	10,940	10,540	-3.7	19.2	18.2	18.1	18.0	17.4[p]	-3.3	408	420	428	444	462	4.1	84.9	86.2	89.2	82.9	80.4	-3.0
25 to 44 Years	146,270	152,580	154,550	155,330	154,680	-0.4	18.7	17.5	17.1	16.9	16.9[p]	0.0	406	419	434	451	464	2.9	1,085.3	1,062.2	1,047.3	1,058.4	1,089.1	2.9
45 to 54 Years	121,400	129,680	128,020	126,060	120,920	-4.1	19.9	18.3	17.9	17.8	17.6[p]	-1.1	388	400	415	431	443	2.8	939.2	905.5	870.1	862.6	859.2	-0.4
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	102,790	117,790	125,380	130,080	133,580	2.7	21.7	20.2	19.6	19.3	19.3[p]	0.0	370	383	396	412	423	2.7	809.8	849.3	898.7	936.3	989.3	5.7
Canada	**381,810**	**412,230**	**419,930**	**422,410[r]**	**419,720**	**-0.6**	**19.9**	**18.5**	**18.1**	**17.9**	**17.9[p]**	**0.0**	**391**	**402**	**417**	**433**	**445**	**2.8**	**2,919.2**	**2,903.2**	**2 905.3[r]**	**2,940.2**	**3,018.1**	**2.6**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Seasonal regular claimants are individuals who established three or more regular or fishing claims in the five fiscal years preceding the reference year, of which at least two were established at the same time of year as their claim in the reference year. For the purposes of this annex, a 17-week window is used to determine whether a claim was established at the same time of year as their claim in the reference year. Specifically, a claim is considered to have been established at the same time of year if was established between eight weeks before and eight weeks after the week in which the reference year claim was established.

2 In previous *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Reports*, this annex dealt with all seasonal claimants, not only seasonal regular claimants. By definition, all those receiving fishing benefits were considered seasonal claimants, and their statistics were therefore included in this annex. For the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, for consistency and simplicity, this annex deals only with seasonal regular claimants, and data on individuals receiving fishing benefits are shown separately in Annex 2.9.

3 Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefits was paid.

4 Data on the actual duration of benefits paid to seasonal regular claimants for the fiscal year covered by the report are preliminary; data for 2014/2015 will be revised, if required, in the *2015/2016 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report.*

5 Excludes benefits paid under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act* for training purposes.

6 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to seasonal regular claimants.

7 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

8 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, provincial and territorial figures are based on the province or territory of residence where a claim was initially established; figures pertaining to years prior to 2013/2014 published in the previous *Reports* have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on the province or territory of residence where the claim ended.

p Preliminary.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.9 Fishing Benefits

	New Claims Established[1]						Average Actual Duration[2] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[3] ($)						Amount Paid[3] ($ Million)					
						Change (%)[4]						Change (%)[4]						Change (%)[4]						Change (%)[4]
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory[5]																								
Newfoundland and Labrador	11,322	12,462	11,833	11,218	11,160	-0.5	19.9	20.9	20.7	21.0	20.7[p]	-1.4	417	440	448	464	484	4.3	92.6	106.1	101.3	100.1	98.6	-1.5
Prince Edward Island	3,022	2,977	2,877	2,834	2,844	0.4	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.8	20.3[p]	2.5	436	449	470	475	493	3.8	23.9	23.8	23.3	22.6	24.1	6.6
Nova Scotia	5,579	5,608	5,436	5,225	5,185	-0.8	19.6	19.6	19.7	19.9	19.9[p]	0.0	432	444	463	474	498	5.1	47.1	50.0	50.7	49.2	49.9	1.4
New Brunswick	2,671	2,770	2,795	2,751	2,791	1.5	19.6	19.6	19.6	19.9	19.8[p]	-0.5	440	455	473	486	499	2.7	22.9	25.5	25.8	27.0	26.6	-1.5
Quebec	1,477	1,499	1,457	1,409	1,390	-1.3	19.7	19.4	18.9	19.9	19.5[p]	-2.0	445	459	475	489	504	3.1	11.6	12.8	12.1	12.3	12.8	4.1
Ontario	89	94	82	90	93	3.3	20.2	20.7	21.5	23.1	21.8[p]	-5.6	392	403	406	417	426	2.2	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.2	0.0
Manitoba	891	777	793	778	750	-3.6	22.8	22.1	23.1	23.4	22.7[p]	-3.0	370	377	391	400	401	0.2	9.2	7.9	8.1	8.3	8.4	1.2
Saskatchewan	137	120	127	116	117	0.9	24.9	24.1	24.7	24.5	24.2[p]	-1.2	369[r]	342	386	394	419	6.3	0.5	0.5	0.8	1.1	1.0	-9.1
Alberta	19	15	20	23	25	8.7	23.1	23.7	20.4	23.7	22.0[p]	-7.2	439	409	404	396	434	9.6	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	200.0
British Columbia	3,294	3,144	2,814	2,644	3,124	18.2	23.0	23.1	22.9	22.8	23.2[p]	1.8	411[r]	415	415[r]	432	459	6.3	32.4	31.0	28.9	25.4	31.7	24.8
Yukon	1	1	3	4	4	0.0	19.0	17.0	25.3	25.5	24.5[p]	-3.9	457	448	485	501	431	-14.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not applicable
Northwest Territories	9	10	12	14	12	-14.3	21.5	25.9	25.9	25.5	24.2[p]	-5.1	399	398	433	449	421	-6.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.0
Nunavut	22	29	41	69	92	33.3	16.6	18.2	19.9	20.7	22.5[p]	8.7	426	458	464	459	485	5.7	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.7	250.0
Gender																								
Men	23,672	24,298	23,222	22,372	22,590	1.0	19.9	20.2	20.1	20.4	20.4[p]	0.0	428	443	456	470	489	4.0	200.1	214.3	209.4	205.0	210.9	2.9
Women	4,861	5,208	5,068	4,803	4,997	4.0	22.0	22.4	22.2	22.3	22.3[p]	0.0	401[r]	421	433	443	465	5.0	41.6	44.8	43.4	43.0	44.7	4.0
Age																								
24 Years and Under (Youth)	1,218	1,361	1,239	1,127	1,218	8.1	20.2	20.3	19.9	20.4	20.2[p]	-1.0	405	421	430	449	464	3.3	9.1	11.3	11.3	10.9	10.4	-4.6
25 to 44 Years	9,639	9,697	8,987	8,335	8,214	-1.5	19.6	20.2	20.0	20.3	20.4[p]	0.5	426	441	453	467	484	3.6	84.0	84.8	77.6	75.0	74.3	-0.9
45 to 54 Years	9,029	9,232	8,805	8,420	8,228	-2.3	20.1	20.3	20.3	20.6	20.5[p]	-0.5	427	444	458	471	490	4.0	75.5	83.0	82.9	78.8	78.7	-0.1
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	8,647	9,216	9,259	9,293	9,927	6.8	21.2	21.3	21.2	21.3	21.3[p]	0.0	419	435	448	461	484	5.0	73.1	80.1	80.9	83.2	92.2	10.8
Canada	**28,533**	**29,506**	**28,290**	**27,175**	**27,587**	**1.5**	**20.3**	**20.6**	**20.5**	**20.8**	**20.7[p]**	**-0.5**	**423**	**439**	**452**	**465**	**484**	**4.1**	**241.7**	**259.2**	**252.8**	**247.9**	**255.6**	**3.1**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of fishing benefits was paid.

2 In the past, data on the actual duration of fishing benefits were reported with a lag of one year after the period covered by the *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report* to ensure that data would pertain to claims that had ended. Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, data on the actual duration of fishing benefits are reported for the fiscal year covered by the *Report* in order to provide timely, relevant and consistent information. This change has been made possible by methodological improvements and the increased availability of historical data. However, data for the fiscal year covered by the *Report* are preliminary; data for 2014/2015 will be revised, if required, in the *2015/2016 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*.

3 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with fishing benefits.

4 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

5 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, provincial and territorial figures are based on the province or territory of residence where a claim was initially established; figures pertaining to years prior to 2013/2014 published in the previous *Reports* have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on the province or territory of residence where the claim ended.

p Preliminary.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data, except for the amount paid which is based on a 10% sample.

Annex 2.10 Special Benefits[1,2,3]

	New Claims Established[4]							Average Weekly Benefit Rate[5] ($)							Amount Paid[5] ($ Million)						
							Change (%)[6]							Change (%)[6]							Change (%)[6]
	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory[7]																					
Newfoundland and Labrador	11,020	10,670	11,550	11,120	11,660[r]	11,970	2.7	344	357	374	393	401	408	1.7	78.7	81.4	85.6	92.1	93.5[r]	98.0	4.8
Prince Edward Island	5,200	5,380	5,950	5,010	5,930	6,350	7.1	355	351	367	384	387	397	2.6	30.0	28.8	33.9	31.8	33.0[r]	39.7	20.3
Nova Scotia	20,820	21,530	22,120	20,500	21,150[r]	21,660	2.4	336	348	362	372	393	400	1.8	148.7	144.1	155.1	158.2	154.2[r]	164.3	6.5
New Brunswick	24,830	25,250	24,690	25,280	24,220[r]	24,920	2.9	339	353	363	379	395	405	2.5	141.7	142.3	149.4	152.9	157.3[r]	156.8	-0.3
Quebec	100,130	97,110	102,050	105,330	105,400[r]	107,700	2.2	330	340	350	364	380	390	2.6	305.6	304.5	320.9	354.8	367.5[r]	375.2	2.1
Ontario	185,230	179,990	183,950	181,920	185,180[r]	184,240	-0.5	357	367	375	386	410	420	2.4	1,915.5	1,905.5	1,929.5	1,991.5	2,105.9[r]	2,176.8	3.4
Manitoba	19,250	18,850	18,450	19,300	19,610[r]	18,990	-3.2	340	350	356	373	397	413	4.0	171.0	165.6	171.7	184.3	206.0[r]	212.6	3.2
Saskatchewan	15,060	14,730	14,060	14,760	15,270[r]	14,790	-3.1	348	360	374	390	414	430	3.9	148.9	153.4	157.9	165.1	187.3[r]	188.0	0.4
Alberta	52,180	50,810	50,450	53,990	54,880[r]	58,440	6.5	372	377	387	402	430	445	3.5	608.4	590.8	601.0	656.4	712.7[r]	761.7	6.9
British Columbia	74,800	73,140	73,140	70,880	71,580[r]	75,350	5.3	346	354	362	375	403	411	2.0	638.8	640.5	653.4	672.9	705.4[r]	750.9	6.5
Yukon	630	540	720	740	590	670	13.6	420	439	437	436	452	463	2.4	6.1	6.7	7.2	9.6	8.1	7.7	-4.9
Northwest Territories	680	800	950	820	690	600	-13.0	420	440	454	466	488	478	-2.0	7.9	9.4	12.3	10.1	10.7	8.5	-20.6
Nunavut	470	470	420	390	380	350	-7.9	422	435	449	470	474	458	-3.4	5.8	5.4	5.9	4.6	6.0	5.0	-16.7
Missing Data	0	0	0	0	280	70	-75.0	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.4	-66.7
Gender																					
Men	163,510	160,700	165,240	167,900	171,210[r]	177,910	3.9	376	386	396	410	433	444	2.5	694.8	682.6	704.3	757.6	803.5[r]	834.2	3.8
Women	346,790	338,570	343,260	342,140	345,610[r]	348,190	0.7	336	345	354	366	388	398	2.6	3,512.4	3,495.8	3,579.5	3 726,9[r]	3,945.4[r]	4,111.3	4.2
Age																					
24 Years and Under (Youth)	48,350	45,700	43,110	41,810	39,880[r]	39,890	0.0	276	284	288	301	321	330	2.8	383.5	350.1	338.4	330.9	334.9[r]	339.5	1.4
25 to 44 Years	301,150	294,460	296,570	297,860	299,790[r]	303,530	1.2	366	375	384	397	420	431	2.6	3,255.1	3,252.7	3,331.2	3,487.9	3,694.1[r]	3,853.5	4.3
45 to 54 Years	91,060	88,460	91,260	90,260	91,400[r]	90,850	-0.6	345	355	365	377	399	409	2.5	326.1	325.6	338.9	361.0	379.2[r]	382.5	0.9
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	69,740	70,650	77,560	80,110	85,750[r]	91,830	7.1	332	339	352	365	385	396	2.9	242.4	250.0	275.3	304.6	340.7	370.1	8.6
Employment Status																					
Employee	510,300	498,990	508,010	509,390	516,170[r]	525,370	2.1	349	358	368	381	403	414	2.7	4,207.2	4,177.7	4,277.4	4,478.8	4,740.7[r]	4,937.8	4.2
Self-Employed Persons[8]	Not applicable	280	490	650	650	730	12.3	Not applicable	319	325	293	326	315	-3.4	Not applicable	0.7	6.4	5.7	8.2	7.7	-6.1
Canada	**510,300**	**499,270**	**508,500**	**510,040**	**516,820[r]**	**526,100**	**1.8**	**349**	**358**	**368**	**381**	**403**	**414**	**2.7**	**4,207.2**	**4,178.4**	**4,283.8**	**4,484.5**	**4,748.9[r]**	**4,945.5**	**4.1**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes maternity, parental, sickness, compassionate care and parents of critically ill children benefits.

2 Also includes special benefits for self-employed individuals.

3 For a breakdown of maternity, parental, sickness, compassionate care and parents for critically ill children benefits, please refer to Annexes 2.12 to 2.17.

4 Includes claims for which at least $1 of special benefits was paid.

5 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with special benefits.

6 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

7 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, provincial and territorial figures are based on the province or territory of residence where a claim was initially established; figures pertaining to years prior to 2013/2014 published in the previous *Reports* have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on the province or territory of residence where the claim ended.

8 Special benefits have been available since January 2011 to self-employed persons who choose to participate in the Employment Insurance program.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.11 Special Benefits (by Employment Insurance Economic Region)[1,2]

	New Claims Established[3]							Average Weekly Benefit Rate[4]							Amount Paid[4]						
							Change (%)[5]	($)						Change (%)[5]	($ Million)						Change (%)[5]
	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Employment Insurance Economic Region																					
Newfoundland and Labrador																					
St. John's	4,100	3,780	4,400	4,290	4,440	4,590	3.4	358	369	387	411	412	415	0.7	37.0	37.5	37.9	44.8	45.4	44.6	-1.8
Newfoundland/Labrador	6,920	6,890	7,150	6,830	7,210	7,350	1.9	336	350	365	382	395	403	2.0	41.7	44.0	47.7	47.3	48.0	53.1	10.6
Prince Edward Island																					
Prince Edward Island *(until October 11, 2014)*[5]	5,200	5,380	5,950	5,010	5,930	3,310	Not applicable	355	351	367	384	387	397	Not applicable	30.0	28.8	33.9	31.8	33.0	33.4	Not applicable
Charlottetown *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	760	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	389	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	2.3	Not applicable
Prince Edward Island *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	2,270	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	399	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	3.9	Not applicable
Nova Scotia																					
Eastern Nova Scotia	5,500	5,940	6,160	5,680	6,470	6,800	5.1	341	360	376	382	412	419	1.7	31.0	30.0	30.8	32.9	35.7	37.9	6.2
Western Nova Scotia	8,050	8,110	8,670	7,780	8,010	7,970	-0.5	329	346	356	369	372	381	2.4	54.3	51.2	59.5	57.7	53.3	56.6	6.2
Halifax	7,270	7,480	7,290	7,040	6,630	6,830	3.0	340	342	356	365	400	401	0.2	63.3	62.8	64.8	67.7	65.0	69.4	6.8
New Brunswick																					
Fredericton–Moncton–Saint John	8,920	9,430	9,220	9,640	9,130	9,050	-0.9	325	343	348	364	386	403	4.4	66.3	67.0	72.1	72.8	78.3	77.9	-0.5
Madawaska–Charlotte	3,700	4,030	3,950	4,010	3,870	4,000	3.4	341	349	370	376	382	394	3.1	21.0	21.7	21.3	24.0	23.2	23.6	1.7
Restigouche–Albert	12,210	11,790	11,520	11,630	11,190	11,800	5.5	349	363	374	392	407	410	0.7	54.4	53.6	56.1	56.2	55.7	54.9	-1.4
Quebec																					
Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine	2,650	2,250	2,620	3,690	3,150	3,530	12.1	332	343	367	380	387	407	5.2	7.6	7.3	8.5	11.4	11.7	11.7	0.0
Quebec	8,760	9,110	9,480	9,380	9,420	9,270	-1.6	318	327	337	349	379	385	1.6	25.2	27.5	28.0	29.4	32.9	30.4	-7.6
Trois-Rivières	2,360	2,570	2,460	2,430	3,000	2,640	-12.0	337	348	363	373	367	382	4.1	6.6	6.9	7.0	7.6	9.4	8.0	-14.9
South Central Quebec	3,100	2,920	3,240	3,040	2,840	2,690	-5.3	317	330	346	349	381	389	2.1	9.7	9.2	9.1	10.0	8.9	9.9	11.2
Sherbrooke	2,300	2,390	2,610	2,140	2,380	2,610	9.7	318	312	323	340	374	390	4.3	7.0	7.0	7.3	6.5	8.2	8.4	2.4
Montérégie	8,050	7,080	7,900	7,670	7,120	7,350	3.2	313	323	337	347	373	386	3.5	24.8	23.1	27.2	26.3	25.6	26.2	2.3
Montreal	32,930	31,230	32,550	33,510	33,090	33,100	0.0	322	334	342	351	382	389	1.8	101.8	98.6	102.6	115.3	117.2	120.0	2.4
Central Quebec	18,650	17,810	18,740	19,720	20,490	21,040	2.7	339	346	356	373	370	382	3.2	57.3	58.5	58.6	68.4	68.5	71.7	4.7
North Western Quebec	4,290	3,880	3,610	4,020	4,540	4,600	1.3	348	341	350	381	379	388	2.4	13.7	12.5	12.1	14.0	17.2	16.7	-2.9
Lower Saint Lawrence and North Shore	10,650	11,000	11,350	13,000	12,250	12,770	4.2	347	362	374	389	391	402	2.8	31.5	33.0	34.7	41.6	42.5	40.8	-4.0
Hull	2,850	3,150	3,450	3,040	3,160	3,380	7.0	352	355	364	375	412	409	-0.7	9.8	10.1	12.3	12.2	12.6	14.8	17.5
Chicoutimi–Jonquière	3,540	3,720	4,040	3,690	3,670	4,080	11.2	360	361	368	387	386	404	4.7	10.5	10.7	13.4	12.2	11.5	12.6	9.6

Continued on the next page...

Annex 2.11 Special Benefits (by Employment Insurance Economic Region)[1,2] *(Continued)*

	New Claims Established[3]							Average Weekly Benefit Rate[4]							Amount Paid[4]						
							Change (%)[5]	($)						Change (%)[5]	($ Million)						Change (%)[5]
	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Ontario																					
Ottawa	13,550	13,620	13,430	13,460	13,960	13,270	-4.9	389	399	400	420	440	453	3.0	153.4	160.7	165.4	168.0	174.8	182.1	4.2
Eastern Ontario	7,400	6,960	7,160	7,450	7,380	7,520	1.9	327	355	352	367	400	410	2.5	53.6	58.7	59.6	67.5	70.2	72.3	3.0
Kingston	2,320	2,190	2,250	2,220	2,210	2,120	-4.1	349	365	363	378	405	414	2.2	22.2	22.4	20.2	23.1	22.2	23.4	5.4
Central Ontario	17,480	17,490	17,410	16,960	18,140	16,790	-7.4	335	345	353	363	388	399	2.8	144.6	151.6	149.6	149.2	168.5	175.7	4.3
Oshawa	5,470	5,810	5,570	5,540	5,630	5,970	6.0	377	388	406	415	418	435	4.1	60.6	63.7	65.8	65.9	68.9	72.7	5.5
Toronto	73,910	70,710	72,160	71,490	71,580	71,370	-0.3	365	372	380	389	417	426	2.2	878.6	845.7	854.7	876.5	926.7	944.5	1.9
Hamilton	10,050	9,960	9,580	9,600	9,800	10,300	5.1	352	361	377	383	411	424	3.2	106.3	101.8	102.6	102.9	110.4	120.8	9.4
St. Catharines	5,730	5,760	5,840	5,950	6,260	5,530	-11.7	324	333	341	358	379	397	4.7	48.4	48.0	46.5	49.3	54.6	54.8	0.4
London	6,690	5,880	6,820	6,520	6,890	6,360	-7.7	361	361	374	373	405	422	4.2	68.0	63.5	68.0	69.9	72.7	74.0	1.8
Niagara	4,970	4,980	5,040	5,500	5,270	5,690	8.0	359	368	385	396	390	404	3.6	44.7	47.7	49.7	54.0	57.9	53.1	-8.3
Windsor	4,500	4,080	4,490	4,620	4,780	4,560	-4.6	358	360	384	398	396	418	5.6	39.1	39.0	39.3	45.7	48.3	45.8	-5.2
Kitchener	6,530	6,990	6,850	7,040	7,640	7,430	-2.7	351	357	372	381	415	422	1.7	70.7	74.3	72.5	74.9	83.9	93.0	10.8
Huron	5,470	4,820	5,790	4,880	4,680	5,260	12.4	342	357	379	387	399	394	-1.3	42.9	40.6	47.9	49.5	39.6	47.0	18.7
South Central Ontario	7,080	7,020	7,680	7,210	6,680	6,880	3.0	347	363	361	374	409	420	2.7	72.7	72.9	75.8	77.6	78.8	82.1	4.2
Sudbury	3,040	3,170	2,800	2,420	2,620	2,790	6.5	344	348	364	376	409	407	-0.5	25.3	24.0	22.3	21.2	22.8	26.1	14.5
Thunder Bay	1,960	2,320	2,090	1,650	2,180	2,100	-3.7	347	359	370	378	418	400	-4.3	15.6	18.0	18.5	16.1	17.0	20.6	21.2
Northern Ontario	9,080	8,230	8,990	9,410	9,020	9,410	4.3	355	369	375	389	405	406	0.2	68.9	72.6	71.2	80.3	85.9	82.9	-3.5
Manitoba																					
Winnipeg	11,980	12,090	11,260	11,990	12,210	12,180	-0.2	339	351	359	376	399	416	4.3	104.2	108.6	111.2	113.5	135.7	133.3	-1.8
Southern Manitoba	5,310	5,070	5,440	5,580	5,380	5,040	-6.3	331	339	344	360	390	407	4.4	49.0	41.5	44.5	54.4	51.0	57.4	12.5
Northern Manitoba	1,960	1,690	1,750	1,730	1,980	1,690	-14.6	368	378	376	390	404	409	1.2	17.8	15.5	16.0	16.4	19.0	21.3	12.1
Saskatchewan																					
Regina	3,460	3,400	3,110	3,470	3,490	3,570	2.3	355	370	388	399	432	436	0.9	34.7	36.7	38.4	40.9	42.4	45.4	7.1
Saskatoon	4,080	3,920	4,040	4,040	4,440	4,120	-7.2	350	370	369	390	416	431	3.6	41.9	44.2	45.7	45.6	56.1	57.5	2.5
Southern Saskatchewan	4,220	4,030	3,810	4,020	3,790	4,010	5.8	330	339	353	374	398	417	4.8	39.6	38.8	39.6	42.6	46.4	45.8	-1.3
Northern Saskatchewan	3,300	3,380	3,100	3,230	3,520	3,040	-13.6	363	365	392	401	410	437	6.6	32.7	33.8	34.2	36.0	42.3	39.0	-7.8
Alberta																					
Calgary	17,590	16,470	15,980	17,780	18,000	19,550	8.6	380	384	393	405	437	449	2.7	220.5	219.4	215.8	230.0	256.4	272.5	6.3
Edmonton	16,890	17,410	16,950	18,530	18,830	19,690	4.6	373	382	393	405	432	443	2.5	194.7	188.5	197.8	217.9	238.9	254.5	6.5
Northern Alberta	4,090	3,880	3,940	4,360	4,190	4,080	-2.6	395	399	419	439	447	464	3.8	47.5	48.8	47.3	59.3	57.4	59.8	4.2
Southern Alberta	13,610	13,050	13,580	13,320	13,710	14,770	7.7	353	356	364	381	412	435	5.6	145.8	134.1	140.0	149.2	159.0	172.5	8.5
British Columbia																					
Southern Interior British Columbia	11,350	11,650	10,590	10,660	10,840	11,680	7.7	334	354	353	362	400	403	0.8	83.3	90.2	87.4	85.8	94.4	100.4	6.4
Abbotsford	4,650	4,800	5,020	4,420	4,580	4,730	3.3	308	312	315	344	356	374	5.1	35.1	31.7	33.7	36.3	34.4	37.4	8.7
Vancouver	36,610	34,970	36,430	34,350	34,840	36,700	5.3	354	359	368	380	407	417	2.5	350.2	345.8	358.2	361.1	378.6	406.3	7.3
Victoria	5,630	5,250	5,160	5,350	5,020	5,390	7.4	354	362	378	391	421	428	1.7	47.9	48.5	45.9	54.2	54.3	56.4	3.9
Southern Coastal British Columbia	10,130	9,940	9,370	10,050	9,470	10,110	6.8	331	336	344	357	396	402	1.5	68.1	73.2	72.0	76.4	82.7	86.5	4.6
Northern British Columbia	6,430	6,530	6,570	6,050	6,690	6,430	-3.9	366	376	389	406	418	418	0.0	54.2	51.0	56.2	59.1	60.2	61.9	2.8

Continued on the next page...

Annex 2.11 Special Benefits (by Employment Insurance Economic Region)[1,2] *(Continued)*

	New Claims Established[3]							Average Weekly Benefit Rate[4]							Amount Paid[4]						
							Change (%)[5]	($)						Change (%)[5]	($ Million)						Change (%)[5]
	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Territories																					
Yukon *(until October 11, 2014)*[5]	630	540	720	740	590	440	Not applicable	420	439	437	436	452	465	Not applicable	6.1	6.7	7.2	9.6	8.1	7.0	Not applicable
Whitehorse *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	180	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	453	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.6	Not applicable
Yukon *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	50	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	478	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.1	Not applicable
Northwest Territories *(until October 11, 2014)*[5]	680	800	950	820	690	380	Not applicable	420	440	454	466	488	475	Not applicable	7.9	9.4	12.3	10.1	10.7	7.6	Not applicable
Yellowkniffe *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	120	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	482	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.5	Not applicable
Northwest Territories *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	100	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	485	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.4	Not applicable
Nunavut *(until October 11, 2014)*[5]	470	470	420	390	380	210	Not applicable	422	435	449	470	474	450	Not applicable	5.8	5.4	5.9	4.6	6.0	4.4	Not applicable
Iqaluit *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	60	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	499	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.3	Not applicable
Nunavut *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	80	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	451	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.2	Not applicable
Missing Data	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,470**	**2,560**	**74.1**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**Not applicable**	**416**	**427**	**2.6**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**7.9**	**16.8**	**112.7**
Canada	**510,300**	**499,270**	**508,500**	**510,040**	**516,820**	**526,100**	**1.8**	**349**	**358**	**368**	**381**	**403**	**414**	**2.7**	**4,207.2**	**4,178.4**	**4,283.8**	**4,484.5**	**4,748.9**	**4,945.5**	**4.1**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes maternity, parental, sickness, compassionate care and parents of critically ill children benefits.

2 Also includes special benefits for self-employed individuals.

3 Includes claims for which at least $1 of special benefits was paid.

4 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with special benefits.

5 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

6 As of October 12, 2014, there is a total of 62 Employment Insurance (EI) economic regions, instead of 58 regions. The EI economic regions of Prince Edward Island, Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut were each divided into two EI economic regions, one consisting of the capital area and the remaining consisting of the non-capital area.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.12 Maternity Benefits[1]

	New Claims Established[2]						Average Actual Duration[3] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[4] ($)						Amount Paid[4] ($ Million)					
						Change (%)[5]						Change (%)[5]						Change (%)[5]						Change (%)[5]
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory[6]																								
Newfoundland and Labrador	2,760	3,060	2,840	2,940	2,730	-7.1	14.3	14.4[r]	14.2[r]	14.3	14.0	-2.1	376	390	412	418	430	2.9	15.3	17.1	16.9	17.4	17.6	1.1
Prince Edward Island	940	1,180	920	990	1,060	7.1	14.3[r]	14.7[r]	14.4[r]	14.0	14.1	0.7	345	374	392	387	421	8.8	5.0	6.5	5.1	5.2	6.9	32.7
Nova Scotia	5,880	5,560	5,130	4,840	5,430	12.2	14.5	14.6[r]	14.6	14.6[r]	14.7	0.7	350	362	370	396	394	-0.5	28.8	29.8	30.2	26.8	32.1	19.8
New Brunswick	4,690	4,820	4,680	4,280	4,230	-1.2	14.6[r]	14.6[r]	14.6[r]	14.6[r]	14.7	0.7	356	363	373	393	403	2.5	25.0	25.9	25.1	25.9	25.6	-1.2
Quebec[7]	0	0	0	0	0	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not applicable
Ontario	84,130	83,880	84,900	84,110	82,350	-2.1	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.7	0.7	377	385	397	420	429	2.1	471.0	471.9	492.8	514.4	522.4	1.6
Manitoba	7,840	7,500	8,460	8,910	8,090	-9.2	14.6	14.7[r]	14.7[r]	14.7	14.7	0.0	348	352	371	388	407	4.9	39.2	39.2	44.9	50.4	49.5	-1.8
Saskatchewan	7,150	6,990	7,710	7,820	7,780	-0.5	14.8[r]	14.6	14.7	14.6	14.7	0.7	363	371	391	409	427	4.4	38.8	39.2	43.5	46.8	48.2	3.0
Alberta	28,080	27,170	29,260	29,280	31,070	6.1	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	0.0	377	386	400	426	441	3.5	153.2	153.8	170.1	182.2	198.1	8.7
British Columbia	26,320	26,370	25,910	25,650	25,690	0.2	14.7[r]	14.7[r]	14.7[r]	14.7[r]	14.7	0.0	361	368	383	409	421	2.9	139.8	143.8	147.1	154.0	159.7	3.7
Yukon	190	360	360	220	250	13.6	14.8[r]	14.9[r]	14.5[r]	14.9	14.2	-4.7	443	441	430	457	438	-4.2	1.3	2.0	2.5	1.8	1.5	-16.7
Northwest Territories	410	440	350	370	260	-29.7	14.7[r]	14.8[r]	14.8	14.9[r]	14.1	-5.4	435	454	468	489	492	0.6	2.7	3.2	2.3	2.8	2.0	-28.6
Nunavut	230	210	160	230	140	-39.1	14.8	13.0[r]	15.0	14.8	14.4	-2.7	433	455	457	472	434	-8.1	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.7	0.8	-52.9
Age																								
24 Years and Under (Youth)	21,340	19,640	18,440	17,650	17,520	-0.7	14.6[r]	14.7[r]	14.6[r]	14.7[r]	14.6	-0.7	268	272	284	304	315	3.6	85.3	81.0	79.5	80.8	80.3	-0.6
25 Years and Older	147,280	147,900	152,240	151,990	151,560	-0.3	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	0.0	386	394	406	429	440	2.6	836.1	852.6	902.4	948.7	984.0	3.7
Canada	**168,620**	**167,540**	**170,680**	**169,640**	**169,080**	**-0.3**	**14.6**	**14.6**	**14.6**	**14.6**	**14.6**	**0.0**	**371**	**380**	**393**	**416**	**427**	**2.6**	**921.4**	**933.6**	**981.9**	**1,029.5**	**1,064.3**	**3.4**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Figures also include maternity benefits for self-employed individuals.

2 Includes claims for which at least $1 of maternity benefits was paid.

3 In the past, data on the actual duration of maternity benefits were estimated using claims starting any time during the fiscal year. To increase the accuracy of this information, starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, the most recent data on the actual duration of maternity benefits (that is, data pertaining to the fiscal year covered by the *Report*) are based on claims starting in the first half of the fiscal year to ensure they are based on claims that have ended. If required, the most recent data will be revised in the following *Report*, once the actual duration of maternity benefits for the entire fiscal year is known. Prior years' figures have been restated to reflect this, and any figures that have changed from those published in a previous *Report* have been marked as revised.

4 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with maternity benefits.

5 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

6 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, provincial and territorial figures are based on the province or territory of residence where a claim was initially established; figures pertaining to years prior to 2013/2014 published in the previous *Reports* have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on the province or territory of residence where the claim ended.

