



Employment Insurance

2012/13  
EI Monitoring and  
Assessment Report



Canada Employment Insurance  
Commission (CEIC)

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

Canada  
CEIC-001-05-14E





March 2014

The Honourable Jason Kenney  
Minister of Employment and Social Development and Minister for Multiculturalism  
Place du Portage, Phase IV  
140 Promenade du Portage  
Gatineau, Quebec  
K1A 0J9

Dear Minister,

We are pleased to present the *2012/13 Employment Insurance Monitoring and Assessment Report*, the seventeenth in a series of annual reports submitted by the Canada Employment Insurance Commission, under section 3 of the *Employment Insurance Act*.

This report, which covers the period from April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013, analyzes the overall effectiveness of EI income benefits, active measures and service delivery. In particular, the report focuses on the responsiveness of the EI program in a period of moderate economic growth.

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



Employment Insurance



# 2012/13 EI Monitoring and Assessment Report



Canada Employment Insurance  
Commission (CEIC)

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

**Canada**  
CEIC-001-05-14E

You can download this publication online at  
**[www12.hrsdc.gc.ca](http://www12.hrsdc.gc.ca)**.

This document is available on demand 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). If you use a teletypewriter (TTY), call 1-800-926-9105.

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2014

For information regarding reproduction rights, please contact via e-mail Employment and Social Development Canada at **[droitdauteur.copyright@HRSDC-RHDCC.gc.ca](mailto:droitdauteur.copyright@HRSDC-RHDCC.gc.ca)**.

**PDF**

Cat. No.: Em13-1/2013E-PDF  
ISSN: 1494-7048

**ESDC**

Cat. No.: CEIC-001-05-14E

# TABLE OF CONTENTS



<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE HIGHLIGHTS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 – LABOUR MARKET CONTEXT</b> .....	<b>5</b>
I. Economic Overview .....	5
II. Labour Market Overview .....	8
<b>CHAPTER 2 – IMPACTS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PART I</b> .....	<b>27</b>
I. Total Income Benefits .....	28
II. Assisting Canadians During Unemployment: EI Regular Benefits .....	40
III. EI Fishing Benefits .....	85
IV. EI Special Benefits .....	89
V. EI Work-Sharing Benefits .....	96
VI. EI Income Benefits and Firms .....	100
VII. EI Finances .....	112
<b>CHAPTER 3 – IMPACTS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND SUPPORT MEASURES (EBSMs – EI PART II)</b> .....	<b>113</b>
I. National Overview .....	114
II. Provincial and Territorial EBSM Activities .....	126
III. National Evaluation of EBSM Medium-Term Incremental Impacts .....	151
IV. Pan-Canadian Activities and the National Employment Service .....	159
<b>CHAPTER 4 – PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION</b> .....	<b>171</b>
I. Context .....	171
II. Service Delivery .....	171
III. Quality .....	178
IV. Integrity .....	181

<b>ANNEX 1 – KEY LABOUR MARKET STATISTICS .....</b>	<b>185</b>
<b>ANNEX 2 – INCOME BENEFITS DATA TABLES .....</b>	<b>203</b>
<b>ANNEX 3 – EBSMs DATA TABLES .....</b>	<b>237</b>
<b>ANNEX 4 – KEY PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION DATA AND RESULTS .....</b>	<b>253</b>
<b>ANNEX 5 – EI FINANCES .....</b>	<b>261</b>
<b>ANNEX 6 – KEY STUDIES REFERENCED IN CHAPTER 2 .....</b>	<b>263</b>
<b>ANNEX 7 – RECENT LEGISLATIVE AND TEMPORARY CHANGES TO EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE.....</b>	<b>277</b>



# INTRODUCTION



*Monitoring and assessing the Employment Insurance (EI) 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 EI program provides temporary financial assistance to workers who have lost their job through no fault of their own while they look for work or upgrade their skills, and helps unemployed people across the country find employment. The EI program also provides assistance to workers who are sick, pregnant, or caring for a newborn or adopted child, as well as to those caring for a family member who is gravely ill with a significant risk of death.

The Unemployment Insurance program was first implemented in 1940, with the last major reform occurring in 1996. At that time, the name of the program was changed from “Unemployment Insurance” to “Employment Insurance,” to reflect the program’s primary objective of promoting employment in the labour force, and to better emphasize that individuals’ 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, and overseeing a research agenda contributing to the report. The CEIC’s annual EI Monitoring and Assessment (M&A) report is delivered to the Minister by fiscal year end, for tabling in Parliament.

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

In another key role, the CEIC contributes to 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 Ministers of ESDC and Finance, also for tabling in Parliament. The CEIC 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 determines which EI appeal decisions will be submitted for judicial review by the Federal Court of Appeal. Additionally, two of the Commissioners—for Workers and Employers—serve in tri-partite committee with the chair of the new appeal body, the Social Security Tribunal (SST), which committee is consulted by the Minister for purposes of Governor in Council appointment of members to the EI section of that Tribunal.

The two EI Commissioners have responsibilities to represent their respective stakeholders, reflecting internally, within the department, the concerns and positions of employers and workers on policy development and program delivery related to EI and the labour market. To do this, they establish and maintain discussions/consultations with private sector organizations and individuals interested in and affected by ESDC programs and services, particularly with regard to EI.

### 3. LEGISLATED MANDATE

Section 3 of the *Employment Insurance Act* gives the CEIC the legislated mandate to produce the M&A 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 M&A Report is produced under the direction and guidance of the CEIC. Officials with ESDC and 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. As such, this report 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 in a period of moderate economic growth, the 2012/13 fiscal year. The first chapter of this report discusses the state of the Canadian labour market over that period. The second chapter analyzes the usage, impact and effectiveness of EI income benefits provided under Part I of the *Employment Insurance Act* for the same period. The third chapter discusses the support provided to unemployed workers through active re-employment measures, 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.

# EXECUTIVE HIGHLIGHTS



*The 2012/13 Employment Insurance (EI) Monitoring and Assessment Report examines the EI program for the 2012/13 fiscal year. Unless otherwise indicated, these highlights are for 2012/13 or relate to changes from 2011/12 to 2012/13.*

**Canada's economy and labour market continued to grow at a moderate pace in the face of a challenging external environment.**

- Real gross domestic product grew by 1.5% in 2012/13, which was slower than the growth rate in 2011/12 (+2.3%).
- Annual employment increased by 234,800 (+1.4%). This represents the third consecutive annual increase. Meanwhile, the annual unemployment rate dropped from 7.4% to 7.2%.

**The number of regular and Work-Sharing claims fell, as the result of ongoing economic growth.**

- The number of regular benefits claims decreased by 4.6% to 1.36 million in 2012/13. However, this figure is 4.8% higher than the figure recorded in 2007/08, prior to the onset of the late-2000s recession. Regular benefit payments decreased by 6.1% to \$10.1 billion.
- Work-Sharing benefits claims decreased by 41.5% to 13,890, as claims figures returned to pre-recession levels in 2007/08, while benefit payments decreased by 17.6% to \$26.1 million.

**As a result of an increase in 2012, the EI eligibility rate approached pre-recession levels.**

- Among unemployed workers who had contributed EI premiums and then had a job separation that qualified under the EI program, 81.9% were eligible for EI regular benefits in 2012, an increase of 3.5 percentage points from 2011 (78.4%).
- The increase was attributable mainly to a shift in the labour market characteristics of unemployed EI contributors toward permanent employment.
- Before the recession, the rate was 82.3% in 2007 and 82.7% in 2006.

**The number of EI special claims increased, while the number of fishing benefits claims decreased.**

- The number of special benefits claims increased by 0.3%, to 510,040 in 2012/13.
- Among the special benefits claims in 2011/12, nearly one third (31.6%) combined more than one special benefit in a single claim.
- The number of fishing benefits claims decreased by 4.1% to 28,290 in 2012/13, after increasing by 3.4% the previous year.

### **Participation in Employment Benefits and Support Measures shifted with the economy.**

- A total of 662,260 clients (+2.5%) participated in 1,076,271 interventions (+11.8%).
- The use of Employment Assistance Services increased 14.2% to 901,063 as provinces and territories helped more job-ready clients with short-term interventions while case-managing more non-insured clients facing multiple barriers. Non-insured clients increased 12.7%.
- Apprenticeships responded to a steady demand for skilled trades (-0.5%).

### **Service Canada continued to respond to a higher than normal volume of EI claims.**

- Service Canada processed 2.76 million EI claims in 2012/13.
- Through the **click-call-visit** model, in 2012/13, clients submitted 98.4% of EI applications electronically; EI specialized call centre agents handled 4.4 million client enquiries; resolving close to 85% of calls at the first point of contact and responded to over 4.2 million EI-related visits to an in-person point of service.
- Significant progress has been made on the automation of claims, with 65.7% of EI initial and renewal claims now fully or partially automated.
- The payment accuracy rate was 94.1% in 2012/13. Errors included overpayments and underpayments attributable to three sources: claimants, employers and Service Canada.

## CHAPTER 1

# LABOUR MARKET CONTEXT

*This chapter outlines key labour market developments and the economic context that prevailed in the 2012/13 fiscal year, the period for which this report assesses the Employment Insurance (EI) program.<sup>1</sup> More detailed information on various elements discussed in this chapter is available in Annex 1.*


## I. ECONOMIC OVERVIEW

The Canadian economy has remained resilient in the face of a challenging external environment. The economy grew moderately from 2011 to 2012 with real Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth of 1.8%, which represents a relatively strong economic performance among the Group of Seven (G7) countries, despite ongoing challenges (see Chart 1).<sup>2</sup> Moderate growth is also taking hold in the American economy, while economic performance in the Euro area remains weak. Real GDP growth in China and other emerging countries, although stronger than in the advanced economies, has slowed, resulting in downward pressure on global commodity prices.

More recently, however, the pace of economic growth in Canada has slowed, compared with that in the previous year. Real GDP<sup>3</sup> growth of 1.5% from 2011/12 to 2012/13 was weaker than GDP growth in 2011/12 (+2.3%) and 2010/11 (+3.5%).

**CHART 1**

Annual Change in Real GDP, G7 Countries, 2012



Source: International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook Database.

<sup>1</sup> The reporting period analyzed is the fiscal year from April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013. Unless otherwise indicated, data in this chapter are taken from Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey (LFS) and the National Income and Expenditure Accounts. Annual data are averages of seasonally unadjusted monthly data, while quarterly and monthly data are seasonally adjusted. Please note that calculations may not add up due to rounding.

<sup>2</sup> Real GDP data here come from the International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook Database.

<sup>3</sup> Real GDP is defined as the total unduplicated value of the goods and services produced in Canada. Quarterly GDP data have been seasonally adjusted at annual rates and are expressed in chained (2002) dollars. Real GDP data here come from Statistics Canada, National Income and Expenditure Accounts.

As indicated in Chart 2, after experiencing negative growth rates during the late-2000s recession, the Canadian economy started to recover in the third quarter of 2009 and maintained positive GDP growth rates in subsequent quarters, with the exception of the second quarter of 2011. Growth in 2012/13 was largely driven by relatively sustained strength in demand from Canadian households and businesses, with the strongest GDP growth during the year coming in the first quarter of 2013. Despite earlier weaknesses, the export sector was the largest contributor to growth in the first quarter of 2013, as export volumes increased by 1.5%.<sup>4</sup>


Canada's labour market growth continues to outpace growth in many other Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries. Canada had one of the strongest rates of employment growth records in the G7 between 2011 and 2012 (+1.2%), ranking second (tied with the United Kingdom) among G7 countries (see Chart 3).

Canadian employment has recorded solid gains since the recession, and the unemployment rate declined for the third consecutive year in 2012/13,

falling from 7.4% in 2011/12 to 7.2%. Employment rose by 1.4% (+234,800) from 2011/12 to 2012/13, while unemployment declined by 1.4% (-19,500).

The labour productivity of Canadian businesses fell by 0.6% in 2012/13, after growth of 0.9% in 2011/12 and 1.5% in 2010/11 (see Chart 4).<sup>5</sup> Prior to the late-2000s recession, labour productivity had been rising, but growth has levelled off in recent years.

Canada's labour productivity growth has lagged behind that of many of its peers over the last several decades, hurting Canada's international competitiveness.<sup>6</sup> In 2012, Canada's labour productivity growth ranked fourth among G7 countries, behind the United States, France and Germany (see Chart 5). According to the Conference Board of Canada, productivity is an important determinant of a country's per capita income over the longer term. Countries that are innovative and able to adapt to the ebb and flow of the new global economy boast high productivity and thus a superior standard of living. Potential contributing factors to productivity performance in Canada include access to international markets, business investment and a skilled workforce.




<sup>4</sup> Statistics Canada, *Canadian Economic Accounts Quarterly Review, First Quarter 2013*, Vol. 12 No. 1 (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2013).

<sup>5</sup> Labour productivity is defined as the ratio of output to hours worked in the business sector. For output, a Fisher-chained index method that builds up real value added (or real GDP) in the business sector and its component two-digit industries is used to produce quarterly estimates for productivity measurement. Hours worked represent the total number of hours that a person devotes to work, whether paid or unpaid. From Statistics Canada, *Labour Productivity Measures*.

<sup>6</sup> The Conference Board of Canada, *Labour Productivity Growth* (Ottawa: The Conference Board of Canada, March 2013).

**CHART 3**


Annual Employment Growth, G7 Countries, 2012



Source: International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook Database.

**CHART 5**


Labour Productivity (GDP per Hour Worked, USD Current Prices), G7 Countries, 2012



Source: Organization for Economic and Co-operation and Development, OECD StatExtracts.

**CHART 4**

Labour Productivity Growth, 2007/08 to 2012/13



Source: Statistics Canada, System of National Accounts.

According to the 2013 Survey of Adult Skills, Canada ranks at the OECD average in literacy, with a larger proportion of its population at both the highest and lowest levels. Canada ranks below the OECD average in numeracy, with a larger proportion of Canadians performing at the lowest levels.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *OECD Skills Outlook 2013: First Results from the Survey of Adult Skills* (Paris: OECD, 2013). Statistics Canada, Employment and Social Development Canada, and Council of Ministers of Education, Canada: *Skills in Canada: First Results from the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies* (Ottawa, Statistics Canada, 2013).

## II. LABOUR MARKET OVERVIEW


### 1. Labour Force Participation Rate

The Canadian labour force<sup>8</sup> grew at a pace of 1.1% (+215,300) to 18.9 million in 2012/13, growing faster than in the previous year, when it grew by 0.8%. While the labour force grew by an average of 1.7% annually between 2000/01 and 2008/09, labour force growth has slowed since the late-2000s recession. Between 2008/09 and 2012/13, annual labour force growth averaged 1.1%.

Over the last 10 years, the participation rate<sup>9</sup> has been relatively stable around 67% and has remained higher than rates observed in previous decades (see Chart 6). After registering a decline in 2011/12, the participation rate remained stable at 66.7% in 2012/13. In contrast, the percentage of Americans who participated in the labour force approached a 30-year low in 2012/13. The rate peaked in the late-1990s at 67.1% and has continued to decline since the start of the recession.

A major implication of the recession in the United States has been a significant withdrawal of participants from the labour force.

The participation rate for core-aged people (25 to 54 years) has remained stable over the last decade (see Chart 7). In 2012/13, those aged 25 to 44 years had a participation rate of 87.2%, while the 45 to 54 age group had a participation rate of 85.7%. Since 2000/01, the participation rate of the 55 to 64 age group rose faster than that of any other age group, increasing by 13.1 percentage points, from 51.0% to 64.1%. The participation rate of the 65 and older age group increased by 6.8 percentage points to 12.7% during the same period (the right axis on Chart 7 indicates the labour force participation rate of this group). The increase in labour force participation of older workers has implications for skills shortages and pension plan viability. The participation rate for the 15 to 24 age group has declined by 1.1 percentage points during the past decade, from 64.7% in 2000/01 to 63.6% in 2012/13.




<sup>8</sup> The labour force is defined as the civilian non-institutional population of 15 years of age and older who, during the LFS reference week, were employed or unemployed.

<sup>9</sup> The participation rate is defined as the total labour force aged 15 years and older—the number of people either working or actively searching for work—as a share of the population aged 15 years and older.



**CHART 7**

Labour Force Participation Rate, by Age, 2000/01 to 2012/13



Note: Shaded area corresponds to a recessionary period.

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

In 2012/13, the number of young people (aged 15 to 24) participating in the labour force fell for a fourth consecutive year to 2.8 million individuals (-1.0% in 2012/13). On the other hand, the 55 and older age group grew consistently over the past 10 years, to 3.5 million individuals. As in the early-1990s recession, high unemployment led to a significant decline in labour force participation, particularly among younger Canadians who decided to stay in school and delay their entry into the job market. At the same time, over the last few years, older Canadians have been encouraged to continue working, and delay retirement, particularly given the effect of the global recession on both their financial assets and the employment prospects of their offspring.

## 2. Employment

Canada experienced an increase in employment in 2012/13, with a net gain of 234,800 jobs (+1.4%) from 2011/12 to reach an annual average of 17.6 million employed individuals. Canada has seen three consecutive years of increases in employment since a significant fall in employment in 2009/10 (-1.2%).

Over the last four decades, the national employment rate has trended upward, increasing from 57.1% in 1976/77 to 61.9% in 2012/13, an increase

of 0.1 percentage points from 2011/12 (see Chart 8). A number of factors have contributed to this rise, including increased participation of women in the workforce, and increased educational attainment.

### 2.1 Employment, by Province

Provincial employment levels have trended upward over the past few years, with employment levels increasing in all provinces in 2012/13.