7 Quebec is excluded from calculations at the national level. Since January 2006, this province has administered its own maternity benefits under the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.13 Parental Benefits (Biological)[1]

	New Claims Established[2,3]						Average Actual Duration[3,4] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[3,5] ($)						Amount Paid[5] ($ Million)					
						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory[7]																								
Newfoundland and Labrador	2,690	3,140	2,900	3,000	2,790	-7.0	29.7[r]	30.7	29.7[r]	30.4[r]	30.7	1.0	389	394	419	428	434	1.4	37.2	36.3	38.6	37.4	41.0	9.6
Prince Edward Island	1,050	1,320	940	1,130	1,140	0.9	28.2[r]	28.6[r]	30.0[r]	29.4[r]	31.5	7.1	361	385	405	400	428	7.0	11.2	12.9	12.9	11.6	15.5	33.6
Nova Scotia	6,560	6,450	5,940	5,450	6,040	10.8	29.3[r]	29.2[r]	29.6[r]	29.2[r]	28.8	-1.4	369	379	386	412	410	-0.5	65.3	72.0	71.8	65.6	71.3	8.7
New Brunswick	5,340	5,220	5,230	4,780	4,640	-2.9	28.5[r]	29.2[r]	29.5[r]	29.6[r]	29.0	-2.0	372	372	388	406	417	2.7	56.0	56.6	59.7	60.7	58.1	-4.3
Quebec[8]	0	0	0	0	0	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not applicable
Ontario	95,630	95,060	96,350	95,810	94,160	-1.7	30.1[r]	30.2[r]	30.3[r]	30.2[r]	29.8	-1.3	387	394	406	429	438	2.1	1,118.1	1,122.9	1,156.2	1,206.5	1,249.2	3.5
Manitoba	8,850	8,570	9,570	9,880	9,280	-6.1	30.1[r]	29.8[r]	30.4[r]	30.7[r]	30.1	-2.0	359	364	381	401	418	4.2	92.4	96.9	100.3	116.0	119.3	2.8
Saskatchewan	7,920	7,720	8,410	8,660	8,420	-2.8	30.5[r]	31.1[r]	31.2[r]	31.0[r]	30.7	-1.0	373	382	402	419	433	3.3	89.3	93.8	95.8	110.7	109.7	-0.9
Alberta	29,760	29,010	31,300	31,330	33,430	6.7	31.1[r]	31.3[r]	31.4[r]	31.3[r]	31.0	-1.0	384	392	407	434	448	3.2	348.7	358.3	382.9	417.3	444.7	6.6
British Columbia	29,450	29,420	28,920	28,460	29,010	1.9	30.4[r]	30.5[r]	30.6[r]	30.6[r]	30.0	-2.0	374	379	395	420	434	3.2	330.1	339.9	344.6	361.0	380.0	5.3
Yukon	210	410	390	280	330	17.9	26.6[r]	28.3[r]	30.8[r]	28.9[r]	26.7	-7.6	445	442	444	458	467	2.0	3.7	3.6	5.6	4.7	4.7	0.0
Northwest Territories	490	600	430	460	340	-26.1	28.1[r]	24.9[r]	26.6[r]	26.1[r]	24.7	-5.4	439	458	469	490	497	1.4	5.2	7.3	5.8	6.4	5.2	-18.8
Nunavut	300	170	230	240	160	-33.3	25.8[r]	27.6[r]	26.7[r]	30.2[r]	25.6	-15.2	433	443	463	469	441	-6.0	2.9	2.8	2.3	3.2	2.9	-9.4
Gender																								
Men	26,350	25,560	25,930	25,150	26,040	3.5	17.1[r]	17.1[r]	17.7[r]	16.4[r]	16.7	1.8	420	427	443	467	480	2.8	183.9	184.6	196.3	192.7	200.3	3.9
Women	161,900	161,530	164,680	164,330	163,700	-0.4	32.3[r]	32.4[r]	32.5[r]	32.5[r]	32.1	-1.2	375	382	396	419	429	2.4	1,976.2	2,018.7	2,080.1	2,208.3	2,301.4	4.2
Age																								
24 Years and Under (Youth)	21,250	19,890	18,420	17,590	17,490	-0.6	31.3[r]	31.1[r]	31.7[r]	31.7[r]	31.2	-1.6	283	283	296	315	327	3.8	197.0	190.1	182.0	179.5	182.9	1.9
25 Years and Older	167,000	167,200	172,190	171,890	172,250	0.2	30.0[r]	30.2[r]	30.4[r]	30.3[r]	29.9	-1.3	394	401	414	436	447	2.5	1,963.1	2,013.1[r]	2,094.4	2,221.5	2,318.7	4.4
Canada	**188,250**	**187,090**	**190,610**	**189,480**	**189,740**	**0.1**	**30.2[r]**	**30.3[r]**	**30.5[r]**	**30.4[r]**	**30.0**	**-1.3**	**382**	**388**	**402**	**425**	**436**	**2.6**	**2,160.1**	**2,203.3**	**2,276.4**	**2,401.0**	**2,501.6**	**4.2**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Figures also include parental benefits (biological) for self-employed individuals.

2 Includes claims for which at least $1 of parental benefits (biological) was paid.

3 Parental benefits (biological) that are shared between two parents are considered as two separate claims.

4 In the past, data on the actual duration of parental benefits (biological) were estimated using claims starting in the first half of the fiscal year, to ensure they are based on claims that have ended, and they were never revised afterward. To increase the accuracy of this information, starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, the most recent data on the actual duration of parental benefits (that is, data pertaining to the fiscal year covered by the *Report*) will continue to be based on claims starting in the first half of the fiscal year but will be revised, if required, in the following *Report*, once the actual duration of parental benefits for the entire fiscal year is known. Prior years' figures have been restated to reflect this, and any figures that have changed from those published in a previous *Report* have been marked as revised.

5 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with parental benefits (biological).

6 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

7 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, provincial and territorial figures are based on the province or territory of residence where a claim was initially established; figures pertaining to years prior to 2013/2014 published in the previous *Reports* have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on the province or territory of residence where the claim ended.

8 Quebec is excluded from calculations at the national level. Since January 2006, this province has administered its own parental benefits under the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.14 Parental Benefits (Adoptive)[1]

	New Claims Established[2,3]						Average Actual Duration[3,4] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[3,5] ($)						Amount Paid[5] ($ Million)					
						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]						Change (%)[6]
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory[8]																								
Newfoundland and Labrador	10	20	20	30	40[c]	-42.9[c]	35.0[c,r]	28.6[c,r]	35.0	35.0	30.5	-12.9	457	468	440	492	357	-27.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.2	-66.7
Prince Edward Island	30	30	0	40					Not applicable	34.5[r]	Not available[7]	Not available	444	453	Not applicable	454	399	-12.1	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	-50.0
Nova Scotia	80	90	100	130	70	-46.2	26.5[r]	25.9[r]	26.3[r]	20.9[r]	31.8	52.2	439	400	489	469	449	-4.3	0.9	0.7	1.1	1.4	1.1	-21.4
New Brunswick	50	20	40	30	80	166.7	23.2[r]	20.5	22.5[r]	31.7[r]	31.5	-0.6	453	464	440	444	464	4.5	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.9	200.0
Quebec[9]	0	0	0	0	0	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not applicable
Ontario	720	940	950	820	760	-7.3	25.3[r]	25.2[r]	26.3[r]	25.1[r]	24.4	-2.4	427	437	459	475	477	0.4	9.3	8.8	11.7	9.8[r]	9.2	-6.1
Manitoba	50	90	80	70	100	42.9	34.4[r]	24.4[r]	30.3[r]	32.6[r]	24.4	-2.8	370	449	388	423	437	3.3	0.5	1.0	1.1	0.9	1.0	11.1
Saskatchewan	40	40	60	90	50	-44.4	33.0	26.8[r]	28.5[r]	23.3[r]	6.8	-70.8	361	430	436	446	483	8.3	1.1	0.1	0.7	0.9	0.5	-44.4
Alberta	210	250	240	190	210	10.5	25.7[r]	29.8[r]	29.0[r]	30.5[r]	31.0	1.6	444	449	449	474	469	-1.1	2.4	3.0	3.5	3.1	2.1	-32.3
British Columbia	280	260	290	200	200	0.0	26.5[r]	25.4[r]	28.6	29.3[r]	24.5	-16.4	435	431	410	434	504	16.1	3.2	2.7	3.3	2.8	2.4	-14.3
Yukon	10	0	0	10	70[c]	75.0[c]	30.3[c,r]	27.6[c,r]	Not applicable	31.3[c,r]	13.0	Not available	468	Not applicable	Not applicable	514	514	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	Not applicable
Northwest Territories	0	10	30	0					20.0[r]		Not available[7]	Not applicable	Not applicable	468	490	Not applicable	514	Not applicable	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
Nunavut	60	90	50	30					23.4[r]		25.5	Not available	419	430	491	483	484	0.2	0.8	1.1	0.5	0.4	0.5	25.0
Gender																								
Men	360	520	460	330	500	51.5	17.4[r]	19.8[r]	16.5[r]	19.5[r]	22.0	12.8	440	466	481	483	507	5.0	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.2	4.9	53.1
Women	1,180	1,320	1,400	1,310	1,080	-17.6	29.3[r]	28.5[r]	30.5[r]	28.6[r]	26.7	-6.6	426	426	438	459	458	-0.2	15.7	14.8	19.0	17.4	13.5	-22.4
Age																								
24 Years and Under (Youth)	30	0	10	20	1580[d]	-3.7[d]	33.7[r]	Not applicable	27.1[d,r]	26.7[d,r]	25.0[d]	-6.4[d]	434	Not applicable	182	336	473[d]	1.9[d]	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.1	18.4[d]	-10.7[d]
25 Years and Older	1,510	1,840	1,850	1,620			26.4[r]	26.0[r]					429	437	450	466			18.9	18.6	22.8	20.5		
Canada	**1,540**	**1,840**	**1,860**	**1,640**	**1,580**	**-3.7**	**26.5[r]**	**26.0[r]**	**27.1[r]**	**26.7[r]**	**25.0**	**-6.4**	**429**	**437**	**449**	**464**	**473**	**1.9**	**19.2**	**18.7**	**22.9**	**20.6**	**18.4**	**-10.7**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Figures also include parental benefits (adoptive) for self-employed individuals.

2 Includes claims for which at least $1 of parental benefits (adoptive) was paid.

3 Parental benefits (adoptive) that are shared between two parents are considered as two separate claims.

4 In the past, data on the actual duration of parental benefits (adoptive) were estimated using claims starting in the first half of the fiscal year, to ensure they are based on claims that have ended, and they were never revised afterward. To increase the accuracy of this information, starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, the most recent data on the actual duration of parental benefits (that is, data pertaining to the fiscal year covered by the *Report*) will continue to be based on claims starting in the first half of the fiscal year but will be revised, if required, in the following *Report*, once the actual duration of parental benefits for the entire fiscal year is known. Prior years' figures have been restated to reflect this, and any figures that have changed from those published in a previous *Report* have been marked as revised.

5 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with parental benefits (adoptive).

6 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

7 When no claim started during the first half of the fiscal year, figures are indicated as not available.

8 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, provincial and territorial figures are based on the province or territory of residence where a claim was initially established; figures pertaining to years prior to 2013/2014 published in the previous *Reports* have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on the province or territory of residence where the claim ended.

9 Quebec is excluded from calculations at the national level. Since January 2006, this province has administered its own parental benefits under the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan.

c For confidentiality purposes, data for Newfoundland and Labrador and Prince Edward Island have been combined. For the same reasons, data for Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut have also been combined.

d For confidentiality purposes, data by age group have been combined.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.15 Sickness Benefits[1]

	New Claims Established[2]						Average Actual Duration[3] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[4] ($)						Amount Paid[4] ($ Million)					
						Change (%)[5]						Change (%)[5]						Change (%)[5]						Change (%)[5]
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory[6]																								
Newfoundland and Labrador	8,560	9,210	8,880	9,460	9,930	5.0	9.2	9.6r	10.1r	10.1r	9.6	-5.0	346	365	385	390	399	2.3	28.7	32.0	36.3	37.8	38.7	2.4
Prince Edward Island	4,550	4,830	4,300	5,050	5,520	9.3	7.5r	7.8r	7.9	8.1r	8.4	3.7	347	361	378	382	389	1.8	12.1	14.2	13.5	15.7	17.0	8.3
Nova Scotia	15,880	16,750	15,310	16,530	16,570	0.2	9.2r	9.0r	9.4	9.4r	9.2	-2.1	335	351	362	383	391	2.1	48.7	52.3	54.8	59.9	58.9	-1.7
New Brunswick	20,910	20,590	21,050	20,440	21,080	3.1	8.3r	8.3r	8.5r	8.3r	8.7	4.8	346	359	374	390	400	2.6	60.8	66.4	67.5	70.1	71.6	2.1
Quebec	95,590	100,590	103,930	104,120	105,880	1.7	8.9r	8.9r	9.1r	9.1r	9.3	2.2	340	350	364	380	390	2.6	296.3	313.0	346.0	362.4	367.9	1.5
Ontario	88,210	92,540	89,260	92,650	93,470	0.9	10.1r	10.1r	10.3	10.5r	10.6	1.0	341	352	359	386	397	2.8	308.1	327.1	331.8	368.9	386.1	4.7
Manitoba	10,260	10,150	10,220	9,960	9,990	0.3	9.8r	9.9r	9.9r	10.5r	10.5	0.0	339	343	361	392	405	3.3	32.8	34.0	37.7	38.0	41.6	9.5
Saskatchewan	7,250	6,680	6,810	7,070	6,910	-2.3	9.6r	10.0r	10.1r	10.2r	10.4	2.0	340	358	373	401	417	4.0	23.8	24.5	24.7	28.3	28.9	2.1
Alberta	22,350	22,500	23,980	24,680	25,430	3.0	10.2r	10.2r	10.6	10.7	10.7	0.0	363	375	389	420	436	3.8	85.4	85.0	98.8	107.5	113.0	5.1
British Columbia	46,730	46,540	45,120	46,210	49,580	7.3	10.3r	10.3r	10.6r	10.5r	10.7	1.9	337	345	358	389	394	1.3	165.8	165.2	176.1	184.6	204.7	10.9
Yukon	370	370	390	300	330	10.0	9.4r	9.6r	9.7	9.9r	8.8	-11.1	434	428	425	444	453	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.3	-13.3
Northwest Territories	340	340	390	220	250	13.6	9.9r	10.3	10.1r	10.1r	10.7	5.9	434	445	461	483r	449	-7.0	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.4	1.1	-21.4
Nunavut	100	130	110	110	130	18.2	10.5r	9.8	12.3r	10.5	10.2	-2.9	449	465	475	500	467	-6.6	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.7	16.7
Gender																								
Men	133,220	138,380	140,380	144,300	149,630	3.7	9.2r	9.2r	9.5r	9.5r	9.9	4.2	379	390	404	427	438	2.6	491.5	512.9	553.4	601.5	621.1	3.3
Women	187,880	192,840	189,370	192,500	195,440	1.5	9.8r	9.7r	10.0r	10.1r	10.1	0.0	316	326	336	359	368	2.5	574.5	604.3	637.6	675.3	710.6	5.2
Age																								
24 Years and Under (Youth)	27,960	26,560	26,160	25,360	25,410	0.2	8.4r	8.5r	8.7r	9.0	9.0	0.0	282	289	303	323	331	2.5	67.2	67.0	69.2	73.9	75.2	1.8
25 to 44 Years	138,460	140,480	137,950	139,080	141,860	2.0	9.2r	9.2r	9.4	9.5r	9.6	1.1	349	359	371	396	406	2.5	448.7	463.6	486.0	513.2	534.6	4.2
45 to 54 Years	85,120	87,870	86,700	88,030	87,430	-0.7	9.8	9.7r	10.1r	10.1r	10.3	2.0	353	364	375	397	407	2.5	304.2	315.0	335.2	353.4	357.4	1.1
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	69,560	76,310	78,940	84,330	90,370	7.2	10.3r	10.2r	10.4r	10.4r	10.7	2.9	338	352	365	385	395	2.6	245.9	271.7	300.6	336.3	364.4	8.4
Canada	**321,100**	**331,220**	**329,750**	**336,800**	**345,070**	**2.5**	**9.5r**	**9.5r**	**9.8r**	**9.8r**	**10.0**	**2.0**	**342**	**353**	**365**	**388**	**398**	**2.6**	**1,066.0**	**1,117.3**	**1,191.0**	**1,276.8**	**1,331.7**	**4.3**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Figures also include sickness benefits for self-employed individuals.

2 Includes claims for which at least $1 of sickness benefits was paid.

3 In the past, data on the actual duration of sickness benefits were estimated using claims starting any time during the fiscal year. To increase the accuracy of this information, starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, the most recent data on the actual duration of sickness benefits (that is, data pertaining to the fiscal year covered by the *Report*) are based on claims starting in the first half of the fiscal year to ensure they are based on claims that have ended. If required, the most recent data will be revised in the following *Report*, once the actual duration of sickness benefits for the entire fiscal year is known. Prior years' figures have been restated to reflect this, and any figures that have changed from those published in a previous *Report* have been marked as revised.

4 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with sickness benefits.

5 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

6 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, provincial and territorial figures are based on the province or territory of residence where a claim was initially established; figures pertaining to years prior to 2013/2014 published in the previous *Reports* have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on the province or territory of residence where the claim ended.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.16 Compassionate Care Benefits[1]

	New Claims Established[2]						Average Actual Duration[3] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[4] ($)						Amount Paid[4] ($ Million)					
						Change (%)[5]						Change (%)[5]						Change (%)[5]						Change (%)[5]
	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory[6]																								
Newfoundland and Labrador	70	56	72	64	76	18.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.7	-6.0	365[r]	385	397[r]	407	410	0.7	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1[r]	0.1	0.0
Prince Edward Island	31	30	37	35	33	-5.7	5.0	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.6	-4.2	358	378	396[r]	377	405	7.4	0.1	0.1[r]	0.1	0.1	0.0	-100.0
Nova Scotia	209	160	163	169	170	0.6	5.0	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	2.1	345	339[r]	379[r]	366	395	7.9	0.4	0.4[r]	0.3	0.4[r]	0.5	25.0
New Brunswick	147	130	150	122	143	17.2	4.9	4.7	5.0	4.6	4.6	0.0	344[r]	344	353	381[r]	397	4.2	0.3	0.2[r]	0.2[r]	0.2[r]	0.3	50.0
Quebec	1,044	1,019	1,030	917	1,046	14.1	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.3	-4.4	349[r]	360	377	392[r]	411	4.8	1.9[r]	1.7	1.9[r]	1.6[r]	1.8	12.5
Ontario	2,681	2,742	2,704	2,725	2,738	0.5	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	0.0	369[r]	380	392	419	431	2.9	5.2[r]	5.0	5.9[r]	5.7[r]	5.4	-5.3
Manitoba	263	247	217	245	229	-6.5	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.7	4.7	0.0	358	370[r]	374[r]	397[r]	415	4.5	0.6[r]	0.5	0.3[r]	0.5[r]	0.6	20.0
Saskatchewan	191	185	148	199	157	-21.1	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.8	5.2	8.3	374	389[r]	396	441[r]	445	0.9	0.4[r]	0.3[r]	0.4[r]	0.5[r]	0.3	-40.0
Alberta	468	483	569	555	675	21.6	4.8	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0	0.0	383[r]	396[r]	413	441	457	3.6	1.0[r]	0.9[r]	1.2[r]	1.7[r]	1.5	-11.8
British Columbia	900	902	985	949	948	-0.1	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.0	361	375	385[r]	420[r]	427	1.7	1.7	1.9[r]	1.7[r]	2.2[r]	2.0	-9.1
Yukon	10	8	11	8	15	87.5	5.5	5.4	5.6	4.0	4.7	17.5	452	447	478	483	499	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	Not applicable
Northwest Territories	6	8	9	9	11	22.2	4.8	4.5	4.9	4.4	4.4	0.0	461	448	451	467	482	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not applicable
Nunavut	7	5	7	6	3	-50.0	5.6	4.2	5.4	6.0	4.3	-28.3	457	468	470	385	504	30.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not applicable
Gender																								
Men	1,575	1,525	1,714	1,648	1,833	11.2	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	0.0	399[r]	411[r]	424[r]	445[r]	461	3.6	3.6[r]	2.8[r]	3.9[r]	4.1[r]	4.3	4.9
Women	4,452	4,450	4,388	4,355	4,411	1.3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	-2.1	351	363	375	403	414	2.7	8.1[r]	8.0[r]	8.3[r]	9.0[r]	8.2	-8.9
Age																								
24 Years and Under (Youth)	129	120	116	100	118	18.0	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.6	-2.1	306[r]	323[r]	329	354[r]	361	2.0	0.2	0.1[r]	0.2	0.3[r]	0.1	-66.7
25 to 44 Years	2,275	2,196	2,115	1,991	2,099	5.4	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	0.0	374[r]	388	402[r]	426	440	3.3	4.3	4.2[r]	4.5[r]	4.3[r]	4.6	7.0
45 to 54 Years	2,162	2,134	2,277	2,199	2,172	-1.2	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	-2.1	368	378	390	418	432	3.3	4.5[r]	4.0[r]	4.5[r]	4.7[r]	3.9	-17.0
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	1,461	1,525	1,594	1,713	1,855	8.3	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.0	345	359	374[r]	401	412	2.7	2.7[r]	2.5[r]	3.1[r]	3.8[r]	4.0	5.3
Canada	**6,027**	**5,975**	**6,102**	**6,003**	**6,244**	**4.0**	**4.7**	**4.7**	**4.7**	**4.7**	**4.7**	**0.0**	**364**	**375[r]**	**389**	**414[r]**	**428**	**3.4**	**11.7[r]**	**10.9[r]**	**12.3[r]**	**13.1[r]**	**12.6**	**-3.8**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Figures also include compassionate care benefits for self-employed individuals.

2 Includes claims for which at least $1 of compassionate care benefits was paid.

3 Data on the actual duration of compassionate care benefits have been estimated using claims starting any time during the fiscal year.

4 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with compassionate care benefits.

5 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

6 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, provincial and territorial figures are based on the province or territory of residence where a claim was initially established; figures pertaining to years prior to 2013/2014 published in the previous *Reports* have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on the province or territory of residence where the claim ended.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data, except for the amount paid which is based on a 10% sample.

Annex 2.17 Benefits for Parents of Critically Ill Children[1,2]

	New Claims Established[3,4]			Average Actual Duration[4,5]			Average Weekly Benefit Rate[4,6]			Amount Paid[6]		
			Change (%)[7]	(Number of Weeks)		Change (%)[7]	($)		Change (%)[7]	($ Million)		Change (%)[7]
	2013/2014[1]	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2013/2014[1]	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2013/2014[1]	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2013/2014[1]	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory												
Newfoundland and Labrador	9	28	211.1	20.6	21.8	5.8	323	408	26.3	0.1	0.2	100.0
Prince Edward Island	4	8	100.0	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	0.0	0.0	Not applicable
Nova Scotia	35	62	77.1	14.6	18.5	26.7	417	396	-5.0	0.2	0.5	150.0
New Brunswick	26	72	176.9	11.2	15.7	40.2	420	406	-3.3	0.1	0.4	300.0
Quebec	293	637	117.4	13.0	15.1	16.2	407	419	2.9	1.4	4.0	185.7
Ontario	457	893	95.4	16.1	16.5	2.5	416	427	2.6	2.7	6.0	122.2
Manitoba	43	82	90.7	20.5	15.0	-26.8	376	424	12.8	0.3	0.5	66.7
Saskatchewan	26	51	96.2	11.4	16.9	48.2	414	453	9.4	0.2	0.3	50.0
Alberta	151	350	131.8	16.3	16.4	0.6	456	447	-2.0	1.0	2.4	140.0
British Columbia	137	305	122.6	16.1	16.3	1.2	410	425	3.7	0.8	2.1	162.5
Yukon Northwest Territories Nunavut	4[c]	5[c]	25.0[c]	Not available[c]	Not available[c]	Not available[c]	Not available[c]	Not available[c]	Not available[c]	0.0[c]	0.0[c]	Not applicable[c]
Missing Data	284	67	-76.4	10.5	12.4	18.1	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	1.2	0.4	-66.7
Gender												
Men	368	563	53.0	12.4	14.6	17.7	456	453	-0.7	2.0	3.6	80.0
Women	1,101	1,997	81.4	14.3	16.4	14.7	402	420	4.5	5.9	13.2	123.7
Age												
24 Years and Under (Youth)	81	162	100.0	12.2	14.0	14.8	335	337	0.6	0.3	0.8	166.7
25 to 44 Years	1,226	2,193	78.9	13.5	15.7	16.3	425	433	1.9	6.6	14.3	116.7
45 to 54 Years	156	194	24.4	16.6	21.5	29.5	394	425	7.9	0.9	1.7	88.9
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	6	11	83.3	16.0	11.8	-26.3	357	391	9.5	0.0	0.1	Not applicable
Canada	**1,469**	**2,560**	**74.3**	**13.7**	**16.0**	**16.8**	**416**	**427**	**2.6**	**7.9**	**16.8**	**112.7**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Benefits for parents of critically ill children have been available since June 2013.

2 Figures also include parents of critically ill children benefits for self-employed individuals.

3 Includes claims for which at least $1 of benefits for parents of critically ill children was paid.

4 Benefits for parents of critically ill children benefits that are shared between two parents are considered as two separate claims.

5 Data on the actual duration of benefits for parents of critically ill children have been estimated using claims starting during the first half of the fiscal year to ensure they are based on claims that have ended.

6 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with benefits for parents of critically ill children.

7 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

c For confidentiality purposes, data for Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut have been combined.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.18 Work-sharing Benefits

	New Claims Established[1]						Average Actual Duration[2] (Number of Weeks)						Average Weekly Benefit Rate[3] ($)						Amount Paid[3] ($ Million)					
	2010/2011[4]	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	Change (%)[5] 2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	Change (%)[5] 2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	Change (%)[5] 2013/2014–2014/2015	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	Change (%)[5] 2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory[6]																								
Newfoundland and Labrador	1	83	5	6	14	133.3	8.0	15.9	12.6	17.8	19.0[p]	6.7	183	84	352	131	135	3.1	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	Not applicable
Prince Edward Island	52	16	15	7	82	1,071.4	20.6	33.0	20.9	22.8	7.6[p]	-66.7	109	103	159	108	160	48.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Nova Scotia	149	336	266	151	20[c]	-90.8[c]	8.8	17.2	14.7	13.5	17.5[p]	29.6	91	93	96	117	202	72.6	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.0
New Brunswick	75	73	78	67			16.8	13.1	21.9	17.2	4.4[p]	-74.4	103	146	133	127	80	-37.0	0.5	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
Quebec	8,228	6,765	6,310	4,759	3,580	-24.8	13.4	13.4	14.3	14.7	14.5[p]	-1.4	99	90	112	107	120	12.1	29.0	9.8	11.8	8.9	8.0	-10.1
Ontario	7,162	13,329	5,373	4,512	2,255	-50.0	13.7	12.4	13.7	16.1	15.4[p]	-4.3	92	100	97	103	118	14.6	47.0	16.3	10.2	8.7	5.4	-37.9
Manitoba	1,777	606	519	536	262	-51.1	11.5	10.5	10.4	14.1	16.8[p]	19.1	100	89	101	110	135	22.7	3.2	1.1	0.7	1.0	0.5	-50.0
Saskatchewan	339	17	11	68	742	991.2	7.4	23.1	19.6	11.2	20.4[p]	82.1	134	170	166	194	196	1.0	0.9	0.0	0.1	0.2	2.4	1,100.0
Alberta	773	882	483	1,024	631	-38.4	11.1	11.0	8.8	5.3	16.1[p]	203.8	106	103	130	222	146	-34.2	5.6	1.1	0.8	1.2	0.4	-66.7
British Columbia	2,373	1,648	815	534	438	-18.0	14.7	14.5	11.1	12.9	15.3[p]	18.6	102	94	114	114	121	6.1	11.5	2.7	1.7	0.9	0.8	-11.1
Yukon	0	0	15	9[d]	0	-100.0[d]	Not applicable	Not applicable	9.7	34.0	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	125	120	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not applicable
Northwest Territories	0	0	0		0		Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	17.0	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	98	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not applicable
Nunavut	0	0	0	0	0	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Not applicable
Gender																								
Men	15,024	15,508	9,594	8,078	5,952	-26.3	13.1	12.6	13.1	13.9	15.1[p]	8.6	103	101	115	123	135	9.8	72.5	23.1	18.6	15.0	14.1	-6.0
Women	5,905	8,247	4,296	3,595	2,072	-42.4	13.8	13.2	14.6	15.2	16.6[p]	9.2	85	88	88	103	112	8.7	25.8	8.6	7.5	6.3	3.6	-42.9
Age																								
24 Years and Under (Youth)	1,514	1,502	759	546	497	-9.0	11.9	11.3	11.6	12.8	12.1[p]	-5.5	90	96	97	99	122	23.2	3.9	1.7	1.0	1.0	0.8	-20.0
25 to 44 Years	9,490	10,492	5,689	5,130	3,475	-32.3	12.9	11.9	13.2	13.5	15.3[p]	13.3	99	96	107	123	132	7.3	39.8	13.0	9.9	8.7	8.3	-4.6
45 to 54 Years	6,391	7,588	4,584	3,702	2,403	-35.1	13.7	13.3	13.9	15.0	15.9[p]	6.0	98	97	108	114	130	14.0	33.8	10.6	8.9	7.0	5.2	-25.7
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	3,534	4,173	2,858	2,295	1,649	-28.1	14.3	14.7	14.5	15.3	16.2[p]	5.9	99	97	108	113	125	10.6	20.8	6.4	6.3	4.6	3.4	-26.1
Canada	**20,929**	**23,755**	**13,890**	**11,673**	**8,024**	**-31.3**	**13.3**	**12.8**	**13.6**	**14.3**	**15.5[p]**	**8.4**	**98**	**97**	**107**	**117**	**129**	**10.3**	**98.3**	**31.7**	**26.1**	**21.3**	**17.7**	**-16.9**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of work-sharing benefits was paid.

2 In the past, data on the actual duration of work-sharing benefits were reported with a lag of one year after the period covered by the *Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report* to ensure that data would pertain to claims that had ended. Starting with the *2014/2015 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, data on the actual duration of work-sharing benefits are reported for the fiscal year covered by the *Report* in order to provide timely, relevant and consistent information. This change has been made possible by methodological improvements and the increased availability of historical data. However, data for the fiscal year covered by the *Report* are preliminary; data for 2014/2015 will be revised, if required, in the *2015/2016 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*.

3 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants with work-sharing benefit.

4 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, the number of new claims established is based on a 100% sample of Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data; the figures for the fiscal years 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 published in the *Reports* before 2013/2014 have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on a 10% sample.

5 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

6 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, provincial and territorial figures are based on the province or territory of residence where a claim was initially established; figures pertaining to years prior to 2013/2014 published in the previous *Reports* have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on the province or territory of residence where the claim ended.

c For confidentiality purposes, data for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have been combined.

d For confidentiality purposes, data for Yukon and Northwest Territories have been combined.

p Preliminary

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data, except for the amount paid which is based on a 10% sample.

Annex 2.19 Family Supplement

	New Claims Established Which Included Family Supplement[1]			Percentage of New Claims Established Which Included Family Supplement[2]		Average Weekly Family Supplement[3]			Average Weekly Benefit Rate[3,4]			Amount Paid[5]						
			Change (%)[6]	(%)		($)		Change (%)[6]	($)		Change (%)[6]	($ Million)						Change (%)[6]
	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2013/2014–2014/2015
Province and Territory[7]																		
Newfoundland and Labrador	2,770	2,390	-13.7	3	3	45	40	-11.1	323	330	2.2	6.0	5.3	4.6	4.3	3.7	3.6	-2.7
Prince Edward Island	1,060	930	-12.3	5	4	42	41	-2.4	328	327	-0.3	2.2	2.0	1.8	1.6	1.3	1.3	0.0
Nova Scotia	4,400	4,210	-4.3	6	5	43	41	-4.7	322	328	1.9	8.9	8.2	7.6	7.1	5.8	5.1	-12.1
New Brunswick	4,750	4,460	-6.1	6	5	40	36	-10.0	331	330	-0.3	7.1	6.2	5.8	5.5	5.5	5.0	-9.1
Quebec	18,760	17,610	-6.1	4	4	41	43	4.9	340	347	2.1	26.2	23.7	19.1	17.9	15.8	15.2	-3.8
Ontario	30,050	28,330	-5.7	5	5	44	39	-11.4	320	326	1.9	49.9	45.3	41.1	39.3	35.6	32.7	-8.1
Manitoba	4,250	4,260	0.2	8	7	50	46	-8.0	334	347	3.9	8.3	7.1	6.3	6.4	5.7	5.4	-5.3
Saskatchewan	2,870	2,680	-6.6	6	6	54	46	-14.8	343	356	3.8	6.5	6.1	4.7	4.3	3.9	3.9	0.0
Alberta	6,520	5,950	-8.7	4	4	43	43	0.0	337	348	3.3	10.9	9.2	7.2	7.1	6.9	7.3	5.8
British Columbia	10,420	9,930	-4.7	5	5	41	38	-7.3	326	333	2.1	16.8	16.2	14.2	13.0	10.8	10.3	-4.6
Yukon	60	40	-33.3	2	2	31	44	41.9	379	326	-14.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	Not applicable
Northwest Territories	40	60	50.0	2	3	51	43	-15.7	372	343	-7.8	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	Not applicable
Nunavut	50	60	20.0	4	6	52	35	-32.7	369	314	-14.9	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	-100.0
Gender																		
Men	17,860	16,850	-5.7	2	2	47	46	-2.1	373	384	2.9	30.0	26.4	21.7	20.1	17.9	16.4	-8.4
Women	68,140	64,060	-6.0	8	8	43	39	-9.3	318	323	1.6	113.2	103.3	90.9	86.5	77.3	73.6	-4.8
Age																		
24 Years and Under (Youth)	11,670	10,640	-8.8	6	6	38	35	-7.9	282	292	3.5	22.8	20.0	17.6	15.4	13.8	13.6	-1.4
25 to 44 Years	60,330	56,930	-5.6	7	7	46	43	-6.5	338	343	1.5	104.7	95.6	83.1	78.9	70.6	66.8	-5.4
45 to 54 Years	12,280	11,760	-4.2	3	3	37	36	-2.7	333	341	2.4	14.2	12.7	10.7	11.0	9.6	8.4	-12.5
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	1,720	1,580	-8.1	0	0	35	36	2.9	327	350	7.0	1.5	1.4	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.2	9.1
Claimant Category[8]																		
Long-Tenured Workers	6,460	4,120	-36.2	1	1	36	36	0.0	352	364	3.4	11.3	11.5	7.9	8.3	5.6	3.9	-30.4
Occasional Claimants	70,590	69,100	-2.1	7	6	44	41	-6.8	324	331	2.2	118.9	105.8	93.6	87.6	80.6	78.4	-2.7
Frequent Claimants	8,950	7,690	-14.1	3	2	38	38	0.0	350	360	2.9	12.9	12.4	11.1	10.7	8.9	7.7	-13.5
Canada	**86,000**	**80,910**	**-5.9**	**4.8**	**4.5**	**43**	**41**	**-4.7**	**329**	**336**	**2.1**	**143.2**	**129.7**	**112.6**	**106.6**	**95.2**	**90.0**	**-5.5**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits with family supplement was paid.

2 Includes claims for which at least $1 of Employment Insurance benefits was paid.

3 Calculations exclude claims without family supplement.

4 Takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to Employment Insurance claimants.

5 Includes only the amount paid in family supplement.

6 Percentage growth between 2013/2014 and 2014/2015.

7 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, provincial and territorial figures are based on the province or territory of residence where a claim was initially established; figures pertaining to years prior to 2013/2014 published in the previous *Reports* have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on the province or territory of residence where the claim ended.

8 Long-tenured workers are Employment Insurance (EI) claimants who have paid at least 30% of the maximum annual EI premiums in 7 of the past 10 years and who, over the last five years, have collected EI regular or fishing benefits for 35 weeks or less. Frequent claimants are EI claimants who have had three or more EI regular or fishing claims and have collected benefits for a total of more than 60 weeks in the past five years. Occasional claimants are EI claimants who do not meet the requirements for either long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.20 Working While on Regular Claim[1,2]

	New Regular Claims Established Which Included Employment Income Earned from Working While on Claim[3]						Average Number of Weeks Worked While on Regular Claim[4]						Average Weekly Employment Income Earned from Working While on Regular Claim[5]						Percentage of New Regular Claims Established Which Included Employment Income Earned from Working While on Claim[3]					
						Change (%)[6]	(Number of Weeks)					Change (%)[6]	($)					Change (%)[6]	(%)					Change (% Points)[7]
	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2012/2013-2013/2014	200/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2012/2013-2013/2014	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2012/2013-2013/2014	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2012/2013-2013/2014
Province and Territory[8]																								
Newfoundland and Labrador	49,790	47,280	46,040	39,150	38,330	-2.1	16.5	16.6	18.7	15.9	15.4	-3.1	703	774	790	882	961	9.0	67	69	68	62	60	-2
Prince Edward Island	13,260	12,520	12,080	9,890	9,150	-7.5	15.1	14.8	19.3	14.4	13.9	-3.5	471	478	517	656	685	4.4	68	67	65	58	57	-1
Nova Scotia	45,930	43,160	44,410	37,040	34,470	-6.9	15.6	15.3	17.4	15.1	14.4	-4.6	588	632	653	733	796	8.6	65	64	64	59	57	-2
New Brunswick	53,280	50,660	51,300	47,130	44,310	-6.0	17.6	17.3	19.8	16.8	16.7	-0.6	589	610	620	725	766	5.7	69	67	67	63	63	0
Quebec	314,190	279,200	292,350	261,070	253,410	-2.9	14.8	14.6	15.8	13.7	13.5	-1.5	587	604	621	697	730	4.7	63	62	63	59	59	0
Ontario	243,820	196,840	199,520	181,810	177,080	-2.6	11.0	10.3	10.8	9.6	9.1	-5.2	520	518	538	589	632	7.3	49	49	47	44	43	-1
Manitoba	21,900	18,130	18,600	16,960	16,510	-2.7	6.9	7.1	7.3	6.3	5.9	-6.3	442	443	461	527	565	7.2	51	48	47	44	46	2
Saskatchewan	17,880	14,610	13,840	12,580	12,350	-1.8	7.9	7.3	8.2	6.2	6.1	-1.6	570	501	539	654	706	8.0	50	49	47	44	44	0
Alberta	58,910	42,830	38,560	34,790	35,710	2.6	8.1	7.7	7.7	6.3	5.9	-6.3	615	726	738	766	818	6.8	44	44	44	41	41	0
British Columbia	105,070	84,930	82,110	72,650	68,600	-5.6	11.2	11.0	11.3	9.5[r]	9.0	-5.3	559	553	577	632	667	5.5	55	52	52	49	48	-1
Yukon	1,150	1,110	1,130	1,140	960	-15.8	8.4	9.3	9.8	8.2	8.4	2.4	518	555	595	630	685	8.7	52	51	54	54	47	-7
Northwest Territories	920	850	680	660	690	4.5	8.3	7.2	9.6	5.0[r]	5.2	4.0	683	714	635	705	798	13.2	47	50	39	41	45	4
Nunavut	460	540	370	300	300	0.0	6.1	7.2[r]	12.3	8.6	5.1	-40.7	551	604	809	820	614	-25.1	50	48	40	32	35	3
Gender																								
Men	553,610	466,330	471,980	418,190	414,720	-0.8	12.7	12.5	13.6	11.9	11.6	-2.5	695	728	752	830	874	5.3	55	54	54	51	50	-1
Women	372,950	326,330	329,010	296,980	277,150	-6.7	13.2	13.2	14.3	12.1	11.6	-4.1	382	388	397	456	480	5.3	59	59	57	54	53	-1
Age																								
24 Years and Under (Youth)	102,010	88,100	81,360	71,990	67,660	-6.0	9.5	9.8	10.8	9.3	9.2	-1.1	438	462	484	546	590	8.1	53	54	54	51	51	0
25 to 44 Years	424,110	360,930	358,920	324,540	314,830	-3.0	12.3	12.0	12.9	11.1	10.8	-2.7	582	600	614	677	720	6.4	56	56	56	54	53	-1
45 to 54 Years	260,740	219,120	224,570	203,450	196,560	-3.4	14.7	14.6	15.5	13.6	13.1	-3.7	632	652	671	720	756	5.0	62	62	61	59	59	0
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	139,700	124,510	136,140	115,190	112,820	-2.1	14.2	14.1	15.9	12.9[r]	12.5	-3.1	509	533	554	668	715	7.0	50	48	47	40	39	-1
Weekly Benefit Rate[9]																								
$100 or Less	2,600	1,720	1,430	940	310	-67.0	10.9	10.4	12.9	11.4	10.3	-9.6	183	180	168	227	226	-0.4	46	43	46	35	30	-5
$101 to $200	55,050	43,140	35,120	28,210	17,910	-36.5	12.6	11.9	12.9	10.6	10.3	-2.8	227	232	226	251	254	1.2	50	49	48	44	44	0
$201 to $300	166,820	146,080	137,500	111,410	86,810	-22.1	12.6	12.5	13.7	11.7	11.3	-3.4	304	304	304	329	332	0.9	53	51	51	47	46	-1
$301 to $400	198,190	172,250	168,290	145,750	129,390	-11.2	13.0	13.0	14.1	12.0	11.6	-3.3	402	403	397	437	431	-1.4	57	56	55	52	51	-1
$401 or More	503,900	429,470	458,650	428,860	457,450	6.7	13.0	12.9	14.0	12.1	11.7	-3.3	762	797	804	874	889	1.7	58	59	58	54	53	-1
Canada	**926,560**	**792,660**	**800,990**	**715,170**	**691,870**	**-3.3**	**12.9**	**12.8**	**13.9**	**11.9**	**11.6**	**-2.5**	**569**	**588**	**606**	**675**	**717**	**6.2**	**56**	**56**	**55**	**52**	**51**	**-1**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 The definition of "working while on claim" includes all regular claimants who earned employment income during their Employment Insurance benefit period.

2 Data on working while on claim are presented up to 2013/2014 to ensure all claims were completed.

3 Includes claims for which at least $1 of regular benefit was paid.

4 Only weeks for which at least $1 of employment income was earned while on regular claim were included in the calculation.

5 Includes employment income only (all amounts paid in Employment Insurance benefits are excluded from the calculation). Only weeks with at least $1 of employment income earned from working while on regular claim are taken into account in the calculation.

6 Percentage growth between 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.

7 Percentage point difference between 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.

8 Starting with the *2013/2014 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, provincial and territorial figures are based on the province or territory of residence where a claim was initially established; figures pertaining to years prior to 2013/2014 published in the previous *Reports* have been restated to reflect this. The previous reporting methodology was based on the province or territory of residence where the claim ended.

9 The weekly benefit rate is the basic amount a claimant can receive for each week in the benefit period when he or she does not earn any employment income. This amount takes into account family supplement top-ups paid to claimants.

r Revised.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.21 Employment Insurance Benefit Repayment[1]

	People Who Repaid Benefits						Amount Repaid					
						Change (%)[2]	($ Million)					Change (%)[2]
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2012–2013	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2012–2013
Province and Territory												
Newfoundland and Labrador	8,115	9,252	11,254[r]	11,799	12,787	8.4	13.3	15.9	19.6[r]	19.5	21.0	7.7
Prince Edward Island	751	850	1,013[r]	1,358	1,048	-22.8	1.2	1.5	1.8	2.9	1.9	-34.5
Nova Scotia	5,924	7,022	7,350[r]	7,712	7,722	0.1	9.3	11.4	12.7[r]	13.9	14.5	4.3
New Brunswick	4,919	5,130	5,687[r]	6,488	6,499	0.2	7.2	8.0	9.3	11.0	11.6	5.5
Quebec	42,787	46,244	48,360[r]	47,748	40,948	-14.2	41.7	47.5	49.3[r]	49.9	45.3	-9.2
Ontario	59,627	55,090	45,635[r]	42,376	38,373	-9.4	67.1	54.2	47.6[r]	44.9	44.5	-0.9
Manitoba	2,789	3,094	3,096[r]	2,913	2,918	0.2	3.3	3.5	3.6[r]	3.6	3.7	2.8
Saskatchewan	4,430	4,768	4,842[r]	4,621	4,585	-0.8	5.2	5.4	5.6[r]	5.5	5.7	3.6
Alberta	22,490	29,552	26,890[r]	23,918	22,813	-4.6	27.2	36.4	35.4[r]	29.8	29.1	-2.3
British Columbia	19,157	22,281	20,337[r]	18,569	18,676	0.6	21.3	25.5	23.8[r]	23.0	23.3	1.3
Yukon	350	336	384[r]	306	288	-5.9	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.0
Northwest Territories	356	433	374[r]	317	275	-13.2	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.0
Nunavut	2	4	46[r]	143	108	-24.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	-50.0
Non-residents of Canada	15	23	33	70	69	-1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0
Gender												
Men	152,912	163,914	155,614[r]	150,102	140,103	-6.7	178.6	189.4	189.6[r]	186.1	182.9	-1.7
Women	18,800	20,165	19,687[r]	18,236	17,006	-6.7	19.2	20.8	20.1[r]	19.0	18.8	-1.1
Age												
24 Years and Under (Youth)	4,521	6,478	6,704[r]	6,629	6,098	-8.0	4.8	7.0	7.5[r]	7.6	7.2	-5.3
25 to 44 Years	74,010	79,814	74,806[r]	72,133	68,297	-5.3	78.1	81.7	80.1[r]	80.2	79.8	-0.5
45 to 54 Years	54,303	54,400	49,526[r]	45,694	41,376	-9.4	62.1	60.1	57.3[r]	53.6	52.0	-3.0
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	38,878	43,387	44,265[r]	43,882	41,338	-5.8	52.8	61.5	64.7[r]	63.7	62.6	-1.7
Canada	**171,712**	**184,079**	**175,301[r]**	**168,338**	**157,109**	**-6.7**	**197.8**	**210.2**	**209.7r**	**205.1**	**201.7**	**-1.7**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 As benefit repayments are administered through the tax system, the most recent data available are for the 2013 taxation year.

2 Percentage growth between 2012 and 2013.

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.22 Contributors to the Employment Insurance Program[1]

	Employment Insurance Premium					Employment Income											
	Total			Paid by Employers[2]	Paid by Employees	Total Employment Income			Total Insurable Earnings		Number of Workers with Employment Income			Employment Income per Worker		Insurable Earnings per Worker	
	($ Million)	($ Million)	(% of Total)	($ Million)	($ Million)	($ Million)	($ Million)	(% of Total)	($ Million)	($ Million)			(% of Total)	($)	($)	($)	($)
	2012	2013	2013	2013	2013	2012	2013	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
Province and Territory of the Employer																	
Newfoundland and Labrador	316.4[r]	342.7	1.6	199.0	143.7	11,010.8	11,905.8	1.4	7,470.9	7,893.2	272,520	275,100	1.5	40,404	43,278	27,414	28,692
Prince Edward Island	82.9[r]	86.5	0.4	49.8	36.7	2,545.1	2,573.7	0.3	1,955.8	1,971.8	79,760	78,680	0.4	31,909	32,711	24,521	25,061
Nova Scotia	539.1[r]	566.7	2.6	323.6	243.1	17,542.1	17,994.2	2.2	12,866.5	13,116.2	480,440	478,550	2.6	36,513	37,602	26,781	27,408
New Brunswick	439.4[r]	455.9	2.1	260.5	195.4	14,043.8	14,117.2	1.7	10,448.5	10,512.1	396,340	389,230	2.1	35,434	36,270	26,362	27,007
Quebec	3,772.9[r]	4,043.9	18.5	2,287.5	1,756.4	158,581.3	162,845.0	19.6	113,817.6	117,340.1	4,193,570	4,185,470	22.7	37,815	38,907	27,141	28,035
Ontario	8,066.6[r]	8,585.8	39.2	4,912.0	3,673.8	311,687.9	320,170.9	38.5	193,188.1	199,406.3	6,821,900	6,882,370	37.3	45,689	46,520	28,319	28,973
Manitoba	754.7[r]	807.6	3.7	461.3	346.3	25,608.9	26,767.3	3.2	18,086.1	18,766.6	654,010	659,770	3.6	39,157	40,571	27,654	28,444
Saskatchewan	691.7[r]	748.7	3.4	429.1	319.6	25,896.9	26,863.0	3.2	16,785.4	17,601.3	579,550	589,480	3.2	44,684	45,571	28,963	29,859
Alberta	3,012.9[r]	3,359.5	15.3	1,947.3	1,412.1	133,756.0	143,169.2	17.2	73,346.5	79,233.6	2,371,420	2,470,270	13.4	56,403	57,957	30,929	32,075
British Columbia	2,606.7[r]	2,795.8	12.8	1,607.0	1,188.9	96,708.5	100,254.6	12.1	62,261.0	64,762.6	2,318,680	2,344,630	12.7	41,708	42,759	26,852	27,622
Yukon	32.9[r]	33.6	0.2	19.5	14.2	1,168.5	1,139.6	0.1	784.5	777.5	25,690	24,890	0.1	45,485	45,785	30,537	31,237
Northwest Territories	43.8[r]	46.0	0.2	26.8	19.2	1,939.1	1,982.1	0.2	1,061.9	1,102.4	32,900	32,480	0.2	58,939	61,025	32,277	33,941
Nunavut	27.2	28.7	0.1	16.7	12.0	1,203.9	1,203.7	0.1	661.4	673.8	22,740	22,450	0.1	52,942	53,617	29,085	30,013
Gender																	
Men	11,324.1[r]	12,189.3	55.7	7,010.8	5,178.5	493,311.0	511,130.2	61.5	285,259.6	297,078.9	9,439,330	9,548,630	51.8	52,261	53,529	30,220	31,112
Women	9,057.2[r]	9,706.9	44.3	5,526.2	4,180.7	307,961.5	319,493.0	38.4	227,335.4	235,954.3	8,792,470	8,868,050	48.1	35,026	36,027	25,856	26,607
Missing Data	5.7	5.2	0.0	3.0	2.2	420.3	363.2	0.0	139.1	124.4	17,720	16,690	0.1	23,719	21,762	7,850	7,454
Age																	
24 Years and Under (Youth)	1,730.1[r]	1,816.4	8.3	1,052.4	764.0	45,311.9	46,178.1	5.6	42,138.1	42,886.2	3,168,380	3,157,520	17.1	14,301	14,625	13,300	13,582
25 to 44 Years	9,569.7[r]	10,276.6	46.9	5,895.1	4,381.5	351,893.4	364,783.3	43.9	241,123.9	250,609.9	7,615,870	7,701,250	41.8	46,205	47,367	31,661	32,541
45 to 54 Years	5,436.7[r]	5,744.2	26.2	3,275.1	2,469.1	238,888.4	243,884.3	29.3	137,839.8	140,870.7	4,088,070	4,057,060	22.0	58,435	60,114	33,718	34,722
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	3,644.8[r]	4,059.0	18.5	2,314.4	1,744.6	165,178.8	175,777.4	21.2	91,493.2	98,666.3	3,359,460	3,500,810	19.0	49,168	50,210	27,234	28,184
Missing Data	5.7	5.2	0.0	3.0	2.2	420.3	363.3	0.0	139.2	124.5	17,740	16,730	0.1	23,692	21,715	7,847	7,442

Continued on the next page...

Annex 2.22 Contributors to the Employment Insurance Program[1] *(Continued)*

	Employment Insurance Premium					Employment Income											
	Total			Paid by Employers[2]	Paid by Employees	Total Employment Income			Total Insurable Earnings		Number of Workers with Employment Income			Employment Income per Worker		Insurable Earnings per Worker	
	($ Million)	($ Million)	(% of Total)	($ Million)	($ Million)	($ Million)	($ Million)	(% of Total)	($ Million)	($ Million)			(% of Total)	($)	($)	($)	($)
	2012	2013	2013	2013	2013	2012	2013	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
Industry																	
Goods-producing Industries	**4,652.3[r]**	**4,990.8**	**22.8**	**2,889.7**	**2,101.1**	**192,341.8**	**197,185.1**	**23.7**	**116,946.3**	**121,268.4**	**3,606,770**	**3,636,270**	**19.7**	**53,328**	**54,227**	**32,424**	**33,350**
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	234.3[r]	246.2	1.1	143.8	102.4	8,175.4	8,498.8	1.0	5,669.9	5,779.0	321,810	323,530	1.8	25,404	26,269	17,619	17,862
Mining, and Oil and Gas Extraction	443.8[r]	458.1	2.1	265.5	192.6	27,557.4	26,665.3	3.2	11,289.8	11,254.8	266,820	258,380	1.4	103,281	103,202	42,312	43,559
Utilities	192.5[r]	208.3	1.0	116.3	92.0	10,469.1	10,937.5	1.3	5,023.7	5,218.1	119,820	120,360	0.7	87,374	90,873	41,927	43,354
Construction	1,491.2[r]	1,667.5	7.6	993.7	673.8	58,438.2	62,822.0	7.6	36,679.4	39,749.0	1,187,850	1,239,740	6.7	49,197	50,674	30,879	32,062
Manufacturing	2,290.5[r]	2,410.7	11.0	1,370.4	1,040.3	87,701.8	88,261.4	10.6	58,283.4	59,267.5	1,710,470	1,694,260	9.2	51,274	52,094	34,074	34,981
Services-producing Industries	**15,154.0[r]**	**15,845.7**	**72.4**	**9,039.4**	**6,806.3**	**587,380.1**	**592,664.7**	**71.3**	**381,029.5**	**385,944.9**	**14,001,900**	**13,890,090**	**75.4**	**41,950**	**42,668**	**27,213**	**27,786**
Wholesale Trade	1,062.3[r]	1,120.4	5.1	642.3	478.1	46,012.8	46,738.6	5.6	26,648.9	27,211.3	834,870	826,170	4.5	55,114	56,573	31,920	32,937
Retail Trade	1,620.6[r]	1,688.8	7.7	974.2	714.6	52,117.8	52,962.2	6.4	39,826.4	40,258.8	2,029,000	1,999,700	10.8	25,686	26,485	19,629	20,132
Transportation and Warehousing	919.1[r]	986.0	4.5	561.4	424.6	34,634.0	36,251.2	4.4	23,145.2	24,061.4	732,570	747,190	4.1	47,277	48,517	31,595	32,203
Finance and Insurance	964.0[r]	1,022.9	4.7	571.3	451.6	51,381.8	52,515.9	6.3	24,899.7	25,508.5	715,790	712,730	3.9	71,783	73,683	34,786	35,790
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	307.9[r]	334.1	1.5	194.4	139.7	13,188.7	13,728.4	1.7	7,543.0	7,936.0	304,760	306,760	1.7	43,276	44,753	24,751	25,870
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	1,175.8[r]	1,269.9	5.8	731.0	538.9	58,477.3	60,643.2	7.3	29,674.9	30,951.9	981,740	998,030	5.4	59,565	60,763	30,227	31,013
Business, Building and Other Support Services[3]	1,151.2[r]	1,301.5	5.9	752.2	549.3	43,753.6	48,258.4	5.8	28,390.3	31,153.3	1,200,070	1,271,970	6.9	36,459	37,940	23,657	24,492
Educational Services	1,586.7[r]	1,698.9	7.8	949.0	749.8	59,612.2	61,127.5	7.4	40,934.9	42,432.4	1,312,520	1,322,010	7.2	45,418	46,238	31,188	32,097
Health Care and Social Assistance	1,738.4[r]	1,866.1	8.5	1,067.2	798.9	60,251.5	62,251.1	7.5	44,544.3	46,275.4	1,469,010	1,499,420	8.1	41,015	41,517	30,323	30,862
Information, Culture and Recreation[4]	692.3[r]	743.5	3.4	422.7	320.8	27,648.8[r]	29,188.6	3.5	17,488.9	18,218.1	642,940	644,730	3.5	43,004	45,273	27,201	28,257
Accommodation and Food Services	753.8[r]	804.6	3.7	468.4	336.2	21,050.8	21,733.7	2.6	18,092.6	18,761.0	1,293,040	1,305,910	7.1	16,280	16,643	13,992	14,366
Other Services (except Public Administration)	691.2[r]	744.8	3.4	433.8	311.0	23,504.9	24,635.5	3.0	16,817.9	17,599.4	711,560	721,720	3.9	33,033	34,134	23,635	24,385
Public Administration	2,490.7[r]	2,264.2	10.3	1,271.5	992.8	95,745.9	82,630.4	9.9	63,022.5	55,577.4	1,774,030	1,533,750	8.3	53,971	53,875	35,525	36,236
Unclassified	**580.8[r]**	**1,064.9**	**4.9**	**610.9**	**454.0**	**21,970.9**	**41,136.5**	**5.0**	**14,758.3**	**25,944.3**	**640,850**	**907,010**	**4.9**	**34,284**	**45,354**	**23,029**	**28,604**
Canada	**20,387.0[r]**	**21,901.4**	**100.0**	**12,540.0**	**9,361.4**	**801,692.8**	**830,986.3**	**100.0**	**512,734.1**	**533,157.6**	**18,249,520**	**18,433,370**	**100.0**	**43,930**	**45,081**	**28,096**	**28,924**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 As Employment Insurance premium payments are administered through the tax system, the most recent data available are for the 2013 taxation year.

2 Employer contributions are 1.4 times employee contributions. However, employers who participate in the Premium Reduction Program may contribute less than 1.4 times their employees' contributions.

3 This industry comprises the industries with codes 55 (management of companies and enterprises) and 56 (administrative and support, waste management and mediation services) from the North American Industry Classification System.

4 This industry comprises the industries with codes 51 (information and cultural industries) and 71 (arts, entertainment and recreation) from the North American Industry Classification System.

Source: Canada Revenue Agency, T4 slips with employment income. Data are based on a 10% sample of T4 slips with employment income.

Annex 2.23 Benefits-to-Contributions Ratios[1]

	Employment Insurance Premium		Employment Insurance Regular Benefits		Total Employment Insurance Benefits		Regular Benefits-to-contributions Ratio[2]	Total Benefits-to-contributions Ratio	Adjusted Regular Benefits-to-contributions Ratio[2,3]	Adjusted Total Benefits-to-contributions Ratio[3]
	($ Million)	(% of Total)	($ Million)	(% of Total)	($ Million)	(% of Total)			(Canada = 1)	(Canada = 1)
	2013	2013	2013	2013	2013	2013	2013	2013	2013	2013
Province and Territory[4]										
Newfoundland and Labrador	342.7	1.6	610.5	6.2	831.8	5.4	1.7	2.4	4.2	3.5
Prince Edward Island	86.5	0.4	136.5	1.4	200.4	1.3	1.5	2.3	3.8	3.3
Nova Scotia	566.7	2.6	519.9	5.3	744.2	4.9	0.9	1.3	2.2	1.9
New Brunswick	455.9	2.1	606.3	6.2	827.9	5.4	1.3	1.8	3.1	2.6
Quebec	4,043.9	18.5	2,860.1	29.2	3,356.8	21.9	0.5	0.8	1.3	1.2
Ontario	8,585.8	39.2	2,963.3	30.3	5,196.9	34.0	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.9
Manitoba	807.6	3.7	242.2	2.5	479.7	3.1	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.9
Saskatchewan	748.7	3.4	192.5	2.0	394.1	2.6	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.8
Alberta	3,359.5	15.3	593.6	6.1	1,402.5	9.2	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.6
British Columbia	2,795.8	12.8	1,008.2	10.3	1,787.0	11.7	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.9
Yukon	33.6	0.2	20.4	0.2	29.6	0.2	0.6	0.9	1.4	1.3
Northwest Territories	46.0	0.2	18.6	0.2	31.1	0.2	0.4	0.7	0.9	1.0
Nunavut	28.7	0.1	11.8	0.1	18.5	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.0	0.9
Gender										
Men	12,189.3	55.7	6,417.9	65.6	7,818.4	51.1	0.5	0.6	1.2	0.9
Women	9,706.9	44.3	3,366.1	34.4	7,482.0	48.9	0.3	0.8	0.8	1.1
Missing Data	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Age										
24 Years and Under (Youth)	1,816.4	8.3	831.3	8.5	1,349.6	8.8	0.4	0.7	1.1	1.1
25 to 44 Years	10,276.6	46.9	4,220.7	43.1	8,261.8	54.0	0.4	0.8	0.9	1.2
45 to 54 Years	5,744.2	26.2	2,512.7	25.7	3,031.7	19.8	0.4	0.5	1.0	0.8
55 Years and Older (Older Workers)	4,059.0	18.5	2,219.3	22.7	2,657.3	17.4	0.5	0.7	1.2	0.9
Missing Data	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Industry										
Goods-producing Industries	**4,990.8**	**22.8**	**4,062.1**	**41.5**	**5,178.0**	**33.8**	**0.7**	**1.0**	**1.8**	**1.5**
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	246.2	1.1	497.7	5.1	599.9	3.9	1.9	2.4	4.7	3.5
Mining, and Oil and Gas Extraction	458.1	2.1	238.2	2.4	305.9	2.0	0.5	0.7	1.2	1.0
Utilities	208.3	1.0	35.6	0.4	61.0	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4
Construction	1,667.5	7.6	2,125.2	21.7	2,507.3	16.4	1.2	1.5	2.9	2.2
Manufacturing	2,410.7	11.0	1,165.2	11.9	1,703.9	11.1	0.4	0.7	1.1	1.0

Continued on the next page...

Annex 2.23 Benefits-to-Contributions Ratios[1] *(Continued)*

	Employment Insurance Premium		Employment Insurance Regular Benefits		Total Employment Insurance Benefits		Regular Benefits-to-contributions Ratio[2]	Total Benefits-to-contributions Ratio	Adjusted Regular Benefits-to-contributions Ratio[2,3]	Adjusted Total Benefits-to-contributions Ratio[3]
	($ Million)	(% of Total)	($ Million)	(% of Total)	($ Million)	(% of Total)			(Canada = 1)	(Canada = 1)
	2013	2013	2013	2013	2013	2013	2013	2013	2013	2013
Services-producing Industries	**15,845.7**	**72.4**	**5,507.6**	**56.3**	**9,817.6**	**64.2**	**0.3**	**0.6**	**0.8**	**0.9**
Wholesale Trade	1,120.4	5.1	415.7	4.2	692.2	4.5	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.9
Retail Trade	1,688.8	7.7	596.7	6.1	1,029.9	6.7	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.9
Transportation and Warehousing	986.0	4.5	410.3	4.2	587.0	3.8	0.4	0.6	0.9	0.9
Finance and Insurance	1,022.9	4.7	158.9	1.6	413.5	2.7	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.6
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	334.1	1.5	148.3	1.5	227.2	1.5	0.4	0.7	1.0	1.0
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	1,269.9	5.8	482.2	4.9	753.1	4.9	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.8
Business, Building and Other Support Services[4]	1,301.5	5.9	750.9	7.7	1,074.0	7.0	0.5	0.8	1.3	1.2
Educational Services	1,698.9	7.8	587.0	6.0	1,056.1	6.9	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.9
Health Care and Social Assistance	1,866.1	8.5	339.9	3.5	1,066.0	7.0	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.8
Information, Culture and Recreation[5]	743.5	3.4	323.9	3.3	465.1	3.0	0.4	0.6	1.0	0.9
Accommodation and Food Services	804.6	3.7	450.3	4.6	721.7	4.7	0.5	0.9	1.3	1.3
Other Services (except Public Administration)	744.8	3.4	319.2	3.3	526.0	3.4	0.4	0.7	1.0	1.0
Public Administration	2,264.2	10.3	524.3	5.4	1,205.9	7.9	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.8
Unclassified	**1,064.9**	**4.9**	**214.2**	**2.2**	**304.8**	**2.0**	**0.2**	**0.3**	**0.4**	**0.4**
Canada	**21,901.4**	**100.0**	**9,783.9**	**100.0**	**15,300.4**	**100.0**	**0.4**	**0.7**	**1.0**	**1.0**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 As Employment Insurance premium payments are administered through the tax system, the most recent data available are for the 2013 taxation year.

2 To factor in the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP), which reduces the premiums paid by employers and employees in Quebec, and the Premium Reduction Program (PRP), which reduces the premiums paid by employers who offer their employees a short-term disability plan, the regular benefits-to-contributions ratios (adjusted and non-adjusted) have been calculated based on an estimate of the Employment Insurance premiums that would have been paid by employees and employers in the absence of QPIP and PRP, rather than on the premiums that were actually paid.

3 For ease of analysis, the benefits-to-contributions ratios have been adjusted (i.e standardized) so that the figure for Canada equals one.

4 The benefits-to-contributions ratios for the provinces and territories are determined by the location of employers for premiums and by the residence of claimants for benefits. As a result, it is possible that the ratio for some provinces and territories may be under- or overstated if contributions are being accredited to a province or territory, while the employment is actually situated in another province or territory.

5 This industry comprises the industries with codes 55 (management of companies and enterprises) and 56 (administrative and support, waste management and mediation services) from the North American Industry Classification System.

6 This industry comprises the industries with codes 51 (information and cultural industries) and 71 (arts, entertainment and recreation) from the North American Industry Classification System.

Sources: Canada Revenue Agency [CRA], T4 slips with employment income (for data on Employment Insurance contributions); and Employment and Social Development Canada [ESDC], Employment Insurance (EI) administrative data (for data on Employment Insurance benefits). CRA data are based on a 10% sample of T4 slips with employment income, and ESDC data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

Annex 2.24 Unemployment Rates Used for the Purposes of the Employment Insurance Program (by Employment Insurance Economic Region)[1]

	Regional Rate of Unemployment[2]														
Effective Date[3]	April 6 to May 10 2014	May 11 to June 7 2014	June 8 to July 12 2014	July 13 to August 9 2014	August 10 Sept. 6 2014	Sept. 7 to Oct. 11 2014	Oct. 12 to Nov. 8 2014	Nov. 9 to Dec. 6 2014	Dec. 7, 2014 to Jan. 10, 2015	Jan. 11 to Feb. 7 2015	Feb. 8 to March 14 2015	March 15 to April 11 2015	Minimum of the 12 Months	Average of the 12 Months	Maximum of the 12 Months
Unemployment Rate Moving Average Ending on the Month of...[4]	March 2014	April 2014	May 2014	June 2014	July 2014	August 2014	September 2014	October 2014	November 2014	December 2015	January 2015	February 2015	2014/2015	2014/2015	2014/2015
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Employment Insurance Economic Region															
Newfoundland and Labrador															
St. John's	5.1	5.8	6.3	6.7	6.6	6.6	6.6	6.2	5.7	5.3	5.5	5.7	5.1	6.0	6.7
Newfoundland/Labrador	16.8	16.6	16.9	17.3	17.5	17.7	17.7	17.9	16.7	16.5	16.3	17.1	16.3	17.1	17.9
Prince Edward Island															
Prince Edward Island *(until October 11, 2014)*[5]	11.8	11.9	12.0	11.4	10.6	9.8	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	9.8	11.3	12.0
Charlottetown *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.4	8.4	8.6	8.0	8.2	8.6
Prince Edward Island *(starting October 12, 2014)*[5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	11.7	11.5	11.9	12.6	12.7	12.2	11.5	12.1	12.7
Nova Scotia															
Eastern Nova Scotia	14.7	14.7	14.8	15.1	15.5	14.7	14.5	14.8	16.0	15.8	15.4	14.7	14.5	15.1	16.0
Western Nova Scotia	10.5	11.1	11.3	11.3	11.1	11.4	11.1	10.8	10.2	10.2	9.8	9.9	9.8	10.7	11.4
Halifax	6.3	6.0	5.7	5.4	5.7	5.8	6.0	5.9	6.0	6.0	5.9	6.0	5.4	5.9	6.3
New Brunswick															
Fredericton-Moncton-Saint John	6.9	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.6	7.4	7.4	7.1	7.1	7.3	6.9	7.3	7.6
Madawaska-Charlotte	10.7	10.7	10.8	10.5	10.0	9.9	10.4	10.7	11.0	10.9	11.1	10.8	9.9	10.6	11.1
Restigouche-Albert	16.7	16.7	16.9	16.7	16.4	14.9	14.4	14.4	15.4	16.7	16.1	16.3	14.4	16.0	16.9
Quebec															
Gaspésie-Îles-de-la-Madeleine	17.7	17.5	17.5	16.9	15.7	15.3	15.7	16.7	17.1	17.8	17.8	18.0	15.3	17.0	18.0
Quebec	4.3	4.7	5.1	5.5	5.7	5.8	5.9	5.6	5.4	5.6	5.8	5.8	4.3	5.4	5.9
Trois-Rivières	8.5	8.2	8.3	8.4	7.5	6.7	6.0	6.3	6.4	6.7	6.7	6.8	6.0	7.2	8.5
South Central Quebec	4.8	5.1	5.1	5.5	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.2	5.7	6.3	6.4	6.0	4.8	5.6	6.4
Sherbrooke	6.7	7.2	7.2	6.9	6.7	7.3	7.7	7.9	7.3	7.5	7.3	7.1	6.7	7.2	7.9
Montérégie	7.7	8.2	7.8	7.8	7.2	7.2	6.8	6.6	6.6	6.6	6.7	6.7	6.6	7.2	8.2
Montreal	8.0	8.0	8.1	8.5	8.9	8.7	8.5	8.4	8.6	8.3	7.9	7.6	7.6	8.3	8.9
Central Quebec	8.6	8.5	8.4	8.1	8.1	7.8	7.4	7.4	7.3	7.3	7.4	7.6	7.3	7.8	8.6
North Western Quebec	10.7	10.4	9.9	9.1	9.3	9.0	9.2	9.4	9.6	10.3	10.9	11.0	9.0	9.9	11.0
Lower Saint Lawrence and North Shore	10.4	10.1	10.1	10.6	10.4	9.9	9.9	9.9	9.7	9.6	9.9	9.8	9.6	10.0	10.6
Hull	6.7	6.7	6.6	6.4	6.6	7.0	7.3	6.9	6.8	7.0	7.5	7.6	6.4	6.9	7.6
Chicoutimi-Jonquière	9.4	10.0	9.8	9.7	9.6	9.4	9.4	9.9	9.9	9.8	8.8	8.3	8.3	9.5	10.0

Continued on the next page...