Saskatchewan witnessed the highest employment growth among provinces in 2012/13, with 3.1% growth since 2011/12. Newfoundland and Labrador averaged nearly 3% employment growth per year between 2009/10 and 2012/13, the highest among provinces, and witnessed a 3.0% increase from 2011/12 to 2012/13. Alberta has also experienced strong growth over the past few years, with 3.9% growth in employment between 2010/11 and 2011/12, and 2.4% growth between 2011/12 and 2012/13.

### 2.2 Employment, by Industry

Employment in the service sector has increased consistently over the past decade, even throughout the late-2000s recession. In 2012/13, employment in the service sector increased by 1.2%, slightly lower than increases in 2011/12 (+1.4%) and 2010/11 (+1.7%).

**CHART 8**

Employment Rate, Canada, 1976/77 to 2012/13



Note: Shaded areas correspond to recessionary periods.

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

Industries that witnessed strong employment increases in 2012/13 included educational services (+5.7%), business, building and other support services (+2.6%) and finance, insurance, real estate and leasing (+2.5%).

Employment growth in the educational services industry was strong in both full-time employment (+5.9%) and part-time employment (+5.3%). Additionally, growth in educational services was particularly strong among those aged 55 and older (+10.2%) and in Saskatchewan (+9.5%).

The goods sector, on the other hand, experienced a significant decline in employment during the late-2000s recession from which it has yet to fully recover. The decrease was mainly due to employment losses in manufacturing industries. However, employment has increased in the past three years in the goods sector, with increases of 1.8% in 2012/13 and 0.9% in 2011/12.


In 2012/13, there were strong increases in employment in the forestry, fishing, mining, quarrying, oil and gas industry (+6.0%), which has had the strongest increases within the goods sector in the past three years. Employment in manufacturing increased by 1.6% in 2012/13, its first increase since 2004/05, while employment in construction increased by 0.8% in 2012/13, lower than its increases in 2011/12 (+2.9%) and 2010/11 (+5.8%).

### 2.3 Employment, by Sector, Age and Job Permanency

Employment in the private sector grew by 1.6% in 2012/13, compared with 1.4% in the public sector (see Chart 9). The number of self-employed people increased by 0.4% in 2012/13. The private sector accounted for 64.2% of overall employment, followed

**CHART 9**

Employment Growth, 2011/12 to 2012/13



Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

by the public sector at 20.6% and the self-employed at 15.2%. Employment growth in the private sector was weaker than employment growth in the public sector between 2007/08 and 2010/11, but growth in the private sector has been stronger in the past two years.


Full-time employment grew by 1.7% (+234,900) in 2012/13, while part-time employment experienced no growth.

Canada's aging demographics have affected the workforce over the past decade, with the number of older workers more than doubling from 1.5 million in 2000/01 to 3.3 million in 2012/13. Meanwhile, the share of core-aged workers (25 to 54 years) and younger workers (15 to 24 years) declined from 74.0%

and 15.6%, respectively, in 2000/01 to 67.6% and 13.9% in 2012/13 (see Chart 10). The share of older workers (55 years and older) increased from 10.4% to 18.6% over this period.

In 2012/13, temporary work arrangements—consisting of seasonal jobs (22.5% of temporary employees), term or contract jobs (53.1%), and casual jobs (23.8%)—represented 13.6% of all employees in Canada (see Chart 11). Among the 14.9 million Canadian employees,<sup>10</sup> those with temporary work arrangements rose by 19,000, or 0.9%, from the year before.

Older workers aged 55 years and older witnessed a significant increase in their share of temporary employees, from 7.1% in 2000/01 to 13.8% in 2012/13




<sup>10</sup> Employees are defined in the Labour Force Survey as those who work for others. They can be subdivided into public sector and private sector employees.

(see Chart 12). The share of temporary employees aged 15 to 24 was relatively flat prior to the late-2000s recession; however, since then, it has experienced a significant drop (from 39.6% in 2007/08 to 35.8% in 2012/13).

The 24 to 54 age group have generally accounted for about 50% of temporary employees in Canada and comprised 50.4% of temporary employees in 2012/13.

**CHART 11**


Temporary Work Arrangements as a Share of Employees, 1997/98 to 2012/13



Note: Shaded area corresponds to a recessionary period.  
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

**CHART 12**

Distribution of Temporary Work Arrangements, by Age, 2000/01 to 2012/13



Note: Shaded area corresponds to a recessionary period.  
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

## 2.4 Employment, by Size of Firm

Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), which are firms with fewer than 500 employees, play an important role in the economy. According to a recent Statistics Canada study, SMEs account for 54.2% of GDP in Canada in 2005, compared with 50.7% of GDP in the United States.<sup>11</sup>

The majority of Canadian workers (8.0 million out of 14.9 million employees) worked for SMEs in 2012/13, according to Statistics Canada's Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours (SEPH). However, the share of employees working for SMEs has been falling since 2000; the share was 55.2% in 2000/01, compared with 53.9% in 2012/13.

Among SMEs, enterprises with fewer than 20 employees accounted for 19.6% of the workforce, while those with 20 to 99 employees accounted for another 19.2%. Enterprises with 100 to 499 employees made up 15.1% of the workforce and the remaining 46.1% of the workforce worked in large firms (500 employees or more).

## 2.5 Wages


Average weekly wages<sup>12</sup> grew by 2.5% in 2012/13, to \$876 (see Chart 13). 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 up to the maximum insurable earnings (MIE) amount. The MIE for 2013 was \$47,400, up 3.3% from \$45,900 in 2012.

Provincially, Alberta had the highest average weekly earnings at \$1,027, followed by Newfoundland and Labrador at \$900, Ontario at \$893, and Saskatchewan at \$890 (see Chart 13).

Average weekly earnings rose in every province in 2012/13 (see Chart 14), with the highest growth occurring in Saskatchewan (+3.9%), followed by Newfoundland and Labrador (+3.8%). New Brunswick experienced the lowest wage growth (+1.8%), followed by Ontario (+2.0%).

**CHART 13**

Average Weekly Earnings, by Province, 2012/13




Source: Statistics Canada, Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours.

<sup>11</sup> Danny Leung and Luke Rispoli, *The Contribution of Small and Medium-Sized Businesses to Gross Domestic Product: A Canada–United States Comparison*, Economic Analysis Research Paper Series (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2011).

<sup>12</sup> Average weekly earnings are calculated by dividing gross taxable payrolls (excluding overtime) by the number of employees. Gross taxable payrolls include regular pay, bonuses, commissions and other types of special payments. Earnings are expressed in current dollars, not in real terms.

**CHART 14**

Average Weekly Earnings Growth, by Province, 2011/12 to 2012/13



Source: Statistics Canada, Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours.

Employees in the goods sector had higher average weekly earnings (\$1,073) than employees in the service sector (\$830). Employees in the goods sector have consistently had higher average weekly earnings than employees in the service sector over the past decade.

Employees in the mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction industry had the highest average weekly earnings (\$1,655) in 2012/13, followed by workers in the utilities industry (\$1,509). The accommodation and food services industry, meanwhile, had the lowest average weekly earnings (\$362). This is due partly to the high proportion of part-time workers in the industry and correspondingly lower average hours worked per week, as described below.

## 2.6 Hours Worked

The average hours worked per week increased for a third consecutive year in 2012/13 to 30.6 hours, an increase of 0.1 hour from 2011/12. EI benefit eligibility requirements and benefit entitlements are based, in part, on the number of insurable hours worked in the previous year.


Employees in Newfoundland and Labrador, Alberta and New Brunswick worked the most hours per week on average, with 32.6, 32.4 and 31.7 hours, respectively. Employees in Newfoundland and Labrador worked two hours more a week than the national average. Employees in British Columbia and Manitoba worked the fewest number of hours in 2012/13, with an average of 29.8 and 29.9 hours, respectively (see Chart 15).

Employees in the goods sector worked 37.6 hours per week on average in 2012/13, similar to the number in the previous year (37.5 hours). Employees in the service sector, meanwhile, worked 28.6 hours per week on average in 2012/13, also similar to results in the previous year (28.5 hours).

In 2012/13, employees in the mining, quarrying, oil and gas extraction industry worked the most hours per week (40.6 hours), while those in the utilities industry also worked a significant number of hours per week (40.4 hours). The educational services industry had the lowest number of hours worked per week (17.8 hours), followed by the accommodation and food services industry (23.0 hours).

**CHART 15**

Average Hours Worked per Week, by Province, 2012/13



Source: Statistics Canada, Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours.

### 3. Unemployment

In 2012/13, there were 1.36 million unemployed individuals on average in a given month, which represented a 1.4% decrease from 2011/12.

For the third year in a row, Canada's annual unemployment rate declined, reaching 7.2% in 2012/13, compared with 7.4% in 2011/12 and 7.9% in 2010/11. The unemployment rate in 2012/13 was still 1.2 percentage points higher than the 6.0% observed in 2007/08, one year prior to the onset of the late-2000s recession (see Chart 16). The OECD recently projected Canada's unemployment rate would drop further by the end of 2014 to 6.7% and that its labour market advantage over the United States would lessen, with both countries projected to post similar unemployment rates over the coming years.<sup>13</sup>


The duration of unemployment fluctuates due to a number of factors, including the economic business cycle and the skills requirements of the labour market relative to the skills of the unemployed. The average duration of unemployment dropped to 18.1 weeks in 2012/13 from 18.6 weeks the year before (see Chart 17).<sup>14</sup> Nevertheless, it represents an increase of 4.2 weeks from 2007/08, the year before the late-2000s recession.

<sup>13</sup> OECD, *OECD Employment Outlook 2013* (Paris: OECD, 2013).

<sup>14</sup> 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. Note that in order to compare the latest recession with previous recessions, data on duration of unemployment for an individual were limited to a maximum of 99 weeks.

**CHART 16**


Unemployment Rate, Canada, 1976/77 to 2012/13



Note: Shaded areas correspond to recessionary periods.  
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

**CHART 17**

Average Duration of Unemployment (Weeks), Canada, 1976/77 to 2012/13



Note: Shaded areas correspond to recessionary periods.  
Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.



### 3.1 Unemployment Rate and Duration, by Province

Unemployment rates in Western Canada remained considerably lower than the national average due to the region's strong economic performance in recent years. Saskatchewan registered the lowest unemployment rate (4.4%) in 2012/13, fuelled in large part by demand in global energy markets, followed by Alberta at 4.5%, Manitoba at 5.2% and British Columbia at 6.6%. As in most other provinces, unemployment rates in the West remained higher than rates observed before the late-2000s recession in 2007/08 (see Chart 18).

Alberta and Newfoundland and Labrador witnessed the largest drop in their unemployment rates in 2012/13, as both provinces experienced a decrease of 0.7 percentage points in their unemployment rates since 2011/12. In Newfoundland and Labrador, the unemployment rate dropped from 12.9% in 2011/12 to 12.2% in 2012/13.

For the seventh consecutive year, the unemployment rate in Ontario was higher than the national average. This was in contrast to the three decades prior to 2005, when Ontario's unemployment rate was consistently below the national average. Since the depths of the global recession, Ontario has begun to show signs of strengthening, with the service sector and construction industry leading employment growth.


Quebec's unemployment rate decreased to 7.6% in 2012/13 from 7.9% in 2011/12. Nevertheless, the unemployment rate in 2012/13 was higher than it was in 2007/08, when it was 7.1%. The unemployment rate in the province has fluctuated around the 8% mark since the early 2000s—considerably lower than the 11% average registered in the 24 years prior, between 1976/77 and 1999/2000. With the exception of 2010/11, Quebec's unemployment rate has been consistently higher than the national average for the past 30 years.

The Atlantic provinces continued to have the highest unemployment rates in the country in 2012/13. Despite the downward trend in Newfoundland and Labrador's unemployment rate over the last four years, it remained 5.0 percentage points above the national average. Prince Edward Island's unemployment rate has fluctuated around 11% for the past decade, while Nova Scotia and New Brunswick experienced slightly lower rates over this period, around 8% and 9%, respectively.

The provinces with the longest duration of unemployment do not necessarily correspond with the provinces with the highest unemployment rate. This is likely due to the nature of unemployment across the country; for instance, in the Atlantic provinces, unemployment levels rise and fall with the seasons

**CHART 18**

Unemployment Rate, by Province, 2007/08 and 2012/13



Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

to a larger extent,<sup>15</sup> while in Ontario and Quebec, the decline in manufacturing has resulted in more dislocated workers and more long-term unemployment.<sup>16</sup> Ontarians experienced the longest average duration of unemployment (19.9 weeks) in 2012/13, followed by Quebec residents at 18.5 weeks (see Chart 19). The duration of unemployment was below the national average of 18.1 weeks in the remaining provinces. When compared with the pre-recession level of 2007/08, Ontario also registered the largest increase in the average duration of unemployment (+6.1 weeks), followed by British Columbia and Manitoba at 5.8 and 4.7 weeks, respectively. Newfoundland and Labrador was the only province where the average duration of unemployment was lower in 2012/13 than in 2007/08 (-0.3 weeks).


### 3.2 Unemployment Rate and Duration, by Gender

Men reported a higher unemployment rate than that for women in 2012/13 (see Chart 20). The unemployment rate for men decreased by 0.1 percentage points to 7.6%, and declined for the third consecutive year. For women, the unemployment rate declined for a second year in 2012/13, falling by 0.2 percentage points to 6.7%. For men and women, the unemployment rates were 1.3 and 1.1 percentage points higher, respectively, than those in 2007/08, when unemployment rates were at their lowest since comparable data have been collected.

As shown in Chart 20, the gender unemployment rate gap reversed itself in the early-1990s. Since that time, unemployment rates for women have remained consistently lower than unemployment rates for men by 0.9 percentage points, on average. In 2012/13, the gender gap was 0.9 percentage points—an improvement from 2.4 percentage points in 2009/10, the year with the largest gap since Statistics Canada started recording comparable data in 1976/77. The gender unemployment rate gap tends to be at its highest during recessions and subsequently falls during recoveries.

**CHART 19**

Average Duration of Unemployment (Weeks), by Province, 2007/08 and 2012/13




Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

<sup>15</sup> Andrew Sharpe and Jeremy Smith, *Labour Market Seasonality in Canada: Trends and Policy*, Centre for the Study of Living Standards (Ottawa: prepared for Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, 2005).

<sup>16</sup> Jane Lin, *Trends in employment and wages, 2002 to 2007* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2008).

As indicated in Chart 21, over the last 30 years, men have nearly always experienced a longer average duration of unemployment than women have. In 2012/13,

the average duration of unemployment was 18.5 weeks for men and 17.7 weeks for women.




### 3.3 Unemployment Rate and Duration, by Age

In 2012/13, the unemployment rates across all major age groups remained relatively unchanged. For individuals between the ages of 25 to 54, the unemployment rate decreased from 6.1% in 2011/12 to 5.9% in 2012/13. For youths aged 15 to 24, the unemployment rate remained stable at 14.1%, while for older workers (aged 55 years and older), it decreased from 6.2% to 6.0%.

Although younger Canadians continued to face higher unemployment rates than other cohorts in 2012/13, their average duration of unemployment was significantly lower, at 11.1 weeks, than those for core-aged and older workers, which were 20.3 and 23.9 weeks, respectively (see Chart 22). In other words, unemployment spells generally last longer for people in older cohorts, although they are less likely to be unemployed than their younger counterparts.


In 2012/13, the unemployment rate of youth was 2.4 times higher than that of core-aged workers (25 to 54 years). The rates were 14.1% and 6.0%, respectively, which represented the largest unemployment rate gap between the two groups since comparable data were first published in 1976/77 (see Chart 23).

**CHART 22**  
Average Duration of Unemployment and Unemployment Rate, by Age Group, 2012/13



Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

**CHART 23**  
Unemployment Rate, by Age Group, 1976/77 to 2012/13




Note: Shaded areas correspond to recessionary periods.

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

### 3.4 Unemployment Rate, by Educational Attainment

Canadians with higher educational levels have generally found greater success in the labour market, with unemployment rates inversely related to educational attainment. In 2012/13, the unemployment rate among individuals with a university degree<sup>17</sup> was 5.0%, compared with 5.7% for those with a post-secondary certificate or diploma<sup>18</sup> and 8.1% for those who graduated high school<sup>19</sup> (see Chart 24). The unemployment rate was 14.8% among those who did not complete high school.<sup>20</sup>



### 3.5 Unemployment, by Reason for Unemployment

Unemployment spells can result from a number of factors. The grounds for a given unemployment spell are a key factor in determining eligibility for EI regular benefits. Generally, benefits are only available to individuals who have lost their job through no fault of their own or left their job with just cause.<sup>21</sup>

In 2012/13, individuals who became unemployed because they lost their jobs (job losers)<sup>22</sup> accounted for the largest share of unemployment in Canada (43.4%). On the other hand, individuals who were unemployed because they left their jobs (job leavers)<sup>23</sup> accounted for the smallest share (18.7%) of unemployment. Individuals who have not worked in the last year or never worked accounted for 37.9% of the unemployed. As shown in Table 1, these figures remained similar to those reported in 2011/12.

However, these figures differ significantly from the pre-recession figures in 2007/08. For example, the share of the unemployed who left their jobs fell during the recession, decreased by 5.6 percentage points, from 24.3% in 2007/08 to 18.7% in 2012/13.

<sup>17</sup> This group includes people with at least a university bachelor's degree.

<sup>18</sup> People in this group have a certificate (including a trade certificate) or diploma from an educational institution beyond the secondary level. Such credentials include certificates from vocational schools, apprenticeship training, community colleges, *collèges d'enseignement général et professionnel* (CEGEPs) and schools of nursing, and certificates below a bachelor's degree obtained at a university.

<sup>19</sup> This group includes those who graduated from high school and those who graduated from high school and attained some post-secondary education (but did not complete it).

<sup>20</sup> This group includes both those with zero to eight years of education and those who have some high school education but did not graduate.

<sup>21</sup> 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*.