Annex 2.24 Unemployment Rates Used for the Purposes of the Employment Insurance Program (by Employment Insurance Economic Region)[1] *(Continued)*

	Regional Rate of Unemployment[2]														
Effective Date[3]	April 6 to May 10 2014	May 11 to June 7 2014	June 8 to July 12 2014	July 13 to August 9 2014	August 10 Sept. 6 2014	Sept. 7 to Oct. 11 2014	Oct. 12 to Nov. 8 2014	Nov. 9 to Dec. 6 2014	Dec. 7, 2014 to Jan. 10, 2015	Jan. 11 to Feb. 7 2015	Feb. 8 to March 14 2015	March 15 to April 11 2015	Minimum of the 12 Months	Average of the 12 Months	Maximum of the 12 Months
Unemployment Rate Moving Average Ending on the Month of...[4]	March 2014	April 2014	May 2014	June 2014	July 2014	August 2014	September 2014	October 2014	November 2014	December 2015	January 2015	February 2015	2014/2015	2014/2015	2014/2015
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Employment Insurance Economic Region															
Ontario															
Ottawa	6.4	6.7	6.7	6.8	6.3	6.6	6.6	6.2	5.9	5.7	6.6	6.9	5.7	6.5	6.9
Eastern Ontario	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.3	7.3	7.6	7.5	7.4	7.3	8.0	8.1	8.1	7.3	7.6	8.1
Kingston	6.6	6.6	6.9	6.5	6.3	6.8	7.5	7.3	6.8	6.3	6.6	6.6	6.3	6.7	7.5
Central Ontario	8.9	8.9	8.6	7.7	7.4	7.0	6.7	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.8	7.0	6.3	7.3	8.9
Oshawa	7.2	7.1	7.3	7.3	7.5	7.7	7.7	7.4	6.8	6.6	6.7	6.8	6.6	7.2	7.7
Toronto	8.0	7.8	7.6	7.8	8.1	8.3	8.2	7.9	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.5	7.5	7.9	8.3
Hamilton	5.8	6.4	6.8	7.2	6.7	6.2	5.9	5.6	5.5	5.5	5.7	5.5	5.5	6.1	7.2
St. Catharines	8.4	8.3	8.0	7.9	7.8	7.9	7.3	6.9	6.4	6.7	6.9	6.9	6.4	7.5	8.4
London	8.2	8.0	7.6	7.6	7.6	7.9	7.5	7.6	7.7	7.7	7.4	7.0	7.0	7.7	8.2
Niagara	9.0	8.8	8.3	8.1	8.3	8.4	8.8	8.8	9.1	9.1	8.5	8.3	8.1	8.6	9.1
Windsor	7.7	9.0	9.1	9.3	8.9	9.1	8.8	8.8	8.8	9.2	9.6	9.7	7.7	9.0	9.7
Kitchener	6.7	6.8	6.6	6.4	6.3	6.5	6.7	6.3	6.2	5.7	5.9	5.6	5.6	6.3	6.8
Huron	7.5	7.7	7.6	7.9	7.6	7.6	7.4	7.7	7.5	7.1	7.0	6.8	6.8	7.5	7.9
South Central Ontario	5.7	5.9	5.8	5.8	5.5	5.0	5.3	5.2	5.2	4.9	5.3	5.4	4.9	5.4	5.9
Sudbury	6.5	5.9	6.3	6.7	6.8	6.4	6.2	6.3	6.3	6.0	5.6	5.9	5.6	6.2	6.8
Thunder Bay	6.1	6.0	6.0	5.4	5.1	4.9	5.0	5.4	5.7	6.0	5.2	4.7	4.7	5.5	6.1
Northern Ontario	12.6	11.9	11.6	11.5	11.6	12.1	11.8	10.9	10.1	10.0	11.8	12.4	10.0	11.5	12.6
Manitoba															
Winnipeg	5.7	5.8	5.9	5.8	5.7	6.0	6.2	6.0	5.6	5.6	6.2	6.3	5.6	5.9	6.3
Southern Manitoba	6.4	6.5	6.4	6.3	6.0	5.7	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.5	5.3	5.8	6.5
Northern Manitoba	32.2	31.9	31.8	31.8	31.8	32.0	32.0	32.0	32.0	32.0	32.0	31.9	31.8	32.0	32.2
Saskatchewan															
Regina	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.2	2.9	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.8	4.2	2.9	3.5	4.2
Saskatoon	4.7	4.5	4.2	3.8	3.6	4.4	4.2	4.4	3.6	3.8	4.4	5.0	3.6	4.2	5.0
Southern Saskatchewan	6.7	6.5	6.4	6.1	6.0	5.9	5.8	6.1	6.2	6.3	5.5	5.6	5.5	6.1	6.7
Northern Saskatchewan	16.5	16.4	16.7	16.6	17.0	17.0	17.0	16.8	16.4	16.4	16.2	17.0	16.2	16.7	17.0

Continued on the next page...

Annex 2.24 Unemployment Rates Used for the Purposes of the Employment Insurance Program (by Employment Insurance Economic Region)[1] *(Continued)*

	Regional Rate of Unemployment[2]														
Effective Date[3]	April 6 to May 10 2014	May 11 to June 7 2014	June 8 to July 12 2014	July 13 to August 9 2014	August 10 Sept. 6 2014	Sept. 7 to Oct. 11 2014	Oct. 12 to Nov. 8 2014	Nov. 9 to Dec. 6 2014	Dec. 7, 2014 to Jan. 10, 2015	Jan. 11 to Feb. 7 2015	Feb. 8 to March 14 2015	March 15 to April 11 2015	Minimum of the 12 Months	Average of the 12 Months	Maximum of the 12 Months
Unemployment Rate Moving Average Ending on the Month of...[4]	March 2014	April 2014	May 2014	June 2014	July 2014	August 2014	September 2014	October 2014	November 2014	December 2015	January 2015	February 2015	2014/2015	2014/2015	2014/2015
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Employment Insurance Economic Region															
Alberta															
Calgary	5.1	5.4	5.5	5.5	5.3	5.5	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.4	5.1	5.5
Edmonton	5.0	5.0	5.3	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.5	5.4	5.1	4.8	4.9	4.8	5.3	5.7
Northern Alberta	9.0	8.9	7.8	7.5	7.8	8.6	8.8	8.3	7.7	7.7	8.6	9.2	7.5	8.3	9.2
Southern Alberta	5.1	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.7	5.3	5.4	5.9	4.6	5.0	5.9
British Columbia															
Southern Interior British Columbia	8.6	8.3	7.9	7.8	7.4	7.2	7.3	7.6	7.6	7.0	6.7	7.4	6.7	7.6	8.6
Abbotsford	8.2	7.7	7.6	7.7	8.2	8.3	8.1	7.2	6.9	6.7	6.2	5.9	5.9	7.4	8.3
Vancouver	6.0	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.8	5.9	6.2	6.2	6.1	5.9	6.0	5.6	5.9	6.2
Victoria	6.1	5.9	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.1	6.0	6.0	5.8	5.8	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.9	6.1
Southern Coastal British Columbia	8.2	7.9	7.9	8.3	8.9	9.2	8.6	8.2	7.8	7.8	7.1	6.5	6.5	8.0	9.2
Northern British Columbia	11.6	11.6	11.8	11.5	11.4	10.9	10.9	10.5	10.5	10.2	8.8	8.5	8.5	10.7	11.8
Territories															
Yukon *(until October 11, 2014)* [5,6]	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	25.0	25.0	25.0
Whitehorse *(starting October 12, 2014)* [5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	4.5	4.2	4.1	4.3	5.4	5.8	4.1	4.7	5.8
Yukon *(starting October 12, 2014)* [5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	7.3	8.6	9.1	7.8	9.0	9.8	7.3	8.6	9.8
Northwest Territories *(until October 11, 2014)* [5,6]	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	25.0	25.0	25.0
Yellowkniffe *(starting October 12, 2014)* [5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.0	3.6	4.0	4.2	4.5
Northwest Territories *(starting October 12, 2014)* [5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	13.2	13.1	13.3	14.2	13.9	13.2	13.1	13.5	14.2
Nunavut *(until October 11, 2014)* [5,6]	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	25.0	25.0	25.0
Iqaluit *(starting October 12, 2014)* [5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	4.9	4.5	4.8	3.9	4.2	5.0	3.9	4.6	5.0
Nunavut *(starting October 12, 2014)* [5]	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	18.2	17.7	16.8	17.1	17.3	16.8	16.8	17.3	18.2

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 The unemployment rate in this annex are those used in the administration of the EI program. These rates come from Statistics Canada but may differ from the official unemployment rates due to differences in methodology, as explained below.

2 To obtain the monthly unemployment rates used for the purposes of the Employment Insurance program relating to periods before April 6 2014, please refer to the Web page *Monthly Seasonal Adjusted Unemployment Rates by EI Economic Region* **http://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/aad2bcd4-9f45-4013-b2a6-8367106dc0b2**

3 Effective for new claims established between the dates indicated.

4 The regional unemployment rates are calculated using a 3-month moving average (or, in the case of the territories, a 12-month moving average if this is larger) of seasonally adjusted unemployment rates for the period ending in the month indicated. These regional rates come from Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey (LFS). The regional unemployment rates in the provinces incorporates an estimate of the rates of unemployment for status Indians living on Indian reserves, as per section 17 of the *Employment Insurance Regulations*. Conversely, the regional unemployment rates in the territories are representative of the population, as LFS data cover persons living on and off reserves. A monthly regional unemployment rate substitute is used if Statistics Canada is not able to publish a monthly unemployment rate for reasons of confidentiality.

5 As of October 12, 2014, there is a total of 62 Employment Insurance (EI) economic regions, instead of 58 regions. The EI economic regions of Prince Edward Island, Yukon, Northwest Territories and Nunavut were each divided in two EI economic regions, one consisting of the capital area and the remaining consisting of the non-capital area.

6 Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut unemployment rates were set at 25% until October 11, 2014 for the purposes of the Employment Insurance program.

Sources : Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey (for data on unemployment rate); and Employment and Social Development Canada, Employment Insurance administrative data (for information on effective dates).

Annex 2.25 Employment Insurance Economic Regions, 2014/2015

#	Region Name*
01	St. John's
02	Newfoundland/Labrador
65	Charlottetown
66	Prince Edward Island
04	Eastern Nova Scotia
05	Western Nova Scotia
06	Halifax
07	Fredericton–Moncton–Saint John
08	Madawaska–Charlotte
09	Restigouche–Albert
10	Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine
11	Quebec
12	Trois-Rivières
13	South Central Quebec
14	Sherbrooke
15	Montérégie
16	Montreal
17	Central Quebec
18	North Western Quebec
19	Lower Saint Lawrence & North Shore
20	Hull
21	Chicoutimi–Jonquière
22	Ottawa
23	Eastern Ontario
24	Kingston
25	Central Ontario
26	Oshawa
27	Toronto
28	Hamilton
29	St. Catharines
30	London
31	Niagara
32	Windsor
33	Kitchener
34	Huron
35	South Central Ontario
36	Sudbury
37	Thunder Bay
38	Northern Ontario
39	Winnipeg
40	Southern Manitoba
41	Northern Manitoba
42	Regina
43	Saskatoon
44	Southern Saskatchewan
45	Northern Saskatchewan
46	Calgary
47	Edmonton
48	Northern Alberta
49	Southern Alberta
50	Southern Interior British Columbia
51	Abbotsford
52	Vancouver
53	Victoria
54	Southern Coastal British Columbia
55	Northern British Columbia
59	Whitehorse
60	Yukon
61	Yellowknife
62	Northwest Territories
63	Iqaluit
64	Nunavut

*As of October 12, 2014, there is a total of 62 Employment Insurance economic regions, instead of 58. For more information, refer to the Web page *Information on Employment Insurance (EI) Economic Regions* (http://srv129.services.gc.ca/eiregions/eng/geocont.aspx).

Annex 2.26 Employment Insurance Economic Regions: Unemployment Rates, 2014/2015

#	Region Name*
01	St. John's
02	Newfoundland/Labrador
65	Charlottetown
66	Prince Edward Island
04	Eastern Nova Scotia
05	Western Nova Scotia
06	Halifax
07	Fredericton–Moncton–Saint John
08	Madawaska–Charlotte
09	Restigouche–Albert
10	Gaspésie–Îles-de-la-Madeleine
11	Quebec
12	Trois-Rivières
13	South Central Quebec
14	Sherbrooke
15	Montérégie
16	Montreal
17	Central Quebec
18	North Western Quebec
19	Lower Saint Lawrence & North Shore
20	Hull
21	Chicoutimi–Jonquière
22	Ottawa
23	Eastern Ontario
24	Kingston
25	Central Ontario
26	Oshawa
27	Toronto
28	Hamilton
29	St. Catharines
30	London
31	Niagara
32	Windsor
33	Kitchener
34	Huron
35	South Central Ontario
36	Sudbury
37	Thunder Bay
38	Northern Ontario
39	Winnipeg
40	Southern Manitoba
41	Northern Manitoba
42	Regina
43	Saskatoon
44	Southern Saskatchewan
45	Northern Saskatchewan
46	Calgary
47	Edmonton
48	Northern Alberta
49	Southern Alberta
50	Southern Interior British Columbia
51	Abbotsford
52	Vancouver
53	Victoria
54	Southern Coastal British Columbia
55	Northern British Columbia
59	Whitehorse
60	Yukon
61	Yellowknife
62	Northwest Territories
63	Iqaluit
64	Nunavut

Annex 3

EBSMs Data Tables

Annex 3.1 Overview of the Labour Market Development Agreements 352
Annex 3.2 Employment Insurance (EI) Part II – General Definitions 353
Annex 3.3 EBSM Program Descriptions 354
Annex 3.4 EBSM Overview 355
Annex 3.5 EBSM Clients – Clients Served, by Client Type 356
Annex 3.6 New EBSM Interventions 357
Annex 3.7 EBSM Designated Members – Women 358
Annex 3.8 EBSM Designated Members – Persons with Disabilities 359
Annex 3.9 EBSM Designated Members – Indigenous People 360
Annex 3.10 EBSM Designated Members – Visible Minorities 361
Annex 3.11 EBSM and Pan-Canadian Activities – Part I – Final Expenditures 362
Annex 3.12 EBSM Final Expenditures 363
Annex 3.13 EI Part II Pan-Canadian – Final Expenditures 364
Annex 3.14 Returns to Employment and Unpaid Benefits Indicators 365
Annex 3.15 Returns to Employment by EBSM Intervention 366
Annex 3.16 Incremental Impacts of EBSMs at the National and Provincial Levels 367

Annex 3.1 Overview of Labour Market Development Agreements

			Allocation ($000s)[1]		
			2015/2016	2014/2015	2013/2014
Province/Territory	Signature Date	Implementation Date	LMDA	LMDA	LMDA
Newfoundland and Labrador	September 4, 2008	November 2, 2009	126,780	127,992	129,219
Prince Edward Island	September 5, 2008	October 5, 2009	25,292	25,656	26,084
Nova Scotia	June 13, 2008	July 1, 2009	78,592	78,870	79,013
New Brunswick	December 13, 1996	April 1, 1997	89,819	89,840	89,763
Quebec	April 21, 1997	April 1, 1998	577,625	579,094	581,242
Ontario	November 23, 2005	January 1, 2007	574,760	570,490	565,471
Manitoba	April 17, 1997	November 27, 1997	43,087	43,083	43,507
Saskatchewan	February 6, 1998	January 1, 1999	35,229	35,855	36,426
Alberta	December 6, 1996	November 1, 1997	109,404	109,138	109,143
British Columbia	February 20, 2008	February 2, 2009	279,959	280,504	280,647
Northwest Territories	February 27, 1998	October 1, 1998	3,082	3,121	3,143
Yukon	July 8, 2009	February 1, 2010	3,560	3,523	3,482
Nunavut	May 11, 2000	April 1, 2000	2,811	2,834	2,859
Canada			**1,950,000**	**1,950,000**	**1,950,000**

[1] Funds that are transferred to cover administrative costs are not included in the amounts. Please refer to Annex 3.12 for administrative costs.

Annex 3.2 Employment Insurance (EI) Part II – General Definitions

Eligibility for Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSMs) or Similar Programs Funded Under Part II
To be eligible for Employment Benefits, individuals must be unemployed and have a current Employment Insurance (EI) claim as an "active EI client" or a claim that ended in the preceding three years as a "former EI client." Those who began a maternity or parental claim in the preceding five years, after which they left the labour market to care for their newborn or newly adopted children, also qualify as former EI clients and are eligible for Employment Benefits upon re-entry into the labour market. Unemployed individuals who are neither active nor former EI clients are considered "non-insured" and are eligible to participate in Employment Assistance Services as well as self-services provided by the National Employment Service.
Labour Market Development Agreements (LMDAs)
LMDAs provide the frameworks within which EBSM delivery takes place. EBSMs are flexible by design, allowing provincial and territorial jurisdictions (P/Ts) to develop and deliver programs that respond to local and regional labour market needs. With the implementation of the Canada-Yukon LMDA on February 1, 2010, all provinces and territories are now fully responsible for the design and delivery of programs similar to EBSMs established under Part II of the *EI Act*. In support of these activities, Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC) transfers LMDA funding to the provinces and territories and focuses on accountability, evaluation and ongoing policy development. ESDC also delivers Pan-Canadian programming and maintains, in partnership with the provinces and territories, specific projects and activities in the national interest under Part II of the *EI Act*. Canada retains responsibility for the delivery of insurance benefits under Part I of the *EI Act* and for the aspects of labour market development reflective of national interests. For more information on LMDAs, please refer to: http://www.esdc.gc.ca/en/training_agreements/lmda/index.page
Apprentices
Apprentices are paid by their employer during periods of practical training. During the classroom portion of their training, apprentices are eligible for regular benefits under Part I of the *EI Act*. The apprentice requires a referral under the authority of Section 25 of the *EI Act* to access these benefits. Depending on the regional and local priorities of the province or territory, the apprentice may receive EI Part II support to cover classroom-related expenses.
Aboriginal Skills and Employment Training Strategy (ASETS)
ESDC negotiates agreements with indigenous organizations todesign and deliver employment programs and services for indigenous people at the community level. Aboriginal Skills and Employment Training Strategy (ASETS) is the successor to the Aboriginal Human Resources Development Strategy (AHRDS), which expired on March 31, 2010. The sun setting of AHRDS and the modernization of ESDC's Aboriginal labou rmarket programming—through ASETS—coincides with ESDC's process of modernizing the administration of grants and contributions. The ASETS advances labour market outcomes for First Nations, Métis, and Inuit via demand-driven skills development, strategic partnerships with provinces, territories and the private sector, and via increased accountability. It also supports the development of a skilled Aboriginal workforce, which is one of the Aboriginal Economic Development Framework's objectives.
Job Bank
Job Bank is an Internet service that helps connect employers and workers. It is the largest web-based network of job advertisements across Canada and is available to Canadian employers and job seekers free of charge. See http://jb-ge.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca.

Annex 3.3 EBSM Program Descriptions

Employment Benefits
Targeted Wage Subsidies assist insured participants to obtain on-the-job work experience by providing employers with financial assistance toward the wages of participants. This benefit encourages employers to hire unemployed individuals whom they would not normally hire in the absence of a subsidy.
Self-Employment provides financial assistance and business planning advice to EI-eligible participants to help them start their own business.This financial assistance is intended to cover personal living expenses and other expenses during the initial stages of the business.
Job CreationPartnerships projects provide insured participants with opportunities to gain work experience that will lead to ongoing employment. Activities of the project help develop the community andthe local economy.
Skills Development helps insured participants to obtain employment skills by giving them direct financial assistance that enables them to select, arrange for and pay for their own training.
Targeted Earnings Supplements encourage unemployed persons to accept employment by offering them financial incentives. Quebe coffers a similar measure – Return to Work Supplement – to help with expenses related to returning to work (for example, new tools, office materials or clothing).
Support Measures
Employment Assistance Services provide funding to organizations to enable them to provide employment assistance to unemployed persons.The services provided may include individual counselling, action planning, job search skills, job-finding clubs, job placement services, the provision of labour market information, case management and follow-up.
Labour Market Partnerships provide funding to help employers, employee and employer associations, and communities to improve their capacityto deal with human resource requirements and to implement labour force adjustments. These partnerships involve developing plans and strategies, and implementing adjustment measures.
Research and Innovation supports activities that identify better ways of helping people to prepare for or keep employment and to be productive participants in the labour force.Funds are provided to eligible recipients to enable them to carry out demonstration projects and research for this purpose.

Annex 3.4 EBSM Overview[1]

2014/2015

Clients Served[2]	
Gender	
Men	59.3%
Women	40.7%
Age[3]	
15 to 19	5.1%
20 to 24	14.3%
25 to 29	13.3%
30 to 34	12.8%
35 to 39	11.6%
40 to 44	10.5%
45 to 49	10.1%
50 to 54	9.9%
55 and Older	12.5%
Unknown	-
EI Clients Served	
Active Claimants	78.7%
Former Claimants	21.3%
Intervention-to-Client Ratio	
Clients	689,459
Interventions	1,106,750
Ratio	1.61

Participation in Interventions as a Percentage of Total	
Employment Benefits	
Targeted Wage Subsidies	1.0%
Self-Employment	0.7%
Job Creation Partnerships	0.3%
Skills Development-Regular	4.4%
Skills Development-Apprentices	6.2%
Targeted Earning Supplements	0.2%
Support Measures: Employment Assistance Services	
Employment Services	52.3%
Group Services	3.2%
Individual Counselling	28.9%
Pan-Canadian	**2.5%**

Designated Group Participation in EBSMs	
Women	44.1%
Indigenous People[4]	7.5%
Persons with Disabilities[4]	9.7%
Visible Minorities[4]	4.0%
Labour Market	
Employment	17,829,642
Unemployment Rate	6.9%

Sources: Client and Participant datasets.

1 In 2013/2014, Newfoundland and Labrador implemented a one-stop employment services delivery model, which included the introduction of a new case management system and ending contracts with third-party providers of employment services. Due to this transition, the 2014/2015 administrative data on clients and interventions presented in this report for the province are estimates, based on partial counts and other sources of information, such as the audited financial statements and temporary transitional data capturing processes for that period. The province has undertaken a supplementary analysis and is adjusting the data collection process of its new system to ensure the data counts for the *2015/2016 MAR* are complete.

2 Clients with an unknown gender were added to the male category.

3 SD-Apprentices and Group Services are excluded from the distribution because client date of birth is not collected.

4 Reported counts are generally lower than actual numbers because data are collected through self-identification.

Annex 3.5 EBSM Clients – Clients Served, by Client Type[1,2]

2014/2015						
Provinces/Territories	EI Clients				Non-Insured Clients Served	Total Clients Served
	EI Active Claimants		Former Claimants Served	Total EI Clients Served		
	Target[3]	Active Claimants Served				
Newfoundland and Labrador	9,500	8,850	2,513	11,363	1,126	12,489
Prince Edward Island	2,844	2,709	621	3,330	1,470	4,800
Nova Scotia	10,000	9,360	2,202	11,562	4,397	15,959
New Brunswick	8,925	8,596	2,393	10,989	4,838	15,827
Quebec	136,500	140,026	24,986	165,012	64,769	229,781
Ontario	58,000	63,061	19,734	82,795	71,278	154,073
Manitoba	10,500	9,996	3,672	13,668	15,174	28,842
Saskatchewan	8,125	10,503	2,565	13,068	813	13,881
Alberta	37,500	43,398	15,820	59,218	60,344	119,562
British Columbia	39,000	34,937	9,502	44,439	32,365	76,804
Northwest Territories	338	294	138	432	500	932
Yukon	300	259	45	304	131	435
Nunavut	160	110	126	236	460	696
National Headquarters	–	–	–	–	–	–
Total EBSMs	**321,692**	**332,099**	**84,317**	**416,416**	**257,665**	**674,081**
Indigenous Pan-Canadian	15,738	7,696	7,682	15,378	–	15,378
Canada	**337,430**	**339,795**	**91,999**	**431,794**	**257,665**	**689,459**

Source: Client dataset.

1 In 2013/2014, Newfoundland and Labrador implemented a one-stop employment services delivery model, which included the introduction of a new case management system and ending contracts with third-party providers of employment services. Due to this transition, the 2014/2015 administrative data on clients and interventions presented in this report for the province are estimates, based on partial counts and other sources of information, such as the audited financial statements and temporary transitional data capturing processes for that period. The province has undertaken a supplementary analysis and is adjusting the data collection process of its new system to ensure the data counts for the *2015/2016 MAR* are complete.

2 This table includes clients served between April 1, 2014, and March 31, 2015, with one count per client served.

3 Each jurisdiction's target refers to the number of EI active clients served, except in Quebec, where it includes both active and former clients served.

Annex 3.6 New EBSM Interventions[1,2]

	2014/2015														
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.[3]	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
Employment Benefits															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	880	437	362	1,632	5,052	1,806	53	–	49	1,295	67	3	7	–	**11,643**
Self-Employment	179	118	422	286	1,680	2,406	120	66	120	1,946	14	2	2	–	**7,361**
Job Creation Partnerships	1,196	108	118	–	–	512	135	–	598	498	–	–	–	–	**3,165**
Skills Development–Regular	3,609	1,013	1,790	3,983	23,050	8,049	1,966	938	1,029	3,367	44	45	208	–	**49,091**
Skills Development–Apprentices	2,727	315	1,560	2,192	–	15,883	3,932	6,566	22,492	12,399	155	177	39	–	**68,437**
Targeted Earning Supplements	–	–	–	–	2,692	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	**2,692**
Total Employment Benefits	**8,591**	**1,991**	**4,252**	**8,093**	**32,474**	**28,656**	**6,206**	**7,570**	**24,288**	**19,505**	**280**	**227**	**256**	**–**	**142,389**
Support Measures: EAS															
Employment Services	8,238	4,252	20,603	9,094	146,501	–	39,241	5,494	212,188	131,710	–	293	678	–	**578,292**
Group Services	4500	–	1852	–	31828	–	–	560	–	602	–	–	–	–	**39,342**
Individual Counselling	3,007	1,345	4,513	16,667	70,349	144,011	15,140	4,785	–	57,829	864	–	–	–	**318,510**
Total Support Measures: EAS	**15,745**	**5,597**	**26,968**	**25,761**	**248,678**	**144,011**	**54,381**	**10,839**	**212,188**	**190,141**	**864**	**293**	**678**	**–**	**936,144**
Total Support Measures: EAS–Without Group Services	*11,245*	*5,597*	*25,116*	*25,761*	*216,850*	*144,011*	*54,381*	*10,279*	*212,188*	*189,539*	*864*	*293*	*678*	–	*896,802*
Total Benefits and Support Measures: EAS	**24,336**	**7,588**	**31,220**	**33,854**	**281,152**	**172,667**	**60,587**	**18,409**	**236,476**	**209,646**	**1,144**	**520**	**934**	**–**	**1,078,533**
Indigenous Pan-Canadian	231	140	462	533	3,229	5,621	4,905	2,727	2,651	6,957	270	201	101	189	**28,217**
Grand Total–Benefits and Support Measures: EAS	**24,567**	**7,728**	**31,682**	**34,387**	**284,381**	**178,288**	**65,492**	**21,136**	**239,127**	**216,603**	**1,414**	**721**	**1,035**	**189**	**1,106,750**
Grand Total–Without Group Services	*20,067*	*7,728*	*29,830*	*34,387*	*252,553*	*178,288*	*65,492*	*20,576*	*239,127*	*216,001*	*1,414*	*721*	*1,035*	*189*	*1,067,408*

Source: Participant dataset.

1 In 2013/2014, Newfoundland and Labrador implemented a one-stop employment services delivery model, which included the introduction of a new case management system and ending contracts with third-party providers of employment services. Due to this transition, the 2014/2015 administrative data on clients and interventions presented in this report for the province are estimates, based on partial counts and other sources of information, such as the audited financial statements and temporary transitional data capturing processes for that period. The province has undertaken a supplementary analysis and is adjusting the data collection process of its new system to ensure the data counts for the *2015/2016 MAR* are complete.

2 Interventions in this table refer to all new starts between April 1, 2014 and March 31, 2015.

3 Ontario counts one individual counselling intervention per client.

Annex 3.7 EBSM Designated Members – Women[1,2]

New Starts, by Intervention (%)—2014/2015															
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
Employment Benefits															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	30.0	35.7	51.9	28.2	44.6	48.3	20.8	–	63.3	45.0	9.0	66.7	28.6	–	**41.5**
Self-Employment	48.6	49.2	49.1	34.6	42.8	53.1	50.0	53.0	48.3	51.1	85.7	–	100.0	–	**49.0**
Job Creation Partnerships	49.2	51.9	64.4	–	–	61.9	22.2	–	47.8	21.3	–	–	–	–	**46.1**
Skills Development–Regular	44.9	51.5	52.5	45.6	40.9	48.6	53.3	44.9	49.3	48.8	29.5	53.3	49.0	–	**44.8**
Skills Development–Apprentices	6.1	2.9	3.8	3.2	–	2.8	2.5	4.5	6.2	4.0	6.5	6.8	2.6	–	**4.5**
Targeted Earning Supplements	–	–	–	–	42.2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	**42.2**
Total Employment Benefits	**31.7**	**40.2**	**34.6**	**30.2**	**41.7**	**23.8**	**20.1**	**10.0**	**9.4**	**19.6**	**14.6**	**16.7**	**41.8**	**–**	**25.4**
Support Measures: EAS															
Employment Services	48.0	50.7	50.6	47.7	44.6	2.6	52.2	35.2	47.6	46.8	2.6	42.7	44.8	–	**47.0**
Individual Counselling	48.0	52.1	52.0	39.5	43.7	50.0	50.0	41.3	–	46.6	35.4	–	–	–	**47.3**
Total Support Measures: EAS	**48.0**	**51.0**	**50.8**	**42.4**	**44.3**	**50.0**	**51.6**	**38.0**	**47.6**	**35.4**	**44.8**	**46.8**	**42.7**	**–**	**47.1**
Total Benefits and Support Measures: EAS	**41.4**	**48.2**	**48.5**	**39.5**	**44.0**	**45.7**	**48.4**	**26.1**	**43.7**	**30.3**	**44.0**	**44.2**	**31.3**	**–**	**44.1**
Indigenous Pan-Canadian	38.5	37.1	36.1	43.7	49.6	48.8	45.1	45.2	38.6	41.1	37.8	31.8	45.5	59.3	**44.4**
Grand Total–Benefits and Support Measures: EAS	**41.4**	**48.0**	**48.3**	**39.5**	**44.1**	**45.8**	**48.1**	**28.7**	**43.6**	**44.1**	**31.8**	**31.5**	**44.2**	**59.3**	**44.1**

Source: Participant dataset.

1 In 2013/2014, Newfoundland and Labrador implemented a one-stop employment services delivery model, which included the introduction of a new case management system and ending contracts with third-party providers of employment services. Due to this transition, the 2014/2015 administrative data on clients and interventions presented in this report for the province are estimates, based on partial counts and other sources of information, such as the audited financial statements and temporary transitional data capturing processes for that period. The province has undertaken a supplementary analysis and is adjusting the data collection process of its new system to ensure the data counts for the *2015/2016 MAR* are complete.