<sup>22</sup> "Individuals who lost their job" refers to persons currently not employed, who last worked within the previous year and left that job involuntarily (due to business conditions or downsizing). It includes people affected by both temporary and permanent lay-offs.

<sup>23</sup> "Individuals who left their job" refers to people currently not employed who last worked within the previous year and left that job voluntarily. Reasons for leaving include illness, personal or family responsibilities, school attendance, no specific reason, change of residence, dissatisfaction with their job, retirement, sale or closure of their business (self-employed only), and pregnancy.

**TABLE 1****Share of Unemployment, by Reason for Unemployment, from 2007/08 to 2012/13**

	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Job leavers	24.3%	22.0%	18.0%	17.7%	18.5%	18.7%
Job losers	45.7%	49.4%	51.8%	45.8%	42.7%	43.4%
Those who have not worked in the last year or never worked	29.9%	28.5%	30.1%	36.5%	38.8%	37.9%

**3.6 Unemployment, by Duration**

In 2012/13, most unemployed people (76.2%) were unemployed for 26 weeks or less, with 33.7% of the unemployed population unemployed for 4 weeks or less (see Chart 25). Those unemployed for 27 weeks or more represented 19.4% of the total unemployed, or 263,800 unemployed individuals.

However, the share of the long-term unemployed—those who have been jobless for a year or longer—has nearly doubled since the beginning of the late-2000s recession. In 2012/13, 162,600 people, representing 12.0% of the unemployed population, had been unemployed for at least a year. While this percentage dropped by 0.9 percentage points compared with the previous year, it was still higher than it was in 2007/08, when it was 6.9% (see Chart 26).

According to the OECD, Canada's long-term unemployed accounted for 12.5% of the total unemployed in 2012 (see Chart 27), which was well below the proportions in other G7 countries, such as Italy (53.0%) and Japan (45.5%).


In 2012/13, Ontario, British Columbia and Quebec registered the highest shares of long-term unemployment, with 14.3%, 12.1% and 12.1%, respectively (see Chart 28). The proportions in the four Atlantic provinces were lower, ranging from 6.3% to 8.8%. An OECD report recently suggested that, despite an improving labour market, the problem of long-term unemployment remains in Canada, with key determinants being barriers to geographical and occupational mobility, a skills mismatch, and employers' preference for hiring new labour-market entrants and the short-term unemployed.<sup>24</sup>

Ontario experienced the most significant increase in the share of long-term unemployment since 2007/08 (+7.5 percentage points), followed by British Columbia (+5.7 percentage points). In 2012/13, the share of long-term unemployment for older workers (55 years and older) was the highest in Ontario and British Columbia at 23.7% and 24.7%, respectively. Since 2007/08, the share of long-term unemployment for older workers, as a percentage of their total unemployment, increased by 10.5 and 6.5 percentage points in Ontario and British Columbia, respectively.

<sup>24</sup> OECD, *OECD Employment Outlook 2013* (Paris: OECD, 2013).

**CHART 25**

Distribution of Total Unemployed, 2012/13




Note: Unemployed distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here.

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

**CHART 26**

Long-Term Unemployed as a Percentage of Total Unemployed, 1976/77 to 2012/13




Note: Shaded areas correspond to recessionary periods.

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

**CHART 27**

Long-Term Unemployed as a Proportion of Total Unemployed, G7 Countries, 2012



Source: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, StatExtracts Database.


### 3.7 Job Vacancies and Unemployment-to-Job-Vacancy Ratio

In 2012/13, there were 243,800 vacant jobs in Canada on average in a given month, compared with 238,700 in 2011/12. For every job vacancy, there was an average of 5.6 unemployed people in 2012/13, a slight decrease from 5.8 unemployed people in 2011/12. The Western provinces registered the lowest unemployment-to-job-vacancy ratios,<sup>25</sup> while the Atlantic provinces registered the highest (see Chart 29).

There were 1.2 unemployed people per job vacancy in the health care and social assistance industry, the lowest ratio among the 10 largest industries in Canada, while the educational services industry experienced the highest ratio among these industries, with 7.2 unemployed for every vacant job (see Chart 30).<sup>26</sup>

**CHART 28**

Long-Term Unemployed as a Proportion of Total Unemployed, by Province, 2007/08 and 2012/13



Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

<sup>25</sup> Data on job vacancies are collected through the monthly Business Payrolls Survey (BPS). A position is considered "vacant" if it meets all three of the following conditions: a specific position exists; work could start within 30 days; and the employer is actively seeking employees from outside the organization to fill the position. The unemployment-to-job-vacancy ratio is calculated using LFS data by dividing the total number of unemployed people, regardless of their previous work experience, by the number of vacant positions. This ratio reflects how many unemployed individuals are available for each vacant position and is a measure of the tightness of the overall labour market.

<sup>26</sup> Industry-specific ratios of unemployment-to-job vacancies are for people who had worked in those industries within the previous 12 months. Those who had never worked or had not worked for at least 12 months are not part of the industry-specific ratios.




The number of job vacancies varies significantly across provinces (see Chart 31). Ontario had the highest number of vacancies (76,000) in 2012/13, followed by Alberta (55,500) and Quebec (45,200). The four Atlantic provinces accounted for a total of 12,000 job vacancies in 2012/13.

As shown in Chart 32, the number of job vacancies was highest in the health care and social assistance industry (39,000), followed by the retail trade industry (25,700), and the accommodation and food services industry (25,400). The educational services industry had the fewest job vacancies at 7,400.

**CHART 29**


Unemployment-to-Job-Vacancy Ratio (Number of Unemployed People per Job Vacancy), by Province, 2012/13



Source: Statistics Canada, Job Vacancy Statistics.

**CHART 30**


Unemployment-to-Job-Vacancy Ratio (Number of Unemployed People per Job Vacancy), by Industry, 2012/13



Source: Statistics Canada, Job Vacancy Statistics.

### CHART 31


Number of Job Vacancies (000s), by Province, 2012/13



Source: Statistics Canada, Job Vacancy Statistics.

### CHART 32

Number of Job Vacancies (000s), by Industry, 2012/13



Source: Statistics Canada, Job Vacancy Statistics.

## CHAPTER 2

# IMPACTS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PART I



*This chapter examines the usage, impacts and effectiveness of Employment Insurance (EI) income benefits under Part I of the Employment Insurance Act.*

Section I analyses total income benefits, which combine all EI benefit types (regular, fishing, special and Work-Sharing benefits). Section II examines income support provided by EI regular benefits to individuals who lost their jobs through no fault of their own. Section III discusses EI fishing benefits paid to self-employed fishers. Section IV examines the role EI plays in helping Canadians balance work commitments with family responsibilities and personal illnesses through EI special benefits, which include maternity, parental, sickness and compassionate care benefits. Section V discusses EI Work-Sharing benefits, which help employers and employees avoid temporary layoffs when business activity declines below normal levels. Section VI profiles firms and their employees' usage of EI income benefits. Finally, section VII provides general information on EI finances.

Unless otherwise indicated, numerical figures, tables and charts in this chapter are based on a 10%<sup>1</sup> sample of EI administrative data. Throughout the chapter, data for 2012/13 are compared with data from previous years and, in some instances, long-term trends are discussed.<sup>2</sup> More data on the benefits discussed in this chapter can be found in Annex 2.

Beyond the discussion of usage (claims<sup>3</sup> and benefits paid<sup>4</sup>), this chapter also provides different measures that analyses the support provided by EI Part I benefits.

In this report, the main source used to examine coverage of, eligibility for and accessibility to EI benefits among unemployed people is Statistics Canada's Employment Insurance Coverage Survey. In addition, data from the Labour Force Survey are used to explore eligibility for EI benefits among the employed population. Supplementary analysis of job separations from Records of Employment is also provided in this chapter.

This chapter also analyses the support provided by EI Part I benefits by reporting on various indicators, including the level of, entitlement to, duration of, exhaustion of and income redistribution from benefits. The level of benefits indicates the generosity of benefits, usually expressed as the average weekly benefit. Entitlement is the maximum number of weeks of benefits payable, which varies depending on the benefit type being discussed. Duration is the average number of benefit weeks that claimants actually use. Exhaustion occurs for two reasons – claims for which all eligible

<sup>1</sup> Due to the relatively small number of fishing, Work-Sharing and compassionate care claims, 100% of these claims established during 2012/13 are used to ensure reliability.

<sup>2</sup> Administrative data in this report provide a snapshot of claims taken in August of each year. A snapshot of the fiscal year 2012/13, taken later, would provide slightly different figures, without qualitatively changing the conclusions.

<sup>3</sup> Claims refer to new claims established in 2012/13 for which at least \$1 of EI benefits was paid. Multiple types of benefits could be included in a single claim.

<sup>4</sup> Benefits paid in 2012/13 could be associated with claims established in previous fiscal years.

regular weeks have been paid and claims that have reached the final week of the benefit period before all eligible regular benefits 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, several key EI provisions and pilot projects are discussed. EI provisions (permanent features of the EI program) are legislated, while pilot projects are temporary measures that modify or replace existing provisions. EI pilot projects are used to test and assess the labour market impacts of new approaches before considering a permanent change to EI. Through these provisions and pilots, the program strives to find a balance between providing adequate income benefits and encouraging work attachment. It does so by providing incentives for EI claimants to work more before establishing a claim, as well as to work while on claim.

This chapter also discusses changes to the EI program introduced through Economic Action Plans 2012 and 2013. The changes to the EI program included the Connecting Canadians to Available Jobs initiative, which clarified EI claimants' responsibilities to undertake a reasonable job search; the Variable Best Weeks approach to calculating the weekly EI benefit rate; and the new Working While on Claim (WWC) pilot project. Economic Action Plan 2013 also extended the temporary Hiring Credit for Small Business for one year;

it provides a credit of up to \$1,000 against a small employer's increase in 2013 EI premiums over those paid in 2012.

For a detailed overview of major changes to the EI program from January 1996 to March 2013, please refer to Annex 7 of the report.


## I. TOTAL INCOME BENEFITS

### 1. Total Income Benefits, Claims and Benefits

In 2012/13, the total number of new EI claims and benefits decreased relative to 2011/12.

The total number of new EI income benefit claims decreased by 3.4% (-63,680), from 1.88 million in 2011/12 to 1.82 million in 2012/13. As illustrated in Chart 1, the total number of new EI claims rose to 2.14 million in 2008/09 and further increased to 2.17 million in 2009/10. These increases were direct results of the late-2000s recession. Since 2010/11, EI claim volumes have decreased slightly, as the economy has been growing at a moderate pace.

The decrease in the number of total EI claims in 2012/13 was primarily driven by a 4.6% (-65,460) decrease in EI regular benefits claims, and a 41.5% (-9,865) decrease in EI Work-Sharing benefits claims. A distribution of all EI Part I claims in 2012/13 is provided in Table 1.



Along with the decrease in the number of total EI claims, total EI benefits also declined by 3.1% (-\$0.5 billion), from \$15.7 billion in 2011/12 to \$15.2 billion in 2012/13, after a decrease of 9.4% (-\$1.6 billion) in 2011/12. As of 2012/13, total EI benefits had decreased for three consecutive years, although they were still significantly higher than amounts prior to the late-2000s recession. Specifically, total income benefits were 23.4% higher in 2012/13 than in 2007/08 (\$12.3 billion). Multiple factors help explain why benefits were higher in 2012/13 than in 2007/08. First, between 2001/02 and 2006/07, average weekly benefits increased by 9.2%.

Comparatively, from 2007/08 to 2012/13, average weekly benefits increased by 14.5%. The higher rate of growth in average weekly benefits since 2007/08 contributed to the larger figure for total income benefits in 2012/13. Second, among regular claimants, the average duration of benefits used was longer in the fiscal years from 2007/08 onward. The 2013/14 Monitoring and Assessment Report will provide an update on the average duration of regular benefits used for 2012/13. Third, the Canadian unemployment rate increased from 6.0% in 2007/08 to 7.2% in 2012/13, suggesting that there were fewer employment opportunities in 2012/13, which may have led some EI claimants to stay on EI benefits longer.


The decline in total EI benefits between 2011/12 and 2012/13 was largely driven by a 6.1% decline (from \$10.7 billion in 2011/12 to \$10.1 billion in 2012/13) in regular benefits as the result of on-going economic growth and the conclusion of the temporary EI measures introduced in response to the late-2000s recession. As shown in Chart 2, regular benefits accounted for 66.1% of total income benefits in 2012/13, decreasing from 68.2% in the previous year (-2.1 percentage points). Special benefits accounted for 29.5% of total benefits, increasing

**TABLE 1**  
**Total EI Income Benefits Claims (Part I), 2012/13**

Type of EI Benefit	EI Claims
EI Regular Benefits	1,356,810
EI Special Benefits <sup>1</sup>	510,040
EI Parental Benefits	192,470
EI Sickness Benefits	329,750
EI Maternity Benefits	170,680
EI Compassionate Care Benefits	6,102
EI Fishing Benefits	28,290
EI Work-Sharing Benefits	13,890
<b>Total<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>1,819,940</b>

<sup>1</sup> The numbers for EI special benefits do not add up to the total presented because EI claimants can apply for multiple types of EI benefits in one EI claim.

<sup>2</sup> The numbers in this table do not add up to the total presented because EI claimants can apply for multiple types of EI benefits in one EI claim.



from 27.3% the previous year (+2.2 percentage points). All other types of benefits, including EI fishing benefits, EI Work-Sharing benefits, and EI Part I benefits paid to Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSMs) participants, comprised 4.5% of total EI income benefits. More detailed information on EBSMs can be found in Chapter 3, and more detailed information on total income benefits can be found in Annex 2.1.

The number of regular claims and the total amount of regular benefits tend to be sensitive to economic cycles and labour market conditions, while the number of special claims and the total amount of special benefits tend to be sensitive to demographic shifts and to changes in labour force characteristics. For example, in 2012/13, the unemployment rate decreased by 0.2 percentage points, from 7.4% in 2011/12 to 7.2%. This was aligned with declines of 4.6% (-65,460) in the number of regular EI claims and 6.1% (-\$649.2 million) in EI regular benefits. However, there were increases of 0.3% (+1,540) in the number of EI special claims and 4.7% (+\$200.9 million) in the total amount of EI special benefits.

### 1.1 Total Income Benefits, by Province and Territory

Provincial and territorial labour markets vary in their demographic and sectoral composition. As shown in Table 2, the provincial/territorial distribution of EI claims does not necessarily align with the distribution of employment in each jurisdiction. For example, the Atlantic provinces had a disproportionate number of claims relative to their employment<sup>5</sup> share. The Atlantic provinces accounted for 15.1% of total EI claims in 2012/13 but accounted for 6.3% of all employment. In contrast, Ontario accounted for 31.7% of total EI claims in 2012/13, and 38.7% of employment. Combined, Ontario and Quebec accounted for the majority of all EI claims (59.4%) and employment (61.5%).

In terms of benefits, similar to the analysis of claims, in 2012/13, the Atlantic provinces received a disproportionate amount of benefits relative to their employment share. The Atlantic provinces accounted for 17.5% of total benefits, compared

**TABLE 2**  
**EI Claims, Employment, Benefits and Average Weekly Benefit, by Province and Territory, 2012/13**

Province or Territory	% of Total EI Claims	% of Employment	% of Total Benefits	Average Weekly Benefit
Newfoundland and Labrador	4.5	1.3	5.5	\$407
Prince Edward Island	1.2	0.4	1.4	\$398
Nova Scotia	4.5	2.6	5.1	\$389
New Brunswick	4.9	2.0	5.5	\$385
Quebec <sup>1</sup>	27.7	22.8	22.7	\$390
Ontario	31.7	38.7	33.3	\$393
Manitoba	3.2	3.6	3.0	\$381
Saskatchewan	2.4	3.1	2.5	\$408
Alberta	8.0	12.3	8.6	\$423
British Columbia	11.6	13.2	11.9	\$389
Nunavut	0.1	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.1	\$466
Northwest Territories	0.1	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.2	\$460
Yukon	0.1	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.2	\$452
<b>Canada</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>\$395</b>

Sources: ESDC, EI administrative data; Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

<sup>1</sup> Quebec claims do not include claims for maternity and parental benefits, as the province has its own program—the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP)—to provide such benefits.

<sup>2</sup> The Labour Force Survey does not capture employment data for the Territories.

<sup>5</sup> According to Statistics Canada's definition, "employment" includes persons who, during the reference week, worked for pay or profit, or performed unpaid family work or had a job but were not at work due to own illness or disability, personal or family responsibilities, labour dispute, vacation, or other reason. Those persons on layoff and persons without work but who had a job to start at a definite date in the future are not considered employed.

with 6.9% of employment. Conversely, Ontario accounted for 33.3% of total benefits, compared with 39.1% of employment. These proportions are consistent with averages for the previous five fiscal years combined.

In 2012/13, total benefits declined in nine provinces and territories, with the sharpest declines occurring in Newfoundland and Labrador (-5.5%, -\$48.4 million) and British Columbia (-5.0%, -\$95.9 million). Of the four provinces and territories with increases in total benefits, the sharpest increases occurred in Yukon (+8.6%, +\$2.5 million) and Manitoba (+2.3%, +\$10.6 million).

In 2012/13, average weekly benefit rates increased in every province and territory. The most notable increases took place in Nunavut (+\$27, +6.1%), Saskatchewan (+\$16, +4.2%) and Prince Edward Island (+\$16, +4.3%). The increases observed in the provincial and territorial average weekly benefit rates were relatively in line with the increases in average weekly earnings, as discussed in Chapter 1. In addition, the maximum weekly benefit in Canada increased from \$485 in 2012 to \$501 in 2013 (+\$16, +3.3%), which contributed to the higher average weekly benefits in the provinces and territories. Provincial and territorial average weekly benefits

ranged from \$381 in Manitoba to \$466 in Nunavut. The three territories had the highest average weekly benefit nationally (Table 2).

### 1.2 Total Income Benefits, by Gender and Age

The number of claims established by women decreased by 21,080 (-2.5%) in 2012/13, following an increase of 22,220 (+2.7%) in 2011/12. The number of claims established by men declined by 42,600 (-4.2%) in 2012/13, after a slight increase of 14,610 (+1.4%) in 2011/12.

The decrease in EI claims for men was mostly attributed to the 7.2% decrease in the number of claims established in the goods sector, where men tend to be over-represented. According to the Labour Force Survey (LFS), men represented 78.2% of workers in the goods sector in 2012/13.<sup>6</sup>

As shown in Chart 3, the proportion of total EI claims established by men increased to a high of 57.6% in 2008/09, while the proportion of total EI claims established by women fell to a low of 42.4%. This is attributable to the fact that the late-2000s recession had a relatively greater impact on industries in the goods sector, such as manufacturing and construction, where men are over-represented



<sup>6</sup> Statistics Canada, *Labour Force Information* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada), Cat. No. 71-001-XIE.

(for example, in 2012/13, men accounted for 71.9% and 88.0% of employment in those industries, respectively). However, since 2008/09, the proportion of total EI claims established by men has declined every year, reaching 54.0% in 2012/13. In contrast, since 2008/09, the proportion of total EI claims established by women has increased every year, rising to 46.0% in 2012/13. The proportion of claims established in 2012/13 by men and women were similar to the levels observed in the early 2000s.

Total benefits paid to men decreased by 4.6 % in 2012/13, after a decrease of 12.1% in the previous year, while total benefits paid to women fell by 1.5% in 2012/13, after a decrease of 6.2% in the previous year. Despite an overall decline in 2012/13, total benefits remained significantly higher than pre-recession levels (23.0% higher for men and 23.7% higher for women in comparison to figures in 2007/08).

The total number of EI claims established by younger workers (aged 15 to 24 years) and core-aged workers (aged 25 to 54 years) decreased by 5.5% (-11,140) and 4.0% (-53,530), respectively, while older workers (55 and older) experienced a slight increase of 0.3% (+990). In comparison to pre-recession levels in 2007/08, the claim volume remained higher for older workers (+32.5%), but lower for younger workers (-5.0%) and core-aged workers (-0.9%). The larger increase in claim volume among older workers could be attributable to the lingering effects of the late-2000s recession, as the precarious financial climate may have caused some older workers to either re-enter the labour market to earn additional income or postpone retirement until the economy strengthens significantly. In addition, the aging of the Canadian demographic has significantly increased the size of the older worker cohort, which may have increased the number of EI claims in this age cohort. Since 2007/08, there has been a 28.0% (+714,900) increase in the number of older workers. During the same period, there has only been a 1.4% (+161,700) increase in core-aged workers, while there has been a 7.4% (-193,700) decrease in younger workers.

## 2. Income Redistribution from Income Benefits

To measure the extent of redistribution for total EI income benefits, the amount of EI benefits paid to each province/territory, industry or demographic group is divided by the total amount of EI premiums collected. This is the benefits-to-contributions (B/C) ratio. These ratios are then normalized, with the ratio for Canada set at 1.0.<sup>7</sup> The resulting ratio for each group indicates whether the province/territory, industry or demographic group receives more in EI benefits than it contributes to the program, relative to Canada as a whole. For this report, the amount of EI premiums collected was based on the latest Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) tax data available, which were for 2011. EI benefit data used for this analysis of B/C ratios were therefore for 2011 as well.

A province/territory, industry or demographic group with an adjusted ratio higher than 1.0 is a net beneficiary of the EI program, while those with an adjusted ratio lower than 1.0 are net contributors to the program within a nationwide context. Annex 2.19 provides a detailed account of EI premiums collected and regular benefits paid across different provinces and territories, industries, and demographic groups.

### 2.1 Benefits-to-Contributions Ratios, by Province and Territory<sup>8</sup>

The Atlantic provinces and Quebec continued to be net beneficiaries of EI total income benefits in 2011, as they were in previous years, with adjusted ratios greater than 1.0, while Ontario and the Prairie provinces<sup>9</sup> remained net contributors, with adjusted ratios below 1.0.


Generally, provinces with higher benefits-to-contributions ratios also have higher unemployment rates. In 2011, the four Atlantic provinces were the four largest net beneficiaries of EI total income benefits, and they also had the highest unemployment rates of all provinces (see Chart 4).

<sup>7</sup> For ease of analysis, the benefits-to-contributions ratios have been adjusted so that the national figure equals 1.0. Provincial/territorial, industry and demographic figures have been normalized to enable a standardized base for comparative purposes. As a result, actual premium contributions and benefits paid will not equate to adjusted benefits-to-contributions ratios.

<sup>8</sup> Provincial and Territorial benefits-to-contributions (B/C) ratios are determined by the location of employers for premiums and of claimants for benefits. As a result, it is possible that some provincial/territorial B/C ratios may be under/overstated if contributions are being accredited to a province/territory, while the employment is actually situated in another province/territory.

<sup>9</sup> The Prairie provinces are Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.



**CHART 4****Adjusted Total Benefits-to-Contributions (B/C) Ratio and Unemployment Rate, by Province, 2011**

Sources: Canada Revenue Agency, 2011 T-4s with employment income; EI administrative data; and Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

## 2.2 Benefits-to-Contributions Ratios, by Sector

In 2011, the goods sector was a net beneficiary of EI benefits, with an adjusted regular benefits-to-contributions ratio of 1.5, while the service sector was a net contributor of EI benefits, with an adjusted ratio of 0.9 (see Chart 5). Within the goods sector, the agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting industry and the construction industry had the highest benefits-to-contributions ratios (3.4 and 2.2, respectively).

## 2.3 Benefits-to-Contributions Ratios, by Gender, Age and Income


In 2011, women were net beneficiaries, with an adjusted 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 have. For example, in 2011/12, women received \$3.7 billion in special benefits compared with \$0.8 billion for men, representing close to a 5:1 ratio, which is consistent with previous years.

In 2009 and 2010, the benefits-to-contributions ratio for men was equivalent to or higher than that for women, which was not consistent with statistics from other recent years. This anomaly can be attributed to the late-2000s recession, which had a relatively greater impact on men than on women. During this recessionary period, total annual EI benefits paid to men were significantly higher in comparison to figures in pre-recession years.

Among different age groups, both claimants aged 15 to 24 (youth) and claimants aged 25 to 44 had an adjusted benefits-to-contributions ratio of 1.1, as they made up the majority of maternity and parental benefit recipients. Claimants aged 55 and older had an adjusted ratio of 1.0, even though their 2012/13 claim volume was 32.4% higher than their pre-recession volume of 2007/08. Claimants aged 45 to 54 years were the only net contributors, with an adjusted ratio of 0.8.

A study on the financial impact of receiving EI<sup>10</sup> concluded that the EI program has a considerable positive income redistribution effect, with lower income families having a higher benefits-to-contributions ratio than higher income families do. In fact, families with after-tax incomes below the median received 34% of total benefits and paid 18% of all premiums, representing a nearly 2:1 ratio of benefits to contributions.

<sup>10</sup> Constantine Kapsalis, *Financial Impacts of Receiving Employment Insurance* (Ottawa: Data Probe Economic Consulting Inc., 2010).

**CHART 5****Adjusted Total Benefits-to-Contributions (B/C) Ratio, by Sector and Industry, 2011**

Sources: Canada Revenue Agency, 2011 T-4s with employment income; EI administrative data; Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

Moreover, an evaluation study<sup>11</sup> using the Longitudinal Administrative Database found that the distributional impact of EI increased substantially during the late-2000s recession. The study concluded that the benefit and contribution side of the program is redistributive, and that EI substantially reduces the percentage of the population in poverty, as benefits are concentrated in the hands of individuals who would otherwise fall just below the poverty line.

### 3. Family Supplement Provision

The Family Supplement provides additional benefits to low-income families with children who receive the Canadian Child Tax Benefit (CCTB),<sup>12</sup> and who have an annual family net income of up to \$25,921.<sup>13</sup> It gives eligible claimants a benefit rate of up to 80% of their average weekly insurable earnings and is available for all benefit types. In 2012/13, the average weekly

<sup>11</sup> Ross Finnie and Ian Irvine, *The Redistributive Impact of Employment Insurance 2007-2009* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2012).

<sup>12</sup> For more information on the Canadian Child Tax Benefit (CCTB), please visit <http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/goc/cctb.shtml>.

<sup>13</sup> For the Family Supplement provision, low-income families are defined as families with a net income of up to \$25,921 per year and at least one child less than 18 years of age.


top-up for the Family Supplement was \$43, similar to that in the previous year. A total of 94,860 claims qualified for the Family Supplement in 2012/13, a decrease of 6.2% from the previous year. As Chart 6 indicates, the number of EI claimants receiving the Family Supplement has now decreased for 10 consecutive years, falling from 182,890 in 2001/02 to 94,860 in 2012/13, representing a 48.1% decrease. The overall decline in these claims can be partially attributed to the fact that the Family Supplement threshold has been held constant at \$25,921 since 1997, while family incomes have continued to rise. From 2000/01 to 2010/11, average family incomes increased by 8.5%, from \$61,000 to \$66,200.<sup>14</sup> In 2012/13, the proportion of all EI claims receiving the Family Supplement top-up fell to 5.2%, a decrease of 0.2 percentage points from the previous year. Over the past several years, the proportion of all EI claims receiving the Family Supplement top-up has declined significantly, falling from 10.7% in 2000/01 to 5.2% in 2012/13, representing a 51.4% decline.

A recent study<sup>15</sup> based on Statistics Canada's Longitudinal Administrative Databank (LAD) examined the effect of inflation and fixed dollar thresholds, and their impact on the EI Family Supplement. The study concluded that between 2001 and 2010, the number

of households in Canada eligible to receive the Family Supplement fell by nearly 20%. The decline could have been due to many factors, such as changing family composition, real wage growth and inflation. Inflation caused the value of the supplement, in constant dollars, to decline by approximately 14% over the same 10-year period.

Women are more likely than men to receive the Family Supplement top-up. Women accounted for 73,980 (78.0%) of the 94,860 new claims receiving the family supplement top-up in 2012/13, similar to the proportion in 2011/12 (77.7%). In 2012/13, claimants aged 25 to 44 accounted for the majority of claims (71.0%). The largest decline in Family Supplement benefits occurred among those aged 15 to 24 years (-12.5%), while claimants aged 55 and older saw an increase (+6.6%).

In 2012/13, low-income families received \$106.6 million in additional benefits through the Family Supplement, a decrease of 5.4% from the previous year. Women accounted for \$86.5 million (81.1%) of Family Supplement benefits. Family Supplement benefits decreased for both genders in 2012/13, with men (-7.4%) experiencing the largest decline.



<sup>14</sup> Information on average family incomes comes from Statistics Canada, CANSIM Table 2020410.

<sup>15</sup> ESDC, *Inflation and Fixed Dollar Thresholds: The EI Family Supplement* (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2014).

In general, recipients of the Family Supplement top-up are entitled to fewer weeks of benefits than non-recipients are but collect more weeks of benefits and use a higher percentage of their entitlement. Among regular claims established in 2011/12,<sup>16</sup> Family Supplement recipients were entitled to an average of 30.4 weeks of EI benefits, while non-recipients were entitled to 33.4 weeks.

However, among regular claims in 2011/12, Family Supplement recipients used 3.3 more weeks of EI benefits, on average, than non-recipients did (23.0 weeks and 19.7 weeks, respectively). While the number of claimants receiving the Family Supplement top-up has been on the decline, this analysis suggests that recipients of the supplement rely on EI benefits more than non-recipients do and that the top-up continues to provide important additional temporary income support for low-income families.<sup>17</sup>

#### 4. Premium Refund Provision

The EI program has specific provisions for contributors who are unlikely to qualify for benefits. Employees with insured earnings of \$2,000 or less are entitled to a full refund of their EI premiums when they file an income tax return.<sup>18</sup>

According to Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) T-4 data from employers, 0.9 million<sup>19</sup> individuals had insured earnings of \$2,000 or less and were eligible for the full EI premium refund in 2011, representing 5.6% of those in paid employment.

While CRA T-4 data are based on the population of individuals receiving a T-4 tax slip, CRA T1 data include individual taxpayers who received a T-4 tax slip and who filed an income tax return. An evaluation study<sup>20</sup> using CRA T1 individual tax-filer data found that 622,000<sup>21</sup> individual tax-filers who earned \$2,000 or less in 2011, received a full EI premium refund.<sup>22</sup> In total, \$10.4 million in full EI premiums were refunded in 2011, a 38.8% decline over 2001.

For 2011, the average payout for the full EI premium refund was \$17, which represents a 25.1% decrease from 2001.

Chart 7 provides an historical breakdown of individuals who were eligible for and received the full EI premium refund. In 2011, 0.9 million individuals were eligible for the full EI premium refund, a decrease of 15.7% (-176,070) since 2001. Similarly, 0.6 million individuals received the premium refund in 2011, representing a decline of 17.2% (-129,000) since 2001. These declines can be attributed to two factors. First, the premium refund threshold has been fixed at \$2,000 since 1997. Second, the nationwide average hourly wage rate increased by 33.6% (+\$5.78) between 2001 and 2011, while the minimum wage rate increased by 63.7% (+\$3.50). Over time, the combination of a fixed premium refund threshold and perpetual increases in wages have led to gradual declines in the number of people who are eligible for and receive the full EI premium refund.

In 2011, 55.5%<sup>23</sup> (622,000) of all individuals eligible for the full EI premium refund filed an income tax return and received benefits. This implies that a substantial proportion (44.5%) of those eligible for the full EI premium refund, did not file an income tax return.

From 2001 to 2011, between 55.3% and 60.5% of all individuals eligible for the full EI premium refund filed an income tax return and received benefits.

##### 4.1 Temporary Hiring Credit for Small Business

In recognition of the challenges small businesses were facing across the country, Economic Action Plan (EAP) 2011 announced a temporary Hiring Credit for Small Business. 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.

<sup>16</sup> Data on duration of regular claims with family supplement benefits relate to claims established in 2011/12 to ensure all claims were completed.

<sup>17</sup> For the 2012/13 Monitoring and Assessment Report, there has been a refinement in methodology to better reflect the entitlement and the duration of family supplement indicators.

<sup>18</sup> Due to data limitations, the reporting of individuals who were eligible for (T-4) and received (T-1) the full EI premium refund is based on those who received a T-4 slip and had employment income of \$2,000 or less, rather than insurable earnings of \$2,000 or less. Those receiving the full EI premium refund must have filed an income tax return.


<sup>19</sup> For the 2012/13 Monitoring and Assessment Report, there has been a refinement in methodology to better reflect the number of individuals who had insured earnings of \$2,000 or less. Figures reported in previous Monitoring and Assessment Reports were slightly overstated.

<sup>20</sup> ESDC, *EI Premium Refund: Trend Analysis 1997–2011* (Updated) (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2014).

<sup>21</sup> The 2011 figures are preliminary, and do not take into account potential late filers.

<sup>22</sup> The analysis excludes partial premium refunds, which a small number of individuals are eligible for and receive, in any given year.

<sup>23</sup> Since the preliminary 2011 figures do not take into account future potential late filers, the 55.5% figure could be slightly understated.

**CHART 7****Number of Individuals Eligible for and Received Full EI Premium Refund, Between 2001 and 2011**

Source: Canada Revenue Agency, T-4 and T-1 data.

Note: Due to data limitations, the reporting of individuals who were eligible for (T-4) and received (T-1) the full EI premium refund is based on those who received a T-4 slip and had employment income of \$2,000 or less, rather than insurable earnings of \$2,000 or less. Those receiving the full EI premium refund must have filed an income tax return.

EAP 2012 extended the temporary credit for one year under the same parameters. EAP 2013 extended the temporary credit for one more year and expanded it to employers whose EI premiums were \$15,000 or less in 2012, with a maximum credit of \$1,000.

In 2012, approximately 547,000 businesses received the temporary Hiring Credit for Small Business at a total cost of about \$217 million.

According to an evaluation study,<sup>24</sup> approximately 538,750 businesses, representing 61.0% of all businesses, received the HCSB in 2011. The average refund in 2011 was \$386 per recipient business, at a total cost of \$208 million.

## 5. EI 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. It is a structured system that combines on-the-job training (during which the apprentice is employed and earns a wage) and technical training, which is typically provided in class at a college or other training institution. The design of apprenticeship programs in Canada, including the

duration and delivery method of technical training, varies across trades and across provinces and territories (P/Ts). In Quebec, for example, apprentices complete all of their technical training before beginning an apprenticeship program. In the other P/Ts, apprentices complete their technical training during the apprenticeship program, using a variety of approaches. In some cases, they take technical training via self-learning, distance learning, night classes or day release programs. Many apprentices, however, complete their technical training using a traditional block release approach that requires them to leave work to attend a college or other training institution full-time for typically, six to eight weeks. These blocks of in-class technical training normally alternate with periods of on-the-job training that involve 1,200 to 1,800 hours of work. Some apprentices completing their technical training through blocks of full-time in-class training may not take this training in a given year for a variety of reasons, including insufficient hours of work, scheduling conflicts, and limited training spaces.

The EI program has special rules and administrative procedures to support apprentices who are unemployed as a result of full-time in-class technical training for which they have been referred by the P/T under section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act*. This legislative provision allows an apprentice to

<sup>24</sup> Constantine Kapsalis, *EI Hiring Credit for Small Businesses: Analysis Based On The 2011 T4 File* (Ottawa: Data Probe Economic Consulting Inc. 2014).