2 All percentages are based on new start interventions only (the number of interventions started in 2014/2015).

Annex 3.8 EBSM Designated Members – Persons with Disabilities[1,2]

New Starts, by Intervention (%)—2014/2015															
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
Employment Benefits															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	2.3	2.7	27.3	1.7	39.2	4.2	7.5	–	2.0	17.9	–	–	–	–	**21.1**
Self-Employment	1.1	1.7	12.8	2.4	2.1	–	4.2	3.0	1.7	22.3	–	–	–	–	**7.4**
Job Creation Partnerships	0.9	2.8	11.9	–	–	–	2.2	–	4.0	8.4	–	–	–	–	**3.1**
Skills Development–Regular	2.2	3.6	19.0	5.4	3.7	–	4.5	7.8	0.3	28.7	–	13.3	0.5	–	**5.4**
Skills Development–Apprentices	0.1	–	0.3	0.2	–	–	0.2	0.8	–	0.2	–	–	–	–	**0.1**
Targeted Earning Supplements	–	–	–	–	4.2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	**4.2**
Total Employment Benefits	**1.3**	**2.7**	**12.0**	**3.1**	**9.2**	**0.3**	**1.7**	**1.7**	**0.1**	**8.7**	**–**	**2.6**	**0.4**	**–**	**4.2**
Support Measures: EAS															
Employment Services	1.4	20.9	25.5	21.9	8.5	–	10.5	9.2	2.9	26.8	–	42.0	0.9	–	**11.6**
Individual Counselling	1.4	5.7	39.1	9.7	4.9	3.9	5.6	9.3	–	28.4	0.8	–	–	–	**9.5**
Total Support Measures: EAS	**1.1**	**17.2**	**27.9**	**14.0**	**7.3**	**3.9**	**9.2**	**9.2**	**2.9**	**27.3**	**0.8**	**42.0**	**0.9**	**–**	**10.4**
Total Benefits and Support Measures: EAS	**1.2**	**13.4**	**25.6**	**11.4**	**7.6**	**3.3**	**8.4**	**6.0**	**2.6**	**25.6**	**0.6**	**24.8**	**0.7**	**–**	**9.61**
Indigenous Pan-Canadian	3.9	0.7	5.6	3.6	0.6	2.3	5.0	1.4	1.6	5.2	1.5	1.0	–	3.7	**3.2**
Grand Total–Benefits and Support Measures: EAS	**1.4**	**13.2**	**25.3**	**11.3**	**7.5**	**3.3**	**8.1**	**5.4**	**2.6**	**24.9**	**0.8**	**18.2**	**0.7**	**3.7**	**9.7**

Source: Participant dataset.

1 In 2013/2014, Newfoundland and Labrador implemented a one-stop employment services delivery model, which included the introduction of a new case management system and ending contracts with third-party providers of employment services. Due to this transition, the 2014/2015 administrative data on clients and interventions presented in this report for the province are estimates, based on partial counts and other sources of information, such as the audited financial statements and temporary transitional data capturing processes for that period. The province has undertaken a supplementary analysis and is adjusting the data collection process of its new system to ensure the data counts for the *2015/2016 MAR* are complete.

2 All percentages are based on new start interventions only (the number of interventions started in 2014/2015). These reported counts are generally lower than actual numbers because data are collected through self-identification.

Annex 3.9 EBSM Designated Members – Indigenous People[1,2]

New Starts, by Intervention (%)—2014/2015															
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
Employment Benefits															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	1.0	0.7	5.2	–	0.1	1.8	7.5	–	6.1	7.9	46.3	33.3	100.0	–	**1.9**
Self-Employment	3.4	0.8	4.5	–	0.1	1.7	10.0	12.1	0.8	7.8	–	–	50.0	–	**3.3**
Job Creation Partnerships	0.3	0.9	6.8	–	–	2.7	7.4	–	1.5	25.7	–	–	–	–	**5.5**
Skills Development–Regular	2.8	1.3	4.1	–	0.1	1.6	8.5	10.9	0.3	9.3	72.7	24.4	85.1	–	**2.3**
Skills Development–Apprentices	0.1	–	0.2	–	–	0.1	1.4	1.6	0.1	0.3	7.1	–	–	–	**0.3**
Targeted Earning Supplements	–	–	–	–	0.1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	**0.1**
Total Employment Benefits	**1.4**	**0.9**	**2.9**	**–**	**0.1**	**0.8**	**4.0**	**2.8**	**0.1**	**3.7**	**26.4**	**5.3**	**72.3**	**–**	**1.4**
Support Measures: EAS															
Employment Services	0.1	1.0	4.4	–	0.1	–	12.5	14.5	5.5	12.6	–	20.5	84.1	–	**6.2**
Individual Counselling	1.2	0.9	3.9	–	0.1	2.3	7.6	13.8	–	13.5	66.3	–	–	–	**4.3**
Total Support Measures: EAS	**0.5**	**1.0**	**4.3**	**–**	**0.1**	**2.3**	**11.1**	**14.2**	**5.5**	**12.9**	**66.3**	**20.5**	**84.1**	**–**	**5.5**
Total Benefits and Support Measures: EAS	**0.9**	**1.0**	**4.1**	**–**	**0.1**	**2.1**	**10.4**	**9.4**	**5.0**	**12.0**	**56.6**	**13.8**	**80.8**	**–**	**4.9**
Indigenous Pan-Canadian	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	**100.0**
Grand Total–Benefits and Support Measures: EAS	**1.9**	**2.8**	**5.6**	**1.6**	**1.4**	**5.1**	**17.1**	**21.4**	**6.0**	**14.8**	**64.9**	**37.9**	**82.7**	**100.0**	**7.5**

Source: Participant dataset.

1 In 2013/2014, Newfoundland and Labrador implemented a one-stop employment services delivery model, which included the introduction of a new case management system and ending contracts with third-party providers of employment services. Due to this transition, the 2014/2015 administrative data on clients and interventions presented in this report for the province are estimates, based on partial counts and other sources of information, such as the audited financial statements and temporary transitional data capturing processes for that period. The province has undertaken a supplementary analysis and is adjusting the data collection process of its new system to ensure the data counts for the *2015/2016 MAR* are complete.

2 All percentages are based on new start interventions only (the number of interventions started in 2014/2015). These reported counts are generally lower than actual numbers because data are collected through self-identification.

Annex 3.10 EBSM Designated Members – Visible Minorities[1,2,3]

New Starts, by Intervention (%)—2014/2015															
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
Employment Benefits															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	1.7	3.0	2.5	1.0	–	–	9.4	–	2.0	9.0	16.4	–	–	–	**1.6**
Self-Employment	–	2.5	1.2	1.0	–	–	9.2	4.5	4.2	11.3	7.1	–	–	–	**3.4**
Job Creation Partnerships	–	2.8	1.7	–	–	–	12.6	–	2.0	4.8	–	–	–	–	**1.8**
Skills Development–Regular	–	3.9	2.5	2.2	–	–	20.1	8.4	4.6	9.6	25.0	–	1.4	–	**2.1**
Skills Development–Apprentices	–	–	0.1	–	–	–	0.7	0.6	0.1	0.2	1.3	–	–	–	**–0.1**
Targeted Earning Supplements	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Total Employment Benefits	**0.2**	**3.0**	**1.5**	**1.3**	**–**	**–**	**7.3**	**1.6**	**0.3**	**3.6**	**8.9**	**–**	**1.2**	**–**	**1.1**
Support Measures: EAS															
Employment Services	0.2	13.2	4.2	4.0	–	–	17.5	9.3	1.9	12.5	–	–	0.7	–	**5.1**
Individual Counselling	0.2	2.1	3.7	3.4	–	–	20.3	8.3	–	12.3	18.2	–	–	–	**3.6**
Total Support Measures: EAS	**0.2**	**10.5**	**4.1**	**3.6**	**–**	**–**	**18.3**	**8.8**	**1.9**	**12.4**	**18.2**	**–**	**0.7**	**–**	**4.6**
Total Benefits and Support Measures: EAS	**0.2**	**8.5**	**3.8**	**3.0**	**–**	**–**	**17.2**	**5.8**	**1.7**	**11.6**	**15.9**	**–**	**0.9**	**–**	**4.1**
Indigenous Pan-Canadian	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Grand Total–Benefits and Support Measures: EAS	**0.2**	**8.4**	**3.7**	**3.0**	**–**	**–**	**15.9**	**5.0**	**1.7**	**11.2**	**12.9**	**–**	**0.8**	**–**	**4.0**

Source: Participant dataset.

1 In 2013/2014, Newfoundland and Labrador implemented a one-stop employment services delivery model, which included the introduction of a new case management system and ending contracts with third-party providers of employment services. Due to this transition, the 2014/2015 administrative data on clients and interventions presented in this report for the province are estimates, based on partial counts and other sources of information, such as the audited financial statements and temporary transitional data capturing processes for that period. The province has undertaken a supplementary analysis and is adjusting the data collection process of its new system to ensure the data counts for the *2015/2016 MAR* are complete.

2 Quebec, and NHQ did not report participation levels for members of the visible minority groups. Therefore, these jurisdictions were excluded from the calculation of the national average.

3 All percentages are based on new start interventions only (the number of interventions started in 2014/2015). These reported counts are generally lower than actual numbers because data are collected through self-identification.

Annex 3.11 EBSM and Pan-Canadian Activities – Part I – Final Expenditures

In $000s by Intervention–2014/2015															
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
Self-Employment	738	606	1,668	2,568	7,562	6,312	839	319	893	1,946	252	22	3	-	**23,728**
Job Creation Partnerships[1]	824	206	174	2	132	911	310	-	8	194	-	-	-	-	**2,761**
Skills Development	21,391	6,797	13,156	28,815	49,166	76,247	23,661	22,944	96,017	41,743	929	916	293	-	**382,07**
TOTAL[2]	**22,953**	**7,609**	**14,998**	**31,385**	**56,860**	**83,470**	**24,810**	**23,263**	**96,918**	**43,883**	**1,181**	**938**	**296**	**-**	**408,564**

Source: Benefit and Overpayment System

[1] In Quebec, this amount refers only to pan-Canadian activities.

[2] Totals may not add due to rounding.

Annex 3.12 EBSM Final Expenditures

In $000s by Intervention–2014/2015															
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.[1]	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada[2]
Employment Benefits															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	7,860	2,135	3,181	9,586	69,792	3,619	317	–	733	5,893	140	8	406	–	103,671
Self-Employment	5,382	1,579	5,626	5,152	25,236	46,160	1,077	301	1,318	10,483	145	58	33	–	102,550
Job Creation Partnerships	8,156	1,381	1,341	–	–	7,417	989	–	7,463	6,853	–	–	–	–	33,599
Skills Development	94,319	13,487	37,624	55,142	241,446	193,770	25,224	28,278	74,452	140,459	1,164	1,871	886	–	908,122
Targeted Earning Supplements	–	–	–	–	1,302	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1,302
Total Employment Benefits	**115,716**	**18,582**	**47,773**	**69,880**	**337,776**	**250,967**	**27,607**	**28,578**	**83,966**	**163,687**	**1,449**	**1,936**	**1,326**	**–**	**1,149,243**
Support Measures: EAS															
Employment Assistance	4,973	4,686	29,070	11,651	157,270	290,022	7,838	4,692	23,177	92,890	1,281	1,314	1,033	–	629,896
Total Support Measures: EAS	**4,973**	**4,686**	**29,070**	**11,651**	**157,270**	**290,022**	**7,838**	**4,692**	**23,177**	**92,890**	**1,281**	**1,314**	**1,033**	**–**	**629,896**
Sub-Total : Employment Benefits and Support Measures: EAS	**120,689**	**23,268**	**76,843**	**81,530**	**495,045**	**540,988**	**35,445**	**33,270**	**107,143**	**256,577**	**2,730**	**3,251**	**2,358**	**–**	**1,779,139**
Other Support Measures															
Labour Market Partnerships	1,521	2,143	2,027	7,636	84,546	13,658	5,635	2,401	1,995	6,887	133	–	–	–	128,582
Research and Innovation	–	245	–	673	253	15,843	2,003	184	–	12,909	18	–	–	–	32,129
Total Other Support Measures	**1,521**	**2,388**	**2,027**	**8,310**	**84,799**	**29,502**	**7,638**	**2,585**	**1,995**	**19,796**	**151**	**–**	**–**	**–**	**160,711**
Total EBSM– Part II	**122,210**	**25,656**	**78,870**	**89,840**	**579,844**	**570,490**	**43,083**	**35,855**	**109,138**	**276,373**	**2,881**	**3,251**	**2,358**	**–**	**1,939,850**
Overcontribution[3]	5,782	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	4,131	240	272	476	–	10,901
Pan Canadian (see details in Annex 3.13)	1,861	225	1,596	1,302	9,086	20,750	14,145	11,253	12,881	13,453	2,475	975	2,314	24,395	116,713
Adjustment[4]	(13,462)	–	–	(543)	–	–	–	–	–	(4,245)	(91)	(176)	(1,506)	(617)	(20,640)
Total including Pan Canadian	**116,390**	**25,881**	**80,466**	**90,600**	**588,931**	**591,240**	**57,228**	**47,108**	**122,019**	**289,712**	**5,505**	**4,322**	**3,642**	**23,778**	**2,046,823**
Administrative Costs Related to LMDAs[5]	8,883	2,646	10,112	8,922	58,920	57,058	6,078	6,021	9,594	20,535	1,450	389	787	–	191,394

Source: provincial/territorial audited statements.

1 Expenditures for Ontario TWS (Job Placement with Incentives) were estimated by Ontario. In Ontario's financial statements, actual expenditures for Ontario's TWS-similar interventions were included in total EAS expenditures, because the province has integrated these services in its new employment service model in order to maximize the flexibility of program delivery by third-party service providers. This amount is estimated and may be revised at a later date.

2 Totals may not add due to rounding. Includes an additional $750,000 in EI Part II funds made available to Quebec in response to the Lac Mégantic train derailment in 2013.

3 Overcontributions will be recovered during 2015/2016.

4 This adjustment reflects overpayments established, refunds of previous years' expenditures and other accounting adjustments.

5 Net Administrative costs include $181 million (salary and non-salary) to administer LMDAs and $10 million for rent.

Annex 3.13 EI Part II Pan-Canadian – Final Expenditures[1]

In $000s by Intervention—2014/2015															
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
Pan-Canadian - Programming Funds															
Aboriginal Skills and Employment Training Strategy	1,861	225	1,596	1,302	9,006	20,750	14,145	11,253	12,881	13,453	2,475	975	2,314	1,000	**93,238**
Labour Market Partnerships	-	-	-	-	80	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,590	**20,670**
Research and Innovation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,805	**2,805**
Grand Total Pan-Canadian	**1,861**	**225**	**1,596**	**1,302**	**9,086**	**20,750**	**14,145**	**11,253**	**12,881**	**13,453**	**2,475**	**975**	**2,314**	**24,395**	**116,713**

Source: SAP

[1] Totals may not add due to rounding.

Annex 3.14 Returns to Employment and Unpaid Benefits Indicators[1]

2014/2015												
Provinces/Territories	Clients Who Returned to Employment[2]						Unpaid Benefits ($ Millions)[2]					
	Targets[3]	Results				Results vs. Targets (%)	Targets[3]	Results				Results vs. Targets (%)
		SD-Apprentices	Group Services	Other[4]	Total			SD-Apprentices	Group Services	Other[4]	Total[5]	
Newfoundland and Labrador	5,600	1,788	–	1,510	3,298	59%	24.0	21.2	–	4.2	25.4	106%
Prince Edward Island	2,195	107	–	1,827	1,934	88%	7.3	1.2	–	4.9	6.1	83%
Nova Scotia	6,000	1,441	191	3,976	5,608	93%	25.0	17.6	1.5	9.3	28.4	114%
New Brunswick	7,800	564	–	6,907	7,471	96%	28.9	6.1	–	21.1	27.3	94%
Quebec	50,900	–	8,358	51,591	59,949	118%	200.0	–	66.5	224.3	290.8	145%
Ontario	24,000	12,003	–	24,163	36,166	151%	157.0	130.2	–	110.7	241.0	153%
Manitoba	8,000	2,792	–	4,364	7,156	89%	45.0	28.4	–	14.7	43.1	96%
Saskatchewan	5,500	3,907	63	2,068	6,038	110%	50.0	47.8	0.5	13.3	61.6	123%
Alberta	22,500	14,811	–	10,934	25,745	114%	215.0	175.9	–	91.1	267.0	124%
British Columbia	24,000	7,478	31	12,309	19,818	83%	134.0	86.1	0.2	40.4	126.7	95%
Northwest Territories	209	66	–	127	193	92%	2.6	1.1	–	1.3	2.4	92%
Yukon	250	104	–	66	170	68%	2.6	1.4	–	0.5	1.9	71%
Nunavut	140	12	–	35	47	34%	0.9	0.2	–	0.3	0.5	58%
Canada	**157,094**	**45,073**	**8,643**	**119,877**	**173,593**	**111%**	**892.3**	**517.2**	**68.7**	**536.1**	**1,122.0**	**126%**

Source: Results dataset.

1 In 2013/2014, Newfoundland and Labrador implemented a one-stop employment services delivery model, which included the introduction of a new case management system and ending contracts with third-party providers of employment services. Due to this transition, the 2014/2015 administrative data on clients and interventions presented in this report for the province are estimates, based on partial counts and other sources of information, such as the audited financial statements and temporary transitional data capturing processes for that period. The province has undertaken a supplementary analysis and is adjusting the data collection process of its new system to ensure the data counts for the *2015/2016 MAR* are complete.

2 ASETS activity resulted in 8,068 returns to employment and $15.5 million in unpaid benefits. These amounts are not included in the provincial totals.

3 Targets are for EBSM regular clients only.

4 The "Other" category includes all other EBSMs. SD-Apprentices and Group Services are reported separately because a different methodology is used to calculate returns to employment for these two measures.

5 Some unpaid benefit figures have been rounded.

Annex 3.15 Returns to Employment by EBSM Intervention[1,2]

	2014/2015														
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
Employment Benefits															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	27	236	192	1,334	1,284	432	14	0	4	595	10	0	6	0	**4,134**
Self-Employment	52	115	319	243	1,237	211	42	19	52	667	14	2	0	0	**2,973**
Job Creation Partnerships	237	73	79	0	0	144	58	0	137	254	0	0	0	0	**982**
Skills Development–Regular	1,037	534	1,007	2,195	8,555	889	663	310	142	1,508	25	16	14	0	**16,895**
Skills Development–Apprentices[3]	1,862	107	1,441	1,068	0	12,167	2,954	4,098	14,811	7,834	71	108	12	0	**46,533**
Targeted Earning Supplements	0	0	0	0	1,894	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**1,894**
Total Benefits	**3,215**	**1,065**	**3,038**	**4,840**	**12,970**	**13,843**	**3,731**	**4,427**	**15,146**	**10,858**	**120**	**126**	**32**	-	**73,411**
Support Measures: EAS															
Employment Services	47	655	2,098	1,031	29,764	0	2,107	573	10,599	7,207	3	44	15	0	**54,143**
Group Services	0	0	191	0	8,358	0	0	63	0	31	0	0	0	0	**8,643**
Individual Counselling	36	214	281	1,600	8,857	22,323	1,318	975	0	1,722	70	0	0	0	**37,396**
Total Support Measures: EAS	**83**	**869**	**2,570**	**2,631**	**46,979**	**22,323**	**3,425**	**1,611**	**10,599**	**8,960**	**73**	**44**	**15**	-	**100,182**
Total Employment Benefits and Support Measures: EAS	**3,298**	**1,934**	**5,608**	**7,471**	**59,949**	**36,166**	**7,156**	**6,038**	**25,745**	**19,818**	**193**	**170**	**47**	-	**173,593**
Target	5,600	2,195	6,000	7,800	50,900	24,000	8,000	5,500	22,500	24,000	209	250	140	-	**157,094**
Results vs. Targets (%)	**58.9%**	**88.1%**	**93.5%**	**95.8%**	**117.8%**	**150.7%**	**89.5%**	**109.8%**	**114.4%**	**82.6%**	**92.3%**	**68.0%**	**33.6%**	-	**110.5%**

Sources: Results dataset and Common System for Grants and Contributions (CSGC)

1 In 2013/2014, Newfoundland and Labrador implemented a one-stop employment services delivery model, which included the introduction of a new case management system and ending contracts with third-party providers of employment services. Due to this transition, the 2014/2015 administrative data on clients and interventions presented in this report for the province are estimates, based on partial counts and other sources of information, such as the audited financial statements and temporary transitional data capturing processes for that period. The province has undertaken a supplementary analysis and is adjusting the data collection process of its new system to ensure the data counts for the *2015/2016 MAR* are complete.

2 Results associated solely with the ASETS are not available.

3 Results for SD-Apprentices do not match those in Annex 3.14. Results presented in this Annex are associated with the last intervention in which a client participated. Employment Benefits participation supersedes participation in Employment Services.

Annex 3.16 Incremental Impacts of EBSMs at the National and Provincial Levels

The following presents the results from an analysis of EBSM incremental impacts over three years after participation for active claimants who started participating in 2007-2008 or between 2006 and 2008 (i.e., post-program impacts over three consecutive years between 2008 and 2012 or 2006 and 2012). The national results from this analysis were presented in the 2013/2014 EI MAR. This section of Annex 3 presents the national results as well as those at the provincial levels.

1. Study Objective and Methodology

Incremental impacts of EBSMs represent the direct effect of program participation on participants' labour market experience (i.e., earnings from employment/self-employment, incidence of employment and use of EI) after participation. The role of the incremental impact analysis is to isolate the effects of participation from other factors such as inflation, economic cycles, layoff, etc. In order to achieve this, the incremental impact analysis compares the labour market experience of participants before and after their participation, with that of non-participants before and after the same period (see diagram).

The analysis covered up to 100% of active and former claimants who started their participation in EBSMs between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2008 or between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2008.

This analysis was conducted at the national level with participants from the 13 PTs. It was also conducted at the provincial level for 9 provinces. Results were not produced for Quebec since the Quebec Government is responsible for evaluating its LMDA[1]. As well, it was not possible to produce incremental impacts for the territories because the number of participants was too low to generate reliable results. The 2007-2008 reference period was used at the national level as well as in provinces where the number of participants was sufficient to produce results. The period was extended by one year (2006-2008) in other provinces in order to increase the sample size. Despite adding this year, the number of participants for some EBSMs was still too low to generate impacts for those program and services.

The analysis was conducted using linked administrative data from EI Part I and II and the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA). The comparison group was composed of active claimants who were eligible to participate in EBSMs but did not start participation in 2007 or 2008 or between 2006 and 2008.

The impacts of EBSM participation on improving the labour market experience of participants were measured using the following indicators:

- **Average earnings** from employment and/or self-employment: An increase in earnings indicates that participants improved their employment situation by either working more hours or by having a better paying job than they did before participation.
- **Incidence of employment** (i.e., incidence of having earnings from employment and/or self-employment): Measures whether participants were more likely to be employed after participation. A gain means that a higher proportion of participants were employed after participation than they would have been if they had not participated or if they had received minimal employment services.
- **Amount of EI benefits received:** Measures the average amount of EI benefits collected.
- **Average number of weeks in receipt of EI:** Measures the average number of weeks participants spent on EI.

The same methodology was used at national and at the provincial levels.

[1] Evaluations of programs and services delivered under the Quebec LMDA are available on Emploi Quebec Website : http://www.emploiquebec.gouv.qc.ca/publications-et-formulaires/

2. Results

The following presents results at the national level and for the 9 provinces covered by this analysis. The national results are presented along with a text description to help readers understand how to interpret the results. The provincial results are presented in table format only. Since different reference periods were used at the national level and across provinces (i.e., 2007-2008 or 2006-2008) the results are not directly comparable.

2.1 National Level

The national analysis covered active claimants in the 2007-2008 period. Key results are as follows:

Skills Development (SD): As shown in Table 1 below, SD participants experienced earnings gains in each of the three years after participation but those increases became larger over time. The incremental gains averaged $2,300 per year. Active claimants also had an average incremental increase of 4.7 percentage points in their incidence of employment in the three years following participation. As well, SD participation resulted in lower use of EI benefits. The incremental decreases averaged $400 per year.

Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS): Active claimants had incremental gains in earnings in each of the three years following the end of their TWS participation averaging $1,300 per year. These gains were accompanied by incremental increases in incidence of employment in each year after participation averaging 6.1 percentage points per year. Most impacts on EI benefits collected were not statistically significant at the 95% level. In this context, it is not possible to draw any clear conclusion about TWS effectiveness in reducing the use of EI after participation.

Self-Employment (SE): Over the three-year period following the end of their participation, active claimants had an average incremental reduction of $10,200 per year in their earnings from employment and/or self-employment and a reduction of 19 percentage points per year in their incidence of employment.

The earnings results should be interpreted with caution, as they may not fully capture the financial situation of participants. Impacts were examined using individual earnings reported in the T1 and T4 taxation files from CRA, and measured relative to active claimants who did not participate in SE and may have been in any employment/unemployment situation following participation (e.g., unemployed, paid employee or self-employed). According to a study from Statistics Canada, self-employed individuals in Canada have a lower average annual income than paid employees ($46,200 versus $52,400 in 2009), but the average net worth of their households is 2.7 times that of the paid employee households, which indicates that some self-employed individuals may leave funds within their business for reinvestment purposes.[2] Since the incremental impacts of SE were measured relative to a comparison group that also included paid employees and did not take the net worth of participants and comparison cases into account, the results may not be fully reflective of the financial situation of SE participants after their participation.

The incremental impact analysis also shows that SE participants collected $1,600 less in EI benefits per year on average. Those results should also be interpreted carefully since the time worked under self-employment does not allow self-employed Canadians to qualify for regular EI benefits.

Job Creation Partnerships (JCP): Participation in JCP improved active claimants' earnings by an average of $1,200 per year. They also had incremental increases in the incidence of employment in each of the three years after participation, averaging 4.9 percentage points per year. As well, on average, active claimants collected $300 less in EI benefits annually.

Employment Assistance Services only (EAS-only): Impacts were measured for the active claimants who only participated in EAS without receiving other programs or services. EAS participation was effective at helping active claimants to return to employment. Incremental impact results show that they improved their incidence of employment, while reducing their use of EI in the three year period after participation. Specifically, they had an average incremental gain of 0.6 percentage points per year in their incidence of employment, as well as average incremental decreases of $390 per year in their use of EI benefits.

Active claimants had incremental decreases in their earnings averaging $465 per year. However, the result should be interpreted with caution, as EAS is a short term and low intensity measure that is not focused on human capital development. EAS mostly includes services such as counselling, help with job search, development of return-to-work action plans and, in

[2] Sébastien LaRochelle-Côté and Sharanjit Uppal, "The Financial Well-Being of the Self-Employed," *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, vol. 23, no. 4, Winter 2011.

some cases, very short training such as first aid. In this context, it may not be reasonable to expect that participation in EAS-only would result in improving participants' earnings. However a recent evaluation on the timing of participation in EAS showed that participants who started their EAS within four weeks after initiating an EI claim had earnings gains in both the short- and medium-term after participation and achieved quicker return to employment.

Table 1

Incremental Impacts at the National Level

For Active Claimants Who Started an EBSM between 2007 and 2008					
Indicators	Post-program period			Average annual impact	Total impact
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year		
Skills Development (n=18,025)					
Earnings ($)	292***	2,745***	3,904***	2,314***	6,943***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	3.1***	5.2***	5.8***	4.7***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-755***	-298***	-191***	-415***	-1,244***
EI weeks (weeks)	-2.3***	-0.9***	-0.5***	-1.2***	-3.7***
Targeted Wage Subsidies (n=9,114)					
Earnings ($)	1,270***	1,112***	1,580***	1,338***	4,014***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	7.7***	5.3***	5.6***	6.1***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-32	-55	-209**	-99	-296
EI weeks (weeks)	0.3	0.2	-0.3	0.1	0.2
Self-Employment (n=10,220)[1]					
Earnings ($)	-11,412***	-9,929***	-9,375***	-10,236***	-30,708***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	-22.7***	-18.3***	-16.1***	-19.0***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-2,038***	-1,473***	-1,172***	-1,561***	-4,682***
EI weeks (weeks)	-5.7***	-4.0***	-3.1***	-4.2***	-12.7***
Job Creation Partnerships (n=2,456)					
Earnings ($)	1,427***	1,286**	850	1,179**	3,537**
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	6.1***	4.5***	3.8***	4.9***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-513***	-404***	-44	-320***	-961***
EI weeks (weeks)	-0.8**	-0.8**	0.3	-0.5	-1.4
Employment Assistance Services (EAS) (n=108,230)					
Earnings ($)	-1,113***	-368***	87	-465***	-1,395***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	0.6***	0.6***	0.8***	0.6**	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-512***	-371***	-288***	-390***	-$1,171
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.7***	-1.1***	-0.8***	-1.2***	-3.6***

Significance level *** 1%; ** 5%; * 10%

[1] Earnings results for Self-Employment should be interpreted with caution. They may not fully capture the financial wellbeing of participants. The impacts were examined using individual earnings reported in the T1 and T4 taxation files from CRA, and measured relative to active claimants who did not participate in SE and may have been in any employment/unemployment situation following participation (e.g., unemployed, paid employee or self-employed). According to a study from Statistics Canada, self-employed individuals in Canada have a lower average annual income than paid employees ($46,200 versus $52,400 in 2009), but the average net worth of their households is 2.7 times that of the paid employee households, which indicates that some self-employed individuals may leave funds within their business for reinvestment purposes.[3] Since the incremental impacts of SE were measured relative to a comparison group that also included paid employees and did not take the net worth of participants and comparison cases into account, the results may not be fully reflective of the financial wellbeing of SE participants after their participation. As well, the decreases in EI use may be due to EI eligibility effect as self-employed Canadians cannot qualify for regular EI benefits.

[3] Sébastien LaRochelle-Côté and Sharanjit Uppal, "The Financial Well-Being of the Self-Employed," *Perspectives on Labour and Income*, vol. 23, no. 4, Winter 2011.

Table 2

Incremental Impacts for Active Claimants in Newfoundland and Labrador

For Active Claimants Who Started an EBSM between 2006 and 2008					
Indicators	Post-program period			Average annual impact	Total impact
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year		
Skills Development (n=8,611)					
Earnings ($)	$1,820***	$3,836***	$6,477***	$4,046***	$12,139***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	1.0**	2.5***	2.9***	2.1***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$800***	-$319***	-$200***	-$440***	-$1,319***
EI weeks (weeks)	-3.4***	-1.8***	-1.4***	-2.2***	-6.6***
Targeted Wage Subsidies (n=728)					
Earnings ($)	$4,229***	$3,331***	$3,234***	$3,598***	$10,795***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	6.5***	5.3***	4.9***	5.6***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$1,677***	-$1,229***	-$1,055***	-$1,320***	-$3,961***
EI weeks (weeks)	-4.4***	-3.1***	-2.5***	-3.3***	-9.9***
Self-Employment (n=314)[1]					
Earnings ($)	-$8,102***	-$5,771***	-$5,647***	-$6,507***	-$19,520***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	-19.9***	-18.3***	-14.8***	-17.7***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$3,860***	-$2,951***	-$2,268***	-$3,026***	-$9,079***
EI weeks (weeks)	-12.0***	-8.9***	-7.0***	-9.3***	-27.9***
Job Creation Partnerships (n=1,346)					
Earnings ($)	-$300	-$678	-$837*	-$605	-$1,815
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	3.2***	1.6	2.3**	2.4***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$714***	-$445***	-$116	-$425***	-$1,275***
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.0**	-0.2	0.9**	-0.1	-0.2
Employment Assistance Services (EAS) (n=11,904)					
Earnings ($)	$927***	$2,158***	$2,503***	$1,863***	$5,588***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	2.0***	2.2***	2.1***	2.1***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$375***	-$176***	-$128**	-$226***	-$679***
EI weeks (weeks)	-0.9***	-0.3**	-0.1	-0.4***	-1.3***

Significance level *** 1%; ** 5%; * 10%

[1] Earnings results for Self-Employment should be interpreted with caution. They may not fully capture the financial wellbeing of participants. The impacts were examined using individual earnings reported in the T1 and T4 taxation files from CRA, and measured relative to active claimants who did not participate in SE and may have been in any employment/unemployment situation following participation (e.g., unemployed, paid employee or self-employed). According to a study from Statistics Canada, self-employed individuals in Canada have a lower average annual income than paid employees ($46,200 versus $52,400 in 2009), but the average net worth of their households is 2.7 times that of the paid employee households, which indicates that some self-employed individuals may leave funds within their business for reinvestment purposes.[3] Since the incremental impacts of SE were measured relative to a comparison group that also included paid employees and did not take the net worth of participants and comparison cases into account, the results may not be fully reflective of the financial wellbeing of SE participants after their participation. As well, the decreases in EI use may be due to EI eligibility effect as self-employed Canadians cannot qualify for regular EI benefits.