**TABLE 3****EI Claims by Apprentices Attending Full-Time In-Class Technical Training (\$M)<sup>1</sup>**

	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10
<b>Number of New Apprentice Claims</b>	<b>51,540</b>	<b>51,040</b>	<b>49,860</b>	<b>57,170</b>
Newfoundland and Labrador	1,810	1,840	1,610	1,930
Prince Edward Island	360	340	460	370
Nova Scotia	1,450	1,150	1,190	1,350
New Brunswick	1,680	2,240	2,140	2,130
Ontario	13,340	13,390	12,780	14,180
Manitoba	3,080	3,030	2,650	2,920
Saskatchewan	4,180	3,650	3,200	3,060
Alberta	17,620	16,530	16,640	20,190
British Columbia	7,720	8,540	8,820	10,790
Territories	300	330	370	250
<b>EI Benefits Paid While Attending Full-Time Technical Training</b>	<b>\$185.6</b>	<b>\$188.8</b>	<b>\$177.2</b>	<b>\$205.0</b>
Newfoundland and Labrador	\$6.7	\$6.6	\$5.7	\$6.7
Prince Edward Island	\$1.1	\$1.0	\$1.2	\$1.1
Nova Scotia	\$4.1	\$3.1	\$3.3	\$3.8
New Brunswick	\$5.0	\$6.6	\$6.4	\$6.5
Ontario	\$46.2	\$48.5	\$43.7	\$48.6
Manitoba	\$11.3	\$12.2	\$9.7	\$10.2
Saskatchewan	\$15.0	\$13.5	\$11.4	\$10.4
Alberta	\$68.7	\$65.2	\$63.3	\$78.9
British Columbia	\$26.4	\$30.6	\$30.8	\$37.9
Territories	\$1.2	\$1.4	\$1.7	\$1.0
<b>EI Benefits Paid Outside of Full-Time Technical Training<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$71.4</b>	<b>\$81.6</b>	<b>\$94.4</b>	<b>\$131.3</b>
Newfoundland and Labrador	\$5.2	\$6.6	\$8.4	\$8.5
Prince Edward Island	\$0.9	\$0.8	\$1.1	\$0.9
Nova Scotia	\$3.3	\$3.4	\$4.8	\$5.0
New Brunswick	\$4.9	\$7.4	\$7.2	\$7.7
Ontario	\$22.2	\$23.9	\$24.4	\$31.6
Manitoba	\$2.7	\$2.8	\$3.1	\$3.7
Saskatchewan	\$3.3	\$2.9	\$3.0	\$3.9
Alberta	\$16.1	\$16.5	\$22.7	\$35.8
British Columbia	\$12.3	\$16.8	\$19.4	\$33.7
Territories	\$0.6	\$0.5	\$0.4	\$0.6
<b>Total EI Benefits paid to apprentices Who Attended Full-Time Technical Training in the Year</b>	<b>\$257.1</b>	<b>\$270.4</b>	<b>\$271.6</b>	<b>\$336.3</b>

<sup>1</sup> No values are included for Quebec, which reflects its unique program design in which apprentices complete all of the in-class technical training prior to beginning an apprenticeship program.

<sup>2</sup> Benefits (regular and special) paid outside of full time in-class technical training to apprentices who also received benefits while attending full time in-class technical training.

receive benefits while attending full-time in-class training without having to be available for work or having to look for work. Apprentices also benefit from having to serve only one two-week waiting period for the full duration of their apprenticeship even if it involves multiple blocks of full-time in-class technical training. They can apply for EI up to seven days before the end of work and can elect to be exempt from

bi-weekly reporting requirements. Apprentices attending full-time, in-class technical training also receive a special reference code that facilitates faster processing and payment of their EI claims. To qualify for EI while attending school, an apprentice must have a valid job separation and sufficient insurable hours of work over the qualifying period.


Outside of these periods of full-time, in-class technical training, an apprentice who loses his or her job due to reasons such as lack of work may also be eligible for EI. For example, many apprentices work in EI regions and industries that experience periods of seasonal unemployment. Eligibility for EI in these cases would still require a valid job separation and sufficient insurable hours of work over the qualifying period.

Historically, the *EI Monitoring and Assessment Report* has not distinguished between EI benefits received during periods of full-time, in-class technical training and benefits received as a result of unemployment incurred during periods of on-the-job training. In this report, we distinguish between the two. Apprentices who complete their technical training through distance learning, nighttime classes, day release or methods other than full-time in-class training and who received EI benefits in the year for reasons such as job-loss or a lack of work (including seasonal unemployment) are not included in this section.<sup>25</sup>

Furthermore, this report also uses a new methodology that more accurately identifies apprentices who received EI benefits while attending full-time in-class technical training and who also received EI benefits at other times of the year.

In 2012/13, apprentices established 51,540 new EI claims, resulting in \$257.1 million in benefits. Of this total, \$185.8 million was paid while the apprentices were unemployed and attending full-time in-class technical training, while \$66.3 million was paid in regular benefits and \$5.4 million was paid in special benefits to these same apprentices for unemployment occurring at times of the year other than during their block of full-time, in-class technical training. Of the 51,540 new apprentice claims, 19,510 involved benefits paid during both the period of on-the-job training and the period of full-time in-class technical training. Table 3 summarizes the results for 2012/13 by province and restates the numbers for prior years using the new methodology. The impact of the economic downturn in 2009 and the associated rise in unemployment rates is reflected in the increase in EI benefits paid outside of full-time in-class technical training.

The average weekly benefit apprentices received while attending full-time, in-class training is higher than that for the program overall (\$439 vs. \$395). In 2012/13, apprentices in Canada received an average of \$3,600 in EI regular benefits while attending full-time, in-class technical training. Apprentices who



<sup>25</sup> Currently, apprentices are only identified in the EI administrative database if they claimed EI while attending full-time, in-class technical training, which involves special legislative provisions in the *Employment Insurance Act*. Once they have been identified, additional EI benefits they received at other times of the year can be captured.

also received benefits outside of their period of full-time, in-class technical training received an average of \$3,400 in additional regular benefits during the year.

Chart 8 shows the distribution of the 51,540 new apprentice claims in 2012/13 by the total number of weeks for which EI benefits were paid during the year while apprentices were attending full-time in-class technical training. For example, when first-year apprentices attended an 8-week block of training and received 6 weeks of EI benefits (the waiting period accounting for the other 2 weeks) they would be included in the 6 weeks bar. If they had previously served a waiting period and received EI for the full duration of their full-time, in-class training block, they would be included in the 8 weeks bar. Any additional weeks of EI received outside of the block of in-class technical training would not influence the distribution in Chart 8. When apprentices attended, and received EI benefits for two separate full-time, in-class technical training blocks as part of the same claim, the combined total weeks of the two training blocks were used. This explains the rise in the number of claims with more than 12 weeks of full-time training (e.g., two 8-week training blocks in the year for a total of 16 weeks of EI while attending full-time, in-class training). The chart also distinguishes between claims for which the waiting period was waived and claims for which the waiting period was served (in 2012/13, roughly 45% of apprentice claimants benefited from the waiver of the waiting period).

Apprentices who only received EI while attending full-time, in-class technical training received an average of 8.0 weeks of benefits in 2012/13. Apprentices who also received benefits outside of their block of full-time, in-class training received an average of 17.3 weeks of EI benefits during the year.

## II. ASSISTING CANADIANS DURING UNEMPLOYMENT: EI REGULAR BENEFITS

EI regular benefits provide temporary financial assistance to workers who have lost their job through no fault of their own, while they look for work or upgrade their skills,<sup>26</sup> provided that they have contributed to the program and accumulated the required number of insurable hours. In most cases, individuals require between 420 and 700 insured hours to qualify, based on the unemployment rate in the economic region where they reside, to access regular benefits. This feature of the EI program is referred to as the Variable Entrance Requirement (VER).

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 insured hours, regardless of where they reside. These two groups are collectively known as new-entrants/re-entrants (NEREs).

### 1. EI Regular Claims and Regular Benefits

In 2012/13, there were 1.36 million new EI regular claims established. That number represented a decrease of 4.6% (-65,460) from 1.42 million in 2011/12. Despite the decline in 2012/13, the number of new EI regular claims remained 4.8% higher than the level (1.29 million) observed in 2007/08, prior to the onset of the late-2000s recession.

Generally, the number of EI regular claims tends to be sensitive to economic cycles and labour market conditions. For example, the unemployment rate, decreased by 0.2 percentage points to 7.2% in 2012/13, but remained 1.2 percentage points higher than the 6.0% observed in 2007/08, mirroring the changes in the number of regular claims discussed above.


Along with the decrease in the number of EI regular claims, EI regular benefits declined by 6.1% (-\$0.6 billion), from \$10.7 billion in 2011/12 to \$10.1 billion in 2012/13, after a decrease of 12.9% (-\$1.6 billion) in 2011/12. Although regular benefits paid have decreased for three consecutive years, they remained 26.4% (+\$2.1 billion) higher than what was paid in 2007/08, prior to the late-2000s recession.

<sup>26</sup> Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* assists Canadians to prepare for, find and maintain employment. Some of these activities include Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSMs). For further information, please refer to Chapter 4 of this report.



**CHART 9**

Average Weekly Wage and Average Weekly Regular Benefit Rate, Canada, 2007/08 to 2012/13



Source: Statistics Canada, Survey of Employment, Payrolls and Hours; and EI Administrative Data.

As shown in Chart 9, in 2012/13, the average weekly benefit for regular claims rose by 3.1% (+\$12), from \$384 in 2011/12 to \$396 in 2012/13. This rise was a result of the combined effect of the 3.0% increase in average weekly wages over the period, as explained in Chapter 1, and the increase in the maximum weekly benefit rate, which rose from \$485 in 2012 to \$501 in 2013.

### 1.1 EI Regular Benefits, by Province

In 2012/13, the number of new regular claims declined in every province. Among provinces, the notable decreases occurred in Nova Scotia (-9.0%, -6,180), Prince Edward Island (-8.3%, -1,480), Newfoundland and Labrador (-6.7%, -4,540) and British Columbia (-6.2%, -9,730).

Despite the overall decline in 2012/13, the number of new regular claims remained higher than the number observed in 2007/08 in most provinces. As shown in Chart 10, in 2012/13, the volumes in the Western provinces,<sup>27</sup> Ontario (+6.7%) and New Brunswick (+1.6%) remained higher than the levels observed in 2007/08. In contrast, the number of regular claims in three Atlantic provinces<sup>28</sup> and Quebec were lower than the levels in 2007/08.


When comparing the provincial distribution of EI regular claims to the provincial distribution of employment in 2012/13, it was found that the Atlantic provinces and Quebec were over-represented among EI regular claims, while Ontario and the Western provinces were under-represented (Table 4).

The Atlantic provinces accounted for 15.8% of total regular EI claims in 2012/13, with 6.3% of all employment. Ontario and Quebec had the largest share of employment, with Ontario accounting for 38.7% of national employment and Quebec accounting for 22.8%. These two provinces also had the largest share of total EI claims, with 29.8% and 32.2%, respectively.

The Western provinces accounted for 21.8% of total EI regular claims, with 32.2% of all employment, representing the largest combined percentage-point difference between the share of EI claims and the share of employment.

<sup>27</sup> The Western provinces comprise Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

<sup>28</sup> The Atlantic provinces comprise Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

**CHART 10****% Change in EI Regular Claims, by Province, Between 2007/08 and 2012/13****TABLE 4****Regular EI Claims, Employment<sup>1</sup> and Regular Benefits Paid, by Province and Territory, 2012/13**

Province or Territory	% of Regular EI Claims	% of Employment	% of Regular Benefits Paid
Newfoundland and Labrador	4.6	1.3	6.3
Prince Edward Island	1.2	0.4	1.5
Nova Scotia	4.6	2.6	5.5
New Brunswick	5.4	2.0	6.2
Quebec	32.2	22.8	29.8
Ontario	29.8	38.7	29.4
Manitoba	2.8	3.6	2.5
Saskatchewan	2.0	3.1	2.0
Alberta	6.2	12.3	5.7
British Columbia	10.8	13.2	10.6
Territories	0.3	N/A <sup>2</sup>	0.5
<b>Canada</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>1</sup> Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.<sup>2</sup> The Labour Force Survey does not capture employment data for the Territories.

## 1.2 EI Regular Benefits, by EI Region

The Canadian economy comprises urban regions that are significant economic hubs, as well as rural regions that preserve more traditional industries that are essential to the functioning of the economy. The six largest census metropolitan areas in terms of population – Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal – are used to characterize the profiles of EI regular benefits in urban regions.

Urban and rural labour markets differ in their demographic and sectoral composition. As shown in Table 5, the urban and rural distribution of regular claims does not necessarily align with their distribution of employment. For example, in 2012/13, rural regions accounted for 48.2% of regular claims, but 30.4% of employment. Conversely, the major urban centres accounted for 32.3% of regular claims, and 47.1% of employment. This contrast can be explained by two factors. First, rural regions had

**TABLE 5****Key Statistics for Regular Benefits in Major Urban Centres, 2012/13**

	% of Regular Claims <sup>1</sup>	% of Employment <sup>2</sup>	% of Regular Benefits	Average Regular Weekly Benefit
Montréal	11.5	11.3	10.3	\$382
Ottawa	1.5	3.1	1.4	\$399
Toronto	10.9	17.2	11.4	\$392
Calgary	2.0	4.3	1.8	\$431
Edmonton	2.0	4.0	1.7	\$437
Vancouver	4.5	7.2	4.3	\$384
Major Urban Centres	32.3	47.1	31.0	\$393
Rural Regions	48.2	30.4	52.0	\$401
<b>Canada</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>\$396</b>

<sup>1,2</sup> Shares of total regular claims and regular benefits for major urban centres and rural regions do not add up to 100%, some regions are classified as urban, but are not considered major urban centres.

a higher unemployment rate (9.1%) than that of the major urban centres (7.5%) in 2012/13. With fewer employment opportunities available, individuals in rural regions may have had higher likelihoods to establish EI claims than individuals in urban centres. Second, in rural regions, the incidence of seasonality was higher. In rural regions in 2012/13, 40.1% of regular claims were considered seasonal, compared to 19.8% of regular claims in major urban centres. Seasonality reflects work patterns, regional availability of work, and industry or personal circumstances.

Regular benefits followed a pattern similar to that of claims. Rural regions had a higher proportion of regular benefits (52.0%) relative to their employment share (30.4%), while major urban centres accounted for a lower proportion of regular benefits (31.0%) relative to their employment share (47.1%). These proportions were influenced by differences in unemployment levels and the seasonality of claims.

Average weekly benefits were higher in rural regions \$401, than in major urban centres (\$393). However, among the major urban centres, Edmonton (\$437), Calgary (\$431) and Ottawa (\$399) had higher average weekly benefits than Canadian average (\$396).

### 1.3 EI Regular Benefits, by Sector and Industry


In 2012/13, the number of new EI regular claims in the goods sector decreased by 7.8% (-41,770). The decrease was driven by the employment gain observed in the sector (+1.8%, +69,000) (see Chart 11). Along with a decrease in the number of regular claims, EI regular benefits paid in the goods sector fell by 8.0% (-\$344.5 million) in 2012/13. The two largest industries in the sector—manufacturing and construction—experienced declines in regular benefits paid of 14.6% (-\$207.1 million) and 5.2% (-\$111.4 million), respectively.

In 2012/13, the service sector also witnessed a decline in the number of new regular claims (-5.5%, -46,330). Similar to the goods sector, the decline was attributable to the employment gain observed in the sector (+1.2%, +165,000) (see Chart 11). Education services, which has the largest proportion of claims in the service sector, experienced a slight decrease in the number of regular claims (-0.8%, -1,240).

In line with the decrease in the number of regular claims, regular benefits paid to claimants in the service sector fell by 6.9% (-416,800) in 2012/13, after a decrease of 13.2% in the previous year. The largest decline in benefits paid in the service sector occurred in the retail trade industry (-12.2%), followed by the wholesale trade industry (-10.1%), and accommodation and food services industries (-9.3%).

**CHART 11**

% Changes in EI Regular Claims, Regular Benefits, and Employment, by Sector Between 2011/12 and 2012/13



#### 1.4 EI Regular Benefits, by Gender and Age

In 2012/13, the number of new EI regular claims decreased for both men (-4.9%) and women (-4.2%). Despite the decreases, the number of new regular claims remained 5.0% and 4.6% higher for men and women, respectively, than the levels in 2007/08. In line with the decreases in the number of regular claims, EI regular benefits paid to men and women decreased by 5.7% and 6.7%, respectively, in 2012/13. Despite the decline in 2012/13, EI regular benefits paid remained higher than the levels observed in 2007/08 (25.0% higher for men and 29.1% higher for women).

Women accounted for 40.0% of total regular claims in 2012/13, and they received 35.2% of regular benefits. Men accounted for 60.0% of total regular claims in 2012/13, and 64.8% of the EI regular benefits. The gender distribution of regular benefits paid is not in line with the gender distribution of EI regular claims because men, on average, received higher weekly benefits than women did. For example, in 2012/13, the average weekly benefit for regular claims was \$422 for men, \$64 higher than that for women (\$358).

In 2012/13, the number of regular claims established by core-aged workers (aged 25 to 54) and young workers (aged 15 to 24) decreased


by 5.6% (-55,160) and 7.0% (-10,460), respectively, while older workers (55 and older) experienced a slight increase of 0.1% (+160).

As illustrated in Chart 12, the proportion of regular claims established by core-aged workers has declined steadily, from 73.1% in 2007/08 to 68.9% in 2012/13, while that of older workers has increased, from 16.3% in 2007/08 to 20.9% in 2012/13. The increase among older workers is attributable to the increase in their share of the Canadian labour force. They accounted for 18.3% of the labour force in 2012/13, a significant increase from 14.9% in 2007/08. The proportion of regular claims established by youth was high (11.7% in 2009/10) during the late-2000s recession, due to a significant loss in youth employment. As the recovery took hold, the proportion of EI claims by those aged 15 to 24 years slowly returned to its pre-recession level (10.6% in 2007/08), as youth accounted for 10.2% of EI regular claims in 2012/13.


When comparing the age distribution of EI regular claims to the age distribution of employment in 2012/13, it was observed that young workers were under-represented among EI regular claims, while core-aged workers and older workers were slightly over-represented (Chart 13). For example, older workers accounted for 20.9% of EI regular claims in 2012/13, while their share of employment was 18.6%.

**CHART 12**

Proportion of EI Regular Claims, by Age, 2007/08 to 2012/13

**CHART 13**

Distribution of EI Regular Claims and Employment, by Age, 2012/13



Sources: EI administrative data and Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

Regular benefits paid fell across all three major age groups in 2012/13. Core-aged workers registered a 6.7% decrease in regular benefits, while youth witnessed a similar decrease of 6.8%. Older workers witnessed a more moderate decrease of 3.7% in 2012/13.

### 1.5 EI Regular Benefits, by Claimant Category

Historically, the *EI Monitoring and Assessment Report* has included analysis of regular claims based on the claimant's prior use of the EI program. Regular claims were grouped into one of three claimant categories—first-time, occasional, or frequent—based on the number of EI claims in the past five years. These claimant categories were used solely for the purpose of examining the impact and effectiveness of the EI program within the report.

Effective January 6, 2013, the *Employment Insurance Regulations* were modified to establish three EI claimant categories used to determine claimant responsibilities, in terms of undertaking a reasonable job search for suitable employment. The three new EI claimant categories are long-tenured workers,<sup>29</sup> frequent claimants<sup>30</sup> and occasional


<sup>29</sup> 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.

<sup>30</sup> 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.

claimants.<sup>31, 32</sup> The following analysis of new EI regular claims is based on the new EI claimant categories. For information regarding the national distribution and provincial breakdown of EI regular claims based on the old EI claimant categories, please refer to the *2012 EI Monitoring and Assessment Report*.


In 2012/13, occasional claimants accounted for the largest share (53.1%) of all EI regular claims, followed by frequent claimants (23.6%) and long-tenured workers (23.3%). As shown in Chart 14, the share of EI regular claims for long-tenured workers decreased by 2.3 percentage points in 2012/13, while the shares for occasional claimants and frequent claimants increased by 1.3 percentage points and 1.0 percentage points, respectively.

The composition of EI regular claims varied from province to province. As illustrated in Chart 15, the Atlantic provinces had a higher proportion of frequent claimants and a lower proportion of long-tenured workers than other provinces did. For example, in 2012/13, frequent claimants represented 49.2% of the total regular claims in the Atlantic provinces, while in Quebec, Ontario and the Western provinces, the proportions were 27.8%, 13.1% and 13.1%, respectively. The higher proportion of frequent claimants in the Atlantic provinces is associated with a higher proportion of employment in seasonal industries, such as fishing, forestry agriculture, and tourism.




<sup>31</sup> Occasional claimants are individuals who do not meet the definition of long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

<sup>32</sup> For more information on the new EI claimant categories, please visit <http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/sc/ei/ccaj/claimant.shtml>.

**CHART 15****Proportion of EI Regular Claims, by Province and EI Claimant Category, 2012/13****1.6 EI Regular Benefits, by Education Level**

As discussed in Chapter 1, individuals with higher educational attainment tend to experience more successful labour market outcomes than those with less education. Chart 16 compares the distribution of employment by the educational level required for an occupation with the distribution of EI regular claimants by educational attainment in 2012/13.

Individuals employed in occupations that did not require a high school diploma accounted for 13.0% of employment but represented 20.7% of all EI regular claimants. However, individuals employed in occupations that required a university degree accounted for 19.3% of employment but represented only 8.0% of EI regular claimants. As discussed in previous reports, the inverse relationship between educational attainment and use of EI regular benefits has continued over time.

**CHART 16****Distribution of Employment and EI Regular Claims, by Educational Requirement of Their Occupation, 2012/13**

## 2. Coverage of EI Regular Benefits


The EI program's definition of coverage is similar to that of other insurance programs. As such, individuals are considered covered by the EI program if they have paid EI premiums in the previous 12 months.

According to the Employment Insurance Coverage Survey (EICS),<sup>33</sup> there were 1,310,000 unemployed individuals in Canada (shown as U in Chart 17) in 2012.<sup>34</sup> This represents a drop of 2.6% from the 1,345,000 unemployed individuals reported in 2011, largely due to improving economic conditions in 2012, as discussed in Chapter 1.

The 2012 EICS estimated that, among the 1,310,000 unemployed individuals, 808,000 had contributed to EI in the previous 12 months before becoming unemployed. Combined, they represented 61.7% of all unemployed people (from Chart 17, UC/U).

Those who had not paid EI premiums (or EI non-contributors) included self-employed workers,<sup>35</sup> individuals who had been unemployed for more than 12 months and people who had never worked. As shown in Table 6, in 2012, self-employed workers represented 4.4% of the total unemployed population, while individuals who had been unemployed for more than 12 months or who had never worked represented 33.9% of the total unemployed population. They together represented 38.3% (501,000) of the total unemployed population.

The higher share of non-contributors to the EI program was due to the increase in the long-term unemployed population in the past three years, which was attributed to the difficult labour market that remained in certain industries following the late-2000s recession. For example, 33.9% of the unemployed population in 2012 had been unemployed for more than 12 months or had never worked, compared with 32.2% in 2011, 32.3% in 2010 and 24.8% in 2009.



<sup>33</sup> 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>.

<sup>34</sup> The Employment Insurance Coverage Survey (EICS) estimate of the number of unemployed people differs slightly from that of the Labor Force Survey (LFS), as the EICS is conducted quarterly, while LFS statistics are collected monthly.

<sup>35</sup> Self-employed individuals can opt in and subsequently pay premiums for special benefits, but they are not eligible for regular benefits.



**TABLE 6****Unemployed EI Contributors and Non-Contributors, Canada, 2007 to 2012**

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
EI Contributors	61.7%	64.5%	64.7%	70.3%	70.1%	70.0%
EI Non-Contributors	38.3%	35.5%	35.3%	29.7%	29.9%	30.0%
...who have not worked in the last 12 months or have never worked	33.9%	32.2%	32.3%	24.8%	25.5%	24.8%
...who have no recent insurable employment (some of the self-employed)	4.4%	3.4%	3.0%	4.9%	4.4%	5.2%

**2.1 Coverage of EI Regular Benefits, by Province**

Coverage rates measure the proportion of the unemployed who had paid EI premiums, and varied by province, from 80.0% in the Atlantic provinces<sup>36</sup> and 65.1% in Quebec to 62.9% in the Western provinces<sup>37</sup> and 55.0% in Ontario. Differences in the composition of the unemployed population help explain the variation in coverage rates among the provinces. As indicated in Table 7, in 2012, Ontario (45.0%) had the largest proportion of unemployed people who did not contribute to the EI program, while the Atlantic provinces (20.0%) had the smallest such proportion. In particular, a significant share of Ontario's unemployed population had been unemployed for more than 12 months (28.0%); a large share of its unemployed population had never worked (11.9%); and 5.1% had not been paying EI premiums due to the nature of their job, such as self-employment.

**TABLE 7****Unemployed EI Contributors and Non-Contributors, by Province, 2012**

	Atlantic	Quebec	Ontario	Western
EI Contributors	80.0%	65.1%	55.0%	62.9%
EI Non-Contributors	20.0%	34.9%	45.0%	37.1%
...who have no recent insurable employment (e.g., Some of the self-employed)	1.9%	2.5%	5.1%	6.0%
...who have not worked for more than 12 months	13.3%	25.6%	28.0%	22.1%
...who have never worked	4.8%	6.8%	11.9%	9.0%

**3. EI Eligibility for EI Regular Benefits**

To be eligible for EI regular benefits, individuals must first be covered by the EI program. That means they must have paid EI premiums in the previous 12 months before the unemployment spell. In addition, they must have had a recent valid job separation(s), and accumulated enough insurable hours of work before the job separation(s).

**3.1 Eligibility for EI Regular Benefits, Among the Unemployed Population**

The 2012 EICS estimated that among the unemployed population, 629,000 individuals, in 2012 had a valid job separation that met the EI program parameters, making them potentially eligible for EI (potentially EI-eligible population, S in Chart 17). They represented 48.0% of the unemployed population in 2012 (see Chart 18).

Among the remaining 52.0% of the unemployed population, there were unemployed individuals who had not contributed premiums to the EI program in the previous 12 months (38.3% of the unemployed population), as discussed in the previous section. However, there were also 180,000 unemployed individuals, whose job separation did not meet the EI program's parameters (13.7% of the unemployed population). These included unemployed individuals who quit their job without an acceptable cause<sup>38</sup> (8.0% of the unemployed population) and those who quit their job to go to school and could not qualify (5.7% of the unemployed population).

Among the 48.0% (629,000) of the unemployed population who had contributed EI premiums recently and had a recent job separation that qualified under the EI program, 81.9% were eligible to receive EI regular


<sup>36</sup> Atlantic provinces comprise Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

<sup>37</sup> Western provinces comprise British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

<sup>38</sup> For more information on job quitting causes that are not acceptable to the EI program, please refer to <http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/ei/types/regular.shtml#eligible>.

## CHART 18

### Total Unemployed Population and Potentially EI-Eligible Population, 2012



Source: Statistics Canada, Employment Insurance Coverage Survey.

benefits<sup>39</sup> in 2012 (from Chart 17, E/S), for a total of 515,000 individuals (E in Chart 17). This EI eligibility rate increased by 3.5 percentage points from 78.4% in 2011 and it returned to pre-recession levels (i.e., 82.3% in 2007 and 82.7% in 2006).

The remaining 18.1% (114,000) of the unemployed population who had contributed and had a valid job separation (or 8.7% of the unemployed population) had not worked enough insurable hours to qualify for EI benefits. This figure decreased by 3.5 percentage points in 2012, from 21.6% (150,100) in 2011.

### 3.2 EI 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 insurable hours to qualify for EI 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 becomes higher.

This is because full-time workers are more likely to have accumulated enough insurable hours and, as a result, are more likely to be eligible to receive regular benefits.

The national eligibility rate increased from 82.1% in 2008 to 86.2% in 2009. The increase was attributed to the change in the composition of unemployed EI contributors. A higher-than-usual proportion of unemployed EI contributors who were previously permanent workers was observed in 2009. As shown in Table 8, this figure increased sharply during the recession, from 58.0% of the potentially EI-eligible population in 2008 to 63.0% of the potentially EI-eligible population in 2009. These workers were more likely to have accumulated enough insurable hours and, as a result, were more likely to be eligible for EI regular benefits.

During the recovery, the EI eligibility rate decreased from 83.9% in 2010 to a historical low of 78.4% in 2011, and then increased to 81.9% in 2012. The change found in the eligibility rate was again attributed to the change in the composition of the labour market.

<sup>39</sup> Please note that due to the design of the EICS questionnaire, it is not possible to differentiate unemployed individuals eligible for regular benefits from those eligible for other types of income benefits. However, as this analysis focuses on unemployed people who fall within the parameters of the program, the numerator, E, can be seen as a proxy for the number of unemployed people eligible for regular benefits. The reason is that most people who receive special benefits are not considered unemployed.

Between 2010 and 2011, there was a shift in the composition of unemployed EI contributors, with more individuals having worked in temporary non-seasonal employment, and a lower proportion having worked in permanent employment. This shift in the composition of the unemployed EI contributors resulted in a decline in the eligibility rate.

However, in 2012, the composition of the unemployed EI contributors started to reverse. The share of individuals who had worked in temporary, non-seasonal employment fell, and the proportion of those who had worked in permanent employment grew.

As shown in Table 8, the proportion of temporary non-seasonal workers decreased slightly, from 28.1% of the potentially EI-eligible population in 2011 to 27.3% in 2012. These workers were less likely to have accumulated enough insurable hours

to qualify for the EI program and, as a result, were less likely to be eligible for EI regular benefits. The EI eligibility rate for this group increased to 69.8% in 2012, from 60.0% in 2011 and 64.7% in 2010.

Meanwhile, those who had worked in permanent employment accounted for 53.8% of the potentially EI-eligible population in 2012, with their share increasing from 51.3% in 2011. These workers were more likely to have accumulated enough insurable hours to be eligible for the EI program and, as a result, were more likely to be eligible for EI regular benefits, with an EI eligibility rate of 89.9% in 2012 (Table 9).

Furthermore, the change in the average duration of employment also contributed to changes in the eligibility rate. In 2011, core-aged workers who held temporary non-seasonal positions saw a decline in their average number of hours worked, from 840 hours in 2010

**TABLE 8**  
Eligibility Rate and Distribution of the Potentially EI-Eligible Population, by Previous Employment Characteristics, 2008 to 2012

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
<b>Eligibility Rate</b>	<b>81.9%</b>	<b>78.4%</b>	<b>83.9%</b>	<b>86.2%</b>	<b>82.2%</b>
Unemployment Rate	7.2%	7.5%	8.0%	8.3%	6.1%
Proportion of the Potentially EI-Eligible Population					
...who had held permanent employment	338,176 53.8%	356,700 51.3%	424,686 57.0%	539,941 63.0%	332,120 58.0%
...who had held non-permanent, non-seasonal	171,529 27.3%	195,471 28.1%	183,891 24.7%	169,597 19.8%	122,391 21.4%

**TABLE 9**  
EI Eligibility Rate (E/S Ratio) Summary

	2012 (%)	2011 (%)	2010 (%)	2009 (%)	2008 (%)	2007 (%)
<b>EI Eligibility Rate (E/S Ratio)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>81.9</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<b>83.9</b>	<b>86.2</b>	<b>82.2</b>	<b>82.3</b>
...for people who had worked full time	91.9	88.5	90.3	91.2	91.1	90.0
...for people who had worked part time	40.0	33.4	46.4	49.5	35.8	33.6
...for people who had worked full and part time	73.9	67.4	76.7	83.9	70.0	81.0
...for people who had worked in a permanent position	89.9	87.2	92.4	92.2	87.6	87.8
...for people who had worked in a permanent full-time position	94.6	91.2	94.5	94.3	92.7	91.1
...for people who had worked in a permanent part-time position	65.2	54.9	74.4	68.8	47.7	56.3
...for people who had worked in a temporary position	72.2	68.3	72.3	75.3	73.5	74.1
...for people who had worked in a temporary seasonal position	75.6	81.2	83.6	81.4	85.0	84.4
...for people who had worked in a temporary non-seasonal position	69.8	60.0	64.7	70.5	63.8	65.2

<sup>1</sup> Due to sample size, EI eligibility rates (E/S ratios) for some sub-groups may fluctuate widely from year to year.

to 640 hours in 2011. In 2012, their average number of hours worked increased to 880 hours. The number of insurable hours worked is the only measure considered when determining an unemployed individual's eligibility for EI regular benefits. As such, their EI eligibility rate dropped from 64.7% in 2010 to 60.0% in 2011, and then increased to 69.8% in 2012.

A recent study<sup>40</sup> 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 the likelihood of being eligible for EI regular benefits is higher for full-time permanent job separators, and lower for temporary non-seasonal workers.


### 3.3 EI Eligibility Among the Unemployed Population, by Province

Eligibility rates fluctuated across the country in 2012, from lows of 69.4% in Alberta and 79.7% in Ontario to a high of 93.5% in Newfoundland and Labrador. Compared with 2011 EICS figures, the EI eligibility rate increased in 7 out of the 10 provinces, remaining relatively stable in Newfoundland and Labrador and Prince Edward Island (see Chart 19).

The largest increases were observed in New Brunswick (+4.5 percentage points), Ontario (+5.4 percentage points), Quebec (+4.3 percentage points), Manitoba (+8.5 percentage points), and British Columbia (+5.9 percentage points). Although a decrease of 8.8 percentage points was observed in Alberta, the decrease is likely over-estimated for statistical reasons. Due of its very strong economic conditions, the number of workers who may need EI is relatively low in that province. Therefore, the small size of the sub-sample used to estimate the eligibility rate in Alberta resulted in a high coefficient of variation.<sup>41</sup> Therefore, the decline in the eligibility rate between 2011 and 2012 is likely over-estimated in Alberta.

### 3.4 EI Eligibility Among the Unemployed Population, by Gender and Age

In 2012, EI eligibility rates increased for all demographic groups (see Table 10). Specifically, the EI eligibility rate for women increased from 79.0% in 2011 to 81.9% in 2012, and that for men increased from 77.0% to 81.9%. As reported in previous *EI Monitoring and Assessment Reports*,



<sup>40</sup> HRSDC, *EI and Non-Standard Workers: Part-Time, Short-Term and Seasonal Workers* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2012).

<sup>41</sup> 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. If the coefficient of variation is in the range of 16.6% to 33.3%, caution should be used when interpreting the estimate. For more information, please refer to <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/131115/dq131115b-eng.html>.

**TABLE 10**  
**EI Eligibility Rate (E/S Ratio) Summary**

	2012 (%)	2011 (%)	2010 (%)	2009 (%)	2008 (%)	2007 (%)
<b>EI Eligibility Rate (E/S Ratio)</b>	<b>81.9</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<b>83.9</b>	<b>86.2</b>	<b>82.2</b>	<b>82.3</b>
...for women	81.9	79.0	80.7	84.3	81.6	87.6
...for men	81.9	77.0	84.4	84.3	77.8	81.0
...for unemployed youth (15 to 24 years)	45.2	42.1	48.4	62.8	51.9	45.9
...for unemployed adult (25 years and older)	87.9	85.1	89.6	90.5	89.1	89.4
...for unemployed adult women	87.2	82.0	89.6	88.3	86.4	87.7
...for unemployed adult men	88.3	87.4	89.5	91.8	90.6	90.4

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 overrepresented among those working in part-time and/or temporary jobs. A recent study<sup>42</sup> showed that the gender differences in eligibility rates may also be attributable to the fact that a higher proportion of women do not have a valid job separation.