2.3 Prince Edward Island

Table 3

Incremental Impacts for Active Claimants in Prince Edward Island

For Active Claimants Who Started an EBSM between 2007 and 2008					
Indicators	Post-program period			Average annual impact	Total impact
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year		
Skills Development (n=1,516)					
Earnings ($)	$2,635***	$4,591***	$5,054***	$4,091***	$12,273***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	1.7**	3.0***	2.6***	2.4***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$477***	-$393***	-$168	-$346***	-$1,038***
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.1***	-1.1**	-0.7	-1.0***	-2.9***
Targeted Wage Subsidies					
Not available due to low sample size.					
Self-Employment					
Not available due to low sample size.					
Job Creation Partnerships					
Not available due to low sample size.					
Employment Assistance Services (EAS) (n=1,635)					
Earnings ($)	$426***	$870	$1,089**	$795**	$2,386**
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	1.7**	2.0**	1.0	1.6**	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$645***	-$330**	-$506	-$494***	-$1,481*
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.8***	-0.6	-1.2***	-1.2***	-3.6***

Significance level *** 1%; ** 5%; * 10%

Table 4

Incremental Impacts for Active Claimants in Nova Scotia

For Active Claimants Who Started an EBSM between 2006 and 2008					
Indicators	Post-program period			Average annual impact	Total impact
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year		
Skills Development (n=4,911)					
Earnings ($)	$3,427***	$5,996***	$7,728***	$5,714***	$17,142***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	6.3***	8.3***	9.7***	8.1***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$1,051***	-$532***	-$440***	-$675***	-$2,024***
EI weeks (weeks)	-3.2***	-1.7***	-1.3***	-2.1***	-6.2***
Targeted Wage Subsidies (n=307)					
Earnings ($)	$3,889***	$2,642**	$3,151**	$3,228**	$9,683**
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	6.2**	6.4**	7.7**	6.8**	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$1,374***	-$834***	-$835**	-$1,015***	-$3,044***
EI weeks (weeks)	-4.3***	-2.3**	-2.5**	-3.0***	-9.1***
Self-Employment (n=846)[1]					
Earnings ($)	-$10,302***	-$8,752***	-$9,691***	-$9,561***	-$28,683***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	-29.5***	-25.4***	-22.4***	-25.8***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$2,506***	-$2,116***	-$1,814***	-$2,145***	-$6,436***
EI weeks (weeks)	-7.3***	-5.7***	-5.0***	-6.0***	-18.0***
Job Creation Partnerships (n=350)					
Earnings ($)	$571	$543	-$923	$64	$191
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	3.9*	-1.1	-1.4	0.5	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$664**	-$426	-$245	-$445*	-$1,335*
EI weeks (weeks)	-2.3**	-1.3	-0.7	-1.4*	-4.3*
Employment Assistance Services (EAS) (n=9,456)					
Earnings ($)	$177	$1,346***	$1,653***	$1,059***	$3,176***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	1.2***	1.9***	1.4***	1.5***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$705***	-$579***	-$414***	-$566***	-$1,698***
EI weeks (weeks)	-2.3***	-1.7***	-1.2***	-1.7***	-5.1***

Significance level *** 1%; ** 5%; * 10%

[1] Earnings results for Self-Employment should be interpreted with caution. They may not fully capture the financial wellbeing of participants. The impacts were examined using individual earnings reported in the T1 and T4 taxation files from CRA, and measured relative to active claimants who did not participate in SE and may have been in any employment/unemployment situation following participation (e.g., unemployed, paid employee or self-employed). According to a study from Statistics Canada, self-employed individuals in Canada have a lower average annual income than paid employees ($46,200 versus $52,400 in 2009), but the average net worth of their households is 2.7 times that of the paid employee households, which indicates that some self-employed individuals may leave funds within their business for reinvestment purposes.[3] Since the incremental impacts of SE were measured relative to a comparison group that also included paid employees and did not take the net worth of participants and comparison cases into account, the results may not be fully reflective of the financial wellbeing of SE participants after their participation. As well, the decreases in EI use may be due to EI eligibility effect as self-employed Canadians cannot qualify for regular EI benefits.

2.5 New Brunswick

Table 5

Incremental Impacts for Active Claimants in New Brunswick

For Active Claimants Who Started an EBSM between 2006 and 2008					
Indicators	Post-program period			Average annual impact	Total impact
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year		
Skills Development (n=4,528)					
Earnings ($)	$1,051	$5,158***	$7,120***	$4,443***	$13,328***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	9.4***	9.9***	11.9***	10.4***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$752***	-$294	$86	-$320*	-$960*
EI weeks (weeks)	-0.8	0.5	0.8	0.2	0.5
Targeted Wage Subsidies (n=388)					
Earnings ($)	$1,998**	$1,276	$1,777**	$1,684**	$5,051*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	7.6***	6.0***	7.7***	7.1***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	$441	$802**	$720**	$655**	$1,964**
EI weeks (weeks)	2.0**	2.9***	2.2**	2.4***	7.2***
Self-Employment (n=628)[1]					
Earnings ($)	-$9,224***	-$8,154***	-$7,771***	-$8,383***	-$25,149***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	-26.7***	-26.1***	-20.2***	-24.3***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$3,297***	-$2,804***	-$2,512***	-$2,871***	-$8,613***
EI weeks (weeks)	-8.6***	-7.0***	-6.1***	-7.2***	-21.7***
Job Creation Partnerships					
JCP was not delivered in New Brunswick during the observed period.					
Employment Assistance Services (EAS) (n=12,841)					
Earnings ($)	$1,636***	$2,528***	$2,668***	$2,277***	$6,832***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	3.1***	3.7***	3.8***	3.5***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$117	$6	$183*	$24	$72
EI weeks (weeks)	0.0	0.5*	1.0***	0.5**	1.5**

Significance level *** 1%; ** 5%; * 10%

[1] Earnings results for Self-Employment should be interpreted with caution. They may not fully capture the financial wellbeing of participants. The impacts were examined using individual earnings reported in the T1 and T4 taxation files from CRA, and measured relative to active claimants who did not participate in SE and may have been in any employment/unemployment situation following participation (e.g., unemployed, paid employee or self-employed). According to a study from Statistics Canada, self-employed individuals in Canada have a lower average annual income than paid employees ($46,200 versus $52,400 in 2009), but the average net worth of their households is 2.7 times that of the paid employee households, which indicates that some self-employed individuals may leave funds within their business for reinvestment purposes.[3] Since the incremental impacts of SE were measured relative to a comparison group that also included paid employees and did not take the net worth of participants and comparison cases into account, the results may not be fully reflective of the financial wellbeing of SE participants after their participation. As well, the decreases in EI use may be due to EI eligibility effect as self-employed Canadians cannot qualify for regular EI benefits.

2.6 Ontario[2]

Table 6

Incremental Impacts for Active Claimants in Ontario

For Active Claimants Who Started an EBSM between 2007 and 2008					
Indicators	Post-program period			Average annual impact	Total impact
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year		
Skills Development (n=17,015)					
Earnings ($)	-$1,959***	$379	$1,607***	N/A	N/A
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	4.2***	5.4***	6.0***	5.2***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$799***	-$233***	-$187***	-$406***	-$1,219***
EI weeks (weeks)	-2.3***	-0.6***	-0.5***	-1.1***	-3.4***
Targeted Wage Subsidies (n=2,530)					
Earnings ($)	$2,176*	$2,439*	$2,650*	$2,479**	$7,437**
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	7.3***	11.3***	8.6***	9.1***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	$442*	$61	-$104	$133	$399
EI weeks (weeks)	1.4*	0.2	0.0	0.6	1.7
Self-Employment (n=3,731)[1]					
Earnings ($)	-$10,930***	-$9,433***	-$8,575***	-$9,646***	-$28,937***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	-23.9***	-18.4***	-14.5***	-18.9***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$1,681***	-$1,099***	-$794***	-$1,191***	-$3,573***
EI weeks (weeks)	-4.7***	-2.9***	-2.0***	-3.2***	-9.6***
Job Creation Partnerships (n=668)					
Earnings ($)	$2,248*	$3,513***	$3,290**	$3,017**	$9,051**
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	7.3***	7.2***	5.8***	6.8***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$518*	-$381	$70	-$276	-$829
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.9***	-1.2*	-0.3	-1.1**	-3.4**
Employment Assistance Services (EAS) (n=35,302)					
Earnings ($)	-$654***	$465***	$895***	$235	$706
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	2.8***	3.1***	3.3***	3.1***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$669***	-$280***	-$162***	-$370***	-$1,111***
EI weeks (weeks)	-2.2***	-0.7***	-0.5***	-1.1***	-3.3***

Significance level *** 1%; ** 5%; * 10%

[1] Earnings results for Self-Employment should be interpreted with caution. They may not fully capture the financial wellbeing of participants. The impacts were examined using individual earnings reported in the T1 and T4 taxation files from CRA, and measured relative to active claimants who did not participate in SE and may have been in any employment/unemployment situation following participation (e.g., unemployed, paid employee or self-employed). According to a study from Statistics Canada, self-employed individuals in Canada have a lower average annual income than paid employees ($46,200 versus $52,400 in 2009), but the average net worth of their households is 2.7 times that of the paid employee households, which indicates that some self-employed individuals may leave funds within their business for reinvestment purposes.[3] Since the incremental impacts of SE were measured relative to a comparison group that also included paid employees and did not take the net worth of participants and comparison cases into account, the results may not be fully reflective of the financial wellbeing of SE participants after their participation. As well, the decreases in EI use may be due to EI eligibility effect as self-employed Canadians cannot qualify for regular EI benefits.

[2] In Ontario, participation in SD is up to three years in length. In the incremental impact analysis, the participation period is defined as two years. As a result, participants may still be in training during the first year of post-program results. Therefore, it is not unexpected to observe incremental decreases in earnings, as participants are not available for full time work in year 1 and will be transitioning into employment in year 2. To interpret trends for Ontario, the third year is the most relevant period to consider for incremental impacts. As a result, the average annual impact and total impact are not applicable for Ontario.

2.7 Manitoba

Table 7

Incremental Impacts for Active Claimants in Manitoba

For Active Claimants Who Started an EBSM between 2006 and 2008					
Indicators	Post-program period			Average annual impact	Total impact
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year		
Skills Development (n=3,750)					
Earnings ($)	$3,387***	$5,971**	$7,032**	$5,461**	$16,384**
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	10.6**	10.1**	11.8**	10.8**	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$546***	-$458***	-$212**	-$405***	-$1,215***
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.8***	-1.3***	-0.6**	-1.2***	-3.7***
Targeted Wage Subsidies (n=339)					
Earnings ($)	-$1,345	-$768	-$86	-$722	-$2,166
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	6.9*	2.6	2.7	4.1	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$407	-$751**	-$251	-$470	-$1,409
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.4	-1.8	-0.5	-1.3	-3.8
Self-Employment (n=517)[1]					
Earnings ($)	-$12,450***	-$9,940***	-$9,231***	-$10,540***	-$31,621***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	-26.6***	-21.3***	-19.1***	-22.3***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$1,364***	-$1,177***	-$999***	-$1,180***	-$3,541***
EI weeks (weeks)	-3.8***	-3.0***	-2.5***	-3.1***	-9.3***
Job Creation Partnerships (n=286)					
Earnings ($)	$4,126***	$4,655***	$5,029***	$4,470***	$13,409***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	8.1***	7.5***	9.9***	8.5***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$549**	-$427	-$130	-$369*	-$1,106*
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.8**	-1.7**	-0.6	-1.4**	-4.1**
Employment Assistance Services (EAS) (n=15,131)					
Earnings ($)	-$320	$266	$407*	$118	$353
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	2.8***	3.5***	1.7***	2.7***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$363***	-$235***	-$253***	-$284***	-$851***
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.4***	-0.8***	-0.8***	-1.0***	-3.0***

Significance level *** 1%; ** 5%; * 10%

[1] Earnings results for Self-Employment should be interpreted with caution. They may not fully capture the financial wellbeing of participants. The impacts were examined using individual earnings reported in the T1 and T4 taxation files from CRA, and measured relative to active claimants who did not participate in SE and may have been in any employment/unemployment situation following participation (e.g., unemployed, paid employee or self-employed). According to a study from Statistics Canada, self-employed individuals in Canada have a lower average annual income than paid employees ($46,200 versus $52,400 in 2009), but the average net worth of their households is 2.7 times that of the paid employee households, which indicates that some self-employed individuals may leave funds within their business for reinvestment purposes.[3] Since the incremental impacts of SE were measured relative to a comparison group that also included paid employees and did not take the net worth of participants and comparison cases into account, the results may not be fully reflective of the financial wellbeing of SE participants after their participation. As well, the decreases in EI use may be due to EI eligibility effect as self-employed Canadians cannot qualify for regular EI benefits.

Table 8

Incremental Impacts for Active Claimants in Saskatchewan

For Active Claimants Who Started an EBSM between 2006 and 2008					
Indicators	Post-program period			Average annual impact	Total impact
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year		
Skills Development (n=1,375)					
Earnings ($)	$2,299***	$5,189***	$6,961***	$4,839***	$14,517***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	5.8***	6.4***	6.5***	6.2***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$401***	-$223**	$83	-$180**	-$541**
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.0***	-0.7***	0.1	-0.5**	-1.6**
Targeted Wage Subsidies					
Not available due to low sample size.					
Self-Employment					
Not available due to low sample size.					
Job Creation Partnerships					
JCP was not delivered by Saskatchewan during the observed period.					
Employment Assistance Services (EAS) (n=5,269)					
Earnings ($)	-$371	$731**	$1,381***	$580**	$1,741**
Incidence of employment(percentage points)	1.9***	2.1***	0.9	1.6***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$442***	-$332***	-$278***	-$351***	-$1,052***
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.3***	-1.0***	-0.8***	-1.0***	-3.1***

Significance level *** 1%; ** 5%; * 10%

2.9 Alberta

Table 9

Incremental Impacts for Active Claimants in Alberta

For Active Claimants Who Started an EBSM between 2006 and 2008					
Indicators	Post-program period			Average annual impact	Total impact
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year		
Skills Development (n=2,356)					
Earnings ($)	-$121	$1,044	$2,359**	$1,108	$3,324
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	9.3***	10.0***	10.6***	10.0***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$277*	$137	$42	-$33	-$98
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.0**	0.2	0.0	-0.3	-0.7
Targeted Wage Subsidies					
Not available due to low sample size.					
Self-Employment (n=658)[1]					
Earnings ($)	-$13,493***	-$12,430***	-$13,046***	-$12,990***	-$38,970***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	-14.7***	-14.4***	-13.9***	-14.3***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$971***	-$658***	-$308*	-$646***	-$1,938***
EI weeks (weeks)	-2.4***	-1.6***	-0.8*	-1.6***	-4.9***
Job Creation Partnerships (n=521)					
Earnings ($)	$144	-$950	-$1,144	-$650	-$1,950
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	7.0***	9.8***	3.7	6.8***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	$314	$616***	$503**	$478***	$1,433***
EI weeks (weeks)	0.9	1.6***	1.4**	1.3***	4.0***
Employment Assistance Services (EAS) (n=20,997)					
Earnings ($)	-$969***	-$627**	-$602**	-$733***	-$2,198***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	1.7***	1.6***	0.8*	1.4***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$530***	-$253***	-$164***	-$315***	-$946***
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.5***	-0.6***	-0.4***	-0.8***	-2.5***

Significance level *** 1%; ** 5%; * 10%

[1] Earnings results for Self-Employment should be interpreted with caution. They may not fully capture the financial wellbeing of participants. The impacts were examined using individual earnings reported in the T1 and T4 taxation files from CRA, and measured relative to active claimants who did not participate in SE and may have been in any employment/unemployment situation following participation (e.g., unemployed, paid employee or self-employed). According to a study from Statistics Canada, self-employed individuals in Canada have a lower average annual income than paid employees ($46,200 versus $52,400 in 2009), but the average net worth of their households is 2.7 times that of the paid employee households, which indicates that some self-employed individuals may leave funds within their business for reinvestment purposes.[3] Since the incremental impacts of SE were measured relative to a comparison group that also included paid employees and did not take the net worth of participants and comparison cases into account, the results may not be fully reflective of the financial wellbeing of SE participants after their participation. As well, the decreases in EI use may be due to EI eligibility effect as self-employed Canadians cannot qualify for regular EI benefits.

Table 10

Incremental Impacts for Active Claimants in British Columbia

For Active Claimants Who Started an EBSM between 2007 and 2008					
Indicators	Post-program period			Average annual impact	Total impact
	1st year	2nd year	3rd year		
Skills Development (n=4,090)					
Earnings ($)	$2,560***	$5,559***	$6,395***	$4,824***	$14,471***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	5.8***	7.2***	6.9***	6.6***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$768***	-$448***	-$173**	-$463***	-$1,389***
EI weeks (weeks)	-2.3***	-1.3***	-0.5***	-1.4***	-4.1***
Targeted Wage Subsidies (n=1,491)					
Earnings ($)	$3,121***	$3,141***	$3,756***	$3,319***	$9,957***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	7.1***	5.9***	6.5***	6.5***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	$113	-$161	-$111	-$53	-$158
EI weeks (weeks)	0.5	-0.3	-0.4	-0.1	-0.2
Self-Employment (n=1,764)[1]					
Earnings ($)	-$10,521***	-$8,450***	-$7,806***	-$8,915***	-$26,746***
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	-17.7***	-13.8***	-13.1***	-14.8***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$1,723***	-$1,155***	-$735***	-$1,204***	-$3,613***
EI weeks (weeks)	-4.7***	-3.1***	-1.8***	-3.2***	-9.5***
Job Creation Partnerships					
Not available due to low sample size.					
Employment Assistance Services (EAS) (n=28,985)					
Earnings ($)	-$511***	$299***	$801***	$196	$589
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	3.6***	2.6***	3.0***	3.0***	N/A
EI benefits ($)	-$507***	-$337***	-$298***	-$381***	-$1,142***
EI weeks (weeks)	-1.7***	-0.9***	-0.8***	-1.1***	-3.4***

Significance level *** 1%; ** 5%; * 10%

[1] Earnings results for Self-Employment should be interpreted with caution. They may not fully capture the financial wellbeing of participants. The impacts were examined using individual earnings reported in the T1 and T4 taxation files from CRA, and measured relative to active claimants who did not participate in SE and may have been in any employment/unemployment situation following participation (e.g., unemployed, paid employee or self-employed). According to a study from Statistics Canada, self-employed individuals in Canada have a lower average annual income than paid employees ($46,200 versus $52,400 in 2009), but the average net worth of their households is 2.7 times that of the paid employee households, which indicates that some self-employed individuals may leave funds within their business for reinvestment purposes.[3] Since the incremental impacts of SE were measured relative to a comparison group that also included paid employees and did not take the net worth of participants and comparison cases into account, the results may not be fully reflective of the financial wellbeing of SE participants after their participation. As well, the decreases in EI use may be due to EI eligibility effect as self-employed Canadians cannot qualify for regular EI benefits.

Annex 4

Key Program Administration Data and Results

Annex 4.1 Service Delivery 380
Annex 4.2 Call Centres 381
Annex 4.3 Mobile Outreach Services 382
Annex 4.4 Electronic Records of Employment (eROEs) 383
Annex 4.5 EI Claims Processing 384
Annex 4.6 Electronic Services 385
Annex 4.7 Integrity Operations 386

Annex 4.1 Service Delivery[1]

	In-person EI Requests[2]						Service Canada Web Site Visits[3]						Web Site Visits that Included the EI Index Page[4]						My Service Canada Account Logins[5]						Points of Service for EI Program Delivery[6]					
	Change (%)	(In millions)					Change (%)	(In millions)					Change (%)	(In millions)					Change (%)	(In millions)					Change (%)	(Number)				
		2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11		2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12[7]	2010/11		2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11		2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11		2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11
Region																														
Atlantic	-25.0	0.6	0.8	0.8	1.0	0.9	-2.5	7.7	7.9	8.0	8.6	N/A	-21.4	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-2.3	84	86	88	88	91
Quebec	-11.7	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.6	1.4	3.6	20.4	19.7	19.4	18.9	N/A	7.6	0.9	0.8	2.3	2.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-2.1	95	97	107	117	115
Ontario	-11.5	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.7	-1.7	28.2	28.7	29.0	28.7	N/A	-16.1	1.8	2.1	3.0	2.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-7.0	172	185	197	198	202
Western	-1.7	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.5	1.6	3.7	22.6	21.8	20.7	20.9	N/A	-9.5	1.4	1.5	2.1	2.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-3.8	205	213	216	222	225
NATIONAL	**-12.6**	**4.0**	**4.6**	**4.9**	**5.7**	**5.7**	**1.0**	**78.9**	**78.1**	**77.1**	**77.2**	**67.0**	**-10.9**	**4.6**	**5.2**	**8.2**	**8.3**	**N/A**	**7.5**	**22.8**	**21.2**	**18.9**	**23.4**	**15.9**	**-4.3**	**556**	**581**	**608**	**625**	**633**

Source: EI administrative data.

1 Discrepancies between totals and the sum of regional values may be due to rounding.

2 These values could reflect multiple requests by the same client. Statistics include clients assisted face to face and those serving themselves at a Client Access Work Station (CAWS) computer.

3 Regional breakdowns for Service Canada web site visits were not available prior to 2011-2012, as the data capturing tool in previous years was not able to track visits at the regional level. In 2011, Service Canada replaced the old data capturing tool.

4 Represents the number of websites visits for general EI information. The total value assumes no cross-over between English and French pages. Regional breakdowns are estimates based on samples of approximately 500,000 page requests per month. These statistics were not available prior to 2011/12.

5 Regional breakdowns for MSCA logins are not available. The data tracking system used for MSCA is a secure information portal; hence, Service Canada does not track personal identifying client information through this portal. Personal identifying client information would be needed in order to capture regional data.

6 The values represent existing points of service as of March 31st for each fiscal year.

7 The national total for 2011/12 Service Canada Web Site Visits was revised since the release of the 2012/13 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment report.

Annex 4.2 Call Centres

	Enquiries Resolved via EI Interactive Voice Response System[1]						Calls Answered (EI Specialized Call Centres)[1]						First Contact Resolution - EI Specialized Call Centres[1,2]						1 800 O-Canada EI-Related Calls[3]						First Call Resolution[4] - 1 800 O-Canada EI-Related Calls					
	Change (%)	(In millions)					Change (%)	(In thousands)					Change (%)	(%)					Change (%)	(In thousands)					Change (%)	(%)				
		2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11		2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11		2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11		2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11		2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11
Region																														
Atlantic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-12.1	53	60	57	57	29	-18.5	8.8	10.8	13.6	9.9	12.1
Quebec	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-4.1	134	140	152	183	105	-21.7	9.0	11.5	13.7	8.9	13.6
Ontario	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-4.8	185	195	176	171	130	-24.6	9.2	12.2	13.9	11.3	10.3
Western	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-3.2	179	185	163	165	103	-21.3	9.6	12.2	14.0	10.6	12.6
NATIONAL	**-9.1**	**20.0**	**22.0**	**22.6**	**29.0**	**28.7**	**-9.0**	**3,789**	**4,166**	**4,364**	**5,290**	**6,803**	**1.9**	**82.6**	**80.7**	**84.4**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**-4.9**	**552**	**580**	**548**	**576**	**366**	**-22.7**	**9.2**	**11.9**	**19.4**	**10.2**	**12.0**

Source: EI administrative data.

1 Regional breakdowns for Enquiries Resolved via the EI Interactive Voice Response Systems and Calls Answered in the EI Specialized Call Centres are not available as calls are distributed across the call centre network based on availability of resources in individual sites and not where the call originates from.

2 The first contact resolution metric was not fully implemented until 2012/13. It was introduced partway through 2011/12. As a result, the metric for that year is not fully comparable to those for subsequent years.

3 Data includes calls from within Canada only.

4 EI Related Calls received on 1 800 O-Canada are based on program activities (enquiries) and more than one program activity may apply to a call. First Call Resolution was derived from program activity statistics that indicated only program information was provided

Annex 4.3 Mobile Outreach Services

	All EI Information Sessions - Citizens						Workers Facing Mass Layoffs Reached						Employers Reached						Work Sharing Sessions					
	Change (%)	(Number)					Change (%)	(Number)					Change (%)	(Number)					Change (%)	(Number)				
	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11
Region																								
Atlantic	4.4	119	114	209	219	254	9.7	1,095	998	1,382	689	1,054	-64.9	47	134	154	298	351	-4.3	22	23	20	15	10
Quebec	37.9	586	425	461	582	849	23.0	6,972	5,668	6,331	7,509	11,710	-42.1	272	470	771	1,822	35,158	37.8	299	217	192	226	270
Ontario	-38.6	632	1,029	1,003	1,021	963	5.7	6,637	6,277	6,621	5,267	3,773	-30.9	496	718	962	2,144	4,291	61.1	145	90	82	129	96
Western	39.6	282	202	318	306	413	45.1	3,202	2,207	2,598	2,160	2,309	-43.6	136	241	594	421	595	-37.5	15	24	17	35	47
NATIONAL	**-8.5**	**1,619**	**1,770**	**1,991**	**2,128**	**2,479**	**18.2**	**17,906**	**15,150**	**16,932**	**15,625**	**18,846**	**-39.2**	**951**	**1,563**	**2,481**	**4,685**	**40,395**	**35.9**	**481**	**354**	**311**	**405**	**423**

Source: EI administrative data.

Annex 4.4 Electronic Records of Employment (eROEs)

	New ROE Web Registrations						ROEs Submitted Electronically by Employers[1]						% Distribution of Paper ROEs vs. Electronic ROEs by Region[2]											
	Change (%)[3]	(Number)					Change (%)[4]	(Number)					Year Over Year Comparison[5]	(%)										
	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015		2013/2014		2012/13		2011/12		2010/11	
														eROEs	Paper	eROEs	Paper	eROEs	Paper	eROEs	Paper	eROEs	Paper
Region																								
Atlantic	-32.7	3,023	4,492	2,924	3,095	3,121	14.2	469,708	411,159	378,528	359,101	321,480	7.3	71.9	28.1	64.6	35.4	59.1	40.9	55.5	44.5	50.0	50.0
Quebec	-42.9	7,928	13,883	10,404	9,727	10,990	8.6	1,860,226	1,712,712	1,532,848	1,427,301	1,252,792	7.7	78.5	21.5	70.8	29.2	64.8	35.2	61.2	38.8	55.6	44.4
Ontario	-31.4	11,924	17,371	11,749	18,918	19,082	8.7	2,570,846	2,365,836	2,232,140	2,161,339	1,860,450	4.8	80.6	19.4	75.8	24.2	70.5	29.5	66.4	33.6	60.6	39.4
Western	-26.9	14,304	19,575	13,853	13,278	8,563	8.1	2,278,175	2,107,413	1,973,827	1,812,232	1,575,802	5.5	84.2	15.8	78.7	21.3	75.3	24.7	71.3	28.7	65.2	34.8
Total[6]	**-33.0**	**37,224**	**55,521**	**39,000**	**45,097**	**41,809**	**9.1**	**7,490,971**	**6,868,995**	**6,247,235**	**5,904,097**	**5,150,249**	**5.2**	**80.2**	**19.8**	**75.0**	**25.0**	**69.7**	**30.3**	**65.8**	**34.2**	**60.0**	**40.0**

Source: ROE Single Database, Corporate Client Information Service (CCIS or Easy Access) - Employer Summary Table (Note: 2nd copy paper ROEs loaded in CCIS)

1 Electronic Record of Employment (eROEs) consist of Web eROEs and Secure Automated Transfer (SAT) eROEs.

2 eROE and paper distribution by region based on postal code and on telephone area code.

3 Significant % change in the number of new ROE web registrations due to a change in methodology. In 2013/2014 new web registrations were counted using the business number whereas in 2014/2015 the organization ID was used.

4 Significant % change in volumes of eROEs issued in each region are due to the manner in which eROEs' regions are established beginning in November 2013. Prior to the launch of My Service Canada Business Account (MSCBA)-ROE Web Online Registration in November 2013, eROE distribution by region was based on postal code/area code of the Parent Business Numbers. With the implementation of MSCBA, business number locations are established based on CRA's PAYDAC data.

5 This figure represents the percentage point increase over the percentage of ROEs submitted electronically the previous fiscal year.

6 Some employers are located in the United States but have employees in Canada. This leads to small variances in the totals, as their data are not captured in the regional breakdowns.

Annex 4.5[1] EI Claims Processing

	EI Claims Processed						Payment Accuracy Rates[2, 3]						Processing Accuracy Rates[4]						Speed of Payment					
	Change (%)	(Number)					Change (%)	(%)					Change (%)	(%)					Change (% pts)	(%)				
	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11
Region																								
Atlantic	1.2	367,670	363,173	367,938	385,658	385,114	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-2.4	94.7	97.0	94.7	90.8	94.9	2.9	75.9	73.0	77.5	73.7	85.2
Quebec	0.5	816,579	812,714	829,635	839,999	847,166	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.9	94.4	92.6	91.5	90.5	93.2	0.8	79.0	78.2	82.4	71.3	84.1
Ontario	1.4	903,317	891,160	876,935	914,101	911,555	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.0	82.6	81.8	80.5	80.6	84.4	2.1	69.9	67.8	70.6	71.1	83.9
Western	7.4	751,325	699,424	694,316	717,352	758,560	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.4	85.3	84.1	84.3	84.9	86.3	7.0	65.9	58.9	68.4	69.5	83.1
NATIONAL	**2.6**	**2,838,891**	**2,766,471**	**2,768,824**	**2,857,110**	**2,902,395**	**0.1**	**95.5**	**95.4**	**94.1**	**95.2**	**94.0**	**0.7**	**88.5**	**87.9**	**86.9**	**85.9**	**88.8**	**3.0**	**72.3**	**69.3**	**74.5**	**71.1**	**83.9**

Source: EI administrative data.

1 Annex 4.5 previously reported on *Claimants Receiving Benefits through Direct Deposit*. This section is now included in Annex 4.6.

2 The EI Payment Accuracy Review (EI PAAR) program cannot provide results at a regional level as the sample size (a random sample of 500 EI claims per year) is insufficient to provide statistically valid results. Results are only available at a national level with a level of confidence of 95% and a margin of error of ±5%. Source: ESDC

3 For analysis of the Payment Accuracy Rate by source, please refer to section 4. Quality: 4.1.1 EI Payment Accuracy Review of Chapter 4, Program Administration for more info.

4 Prior to fiscal year 2010/11, results were presented by province, not by region.

Annex 4.6 Electronic Services

	Applications Submitted Online						Partially or Fully Automated Claims						Claimants Receiving Benefits through Direct Deposit[1]					
	Change (% pts)	(%)					Change (% pts)	(%)					Change (% pts)	(%)				
	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2013/2014–2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11
Region																		
Atlantic	-0.1	98.7	98.8	98.8	98.5	98.3	0.0	73.6	73.6	74.1	66.8	65.8	1.7	93.8	92.1	90.3	88.0	81.8
Quebec	0.1	98.0	97.9	97.9	97.7	97.2	0.2	68.4	68.2	65.6	60.5	59.1	1.0	94.6	93.6	92.7	91.2	86.5
Ontario	0.0	98.5	98.5	98.4	97.9	96.2	1.2	67.5	66.3	65.5	59.0	56.7	1.4	93.3	91.9	90.8	88.5	82.6
Western	0.1	98.6	98.5	98.6	98.1	97.7	2.3	62.4	60.1	61.6	55.8	53.9	1.1	92.1	91.0	89.6	88.0	82.1
NATIONAL	**0.0**	**98.4**	**98.4**	**98.4**	**98.0**	**97.2**	**1.0**	**67.2**	**66.2**	**65.7**	**59.7**	**57.9**	**1.3**	**93.4**	**92.1**	**90.9**	**88.9**	**83.2**

Source: EI administrative data.

[1] Prior to the 2013/2014 Monitoring and Assessment Report, this information was reported under Annex 4.5.

Annex 4.7 Integrity Operations

	Investigations Completed							Value of Overpayments Imposed							Value of Penalties Imposed							Total Savings						
	Change (%)	(Number)						Change (%)	($ Millions)						Change (%)	($ Millions)						Change (%)	($ Millions)					
	2013/2014-2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13[2]	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2013/2014-2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13[3]	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2013/2014-2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13[4]	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2013/2014-2014/2015	2014/2015	2013/2014	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10
Region																												
NIS[1]	9.6	32,289	29,464	32,510	38,584	36,200	36,325	77.4	15.9	9.0	11.2	13.3	11.4	11.5	110.0	4.9	2.3	3.7	4.1	2.7	2.8	56.6	35.4	22.6	28.6	30.9	24.4	24.9
Atlantic	-7.2	27,342	29,452	44,569	49,162	79,732	87,312	-30.7	13.9	20.0	23.6	20.4	22.2	18.4	0.0	5.3	5.3	7.8	6.6	6.4	5.1	-10.0	39.5	43.9	52.9	49.5	58.6	64.4
Quebec	-4.1	62,503	65,148	80,868	90,988	142,698	174,213	-7.8	39.9	43.2	54.7	38.8	41.8	46.6	-6.6	11.1	11.9	14.4	12.2	11.5	12.5	-4.6	100.2	105.0	121.6	98.3	114.6	124.4
Ontario	2.3	66,643	65,152	95,657	103,658	143,293	150,205	-33.0	30.1	44.9	59.0	45.7	53.7	42.7	-38.5	6.9	11.2	13.9	12.6	13.3	9.4	-11.1	87.0	97.9	120.4	107.8	125.7	113.0
Western	-22.9	77,466	100,471	83,932	84,661	103,700	104,619	-29.2	28.7	40.6	39.8	31.7	43.3	38.6	-13.1	8.3	9.5	10.5	8.3	10.3	7.5	-21.9	88.7	113.6	115.0	99.1	130.2	112.5
NATIONAL	**-8.1**	**266,243**	**289,687**	**337,536**	**367,053**	**505,623**	**552,674**	**-18.5**	**128.5**	**157.7**	**188.3**	**150.0**	**172.4**	**157.7**	**-9.1**	**36.4**	**40.1**	**50.3**	**43.8**	**44.1**	**37.3**	**-8.4**	**350.8**	**383.0**	**438.5**	**385.6**	**453.5**	**439.2**

Source: EI administrative data.

[1] National Investigative Services (NIS)

[2, 3, 4] Figures reported for 2012/13 were incorrect, the table reflects the revised figures for 2012/13.