Youth (aged 15 to 24) had a lower EI eligibility rate (45.2%), while workers aged 25 years and older had a higher eligibility rate (87.9%) in 2012. The above-mentioned study found that the low eligibility rate for youth may be associated with two factors: many young people quit their job to go to school, and they do not accumulate enough insurable hours to qualify for EI regular benefits.

### 3.5 EI Eligibility for Regular Benefits, Among the Employed Population

An evaluation study, using the Labour Force Survey,<sup>43</sup> measured the proportion of employees who would have had sufficient insured hours over the qualifying period to meet regional EI entrance requirements—ranging from 420 to 700 hours for most individuals to 910 hours for new entrants and re-entrants (NEREs)<sup>44</sup>—if all workers had been laid off in the year studied.

The LFS-based simulations suggest that 87.2% of individuals who were working as paid employees in 2012 would have been eligible for regular benefits if they had lost their job.<sup>45</sup>

The LFS-based simulations suggest the proportion of unemployed individuals with sufficient hours to claim regular benefits varied only slightly across the country, ranging from 89.1% in the Atlantic region to 85.3% in British Columbia (see Chart 20). The eligibility rates in the Atlantic provinces (89.1%), Ontario (88.1%) and Quebec (87.5%) were higher than the national average, while rates were lower than the national average in the Prairie provinces (85.8%) and British Columbia (85.3%).

The regular benefit eligibility rate in 2012 was lower for women (85.8%) than for men (88.6%), primarily because women were more likely to work part-time, and more likely to be NEREs. However, women had a slightly higher eligibility rate than men (93.8% vs. 92.9%) among individuals who were employed in full-time jobs.

Male part-time workers (50.5%), female part-time workers (60.6%) and young workers aged 17 to 24 (60.8%) had the lowest regular benefit eligibility rates in 2012. The low eligibility rate for part-time workers is explained by the fact that they work fewer hours than full-time workers. In addition, youth and part-time workers are more likely to be considered as NEREs than their older, full-time worker counterparts.

<sup>42</sup> HRSDC, *Employment Insurance (EI) and Key Socio-Economic Groups* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2011).


<sup>43</sup> Until last year, the EI eligibility rate among the employed population was estimated using the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID). However, since the SLID has been discontinued, in this report we relied on the Labour Force Survey (LFS). Comparing the results using SLID and LFS, it shows that the two data sources lead to very similar estimates.

<sup>44</sup> More detailed information on NEREs can be found in Chapter 1 of the *2011 EI Monitoring and Assessment Report*, at <http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/ei/reports/mar2011/chapter1.shtml>.

<sup>45</sup> Constantine Kapsalis, *Potential EI Eligibility of Canadian Paid Workers* (Ottawa: Data Probe Economic Consulting Inc., 2013).

**CHART 20**

Percentage of Employed Individuals with Sufficient Hours to Claim Regular Benefits, by Province, 2010



Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

#### 4. Accessibility to EI Regular Benefits

While the above analysis focuses on EI eligibility, it is also possible to measure the level of access to EI regular benefits by unemployed people with qualifying separations. This ratio is calculated by dividing the number of unemployed individuals who received regular benefits in the EICS reference week by the number of unemployed individuals with a recent job separation that met EI program eligibility criteria (R/S in Chart 17). The R/S ratio is considered more relevant than the other accessibility measures, as it considers only the unemployed individuals who are among the intended EI client population.

Access to regular benefits (R/S) can differ from eligibility for a number of reasons. For instance, eligible individuals may decide not to establish an EI claim, or individuals may make a claim but decide not to collect benefits. In 2012, among unemployed individuals with a recent job separation that met EI criteria, an average of 53.9% received regular benefits during the reference week compared with 55.1% in 2011 and 62.7% in 2010.


Similar to the eligibility rate, accessibility to EI regular benefits (R/S) varies by demographics, labour market characteristics and province. In 2012, the R/S ratio for women (54.1%) was slightly higher than that for men (53.7%) as women had experienced relatively strong growth in the accessibility ratio over the past two years. Youth (aged 15 to 24 years) and part-time

workers had the lowest accessibility ratios in 2012, at 22.1% and 19.0%, respectively, particularly when compared with adults (25 years or older) (59.1%) and full-time workers (62.2%).

The EI access rate ranged from 30.7% in Alberta to 73.8% in the Atlantic provinces in 2012. Alberta's ratio had the most notable change, decreasing from 52.2% in 2011 to 30.7% in 2012.

Another measure, the beneficiaries-to-unemployed ratio (B divided by U), is often used as an indicator of accessibility to the EI program. The B/U ratio has the advantage of simplicity and historical availability. However, it has a number of limitations.

First, its denominator (all unemployed) includes many people who are outside the parameters of the EI program (e.g., individuals who are going back to school, who did not pay EI premiums during the last 12 months or who quit their jobs without just cause). Second, its numerator (total regular beneficiaries in the reference week) includes EI beneficiaries who are not unemployed, such as claimants who received both benefits and earnings in a given week (see section 5 of this chapter for more information on the Working While on Claim provision). Third, the numerator and the denominator of the B/U ratio are derived from two separate sources, as the numerator comes from Statistics Canada's monthly EI Statistics release and the denominator

**CHART 21****El Accessibility Ratios, 2003 to 2012**

Source: Employment Insurance Coverage Survey and Labour Force Survey.

comes from Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey. The accessibility ratio (R/S) remains a more appropriate measure of EI access than the B/U ratio.

In 2012, the B/U ratio was 38.8%, dropping from 41.3% in 2011. The decrease is attributable to the fact that the number of regular beneficiaries decreased to a larger extent than the decrease in the number of total unemployed population. For example, from 2011 to 2012, the number of beneficiaries decreased by 8.4%, while the number of total unemployed decreased by 2.6%. In addition, the end of the temporary EAP EI measures is another factor behind the recent decline in the B/U ratio.

A number of different factors have contributed to the 8.4% decrease in the number of beneficiaries, including the increase in the proportion of long-term unemployed to total unemployed population. These long-term unemployed individuals have not contributed to EI in the previous year; as a result, they are not covered by the EI program. According to the EICS, in 2012, of the total unemployed population, the proportion of those who have not contributed to EI in the previous year increased from 32.2% in 2011 to 33.9% in 2012.

A third measure, the 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 is a slight improvement over the B/U ratio, in that its denominator includes only those individuals who paid premiums. However, the denominator still includes individuals who had invalid job separations under the EI program (e.g., those who quit their job to return to school or quit without a just cause). This ratio also suffers from the same issues with its numerator as the B/U ratio. Therefore, once again, the R/S ratio remains the more accurate measure of accessibility to EI.

In 2012, the B/UC ratio was 62.9%, compared with 64.1% in 2011. The decrease is due to the increase in the number of beneficiaries (-8.4%), which outpaced the decrease in the number of unemployed who paid EI premiums (-6.7%) in 2012.

## 5. Level of EI Regular Benefits

Under the *Employment Insurance Act*, the methodology used to determine the maximum insurable earnings threshold (MIE)<sup>46</sup> for EI reflects prior average weekly earnings (AWE).<sup>47</sup> The MIE was \$44,200 in 2011, \$45,900 in 2012, and \$47,400 in 2013. Accordingly, the maximum weekly benefit was \$468 in 2011, \$485 in 2012, and \$501 in 2013. The proportion of regular claimants receiving the maximum weekly benefit increased slightly from 41.3% in 2011/12 to 41.6% in 2012/13. This marked the second consecutive year that the proportion of regular claimants receiving the maximum benefit increased, reversing a two-year decline observed in 2009/10 and 2010/11, which was attributable to the effects of the late-2000s recession on work attachment and to weaker growth in average earnings.

A claimant's history of collecting benefits has an impact on the likelihood that he or she will receive the maximum weekly benefit. In 2012/13, 55.3% of long-tenured workers and 46.3% of frequent claimants who established an EI claim were entitled to the maximum weekly benefit, in contrast to only 33.5% of occasional claimants.


EI regular claimants were entitled to an average weekly regular benefit of \$396 in 2012/13, a 3.3% increase from \$384 in 2011/12. Using the EI claimant categories, long-tenured workers had an average EI weekly regular benefit of \$429, while frequent claimants had an average EI weekly regular benefit of \$412 in 2012/13. In contrast, occasional claimants had an average EI weekly regular benefit of \$375.

On average, men were entitled to \$422 and women to \$358 in weekly regular benefits for claims established in 2012/13. While the difference in average weekly regular benefit reflects the earnings gap between men and women, a general trend of strong growth in women's average weekly regular benefits means that the gap is gradually closing. In 2012/13, the average weekly regular benefit for women was 84.8% of that for men, compared with 71.1% in 2000/01.

Historically, the average weekly benefit for EI regular benefit has increased every year. However, growth of the average weekly regular benefit has fluctuated in recent years, due in part to the effects of the late-2000s recession (see Chart 22). The average weekly regular benefit increased by 4.9% in 2008/09, but only

**CHART 22**

Average Weekly Regular Benefit, by Gender, 2000/01 to 2012/13



Note: Shading corresponds to a recessionary period.

<sup>46</sup> The methodology used to obtain the maximum insurable earnings (MIE) is outlined in the *Employment Insurance Act* and in the *2013 Actuarial Report on the Employment Insurance Premium Rate* (Ottawa: Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board, Chief Actuary, 2012), [http://www.ceifb-foaec.ca/en/PDF\\_Reports/Rate%20Setting/CA%20English%20Report%202013%20FINAL.pdf](http://www.ceifb-foaec.ca/en/PDF_Reports/Rate%20Setting/CA%20English%20Report%202013%20FINAL.pdf).

<sup>47</sup> Average weekly earnings (AWE) figures are published by Statistics Canada under the authority of the *Statistics Act*.



increased by 0.8% in 2009/10 and 1.1% in 2010/11, due to the weaker growth in average earnings, and in the MIE in 2010 (+2.1%) and 2011 (+2.3%) compared to 2009 (+2.9%). The growth rate only returned to pre-recession levels in 2011/12, with a 3.5% increase in the average weekly regular benefit from the previous year. In 2012/13, the growth rate remained stable, with a 3.1% increase over the previous year.

The effective replacement rate, which is the actual proportion of earnings replaced by EI regular benefits, provides further insight into the level of support provided by EI benefits. The EI program is designed to replace 55% of previous employment earnings, up to the MIE threshold.

A study<sup>48</sup> based on the EICS and the Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID) found that, between 2001 and 2010, the average effective replacement rate was 48% and 50%, according to the EICS and the SLID, respectively. The study also found that 62% of regular beneficiaries in 2009 and 2010 received regular benefits that equated to 55% of their previously insured employment earnings.

This study also found that, over a 10-year period (2001–10), the proportion of beneficiaries receiving 55% of their prior earnings has declined consistently at an annual rate of 1.5 percentage points. This decline over time is explained by the fact that, for several years, average wage rates increased at a faster pace than the MIE. In fact, the MIE was frozen from 1996 to 2006, but it has increased every year since then.

### 5.1 Working While on Claim Provision

The purpose of the Working While on Claim (WWC) provision is to encourage work attachment by allowing claimants to accept all available work while receiving EI benefits. Under the *Employment Insurance Act*, the provision applies to regular, fishing, parental and compassionate care benefits and claimants may earn the greater of 25% of their weekly benefit or \$50, without a reduction in their weekly benefit. Employment earnings above this threshold are deducted dollar for dollar from the claimant's weekly 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 is one year from the start of the claim.

#### 5.1.1 Working While on Claim Pilot Project<sup>49</sup>

The WWC pilot project was first introduced in 23 pilot regions, on December 11, 2005 and ran until December 6, 2008, to test whether allowing beneficiaries to earn more income while claiming EI benefits would encourage them to accept all 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. EI claimants in non-pilot regions continued to be subject to an allowable earnings threshold of \$50 or 25% of their weekly benefit based on the WWC provision in the *Employment Insurance Act*.

The pilot project was re-introduced on December 7, 2008 nationally in all EI economic regions and ran until August 6, 2011. A new pilot began under the same parameters on August 7, 2011, and ran until August 4, 2012, to assess the effectiveness of the pilot during a period of economic recovery and a full economic cycle.

EI administrative data indicate that among all EI claims established in 2011/12, a total of 811,200 involved work while on claim, representing 42.7% of all EI claims established that year. Almost all claimants who worked while on claim (800,990 claims or 98.7%) received regular benefits. Among regular claims established in 2011/12, 55.4% worked while on claim. This proportion has remained relatively stable at around 55% for the last few years and suggests that the likelihood of finding employment while on claim remains relatively high. In 2011/12, among regions with unemployment rates of 10% or lower, 52.8% of regular claims had work while on claim, while among regions with unemployment rates of 10.1% and higher, 65.4% of regular claims had work while on claim.

In 2011/12, in relation to regular benefits, some provinces had a higher proportion than others of EI claims with work while on claim. For instance, among regular EI claims established in the Atlantic provinces in 2011/12, 66.2% (153,210) involved work while on claim, as did 62.5% (292,240) of EI claims established in Quebec. In the rest of Canada, 47.5% (355,540) of EI claims established in 2011/12 involved work while on claim. This regional variability in the likelihood of working while on claim could be influenced by a number of factors,

<sup>48</sup> Constantine Kapsalis, *Estimates of the Employment Insurance Replacement Rate* (Ottawa: Data Probe Economic Consulting Inc., 2011).

<sup>49</sup> Data and analysis on WWC statistics in section 5.1.1 relate to claims established in 2011/12 to ensure all claims were completed.

such as regional availability of work, seasonal work patterns, industry circumstances and familiarity with the provision.

Among the 800,990 regular benefit claims involving work while on claim in 2011/12, 6.8% received full EI benefits,<sup>50</sup> 22.3% received partial EI benefits, 22.4% received no EI benefits and deferred their weeks of entitlement and almost half (48.5%) received a mix of EI benefit deductions during the weeks they worked while on claim indicating varied patterns of work and earnings over the course of their claims. An evaluation study<sup>51</sup> based on WWC pilot data from 2005 to 2008 found that for those claimants receiving full benefits, the WWC pilot project increased the likelihood of working while on claim by 96% for men and 69% for women, and increased average weeks of working on claim by 0.6 weeks for men and by 0.7 weeks for women.

For regular claims established in 2011/12 involving work while on claim, the average entitlement was 33.7 weeks of claims, and the average number of weeks worked while on claim was 12.5 weeks. Compared to 2010/11, regular claims involving work while on claim had an average entitlement of 36.4 weeks of claims and an average of 12.8 weeks worked. The above-mentioned study also indicated that the WWC pilot reduced average total weeks on claim by 1.2 weeks for men and 1.5 weeks for women.

### **5.1.2 New Working While on Claim Pilot Project<sup>52</sup>**

A new WWC pilot project was introduced on August 5, 2012, as announced in Economic Action Plan 2012. Under the 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 earnings used to establish his or her benefit rate. At that point, the claimant's 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. After the new WWC pilot project began, some claimants indicated they could not find additional work beyond approximately one day per week and were experiencing difficulty transitioning

to the new pilot rules. As a result, eligible EI claimants who had earnings between August 7, 2011, and August 4, 2012, and were covered by the provisions of the previous WWC pilot project, may be able to revert to the rules of the previous WWC pilot project (which allowed them to earn the greater of \$75 or 40% of their weekly benefit without a reduction in their benefit).

As such, the 2012/13 Monitoring and Assessment Report encompasses various periods of WWC pilots—namely, the pilot that allowed claimants to earn the greater of \$75 or 40% of their weekly benefit without a reduction in their benefit; the introduction of the new pilot project that reduced claimants' benefits by 50% of their earnings while on claim, starting with the first dollar earned, until the claimant's earnings reach 90% of the earnings used to establish their benefit rate; and the option to revert to the rules of the previous WWC pilot. The option to revert was operational on January 6, 2013. As of August 4, 2013, approximately seven months after eligible claimants were first allowed to revert, a total of 11,375 claims had reverted to the previous WWC rules (\$75 or 40%). In the period from January 6, 2013, to February 4, 2013, an average of 1,360 claims per week reverted to the previous WWC pilot rules. As shown in Chart 23, the number of claims that reverted peaked during this period. Since then, an average of 180 claims per week, have reverted to the previous WWC rules. As of August 4, 2013, 6% of those who had the opportunity to revert had chosen to do so.


<sup>50</sup> An EI claimant receiving full benefits implies the claimant worked less than the 40% or \$75 threshold under the previous pilot, as no EI benefits were clawed back. An EI claimant receiving partial benefits implies the claimant worked above this threshold but still received partial benefits during the week(s) he or she worked while on claim, with some earnings reductions. An EI claimant receiving no EI benefits implies the claimant earned sufficient income to defer the full week of entitlement during the weeks he or she worked while on claim. An EI claimant receiving a mix of EI benefits implies the claimant received at least two EI benefit deductions (full, partial, or no benefits) during the weeks he or she worked while on a claim.

<sup>51</sup> Stephanie Lluís and Brian P. McCall, *Evaluation of the Impacts of the Increase in EI Allowable Earnings Pilot Project: Updated Study* (Ottawa: HRSDC, 2011).

<sup>52</sup> Data on and analysis of WWC statistics in section 5.1.2 are based on the point in time when the work while on claim occurred for all open claims.

**CHART 23**

Number of Weekly WWC Reversions, Between Week of January 6, 2013 and Week of October 27, 2013

**Weeks of Work While on Claim<sup>53</sup>**

Because different WWC rules were in place during 2012/13, the following analysis draws on quarterly rather than annual data to assess aspects of their impact. Table 11 presents analysis of the weeks for which a claimant reported working while on claim. The first row in the table indicates the average number of weeks worked while on claim per month for each quarter of 2011/12 and 2012/13. The second row shows the weeks worked while on claim as a percentage of all weeks; a higher number indicates that more weeks were worked relative to the number of EI benefit weeks paid. The final section of the table displays the distribution of weeks worked based on earnings relative to the benefit rate. For example, in the fourth quarter of 2011/12, in a total of 15.6% of weeks worked while on claim, claimants had earnings that were between 26% and 40% of their weekly EI benefit rate.