Annex 5

Employment Insurance Financial Information

Annex 5.1 Employment Insurance Operating Account – Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus (Deficit) for the Year Ended March 31 388

Annex 5.1
Employment Insurance Operating Account – Statement of Operations and Accumulated Surplus (Deficit) for the Year Ended March 31[1]

	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
	($ Million)		
Revenues and Funding			
Premiums	**20,795.7**	**22,160.2**	**22,962.3**
Interest[2]	**27.6**	**25.7**	**12.8**
Penalties	**59.1**	**41.0**	**39.7**
Economic Action Plan Measures Funding (Budget 2009)[3]	**(10.6)**	**0.0**	**0.0**
Total Revenues and Funding	**20,871.9**	**22,226.9**	**23,014.7**
Expenditures[4]			
Part I: Employment Insurance Benefits	**15,240.9**	**15,520.2**	**16,235.8**
Regular Benefits	10,503.6	10,497.8	10,885.7
Fishing Benefits	262.9	259.1	276.2
Work-sharing Benefits	25.6	21.1	18.1
Special Benefits for Insured Employees	4,441.1	4,733.9	5,046.8
Parental Benefits[5]	*2,290.0*	*2,412.0*	*2,570.8*
Sickness Benefits	*1,165.3*	*1,271.6*	*1,357.4*
Maternity Benefits	*974.5*	*1,031.1*	*1,090.6*
Other Special Benefits[6]	*11.3*	*19.3*	*28.0*
Special Benefits for Self-Employed	7.8	8.3	9.1
Part II: Employment Benefits and Support Measures	**2,075.8**	**1,987.3**	**2,046.8**
Employment Benefits[7]	1,925.4	1,872.0	1,930.7
Support Measures	150.4	115.3	116.1
Labour Market Partnerships	*138.9*	*113.3*	*112.7*
Research and Innovation	*11.5*	*2.0*	*3.4*
Benefit Repayments[8]	**(217.7)**	**(206.9)**	**(230.4)**
Administration Costs	**1,791.1**	**1,680.2**	**1,657.1**
Bad Debts	**(3.0)**	**16.4**	**50.1**
Total Expenditures	**18,887.2**	**18,997.2**	**19,759.3**
Net Surplus for the Year	**1,984.7**	**3,229.7**	**3,255.4**
Accumulated Deficit at Beginning of Year	**(7,948.2)**	**(5,963.5)**	**(2,733.7)**
Accumulated Surplus (Deficit) at Beginning of Year	**(5,963.5)**	**(2,733.7)**	**521.7**

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

1 The terms used for accounting items referred to in this annex have been harmonized with the terminology used elsewhere in this report and may therefore differ from those appearing in the *Public Accounts of Canada.*

2 This interest includes interest accrued on overdue accounts receivable.

3 Budget 2009 included various temporary measures to support workers affected by the economic downturn. The cost of these measures was funded by the Consolidated Revenue Fund and was credited to the Employment Insurance Operating Account in addition to the other revenues. The negative amount in 2012/2013 corresponds to an amount that was recovered from a credit overreported in prior years, which was based on actual final cost of these measures.

4 Expenditures reported in Chapter II of this report are based on administrative data and may differ from the ones reported in the financial statements of the Employment Insurance Operating Account that are included in the *Public Accounts of Canada,* due to methodological differences.

5 Includes parental benefits paid to biological parents and adoptive parents.

6 Includes compassionate care benefits and benefits for parents of critically ill children.

7 These benefits correspond to transfer payments to provinces and territories related to labour market development agreements, net of previous fiscal years' overcontribution.

8 These repayments correspond to benefit repayments from higher income claimants.

Source: Government of Canada, *Public Accounts of Canada 2015*, Volume I: Summary Report and Consolidated Financial Statements (Ottawa: Receiver General for Canada, December 2015); and Government of Canada, *Public Accounts of Canada 2014*, Volume I: Summary Report and Consolidated Financial Statements (Ottawa: Receiver General for Canada, October 2014).

Annex 6

Key Studies Referenced in Chapters 2 and 4

1. Use of EI Regular and Special Benefits by Maternity and Parental Claimants 390
2. Compassionate Care Benefits: Update 391
3. Training through the Ages 391
4. Job-related Training of Older Workers 392
5. The Redistributional Impact of Employment Insurance 2007– 2009 392
6. Financial Impacts of Receiving Employment Insurance.....393
7. Employment Insurance (EI) and Non-Standard Workers: Part- Time, Short-Term and Seasonal Workers 393
8. Changing Working Time and Employment Insurance 394
9. ROE-based Measures of EI Eligibility: Update 2001-2014 394
10. Potential EI Eligibility of Canadian Paid Workers Using the Labour Force Survey 395
11. Focus Groups for the Evaluation of Working While on Claim (WWC): Synthesis Report.....395
12. Who are Workers Working for When Working While on Claim? 396
13. Extended Duration of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits: Second Evaluation Study Update 396
14. Geography-based Analysis of the Impact of EI Measures 397
15. Training and the Duration of Employment Insurance Benefits 397
16. An Evaluation Overview of Seasonal Employment: Update 398
17. Interprovincial Mobility and Earnings 398
18. Explaining Canada's Regional Migration Patterns 399
19. Interprovincial Employment in Canada, 2002 to 2011 399
20. The Impact of Employment Insurance (EI) Regional Boundary Revisions on Mobility in New Brunswick: Evidence from the Longitudinal Administrative Databank 399
21. Regional Out-Migration and Commuting Patterns of Employment Insurance (EI) Claimants.....400
22. Commuting and Mobility Patterns of Employment Insurance (EI) Recipients and Non-Recipients 400
23. EI Payments and the GIS System.....401
24. 2016 Actuarial Report on the Employment Insurance Premium Rate 401
25. EI Payroll Tax Refunds: The Characteristics of Firms Benefitting from the EI Premium Reduction Program 2000-2013.....402
26. Evaluation of the Work-Sharing Program 402
27. Usage of the Work-Sharing Program: 2000/01 to 2014/2015.....403
28. Record of Employment and Accuracy of Reported Earnings: Firms 2005-2012 403

1. Use of EI Regular and Special Benefits by Maternity and Parental Claimants

Author(s), Year

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2013

Objective(s)

This study examines the use of EI special and regular benefits by maternity and parental claimants. The objective is to determine the extent to which these claimants combine benefits and how. Given that Quebec introduced the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan in 2006, the focus of the report is on claims from Canada outside of Quebec.

Key finding(s)

- The number of maternity/parental claims rose by 17.5% from 2002/2003 to 2010/2011. Most noticeable is the increase in parental claims for males, which rose by 43.1% from 18,830 to 26,950 over the same period.
- Most claimants did not combine benefits. For males, 84.5% of the parental claims were not combined with any other type of claims. When benefits were combined, males most often combined parental benefits with regular benefits (11.2%). When males combined parental benefits with sickness or regular benefits, the parental benefits were paid first in about half of the claims. The overall duration of claims averaged 20 weeks and duration was longer when the parental benefits were not paid first.
- For females, the proportion of claims representing maternity/parental benefits only was 82.7%. When benefits were combined, females most often combined maternity/parental benefits with sickness benefits (11.9%). When sickness benefits were combined with maternity/parental benefits, almost all claims paid sickness benefits first (98.3%). The overall duration of claims averaged 47.6 weeks.
- Working in occupations requiring university education or a high level of skill for management positions decreased the likelihood of combining benefits. As insured earnings and insured hours increased there was a decrease in the likelihood that claimants would combine benefits.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

2. Compassionate Care Benefits: Update

Author(s), Year

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2015

Objective(s)

The report presents an overview of compassionate care benefits (CCB) and provides a socio-economic profile of CCB applicants and claimants. It also examines benefit usage. Data are updated from previous reports. Due to the small number of claims established by self-employed applicants in 2012/2013, the report does not cover the use of compassionate care benefits by self-employed individuals.

Key finding(s)

- The acceptance rate averaged 63.8% since the extension of family definition in 2006.
- The main reasons for applicants not qualifying for CC benefits remain unchanged: the family member is not at significant risk of death, the patient dies before the benefit is paid or the claimant does not provide an acceptable medical certificate.
- The study also found that in 2012/2013, CCB applicants caring for a spouse or partner were more likely to have their claims approved than those caring for a parent, sibling, child or other type of family relation.
- The mortality rate of care recipients remains the main factor affecting how much of the six-week CCB period claimants use. If the care recipient passes away while the claimant is receiving CCB, the claimant does not receive the full six weeks.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

3. Training through the Ages

Author(s), Year

Cathy Underhill, 2006

Objective(s)

This study investigated the effects of socio-demographic characteristics on the incidence of training. Specifically, the effects these characteristics have on training for different age groups (youth, core-aged workers and older workers).

Key finding(s)

- There are differences in the significance of certain socio-demographic characteristics within different age groups. However, overall older workers (aged 55 to 64) were significantly less involved in job-related training than younger workers.
- Women aged 55 to 64 (older workers) are 1.4 times more likely to take job-related training than men in the same age group. Conversely, women and men in the 25 to 34 age group were equally likely to participate.
- Overall, higher educational attainment are associated with higher rates of training. Specifically, holding constant other characteristics, those aged 25 to 34 with a university degree were significantly more likely to participate in job-related training, however there was not such a significant difference in older workers.

Availability

This report is available on Statistics Canada's web site at:
http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-001-x/11006/9502-eng.pdf

4. Job-related Training of Older Workers

Author(s), Year

Jungwee Park, 2012

Objective(s)

This study focused on three areas: if there is differences in the participation rate in job-related training between those aged 55 to 64 (older workers) and core aged employees (25 to 54); the characteristics of older workers that are associated with an increased participation in job training; and finally how the participation of older workers in employer-supported training has changed over time.

Key finding(s)

- Older-workers (55 to 64) have a much lower probability of taking job-related training than core-aged individuals. Specifically, 32% of older workers took training compared to 45% of core-aged workers.
- Among older workers, the characteristics associated with lower training rates were education less than postsecondary, temporary employment, and sales and service jobs.
- The training gap between older and younger workers has been closing, primarily attributable to increases in educational attainment and changes in types of jobs.

Availability

This report is available on Statistics Canada's web site at:
http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-001-x/2012002/article/11652-eng.pdf

5. The Redistributional Impact of Employment Insurance 2007– 2009

Author(s), Year

Ross Finnie, Queen's University School of Policy Studies; and Ian Irvine, Concordia University for HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2013

Objective(s)

The objective of this study is to investigate the degree to which Canada's Employment Insurance (EI) program has redistributed purchasing power during the recent economic recession. Precisely, this period of investigation runs from 2007 to 2009, although results from the 2002 to 2006 period are also presented in order to place the recession period in a longer–term context.

Key finding(s)

- EI redistributes income substantially when the unit of analysis is individual earnings. The lower deciles of the distribution benefit both on the contributions and benefits sides.
- The quantitative redistributional impact of EI in 2009 appears to be approximately twice the impact of 2007.
- In 2007 and 2008, Quebec was the largest recipient of benefits (even without accounting for family benefits. However, 2009 saw a reversal of this pattern: Quebec's benefits increased by 20%, whereas Ontario's benefits increased by almost 50%, a reflection of how much harder the recession hit the employment sector in Ontario than in Quebec.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

6. Financial Impacts of Receiving Employment Insurance

Author(s), Year

Constantine Kapsalis, Data Probe Economic Consulting Inc., 2010

Objective(s)

This study explores the financial impact of receiving EI benefits. The study probes the evolution of individual incomes before, during and after the receipt of EI benefits, as well as the influence of receiving EI on household consumption.

Key finding(s)

- The average EI beneficiary experienced a 38% drop in wages during a year with EI. The most important offsetting factor was EI; it replaced about 38% of lost wages. The second most important factor was investment income; it replaced about 9% of lost wages. Other income sources played a lesser role.
- Lower income families received a higher return of their contributions than did higher income families. In fact, families with after-tax income below the median received 34% of total benefits and paid 18% of all premiums in 2007. The study also found that EI halved the incidence of low income among beneficiaries (from 14% to 7%) during that period.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

7. Employment Insurance (EI) and Non-Standard Workers: Part- Time, Short-Term and Seasonal Workers

Author(s), Year

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2013

Objective(s)

This study examines the EI eligibility rate at the time of a job separation and regular benefits use by employment type for individuals unemployed due to a work shortage. It contrasts EI characteristics for full-time permanent job separators to separators who were full-time non–permanent, part-time permanent, part-time non-permanent, or seasonal for the years 2005 to 2010.

Key Finding(s)

- Full-time permanent job separators have an 85.7% eligibility rate while eligibility rates for job separators from other employment types varied between 64% and 76%.
- EI eligibility patterns by employment type were very similar to those for insured hours of work.
- Among separators eligible for EI, 61% used regular EI benefits overall. Full-time permanent job separators had a 68% use rate. Eligible separators from other employment times had use rates lower than 60%.
- Holding other factors constant, the likelihoods of benefit use by eligible separators were similar for separators from permanent and seasonal jobs. Compared to eligible full-time permanent job separators, eligible non-permanent separators had an 8 to 11 percentage point lower benefit use rate.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

8. Changing Working Time and Employment Insurance

Author(s), Year

ESDC, Policy Research Directorate, 2015

Objective(s)

This study documents on changes in working hours per week, EI eligibility rate (using the 35 hours grid) and weeks of entitled EI benefits at the aggregate level and by sub-groups since 1996. It also examines to what extent a potential adjustment to a grid based on a 30 hour work week would affect EI eligibility rates and the maximum weeks of benefits.

Key Finding(s)

- Average weekly hours did not change much since 1996, decreasing slightly for men and rising somewhat for women.
- Overall, the EI eligibility rate was relatively stable over the past two decades, suggesting that changes in the EI system did not have a significant impact on EI eligibility. Notably, the EI eligibility rate fell sharply among youths and most of this decline occurred before the last recession.
- Weeks of entitled EI benefits fell significantly after 1996, particularly among men, but this is largely explained by the declining trend in unemployment.
- A 30 hour grid to determine EI eligibility would have a relatively small overall impact, and mainly benefit part-time workers, youth, less educated workers and recent immigrants.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

9. ROE-based Measures of EI Eligibility: Update 2001-2014

Author(s), Year

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2016

Objective(s)

Using administrative data this study examined the percentage of job separators with enough hours to meet the variable entrance requirement (VER) and also the percentage of job separators with an EI claim. It looked at the eligibility and the claim rates across unemployment rates, provinces, industries, regions and selected cities.

Key Finding(s)

- From 2001 to 2014, the percentage of individual ROEs that met the VER varied around 46% with the lowest percentage observed in 2007 (43.2%) and the highest in 2009 (49.1%).
- In general, there is a decreasing trend in the percentage of individuals who were laid-off and able to meet the VER with combined hours from the previous 52 weeks. Overall, the percentage is around 70%, with the lowest and highest levels observed respectively in 2013 (67.7%) and in 2002 (71.8%).
- Across unemployment rates, the general trend was such that the percentage of eligible laid-off job separators increased as the unemployment rate increased, with fall-backs at different unemployment rates varying across years.
- From 2001 to 2014, the percentage is highest where the unemployment rate is 13.1% and up, and lowest for unemployment rates at or below 6%.
- With respect to provinces, from 2001 to 2014, the Atlantic provinces had a higher proportion of eligible laid-off job separators than the western and central provinces. Overtime, the percentage meeting the VER was slightly decreasing, especially for Manitoba.
- Between 2001 and 2014, the manufacturing and construction industries had the highest percentage meeting the VER, followed by primary sector. Laid-off job separators who worked in the government had the lowest percentage meeting the VER, compared to other industries.
- With regard to EI economic region, the percentages for laid-off job separators who met the VER were generally higher on the east coast compared to the west.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

10. Potential EI Eligibility of Canadian Paid Workers Using the Labour Force Survey

Author(s), Year

Constantine Kapsalis and Pierre Tourigny, 2015

Objective(s)

The study estimates the proportion of Canadian paid workers, aged 19 to 69, who in the event of a layoff would have sufficient insurable hours of work to be eligible for EI benefits.

Key Finding(s)

- Simulations indicate that 88.5% of individuals who were working as paid workers in 2014 would have been eligible for EI regular benefits if they were to be laid off. Due to the very large sample, estimates are very accurate.
- The EI eligibility rate is somewhat lower for women, due to the fact that part-time employment is more common among women. Among full-time employees, however, women tend to have a somewhat higher EI eligibility rate than men. There are also small differences among the provinces.
- With respect to age, there is a significant gap between youth and adults aged 25 to 69 (65.5% vs. 91.8%). One reason for this result is that many youth are still in school and often work few hours. Another reason is that many youth workers are new entrants to the labour force and, therefore, face a higher entrance requirement (910 hours).
- Finally, there is also a significant gap between full-time and part-time paid workers (93.6% vs. 61.0%). The main reason is that fewer part-time workers are able to accumulate enough hours over a 52 week period.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

11. Focus Groups for the Evaluation of Working While on Claim (WWC): Synthesis Report

Author(s), Year

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2014

Objective(s)

This study was conducted as part of the evaluation of the WWC pilot projects. There were eight focus groups conducted in four locations: Laval, Moncton, Montague and Sudbury. In each location, one group was with EI claimants eligible to revert to the previous WWC pilot rules ($75/40%), and one group was with EI claimants not eligible for the reversion.

Key finding(s)

- About three-quarter of focus group participants were seasonal/intermittent workers with regular employers that they returned to after lay-off period.
- For about half of focus group participants, the WWC provisions were not significant factors in their decision to work or not during a claim.
  - Some participants were unlikely to work regardless of the WWC rule in effect due to the following reasons: off-season may be relatively short (1 ½ to 2 months) and viewed as a vacation time; lack of temporary jobs; working while on claim can interfere with looking for full-time work; lack of motivation and financial need among older workers.
  - Some participants would work regardless of the WWC rule in effect. Most of them were seasonal/intermittent workers who would not turn down weeks of work offered by their regular employer by fear of risking their regular job.
- None of the focus group participants said that they started to work while on claim because of the new WWC pilot (50%/90% rule).
- The large majority of participants said that they would be less likely to work while on claim under the new pilot (50%/90% rule) in comparison to the previous pilot ($75/40% rule) because of the expectation that they could not find more than 1-2 days of work per week.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

12. Who are Workers Working for When Working While on Claim?

Author(s), Year

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2016

Objective(s)

This study investigates the pre-claim and post-claim relationships between Employment Insurance (EI) claimants who work while on claim and their employers. The study is based on an analysis of administrative data from the EI Status Vector (STVC), the Record of Employment (ROE), and the T4 file. The target population is "pure" regular claimants (i.e. claimants who received only regular benefits during their claim) who started their claim in 2010.

Key finding(s)

- Almost three-quarters (73.8%) of claimants who worked while on claim worked for a single employer while 19.7% worked for two employers and 4.5% worked for 3 employers.
- The average claimant who worked while on claim, worked about one-third (32.3%) of the time spent on claim. The weeks of employment (both in absolute terms and as a percentage of the weeks on claim) increase with the number of employers. This suggests that those who try to work more weeks during the claim have to look for employment opportunities with more employers.
- Almost four-out-of five (79.3%) claimants who worked while on claim had worked for the same employer before the start of their claim. Virtually all claimants (96.0%) who worked while on claim and worked for the same employer before did so in the same or previous year.
- In total, 82.4% of claimants who worked while on claim worked for the same employer after their claim. However, half of these cases may represent claimants who found a new job towards the end of the claim.
- For 76.0% of claimants, work during the claim leads to longer than a year employment after the claim.
- Virtually all claimants who worked while on claim (94.8%) worked for the same employer before and/or after their claim. More specifically, 64.7% worked for the same employer before and after their claim; 19.1% worked for the same employer only before their claim; and 16.2% worked for the same employer only after their claim.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

13. Extended Duration of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits: Second Evaluation Study Update

Author(s), Year

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2013

Objective(s)

The extended duration of EI regular benefits (EDB) initiative increased EI entitlements for regular claims by five weeks. It was introduced as part of a stimulus package in Budget 2009, along with several other relief measures. This study estimates the effect of EDB on benefit use and exhaustion of entitlements.

Key finding(s)

- Mean weeks of EI benefits received rose with the entitlement increase.
- The proportion of claimants using additional EDB weeks and their EI exhaustion rates declined with the entitlement increase.
- From March 9, 2008 until April 4, 2010, the joint effect of the extra EDB weeks used and the increase in entitlement, controlling for other factors, led to an average increase in benefit use of 2.1 weeks.
- Controlling for the same factors, the average probability of claimants exhausting their EI entitlement decreased by 4.8 percentage points due to the EDB initiative. Specifically, in EI economic regions previously eligible for the two preceding EI pilot projects that extended regular benefit weeks, the average probability of exhausting benefits was 4.4 percentage points lower due to EDB. In non-pilot regions, it was 5.0 percentage points lower.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

14. Geography-based Analysis of the Impact of EI Measures

Author(s), Year

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2016

Objective(s)

This study contrasts claimants' behaviours living close to the border between pilot and non-pilot regions to measure the impact of Pilot 15 on EI usage.

Key finding(s)

- EI benefit weeks used increased by 2.7 weeks in the pilot regions. Increased use of EI benefit was measured for all claimants in pilot regions, not just for those who used additional weeks of benefits provided under the pilot.
- Entitlement exhaustion rate decreased by as much as 7.3 percentage points. The rate of exhaustion of the benefit period before full entitlement is paid, referred to as benefit period exhaustion rate, is 5.4 percentage points higher due to the Pilot 15 entitlement extension.
- The occurrence rate of income gap for seasonal claims in pilot regions decreased by as much as 6.6 percentage points. Pilot 15 shortened the number of weeks of income gap by 2.6 weeks for workers between seasonal jobs.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

15. Training and the Duration of Employment Insurance Benefits

Author(s), Year

ESDC, Economic Policy Directorate, 2015

Objective(s)

This study, using data from the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID), looked at the impact of participation in job-related training on the incidence of receiving EI regular benefits and the duration of regular benefit payments during the period 2002 to 2008 (when SLID collected data on participation in training).

Key finding(s)

- For males who participated in job-related training in a given year, the probability of receiving EI regular benefits in the following year was reduced by 1.4 percentage points, from an average predicted probability of 4.7%.
- For females who participated in job-related training in a given year, the probability of receiving EI regular benefits in the following year was found to be reduced by 0.6 percentage points, from an average predicted probability of 4.1%.
- Among different types of training, it was found that it is employer-sponsored and workplace-based job-related training that reduced the incidence of receiving EI regular benefits; self-sponsored and classroom-based job-related training were not found to have an impact.
- With respect to the duration of EI regular benefits, participation in job-related training in a given year had only a limited impact, reducing the duration of benefit payments in the following year by 1.6 days among male recipients and 0.9 days among female recipients.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

16. An Evaluation Overview of Seasonal Employment: Update

Author(s), Year

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2009

Objective(s)

This study provides an overview of seasonal employment in Canada and draws conclusions on the subject of seasonal work.

Key finding(s)

- Based on aggregate Labour Force Survey (LFS) data, it has been estimated that seasonal employment accounts for 2.8% of total employment.
- The Canadian Out of Employment Panel (COEP) survey estimated seasonal workers made up 15.8 percent of job separations over the 2004 to 2007 period.
- Seasonal workers are:
  - more likely than other workers to be male, to have a lower level of education and to have fewer family dependants;
  - more prominent in eastern provinces and primary industries;
  - less likely to be unionized, to have a medical plan or to have a pension plan; and
  - more likely to expect to return to a previous employer.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

17. Interprovincial Mobility and Earnings

Author(s), Year

André Bernard, Ross Finnie and Benoît St-Jean, Statistics Canada, 2008

Objective(s)

This study looks at interprovincial migration longitudinally to identify factors that affect the probability that someone will move and to quantify the labour market gains associated with migration. It also compares the situations of migrants and non-migrants.

Key finding(s)

- Factors such as personal and labour market characteristics, as well as moving costs, play a key role in mobility decisions.

Availability

This study can be found on Statistics Canada's web site at:
http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-001-x/2008110/pdf/10711-eng.pdf.

18. Explaining Canada's Regional Migration Patterns

Author(s), Year

David Amirault, Daniel de Munnik and Sarah Miller, 2013

Objective(s)

The study investigated the factors that determine the migration of labour between regions.

Key finding(s)

- Labour migration tends to increase with regional differences in employment rates and household income.
- There is evidence that migrants respond to economic signals and are key in the stabilization process following economic shocks.
- Language differences and provincial barriers are associated with lower labour migration.

Availability

This report is available on the Bank of Canada's web site at:
http://www.bankofcanada.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/boc-review-spring13-amirault.pdf

19. Interprovincial Employment in Canada, 2002 to 2011

Author(s), Year

René Morissette and Hanqing Qiu, 2015

Objective(s)

This study was conducted to assess the extent of interprovincial paid employment for both sending provinces and receiving provinces.

Key finding(s)

- The number of interprovincial employees has been steadily increasing since 2002, with the exception of 2009.
- Newfoundland and Labrador, Yukon and Nunavut had the highest proportion of interprovincial employees.
- Overall, men are significantly more likely to be interprovincial employees, as well as those under 25 years of age.

Availability

This report is available on Statistics Canada's web site at:
http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-626-x/11-626-x2015047-eng.pdf

20. The Impact of Employment Insurance (EI) Regional Boundary Revisions on Mobility in New Brunswick: Evidence from the Longitudinal Administrative Databank

Author(s), Year

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2012

Objective(s)

This report investigates whether the change in the generosity of EI that occurred in the eastern region of New Brunswick with the revision of the EI regional boundary in 2000 affected the probability of moving out of that region.

Key finding(s)

- The impact of the boundary revisions on the decision to move out of the eastern region was not statistically significant, which confirms that EI generosity does not seem to affect mobility decisions.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

21. Regional Out-Migration and Commuting Patterns of Employment Insurance (EI) Claimants

Author(s), Year

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2012

Objective(s)

This paper compares the mobility and commuting behaviour of EI claimants living in high and low unemployment regions. The objective is to determine whether EI claimants residing in high unemployment regions were less mobile than those living in low unemployment regions and whether the mobility gap could be attributed to generosity of EI benefits.

Key finding(s)

The study suggested that EI does not impede mobility:

- Between 2007 and 2011, about 24% of EI claimants were commuters (i.e. their home address and employer's address were located in two different economic regions) and 7% were movers (i.e. they changed their home economic region between claims).
- Claimants residing in high unemployment regions (unemployment rate over 12%) were less likely to move (by about 2 percentage points) and more likely to commute (by about 4 percentage points) than claimants residing in lower unemployment regions.
- The lower likelihood of moving out of high unemployment regions could not be attributed to the longer EI entitlement provided in these regions. And only a small part of the commuting gap (about 1 percentage point) was attributed to the EI entitlement.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

22. Commuting and Mobility Patterns of Employment Insurance (EI) Recipients and Non-Recipients

Author(s), Year

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2011

Objective(s)

This report investigates whether EI benefits can foster mobility by helping to finance mobility and commuting costs. It also examines the alternative hypothesis—that, by providing a safety net, EI benefits can lower the pressure to move or commute to areas where better job opportunities are available. The objective of this paper was to compare mobility and commuting patterns of EI recipients and non-recipients to shed light on these unresolved questions.

Key finding(s)

The study suggested that EI does not discourage workers from being mobile:

- EI recipients were found to be more likely than non-EI recipients to commute 30 kilometres or more to go to work.
- EI recipients were more likely to work outside their census subdivision of residence.
- Also, following a job loss, EI recipients were more likely than non-EI recipients to move more than 100 kilometres away.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

23. EI Payments and the GIS System

Author(s), Year

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2009

Objective(s)

This paper assesses the impact of the Guaranteed Income Support (GIS) clawback provisions on overall individual income for EI claimants. It analyzes the interaction between the EI program and the GIS system, as well as how potential changes to Statistics Canada's Social Policy Simulation Database and Model (SPSD/M) would affect these two programs.

Key finding(s)

- Older workers (aged 55 and older) are generally net beneficiaries of EI regular benefits.
- Even though workers aged 65 and older contribute more to the program than they receive in benefits, their premiums amount to only about 8% of what older workers in total contribute.
- Workers between the ages of 55 and 64, who represent the vast majority of older workers, more than offset this by being net beneficiaries.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

24. 2016 Actuarial Report on the Employment Insurance Premium Rate

Author(s), Year

Office of the Chief Actuary, 2015

Objective(s)

The purpose of this report is to provide the Commission with all the information prescribed under section 66.3 of the EI Act. Pursuant to this section, the Chief Actuary shall provide the Commission with a report that sets out: i) the forecast premium rate for the upcoming year and a detailed analysis in support of the forecast; ii) the calculations performed for the purposes of sections 4, 66 and 69 of the EI Act; and iii) the source of the data, the actuarial and economic assumptions and the actuarial methodology used.

Key finding(s)

- The 2015 Maximum Insurable Earnings (MIE) was $49,500 or a 1.8% increase from the 2014 MIE of $48,600.
- The 2016 estimated employer premium reduction due to qualified wage-loss replacement (WLR) plans is$915 million, compared to $855 million in 2015.

Availability

This report is available on the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions' web site at: **http://www.osfi-bsif.gc.ca/Eng/Docs/EI2016.pdf**

25. EI Payroll Tax Refunds: The Characteristics of Firms Benefitting from the EI Premium Reduction Program 2000-2013

Author(s), Year

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2016

Objective(s)

This study describes the characteristics of firms benefitting from the EI Premium Reduction Program (PRP) over tax years 2000 to 2013.

Key finding(s)

- In 2013, there were 26,650 employers with EI premium reductions, down from 31,040 participating employers in 2000. The decline in employer participation coincided with an increase by 21% in the number of employers in Canada. The changes in employer participation did not result in a decline in the percentage of workers covered: both the number of workers and the percentage of workers covered increased over the period. At the end of the study period, 7.1 million (34.8%) of workers had employment in firms receiving a premium reduction.
- The larger the firm, the more likely the firm is to participate.
- Firms that are unionized more likely to participate.
- Most employers (between 88% and 89%) register for Category 3 plans (weekly indemnity plans with a maximum benefit period of at least 15 weeks.
- In 2013, premium reductions were observed for one-third of firms in Public Administration and about one-fifth of firms in the Utilities sector.
- Firms in Atlantic Canada were less likely to participate compared to firms in Ontario.
- The small, and declining, proportion (2.2% in 2013) of all employers who participate in the PRP cover approximately one-third of workers in Canada.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

26. Evaluation of the Work-Sharing Program

Author(s), Year

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2016

Objective(s)

The Work-Sharing Evaluation was conducted to assess the relevance and performance of the program as well as recent program changes, both temporary and permanent, introduced in response to the 2008-2009 economic recession.

Key finding(s)

- The changes allowed a large number of employers to avoid unnecessary layoffs when faced with a temporary downturn in business that was beyond their control, while still allowing for the necessary structural adjustments that may occur during and after a recession to take place.
- On average between the years 2000/2001 and 2010/2011, 60% of layoffs averted during the agreement remained averted for at least 6 months, resulting in an estimated net effect of 11,189 and 24,385 layoffs averted during the years 2008/09 and 2009/10 respectively. This was an improvement over the estimated 49% of layoffs averted for 6 months during the 1990/1991 to 2001/2002 period, as documented by the 2004 Work-Sharing evaluation.
- More than 75% of employers said that the costs of lay-offs in terms of subsequent recruiting and training would have been very substantial and that avoiding this was the principal benefit of applying to the program.
- The evaluation found that the program's take-up, in terms of volume of participants, followed its typical counter cyclicality pattern. However, the average agreement size increased during the recent recession, both in terms of employees claiming Work-Sharing per employer, and in terms of the average claim duration.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

27. Usage of the Work-Sharing Program: 2000/01 to 2014/2015

Author(s), Year

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2016

Objective(s)

This report examines the usage of the Work-Sharing program from 2000/2001 to 2014/2015. Specifically, it examines the extent to which the Work-Sharing program is used, expenditures on Work-Sharing benefits, the characteristics and experiences of Work-Sharing participants, and layoffs averted by the program.

Key finding(s)

- Work-Sharing usage and expenditures are counter-cyclical.
- By using data on the annual number of Work-Sharing claimants and the average work reduction due to Work-Sharing agreements, it was estimated that the number of layoffs averted or postponed in 2014/2015 by the Work-Sharing program was 2,500, down from 35,500 in 2009/2010.
- In 2014/2015, 435 Work-Sharing participants were laid-off in the 6 months following their agreement termination. The resulting estimate of net layoffs averted for 2013/2014 was 2,065.

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

28. Record of Employment and Accuracy of Reported Earnings: Firms 2005-2012

Author(s), Year

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2016

Objective(s)

Using EI administrative and CRA datasets, this study compares the reported insured earnings from 2005 to 2012 and estimates the proportion of earnings interruptions without an ROE.

Key finding(s)

- Over the study period, earnings interruptions without an ROE dropped to 28.9% (3,086,320) in 2012 from 33.1% (3,461,895) in 2005.
- In 2012, the highest earnings interruptions without an ROE occurred in the service sector (28.7%), firms with fewer than 100 employees (39.1%), and firms without union membership (33.1%).
- Among provinces, the territories and British Columbia had seen a higher proportion of job separators without an ROE (44% and 33.5%).
- Between 2001 and 2012, slightly above 80% of ROE insured earnings are within $2 variance of T4s, using a subsample where all ROEs are within a calendar year and no more than 26 weeks.
- In 2012, the proportions of ROE insured earnings being consistent with T4s (within $2 difference) are lower with jobs in the government sector (75.6%), in firms with more than 500 employees (78.7%), and with union membership (73.3%).

Availability

A PDF version of this document can be ordered by calling 1 800 O-Canada (1-800-622-6232). If you use a TTY, call 1-800-926-9105. The PDF version can only be sent via e-mail. Please note there will be a certain delay before receiving the documents.

Annex 7

Recent Legislative Changes to the Employment Insurance Program

Annex 7.1 Major Changes to the Employment Insurance Program Implemented from April 1, 1996 to January 1, 2016 406

Annex 7.1 Major Changes to the Employment Insurance Program Implemented from April 1, 1996 to January 1, 2016

Economic Action Plan 2015 Act, No. 1, S.C. 2015, c. 36 (Bill C-59)	
Element	**Rationale**
Increased Duration of Compassionate Care Benefits	
• Amendments to the *Employment Insurance Act* increased the duration of compassionate care benefits to a maximum of 26 weeks (up from 6 weeks) and allowed weeks of benefits to be taken within a 52-week period (up from a 26-week period). • Bill C-59 also amended the *Canada Labour Code* concurrently to ensure that the jobs of employees in federally regulated enterprises remain protected while they avail themselves of compassionate care benefits. • These changes came into effect on January 3, 2016.	• Provides additional financial security to Canadians workers and their families in times of need.

Regulatory Amendments: Working While on Claim (2015)	
Element	**Rationale**
Working While on Claim Pilot Projects	
• Pilot Project No. 8 (Working While On Claim Pilot Project) took effect on December 11, 2005 in 23 Employment Insurance (EI) economic regions with an unemployment rate of 10% or higher. The parameters of this pilot were re-introduced nationally in 2008 as Pilot Project No. 12. • Pilot Project No. 12 was then extended on October 12, 2010, until August 6, 2011. • Budget 2011 announced a one-year renewal of the Working While on Claim (WWC) Pilot Project parameters through a new pilot project (Pilot Project No. 17), available nationally, until August 4, 2012. • These pilot projects (Pilot Projects No. 8, No. 12 and No. 17) increased the amount that claimants were allowed to earn while on claim to $75 per week or 40% of their weekly EI benefit rate, whichever was higher. Any income above that amount was deducted dollar-for-dollar from benefits. These pilot projects applied to regular, fishing, parental and compassionate care benefits, but excluded maternity and sickness benefits.	• Tests to determine whether allowing claimant's to earn more income without a reduction in their EI benefits gave them incentives to accept all available work. • Provides additional data to assess the effectiveness of the pilot parameters during a period of economic recovery and a full economic cycle.

Element	Rationale
Working While on Claim Pilot Projects *(Continued)*	
• On August 5, 2012, as part of Budget 2012, the Government introduced Pilot Project No. 18 under which claimants keep 50% of their EI benefits from the first dollar earned, up to 90% of weekly insurable earnings to ensure that claimants do not earn more than when they were working. Claimants who had earnings during the period beginning on August 7, 2011 and ending on August 4, 2012 can elect to have their EI weekly benefits calculated based on the parameters of the previous WWC pilot project (Pilot Project No. 17) rather than the Pilot Project No. 18. This pilot project concluded on August 1, 2015.	• Pilot Project No. 18 tests whether the new approach will further encourage claimants to work additional days while on claim. Pilot Project No. 18 was amended to test which method, parameters under Pilot Project No. 17 or those under Pilot Project No. 18, is more effective in encouraging claimants to work more while receiving EI benefits.
• On August 2, 2015, as part of Budget 2015, the Government of Canada re-introduced the parameters of Pilot Project No. 18 through a new pilot project (Pilot Project No. 19). This new pilot project is scheduled to conclude on August 5, 2016.	• Provides additional data to assess the effectiveness of the pilot parameters and test which method, parameters under Pilot Project No. 17 or those under Pilot Project No. 18, is more effective in encouraging claimants to work more while receiving EI benefits.

Regulatory Amendments: Unemployment Rates in the Territories and Employment Insurance Economic Regions in the Territories and Prince Edward Island (2014)	
Element	**Rationale**
New Regional Unemployment Rate Methodology in the Territories and New Employment Insurance Economic Regions in the Territories and Prince Edward Island	
• Amendments to the *Employment Insurance Regulations* replaced the administratively set 25 percent unemployment rate used for Employment Insurance (EI) purposes in the Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut with variable monthly regional unemployment rates. Under this new approach, the regional monthly unemployment rate is henceforth equal to the greater of a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate based on a 3-month moving average or a 12-month moving average. A monthly regional unemployment rate substitute is used if Statistics Canada is not able to publish a monthly unemployment rate for reasons of confidentiality.	• Ensures a better reflection of regional labour market conditions in the territories. • Offers a balance between responsiveness to regional labour market conditions in the territories (with the 3-month moving average) and better protection against statistical variance (with the 12-month moving average).
• In addition, the EI economic regions of Prince Edward Island, Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut were each divided into two EI economic regions, one consisting of the capital area and the other the remaining non-capital area. • These changes came into effect on October 12, 2014.	• Recognizes differences in labour market realities between the capital and the non-capital areas in the Yukon, the Northwest Territories, Nunavut and Prince Edward Island.

Economic Action Plan 2014 Act, No. 1, S.C. 2014, c. 20 (Bill C-31)	
Element	**Rationale**
Enhanced Access to Sickness Benefits for Compassionate Care Benefits or Parents of Critically Ill Children Benefits Claimants	
• Effective October 12, 2014, claimants receiving compassionate care benefits (CCB) or parents of critically ill children (PCIC) benefits no longer have to be otherwise available for work to receive sickness benefits. This legislative change allows claimants who fall ill or injured while receiving CCB or PCIC benefits to access sickness benefits and then resume collecting the balance of their CCB or PCIC benefits, if needed, once their sickness benefits have been paid.	• Recognizes that a claimant who becomes ill or injured while in receipt of CCB or PCIC benefits may not be able to take care of a gravely ill family member or his/her a critically ill child. • Enhances the flexibility and responsiveness of the EI program.

Regulatory Amendments: Access to Maternity and Parental Benefits (2012)	
Element	**Rationale**
Limiting Access to Maternity and Parental Benefits to Persons Authorized to Remain in Canada	
• Claimants who leave Canada and whose work permit and Social Insurance Number (SIN) expire are no longer eligible to receive maternity and parental benefits. • Claimants with a valid SIN can continue to receive these benefits both inside and outside Canada.	• Ensures that maternity and parental benefits are paid only to claimants with ongoing ties to the Canadian labour market—notably, those authorized to live and work in Canada.

Jobs and Growth Act, 2012, S.C. 2012, c. 31 (Bill C-45)	
Element	**Rationale**
Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board Act	
• Effective March 7, 2013, the *Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board Act* has been suspended until the Employment Insurance Operating Account has returned to cumulative balance and the Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board can fulfill its full legislative mandate.	• Ensures that independent Employment Insurance rate-setting is performed in the most cost-effective manner.
Premium Rate-setting	
• An interim rate-setting regime takes effect, under which Employment Insurance premium rates are set by the Governor-in-Council on the joint recommendation of the Minister of Employment and Social Development and the Minister of Finance. The 2014 rate is the first rate set under the interim regime.	• Ensures premium rates are set according to the premium rate-setting mechanism set out in the *Employment Insurance Act*, and provides ongoing stability and predictability for contributors.

Helping Families in Need Act, S.C. 2012, c. 27 (Bill C-44)	
Element	**Rationale**
Parents of Critically Ill Children	
• Effective June 9, 2013, a new 35-week Employment Insurance special benefit is available to provide income support to eligible parents who are unable to work while providing care or support to a critically ill or injured child under the age of 18.	• Helps parents balance work and family responsibilities by reducing the financial pressure faced by parents who take time off work to care for their critically ill or injured children.
• Bill C-44 also amended the *Canada Labour Code* to protect the jobs of employees in federally regulated enterprises while they take unpaid leave to care for their critically ill or injured child.	• Recognizes the needs of parents who are likely to take time away from work when their child is critically ill.
Enhanced Access to Sickness Benefits	
• Effective March 24, 2013, claimants receiving parental benefits no longer have to be otherwise available for work to receive sickness benefits. This legislative change allows claimants who fall ill or injured while receiving parental benefits to access sickness benefits and then resume collecting the balance of their parental benefits, if needed, once their sickness benefits have been paid.	• Recognizes that it may be difficult for a parent who becomes ill or injured to take care of and bond with his/her child. • Enhances the flexibility and responsiveness of the EI program.

Jobs, Growth and Long-term Prosperity Act, S.C. 2012, c. 19 (Bill C-38)	
Element	**Rationale**
Connecting Canadians to Available Jobs	
• Enhanced the content and frequency of job and labour market information for job seekers. • Strengthened and clarified claimants' obligations by defining reasonable job search and suitable employment for claimants who are receiving regular or fishing benefits. • Ensured qualified Canadians are considered before temporary foreign workers are hired to fill job vacancies. • Initiated discussions with provinces and territories to make skills training and job search support available to Employment Insurance (EI) claimants earlier in their claim.	• Ensures unemployed Canadians are better connected with available jobs in their local area. • Clarifies claimants' responsibility to undertake a reasonable job search for suitable employment while receiving EI regular or fishing benefits.

Element	Rationale
Variable Best Weeks	
• Effective April 7, 2013, claimants (with the exception of fishing and self-employed claimants) have Employment Insurance (EI) benefits calculated based on the weeks of their highest insurable earnings during the qualifying period.	• Makes the EI program more responsive to regional economic conditions.
• The best 14 to 22 weeks are used to calculate EI benefits, depending on the unemployment rate in the EI economic region where the claimant resides.	• Ensures that those living in areas with similar labour market conditions receive similar benefits.
Premium Rate-setting	
• The Employment Insurance (EI) premium rate-setting mechanism has been amended whereby the premium rate will be set annually at a seven-year break-even rate. This revised rate-setting mechanism is intended to come into force once the Employment Insurance Operating Account has returned to cumulative balance.	• Ensures that the Employment Insurance Operating Account is in cumulative balance at the end of the seven-year period.
• The legislated limit on year-to-year changes to the premium rate has been adjusted from 15 cents to 5 cents per $100 of insurable earnings.	• Enhances the predictability and stability of the EI premium rate.
• Advanced the date by which the premium rate must be set to September 14, rather than November 14.	• Provides employers and workers with more notice of the EI premium rate for the coming year.

Element	Rationale
Social Security Tribunal	
• The Social Security Tribunal (SST) replaced the four Employment and Social Development Canada tribunals for Employment Insurance (EI), Canada Pension Plan (CPP) and Old Age Security (OAS) appeals with a single decision-making body. • The SST is comprised of two levels of appeal, similar to the previous appeal process: – The General Division has an Employment Insurance Section for EI appeals, and an Income Security Section for CPP and OAS appeals. A vice-chairperson heads each of the sections of this Division. – The Appeal Division reviews decisions made by the General Division. The third vice-chairperson heads this Division. • Before an EI appeal can be filed with the SST, clients must make a formal request for reconsideration. This is a new process whereby EI clients who disagree with the Canada Employment Insurance Commission's decision are able to submit new or additional information that the Commission is required to review to determine if the decision can be reversed or modified. • Appeals are considered and decided by single member panels. Tribunal members have the authority to summarily dismiss an appeal when the member is satisfied that the appeal has no reasonable chance of success. • The SST began its operations on April 1, 2013.	• Eliminates administrative duplication in appeals and tribunal services by replacing the administrative tribunal system for major federal social security programs with a single-window decision body. • This new approach to appeals introduced a number of measures to improve efficiencies, simplify and modernize the process and reduce costs.

Keeping Canada's Economy and Jobs Growing Act, S.C. 2011, c. 24 (Bill C-13)	
Element	**Rationale**
Temporary Hiring Credit for Small Businesses	
• Provided small businesses with a temporary hiring credit of up to $1,000 against an increase in the firm's 2011 Employment Insurance premiums over those paid in 2010. • Available to approximately 525,000 employers whose total EI premiums were at or below $10,000 per employer in 2010 and will reduce their 2011 payroll costs by about $165 million.	• Encourages additional hiring in small businesses, and helps them to take advantage of emerging opportunities and compete in the global economy.

Regulatory Amendments: Extended EI Benefits and Best 14 Weeks Pilot Projects (2010)	
Element	**Rationale**
Extended Employment Insurance Benefits Pilot Project	
• Pilot Project No. 6, Pilot Project Relating to Increased Weeks of Benefits, was introduced for a two-year period on June 6, 2004 in 24 Employment Insurance (EI) economic regions with an unemployment rate of 10% or higher. It increased the maximum number of weeks for which regular benefits could be paid by five, to a maximum of 45 weeks. • The parameters of this pilot were re-introduced as a new pilot project on June 11, 2006, under Pilot Project No. 10, for a period of 18 months in 21 EI economic regions and were further extended until May 31, 2009. Pilot Project No. 10 increased the maximum number of weeks for which regular benefits could be paid by five, to a maximum of 45 weeks.	• Tests the cost and impact of extending the number of weeks of benefits in EI economic regions of relatively high unemployment.
• Pilot Project No. 10 ended earlier, on February 28, 2009, and was replaced by the national Extra Five Weeks Budget measure, which came into effect on March 1, 2009 and lasted until September 11, 2010. It increased the maximum number of weeks for which regular benefits could be paid by five, to a maximum of 50 weeks, on all claims that were open between March 1, 2009, and September 11, 2010.	• Provides time-limited, broad-based support for all workers during the recent recession.
• On September 12, 2010, the Government of Canada re-introduced the parameters of the Extended Employment Insurance Benefits Pilot Project (as Pilot Project No. 15) for two years, until September 15, 2012, or earlier if there was a sustained economic recovery. An automatic termination trigger was implemented in regions where regional unemployment rates were below 8% for 12 consecutive months. It included the same 21 Employment Insurance (EI) economic regions as Pilot Project No. 10. • Pilot Project No. 15 increased the maximum number of weeks for which regular benefits could be paid by five, to a maximum of 45 weeks. • Pilot Project No. 15 concluded earlier in three regions where the unemployment rate was less than 8% for 12 consecutive months. This was the case for the EI economic region of St. John's (September 24, 2011), Chicoutimi-Jonquière (March 24, 2012) and Sudbury (June 23, 2012).	• Tests the effectiveness of providing additional EI regular benefits in reducing the number of individuals experiencing an income gap between EI and their return to work, as well as the impact of a regional unemployment rate-based trigger. • Allows for further collection of data and testing to more fully capture the impact of increasing the maximum number of weeks for which regular benefits could be paid during a period of economic recovery.

Element	Rationale
Best 14 Weeks Pilot Project	
• Pilot Project No. 7 (Best 14 Weeks) was introduced on October 30, 2005, in 23 EI economic regions with unemployment rate of 10% or higher. The parameters of the pilot project were re-introduced on October 26, 2008, for two years, as Pilot Project No.11 in 25 Employment Insurance (EI) economic regions with an unemployment rate of 8% or higher. • Under this pilot project, EI benefits were based on claimants' 14 weeks of highest earnings in the qualifying period.	• Tests whether basing claimants' benefit rate on their 14 weeks of highest earnings in the qualifying period (generally 52 weeks) before they claimed EI encouraged claimants to accept all available work.
• Initially scheduled to end on October 23, 2010, Pilot Project No. 11 was subsequently extended until June 25, 2011. • Budget 2011 announced a one-year renewal of the Best 14 Weeks pilot project parameters (as Pilot Project No. 16) in the same 25 EI economic regions until June 23, 2012. Pilot Project No. 16 was subsequently extended until April 6, 2013.	• Provides additional data to assess the effectiveness of the pilot during a period of economic recovery and a full economic cycle.

Fairness for Military Families (Employment Insurance) Act, S.C. 2010, c. 9 (Bill C-13)	
Element	**Rationale**
Improved Access to Employment Insurance Parental Benefits for Military Families	
• The Employment Insurance (EI) parental benefits eligibility window has been extended to support Canadian Forces (CF) members, including reservists, who are ordered to return to duty while on parental leave or whose parental leave is deferred as a result of an imperative military requirement. • This gives these CF members a window of up to 104 weeks following their child's birth or adoption in which to access part or all of their 35 weeks of EI parental benefit entitlement.	• Provides additional flexibility to CF members to access parental benefits for parent-child care and bonding, while recognizing the importance of military service.

Jobs and Economic Growth Act, S.C. 2010, c. 12 (Bill C-9)	
Element	**Rationale**
Employment Insurance Operating Account	
• The Employment Insurance Operating Account was established in the accounts of Canada to record all Employment Insurance (EI) related credits and charges since January 1, 2009, the date from which the Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board (CEIFB) was to ensure that EI revenues and expenditures broke even and the Employment Insurance Account was closed. • This change repeals the provision under which advances from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the Employment Insurance Account were made and the provision under which interest could be paid on the balance of the Employment Insurance Account. • The CEIFB's obligation to set EI premium rates under section 66 of the *Employment Insurance Act* has been clarified to ensure that EI revenues and expenditures recorded in the Employment Insurance Operating Account balance over time, beginning January 1, 2009.	• Further strengthens the transparency and effectiveness of the financing of the EI program. • In line with steps taken in 2008 to establish the CEIFB.

Fairness for the Self-employed Act, S.C. 2009, c. 33 (Bill C-56)	
Element	**Rationale**
Special Benefits for Self-employed Persons	
• Effective January 31, 2010, Employment Insurance (EI) special benefits (maternity, parental, sickness and compassionate care benefits) have been extended to self-employed workers. Self-employed persons can opt into the EI program on a voluntary basis. Benefits were paid starting January 1, 2011. • These benefits for self-employed persons mirror special benefits available to salaried employees under the current EI program.	• Provides a voluntary scheme of EI benefits to self-employed Canadians for life transitions such as the birth of a child, adoption, illness, injury or critical illness of a family member.

Budget Implementation Act, 2009, S.C. 2009, c. 2 (Bill C-10)	
Element	**Rationale**
Career Transition Assistance Initiative	
• Two measures to support long-tenured workers: – The Extended Employment Insurance and Training Incentive (EEITI) extended EI regular benefits to a maximum of 104 weeks for long-tenured workers who enrolled in long-term training, including up to 12 weeks of EI regular benefits for job search. – The Severance Investment for Training Initiative allowed eligible long-tenured workers who used their severance payments to invest in full-time training to receive EI regular benefits sooner. • For the purposes of the Career Transition Assistance Initiative, long-tenured workers' claims must have started on or after January 25, 2009, and no later than May 29, 2010.	• Improved claimants' incentive to renew or upgrade their skills. • Encouraged claimants to invest in their own training. • Encouraged claimants to undertake long-term training to improve their re-employability.
Premium Rate Freeze	
• This measure froze Employment Insurance (EI) premium rates for employees at $1.73 per $100 for 2010, the same rate as in 2009 and 2008.	• Maintained premium rate stability during the recession despite higher EI costs.
Premium Rates	
• Legislation was enacted to retroactively set the premium rates for 2002, 2003 and 2005.	• This retroactive change was made necessary by the ruling of the Supreme Court of Canada in the *CSN-Arvida case*, in which the Court ruled that the premium rates in 2002, 2003 and 2005 were not constitutionally valid as regulatory fees and represented an unlawful tax on premium payers.

Budget Implementation Act, 2008, S.C. 2008, c. 28 (Bill C-50)	
Element	**Rationale**
Temporary Additional Employment Insurance Benefits for Unemployed Long-tenured Workers	
• Long-tenured workers are individuals who have worked and paid Employment Insurance (EI) premiums for a significant period and have previously made limited use of EI regular benefits. • Provided up to 20 weeks of additional benefits, depending on how long an eligible individual had been working and paying into EI. • Applied to claimants who met the long-tenured worker definition and who made their claim between January 4, 2009, and September 11, 2010.	• Benefited workers who faced unemployment with low prospects of finding work and who had previously made limited use of EI benefits. • Helped workers who, in many cases, had skills that were not easily transferable. For such workers, finding a new job in their industry or an alternative one may have been particularly difficult in the economic environment of that time period.
Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board	
• The legislation creating the Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board (CEIFB) received Royal Assent on June 18, 2008. • The CEIFB's legislated mandate was to: – set Employment Insurance (EI) premium rates in a transparent fashion; – manage a separate account where excess premiums were held and invested; and – maintain a reserve to ensure the Employment Insurance Operating Account breaks even over time.	• Ensures that EI revenues were sufficient to cover EI costs in the following year. • Uses current premium surpluses to reduce future premium rates.

Regulatory Amendments: New Entrants and Re-Entrants Pilot Project (2008)	
Element	**Rationale**
New Entrants and Re-Entrants Pilot Project	
• Pilot Project No. 9 (New Entrants and Re-Entrants Pilot Project) was introduced on December 11, 2005 in 23 Employment Insurance (EI) economic regions with an unemployment rate of 10% or higher. The parameters of the pilot project were renewed on December 7, 2008, as Pilot Project No. 13 in 25 EI economic regions with an unemployment rate of 8% or higher. • The pilot project reduced the number of hours New Entrants and Re-Entrants (NEREs) needed to be eligible for EI regular benefits from 910 to 840. • Pilot Project No. 13 sunset as scheduled on December 4, 2010.	• Tests to determine whether providing NEREs with lower EI eligibility requirements and informing them of EI employment programs improves their employability and helps reduce their future reliance on EI benefits, partly by improving their access to measures under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act*.

Regulatory Amendments: Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (2006)	
Element	**Rationale**
Quebec Parental Insurance Plan	
• Effective January 1, 2006, Quebec residents receive maternity and parental benefits through the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP) while they continue to have access to sickness and compassionate care benefits through the Employment Insurance (EI) program. • The *Employment Insurance Regulations* provide for a reduction of EI premiums for Quebec residents, reflecting the savings to the Employment Insurance Operating Account resulting from the Government of Quebec providing maternity and parental benefits.	• Ensures consistency with the *Employment Insurance Act* provisions that provinces may provide their own benefit plans, as long as they provide benefits equivalent to those offered under the EI program.

Regulatory Amendments: Compassionate Care Benefit (2006)	
Element	**Rationale**
Definition of Family Member	
• Effective June 14, 2006, expanded the eligibility criteria and the definition of family member for the compassionate care benefit from that of immediate family to include extended family members and any other individuals considered by the person who has a serious medical condition to be like family members.	• Expands the definition of family member to ensure that additional caregivers, who were previously excluded from the definition of family member, are able to get access to income support when they must leave work to care for a family member who has a serious medical condition.

Budget Implementation Act, 2005, S.C. 2005, c. 30 (Bill C-43)	
Element	**Rationale**
Premium Rate-setting Process	
• Effective January 1, 2006, the legislation allows the Canada Employment Insurance Commission to set the premium rate under a new rate-setting mechanism. • In setting the rate, the Commission will take into account the principle that the premium rate should generate just enough premium revenue to cover payments to be made for that year. It will also consider the report from the Employment Insurance Chief Actuary and any public input.	• Allows for a new rate-setting process where the Employment Insurance premium rate is determined independently by the Canada Employment Insurance Commission.

Budget Implementation Act, 2003, S.C. 2003, c. 15 (Bill C-28)	
Element	**Rationale**
Compassionate Care Benefits	
• Since January 4, 2004, compassionate care benefits have been available to help eligible family members to provide or arrange care for a family member who has a serious medical condition with a significant risk of death. The duration of the benefits is up to 6 weeks within a 26-week period. • Flexibility is a key feature of the benefits. Claimants can choose how and when to claim benefits within the 26-week window. Eligible family members can decide to have one person claim all six weeks or decide to share the benefit. Eligible family members can claim weeks of compassionate care benefits concurrently or consecutively.	• Provides support to workers during temporary absences from work to provide care or support to a family member who has a serious medical condition with a significant risk of death within 26 weeks.

Budget Implementation Act, 2001, S.C. 2002, c. 9 (Bill C-49)	
Element	**Rationale**
Extension of Benefit Period for Parental Benefits – Child in Hospital	
• Effective April 21, 2002, parents of a newborn or newly adopted child who is hospitalized can have their parental benefit window extended up to 104 weeks, instead of 52 weeks.	• Provides flexibility for parents who choose to wait until their child comes home before collecting parental benefits.
Maximum Duration of Combined Special Benefits	
• Effective March 3, 2002, the maximum number of combined weeks of special benefits has been increased from 50 to 65 weeks and the benefit period may be extended accordingly, under certain circumstances.	• Ensures full access to special benefits for biological mothers who claim sickness benefits prior to and following maternity or parental benefits. • Responds to the ruling of the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal in the *McAllister-Windsor case*.

Regulatory Amendments: Small Weeks Provision (2001)	
Element	**Rationale**
Small Weeks Provision	
• Before the introduction of the Variable Best Weeks method of calculating claimant benefits on April 7, 2013, benefits were calculated based on the average weekly earnings in the 26-week period prior to claiming benefits. The small weeks provision allowed claimants to exclude weeks where they earned less than $225 unless those weeks were needed to satisfy the "minimum divisor". • Pilot projects between 1997 and 2001 tested a $150 exclusion from 1997 to 2001 before legislating the parameters of the pilot projects ($150 exclusion) in all Employment Insurance (EI) economic regions on November 18, 2001. On September 7, 2003, the legislation was amended to increase the exclusion to $225.	• At the time when the small weeks provision was introduced, weekly EI benefit rates were based on an average insured earnings in the 26 weeks preceding the last day of employment. Including "small weeks" in the calculation of a claimant's average earnings resulted in reduced weekly EI benefit amounts. This approach to calculating EI benefit rates could have the unintended effect of discouraging some workers from accepting weeks with lower earnings.
• Between October 2005 and April 2013, EI claimants in the select EI economic regions had their benefit rates calculated according to the Best 14 Weeks pilot project provisions. • The small weeks provision was replaced by the Variable Best Weeks provision on April 7, 2013, except for fishers.	• Removes program features which may discourage workers from accepting all available work. Calculating the weekly benefit rate using insurable earnings from the 14 highest weeks of insurable earnings aims to ensure that workers who accept work with lower earnings will not see a reduction in their EI benefits.

An Act to amend the Employment Insurance Act and the Employment Insurance (Fishing) Regulations, S.C. 2001, c. 5 (Bill C-2)	
Element	**Rationale**
Intensity Rule	
• Effective October 1, 2000, eliminated the intensity rule, which had reduced the benefit rate by 1 percentage point for every 20 weeks of Employment Insurance regular benefits used in the past. The maximum reduction was 5 percentage points.	• Eliminated an ineffective rule that had the unintended effect of being punitive.
Benefit Repayment (Clawback)	
• Applied new rule, effective retroactively to the 2000 taxation year: – First-time claimants of regular or fishing benefits are now exempt from the benefit repayment. – Claimants of special benefits (maternity, parental and sickness benefits) are no longer required to repay any of those benefits. – The benefit repayment threshold for regular and fishing benefits was set at one level: $48,750 of net income, with a repayment rate of 30%. The maximum repayment is the lesser of 30% of excess net income above the threshold of $48,750, or 30% of the claimant's benefits.	• Corrects a discrepancy, as analysis indicated that the benefit repayment provision was having a disproportionate impact on middle-income claimants. • Focuses on repeat claimants with high incomes. • Simplifies the provision.

Element	Rationale
Re-Entrant Parents	
• Effective retroactive to October 1, 2000, the rules governing new entrants/re-entrants have been adjusted so that claimants who are re-entering the workforce following an extended absence to raise children and who have received parental benefits are now only required to work the same number of hours as other workers to qualify for regular benefits.	• Ensures that parents returning to the workforce following an extended absence to raise young children are not penalized.
Maximum Insurable Earnings	
• The maximum insurable earnings (MIE) will remain at $39,000 until average earnings exceed this level, at which time the MIE will be based on average earnings.	• Corrects a discrepancy in which the MIE was higher than the average industrial wage.

Budget Implementation Act, 2000, S.C. 2000, c. 14 (Bill C-32)	
Element	**Rationale**
Parental Benefits	
• Effective December 31, 2000, the duration of parental benefits has been increased from 10 to 35 weeks.	• Helps working parents to better balance their work and family responsibilities by providing them with temporary income replacement when they take time off work to take care of their newborn in the first year of the child's life or the first year of placement of the child (for adoptive parents).
Entrance Requirements: Special Benefits	
• Effective December 31, 2000, the number of hours of insurable employment required to qualify for maternity, parental or sickness benefits has been reduced from 700 to 600 hours.	• Improves access to special benefits.
Waiting Period	
• Effective December 31, 2000, the second parent sharing parental leave is no longer required to serve the two-week waiting period.	• Promotes gender equality and improves flexibility by reducing the income loss for the second parent.
Allowable Earnings While on Claim (Parental Benefits)	
• Effective December 31, 2000, claimants receiving parental benefits can also earn $50 or 25% of their weekly parental benefit rate, whichever is higher, without a reduction of their Employment Insurance benefits.	• Improves flexibility and fosters labour attachment by allowing parents to work while receiving parental benefits.

Employment Insurance Act, S.C. 1996, c. 23 (Bill C-12)	
Element	**Rationale**
Hours-based System	
• Effective January 1997, Employment Insurance eligibility is based on hours of insurable employment rather than weeks worked. • For regular benefits, claimants need 420 to 700 hours of insurable income instead of 12 to 20 weeks of insurable employment. • For special benefits, claimants need 700 hours instead of 20 weeks.	• Introduces a fairer and more equitable measure of time worked by making all hours count. • Removes inequities and anomalies of the weeks system by: – recognizing the intense work patterns of some employees; – correcting the anomaly that existed under the Unemployment Insurance, when a week of 15 hours or a week of 50 hours each counted as one week; and – eliminating the 14-hour job trap as, under the Unemployment Insurance, those working fewer than 15 hours (either all of the time or some of the time) with a single employer were not insured or not fully insured.
New Entrants and Re-Entrants	
• Effective July 1996, new entrants and re-entrants to the labour force needed 26 rather than 20 weeks of insurable employment to qualify for Employment Insurance (EI) regular benefits. In January 1997, the 26 weeks were converted to 910 hours. – This rule applies only to those who have had minimal or no labour market attachment (that is those who had less than 490 hours of work) during the 52-week period prior to the qualifying period. Time on EI, workers' compensation, disability benefits and sick leave counts as time worked. • Effective July 1996, new entrants and re-entrants to the labour force needed 26 rather than 20 weeks of insurable employment to qualify for EI fishing benefits. In January 1997, the 26 weeks were converted into earnings of $5,500 from employment as a fisher. – This rule applies only to those who have had minimal or no labour market attachment (that is those who had less than $3,000 in earnings from employment as a fisher) in the 52-week period prior to the qualifying period. Time on EI, workers' compensation, disability benefits and sick leave counts as time worked.	• Discourages a cycle of reliance by ensuring that workers, especially young people, develop a significant attachment to the labour force before collecting EI benefits. • Reintroduces insurance principles to the system by ensuring that workers make a reasonable contribution to the system before collecting benefits. • Strengthens the relationship between work effort and entitlement to benefits.

Element	Rationale
Reduction in Maximum Insurable Earnings	
• The maximum insurable earnings (MIE) was reduced to $39,000 per year ($750 per week) in July 1996 and frozen at this level until 2006. This reduced the maximum weekly benefit to $413 (55% of $750), from $448 in 1995 and $465 for the first six months of 1996.	• Adjusts the MIE to a level where Employment Insurance benefits would no longer be competitive with wages in some parts of the country and in some industries. • Was based on a formula that took into account average wage increases over the eight years before the reduction. Because the high inflation and wage increases of the 1980s continued to be considered in setting the MIE, it had escalated faster than wages.
Reduced Maximum Duration of Regular Benefits	
• Effective July 1996, the maximum length of a claim was reduced from 50 to 45 weeks.	• Reflects the fact that most claimants find work within the first 40 weeks of receiving benefits.
Calculation of Weekly Benefit Rate	
• Weekly benefits are calculated based on total earnings over the 26-week period preceding the establishment of the claim, divided by the number of weeks of work in this period or the minimum divisor of 14 to 22 (depending on the regional rate of unemployment), whichever is higher. The result is multiplied by 55% to determine the weekly benefit rate.	• Creates a strong incentive to work more than the minimum amount of time to qualify for benefits (at least two more weeks than the old entrance requirement). • Provides an incentive to work in the "shoulder" season.
Family Supplement	
• Claimants with children who receive the Canada child tax benefit and who have an annual family net income of up to $25,921 receive a top-up of their basic Employment Insurance benefits. • The Family Supplement increased the maximum benefit rate to 65% in 1997, to 70% in 1998, to 75% in 1999 and to 80% in 2000.	• Improves assistance to those most in need, because: – the old 60% dependent rate under the Unemployment Insurance was very poorly targeted—about 45% of low-income families did not qualify; and – about 30% of those who did receive the 60% rate had family incomes over $45,000.
Allowable Earnings While on Claim	
• Effective January 1997, claimants can earn $50 or 25% of their weekly benefit rate, whichever is higher, without a reduction of their Employment Insurance benefits. Prior to 1997, the exemption was only 25% of the weekly benefit rate.	• Helps low-income claimants. • Encourages claimants to maintain work attachment and increase their earnings from work.

Element	Rationale
Benefit Repayment (Clawback)	
• Benefits were repaid at the rate of $0.30 for every $1 of net income above the threshold. • For those who had collected 20 or fewer weeks of benefits in the last five years, the threshold was $48,750 of net income (the former level was $63,570). The maximum repayment remained at 30% of benefits received. • For those with more than 20 weeks of benefits in the last five years, the threshold was $39,000 of net income. The maximum repayment varied from 50% to 100% of benefits received, depending on previous use.	• Makes benefits fairer and more accurately reflective of insurance principles. • Discourages repeated use of EI by those with high levels of annual income. • The Benefit Repayment provision was revised in Bill C-2 (2001).
Intensity Rule	
• The intensity rule reduced the benefit rate by 1 percentage point for every 20 weeks of regular or fishing benefits collected in the past five years. • The maximum reduction was 5 percentage points.	• Introduces an element of experience rating to the program, since heavy users of the system bore more of the costs. • Discourages use of Employment Insurance as a regular income supplement rather than insurance for times of unpredictable job loss, while not excessively penalizing those who makes long or frequent claims. • Creates a better balance between contributions made and benefits received. • Repealed in Bill C-2 (2001).
First-dollar Coverage	
• Effective January 1997, all earnings from the first dollar are insurable up to the maximum yearly insurable earnings. There are no weekly minimums or maximums for determining earnings.	• Creates a more equitable and balanced system—all earnings are insurable. • Decreases paper burden for employers. • Helps guard against abusing the system to avoid paying premiums.
Premium Refunds	
• Since 1997, workers earning $2,000 or less per year have had their premiums refunded.	• Helps workers who must pay premiums but do not have enough hours to qualify for benefits.
Increased Sanctions for Fraud	
• Effective July 1996, penalties for fraud by employers and claimants were increased. • Since January 1997, claimants who committed fraud after June 1996 have faced higher entrance requirements.	• Protects the integrity of the Employment Insurance program.

Element	Rationale
Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act*: Employment Benefits and the National Employment Service	
• Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* provides authority for three types of arrangements for employment program implementation and delivery with support from EI funds.	• The Canada EI Commission is authorized to: – establish federal employment programs, coupled with a duty to work with provincial governments regarding their design, delivery and evaluation; – enter into agreements for the administration on its behalf of its employment benefits and support measures; and – enter into agreements with provinces and other entities to contribute toward the costs of their similar benefits and measures programs (Labour Market Development Agreements).