Since the new WWC pilot has been in effect, there has been an increase in the intensity of work compared to the previous WWC pilot, implying that the average number of days worked while on claim per week has increased. As shown in Table 11, the percentage of claimants with earnings greater than 40% of their weekly benefit rate (the allowable earnings threshold under the previous pilot) increased significantly,

from 75.8% to 85.3%, between the fourth quarter of 2011/12 (January to March 2012) and the fourth quarter of 2012/13 (January to March 2013). Conversely, during the same period, the percentage of claimants with earnings less than 40% of their weekly benefit rate decreased from 24.1% to 14.7%. With an increase in work intensity, there could be an associated decline in the overall number of weeks worked, as employers may be less likely to utilize multiple employees to address temporary labour requirements. More specifically, employers may be able to address their temporary labour needs with fewer employees (thus fewer weeks worked while on claim), as they are more readily available to accept all available work under the new rules.

The slight decline in the proportion of weeks worked while on claim in relation to total weeks paid, from 16.3% in the fourth quarter of 2011/12 to 13.9% in the fourth quarter of 2012/13, may also be attributable to the change in the intensity of work when claimants work while on claim.

Chart 24 shows the distribution of weeks worked while on claim, in terms of earnings in relation to EI benefit rate, under the three different WWC regimes. In 2005, the legislated 25% earnings allowance was in force. In 2009, the first WWC pilot project—which increased

<sup>53</sup> 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 11**

**Quarterly Statistics on Weeks Worked While on Claim,<sup>1</sup> 2011/12 and 2012/13**

Category	2011/12 <sup>2,3</sup>				2012/13 <sup>1,2,3</sup>			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Average Weeks Worked While on Claim per Month	958,130	837,020	800,823	901,020	900,673	768,367	711,347	731,080
Weeks Worked While on Claim as a Percentage of All Weeks	18.2	16.6	16.4	16.3	18.3	15.9	14.9	13.9
Distribution of WWC - Earnings as a Percentage of EI Benefit Rate								
Less than 25% <sup>4</sup>	6.3	6.4	<b>6.9</b>	<b>8.5</b>	6.1	5.5	<b>4.9</b>	<b>6.6</b>
26% to 40%	10.3	8.8	<b>10.7</b>	<b>15.6</b>	9.8	6.9	<b>5.8</b>	<b>8.1</b>
41% to 75%	9.2	8.6	<b>9.6</b>	<b>10.6</b>	8.5	8.2	<b>9.3</b>	<b>10.4</b>
76% to 100%	5.3	5.0	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.2</b>	4.9	5.1	<b>6.2</b>	<b>6.4</b>
101% to 125%	5.9	5.3	<b>5.8</b>	<b>5.3</b>	5.4	5.7	<b>6.9</b>	<b>6.9</b>
126% or more	63.1	66.0	<b>61.5</b>	<b>54.6</b>	65.3	68.5	<b>66.9</b>	<b>61.6</b>

Source: EI administrative data, includes weeks of EI benefits processed in the quarter.

<sup>1</sup> Data are based on the weeks worked while on claim during this period, regardless of when the claim was established.


<sup>2</sup> Excludes weeks worked while on claim with missing earnings data, which represent less than 1% of the weeks.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes any claims that reverted to previous WWC rules (\$75 or 40%).

<sup>4</sup> 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.

**CHART 24**

**Distribution of Weeks Worked Under Different Working While on Claim Regimes**



Notes:

1. Full weeks worked are excluded.
2. Data based on the weeks of benefits were worked while on claim, regardless of when they were established.
3. Excludes weeks worked while on claim with missing earnings data, which represents less than 1% of the weeks.
4. Excludes any claims that reverted to previous WWC rules (\$75/40%) on or after January 6, 2013.

the earnings allowance to 40%—was in force. And in 2013, the current WWC pilot project—which reduces EI benefits by 50% of earnings while the claimant is on claim—was in force.

The 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 but no incentive to work beyond, as beyond a half-day's to one day's work, claimants would receive the same amount in combined EI benefits and earnings from working while on claim, no matter how many extra days they worked. 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.

Behavioural impacts of the incentives are suggested by the two distinct peaks in the 2005 and 2009 data, where claimants reached the respective thresholds. Chart 24 also illustrates the change in claimant behaviour under the current pilot project; there is now a smoother distribution of weeks worked while on claim, which demonstrates the consistent incentive to accept available work.

Future *Monitoring and Assessment Reports* will continue to assess the impact of the new WWC pilot project.

## 5.2 Small Weeks Provision

EI benefits are calculated using earnings in the 26-week period before the establishment of a claim. During that period, weeks with relatively lower earnings could reduce the benefits claimants receive. The objective of the Small Weeks provision is to encourage individuals to accept all available work by excluding weeks of earnings below \$225 from the benefit calculation, provided that the number of weeks of earnings exceeds the minimum divisor,<sup>54</sup> which encourages workers to accept work beyond the minimum required to qualify for EI.

As noted in the *2010 Monitoring and Assessment Report*, the Small Weeks provision was tested through multiple pilot projects from 1997 to 2001. Evaluation results<sup>55</sup> indicated that the provision increased total

duration of work in the 26 weeks prior to job separation, and increased the total average income of male and female participants. Based on these evaluation results, Small Weeks was made a permanent provision of the EI program in November 2001. In November 2005, the Best 14 Weeks pilot project replaced the Small Weeks provision in several EI economic regions of high unemployment. The Best 14 Weeks pilot project was renewed from June 26, 2011, to June 23, 2012, and was extended a second time until April 6, 2013. Consequently, the following analysis is based on the EI regions where the Best 14 Weeks pilot project was not in effect.<sup>56</sup>

The Small Weeks provision affected 217,850 of all claims established in 2012/13, or 18.1% of claims in EI regions where the Best 14 Weeks pilot project was not in effect. The average Small Weeks claim received an average of \$21 more per week than what would have been received had the provision not been in place, as the average weekly benefit for Small Weeks claims would have been \$268, rather than \$289.


The Small Weeks provision primarily benefits youth, women and occasional claimants, who are proportionally overrepresented in non-standard employment. In 2012/13, it benefited 27.2% of claims made by those aged 15 to 24, 16.2% of claims made by those aged 25 to 44, 17.1% of claims made by those aged 45 to 54, and 19.5% of claims made by older claimants. On a per-claim basis, women were significantly more likely than men to benefit (22.7% vs. 13.7%). Based on EI claimant category, the Small Weeks provision benefited 22.7% of claims made by occasional claimants, 15.7% of claims made by frequent claimants and 10.7% of claims made by long-tenured workers (see Chart 25).

Beginning April 7, 2013, a new legislated Variable Best Weeks approach will be used to calculate weekly EI benefits nationally, as discussed in section 5.5 of this report. As a result, the Small Weeks provision will no longer exist and future reports will not report on it.

<sup>54</sup> More information on the Minimum Divisor provision can be found in Chapter 1 of the *2011 Monitoring and Assessment Report*, at <http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/ei/reports/mar2011/chapter1.shtml>.

<sup>55</sup> HRSDC, *An Evaluation of the EI Pilot Project on Small Weeks, 1998–2001* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2001).

<sup>56</sup> The Best 14 Weeks pilot project applied to 23 EI economic regions from October 2005 until October 2008. The project was extended from October 2008 until June 2011 in 25 EI economic regions, and then extended until April 6, 2013, in the original 23 EI regions.

**CHART 25****Proportion of Claimants who Benefited from the Small Weeks Provision, 2012/13**

### 5.3 Minimum Divisor Provision

The EI weekly benefit rate is determined by dividing 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.

The minimum divisor ranges from 14 to 22 weeks<sup>57</sup> and is two weeks more than the minimum number of weeks a claimant is required to work<sup>58</sup> in order to qualify for benefits. The minimum divisor encourages workers to accept all available employment and provides claimants with a strong incentive to work beyond what is required to establish a claim, in order to avoid a reduced weekly benefit.<sup>59</sup>

However, the Minimum Divisor provision did not apply to the 25 EI economic regions that were covered by the Best 14 Weeks pilot project in 2012/13,<sup>60</sup> as this pilot project effectively sets the divisor at 14 weeks in the pilot regions by having the best 14 weeks selected from a qualifying period of 52 weeks.

In Budget 2012, the Government of Canada introduced a new method for calculating weekly EI benefits. Based on a new legislated national

Variable Best Weeks approach, it became effective on April 7, 2013, as discussed in section 5.5 of this report. As a result, the Minimum Divisor provision no longer exists and future reports will not report on it; instead, the analysis will focus on the new Variable Best Weeks provision.

In 2012/13, the minimum divisor decreased benefits for 2.5% (21,050) of regular benefit claimants and 3.8% (14,280) of special benefit claimants in the non-pilot regions. Had the Best 14 Weeks pilot project not been in place, the divisor would have affected 4.1% of regular claims and 2.7% of special claims in the pilot project regions.<sup>61</sup>

The minimum divisor was more likely to affect regular EI beneficiaries in the non-pilot regions who were women, older claimants (55 and older), occasional claimants or frequent claimants. Moreover, claimants affected by the divisor received lower average weekly benefits than claimants not affected by the divisor. As shown in Table 12, regular benefit claimants who were affected by the divisor received an average weekly benefit of \$301, compared to the national average of \$397. Women, older claimants and occasional claimants affected by the divisor received an average of \$263,

<sup>57</sup> The number of weeks depends on the rate of unemployment in the economic region in which the claimant resides.

<sup>58</sup> The number of hours required under the VER provision is converted into weeks using a 35 hours per week factor.

<sup>59</sup> More detailed information on the Minimum Divisor provision can be found in Chapter 1 of the 2011 EI Monitoring and Assessment Report, at <http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/ei/reports/mar2011/chapter1.shtml>.

<sup>60</sup> During the reporting period (2012/13), the Best 14 Weeks pilot project was in effect in 25 of the 58 EI economic regions. The minimum divisor applied in the remaining 33 EI economic regions.

<sup>61</sup> The analysis of claims affected by the divisor is an approximation based on available EI administrative data.

**TABLE 12**  
**Average Weekly Benefit, 2012/13**

	Regular Claimants Affected by the Divisor	Regular Claimants
<b>Gender</b>		
Men	\$334	\$422
Women	\$263	\$359
<b>Age</b>		
Under 25 years	\$282	\$362
25 to 44 years	\$320	\$407
45 to 54 years	\$305	\$401
55 years and older	\$278	\$386
<b>EI Claimant Category</b>		
Long-tenured workers	\$317	\$429
Occasional claimants	\$286	\$376
Frequent claimants	\$329	\$412
<b>Canada</b>	<b>\$301</b>	<b>\$397</b>

\$278, and \$286, respectively. In comparison, women, older claimants and occasional claimants who were not affected by the divisor received an average of \$359, \$386 and \$376, respectively.

#### 5.4 Best 14 Weeks Pilot Project

The Best 14 Weeks pilot project tests whether basing claimants' benefits on their 14 weeks of highest earnings in the 52 weeks before they claim EI encourages claimants to accept all available work. This pilot project effectively replaces the Small Weeks provision in the EI pilot project regions. It also extends the rate calculation period, from 26 weeks preceding the claim to 52 weeks preceding the claim.

The Best 14 Weeks pilot project was introduced in 23 EI economic regions on October 30, 2005. It was re-introduced in 25 EI economic regions in 2008 and renewed several times until April 6, 2013. Administrative data indicate that 351,640 claims received higher weekly benefits due to the Best 14 Weeks pilot project in 2012/13. Over half (56.9%) of all claims in the EI pilot regions in 2012/13 benefited from the pilot project, similar to the proportion in 2011/12 (57.4%).

Women were significantly more likely to benefit from the pilot project; 74.3% of claims established by women in the pilot regions benefited from the pilot project compared with 45.4% of claims established by men.

Similarly, young people in the pilot regions were more likely to benefit from the pilot project; 71.6% of claims made by claimants under 25 received a higher weekly benefit, compared with 55.4% of claims made by claimants aged 25 to 44, 55.1% of claims made by claimants aged 45 to 55, and 54.8% of claims made by older workers. Furthermore, on a per-claim basis, occasional claimants (68.0%) were more likely than long-tenured workers (49.0%) and frequent claimants (47.9%) to benefit from the pilot project. An evaluation study<sup>62</sup> found that women and younger claimants saw the largest increases in their weekly benefit as a result of the pilot project.

Had the pilot project not been in place, the average weekly benefit per claim in 2012/13 would have been \$310 instead of \$361.<sup>63</sup>

In Budget 2012, the Government of Canada introduced a new method for calculating weekly EI benefits. Based on a new legislated national Variable Best Weeks approach, it became effective on April 7, 2013, as discussed in section 5.5 of this report. Future reports will examine the new rate calculation.

#### 5.5 Variable Best Weeks Provision

Economic Action Plan 2012 included a number of changes to the EI program. One of these changes was a new, national, legislated approach to the way EI benefits are calculated, called the Variable Best Weeks (VBW) provision.

The new approach makes the EI program more responsive to changes in local labour markets and ensures that those living in similar labour market conditions are treated the same way.<sup>64</sup> It became effective on April 7, 2013. The VBW provision replaces the previous 26-week benefit calculation<sup>65</sup> established under former legislation in 1996 and marks an end to

<sup>62</sup> ESDC, *Labour Supply and the Impacts of the Best 14 Weeks Pilot* (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Services, 2014).

<sup>63</sup> The analysis of the effect of the Best 14 Weeks pilot project does not take into account the potential effects of the Small Weeks provision on weekly benefits.

<sup>64</sup> For more information on the Variable Best Weeks Provision, please visit <http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/ei/vbw/index.shtml>.

<sup>65</sup> For information on previous benefit calculation methods, please see Chapter 1 of the *2011 Monitoring and Assessment Report* (EI Part 1, section 4). For more recent analysis of the Small Weeks and the Minimum Divisor provisions, please see sections 5.2 and 5.3 of the *2012/13 Monitoring and Assessment Report*.

**TABLE 13**  
Variable Best Weeks

Regional Rate of Unemployment	Number of Weeks Used for Calculating Benefit Rate
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


the Best 14 Weeks pilot project.<sup>66</sup> The VBW provision applies to all economic regions in Canada and to all benefit types, except self-employed people and claimants receiving fishing benefits. Under the VBW provision, EI claimants' benefits are calculated based on their highest (best) weeks of insurable earnings during the qualifying period (generally 52 weeks preceding the claim). The number of weeks used to calculate benefit rates ranges from 14 to 22, depending on the EI monthly unemployment rate<sup>67</sup> in the EI economic region where the claimant lives, as illustrated in Table 13.

### 5.5.1 Measuring the impact of the Variable Best Weeks provision

Future EI Monitoring and Assessment Reports will analyse average weekly benefit rates, before and after the implementation of VBW provision. Chart 26 serves as a reference point, comparing average weekly benefit rates between 2008/09 and 2012/13 for the two benefit rate calculation methods—that is, the Best 14 Weeks method for participating pilot regions and the previous 26-week method for non-pilot regions. Future EI Monitoring and Assessment Reports may also use additional measures and indicator to assess the impact of the new VBW provision.

**CHART 26**

Average Weekly Regular Benefit, by Benefit Rate Calculation Type, 2008/09 to 2012/13



Comparing pre-VBW average weekly benefits from 2008/09 to 2012/13 and VBW average weekly benefits for 2013/14 and beyond will provide insight into the impact of the change in benefit calculation methodology. However, factors both internal and external to EI—such as the maximum insurable earnings threshold, growth in wage rates and labour market conditions—may influence EI benefit rates. For this reason, changes to average weekly benefits over the coming years cannot be solely attributed to the VBW provision.

### 5.6 Benefit Repayment Provision

To better reflect insurance principles, high-earning claimants of regular or fishing benefits who have received at least one week of regular or fishing benefits in the preceding 10 taxation years repay part of the benefits they receive.<sup>68</sup> In 2011, repeat EI beneficiaries whose net income exceeded \$55,250 had to repay the lesser of 30 cents of every dollar in benefits they received or 30 cents for every dollar of net income above the threshold.

<sup>66</sup> For more information on the Best 14 Weeks pilot project, please see Chapter 1 of the 2011 *Monitoring and Assessment Report* (EI Part 1, section 5.2). For more recent analysis on the Best 14 Weeks pilot project, please see section 5.4 of the 2012/13 *Monitoring and Assessment Report*.

<sup>67</sup> The EI monthly unemployment rate is based on a rolling average of Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey unemployment rates for the previous three months.

<sup>68</sup> See Annex 2.17 for further details on the benefit repayment provision.



For the 2011 taxation year,<sup>69</sup> 176,475 claimants of regular or fishing benefits repaid \$212.9 million. The number of claimants who repaid benefits fell by 4.1% and the amount repaid was 1.3% higher than in 2010. On average, claimants repaid \$1,206, which is 5.6% higher than the amount repaid in 2010 (\$1,142). In 2011, claimants who repaid a portion of their benefits were on claim for an average of 11.8 weeks, which is the same figure as 2010. In 2011, these claimants received \$5,093, on average, compared with \$4,915 in 2010.

Men continued to comprise the vast majority of claimants who repaid benefits. They accounted for 88.7% of the total in 2011, a share that has remained stable for over a decade. In terms of repayment, on average, women repaid 83.9% of the amount that men repaid (\$1,031 compared to \$1,229). This proportion decreased compared to 2010 (89.1%), but is higher than the amount registered in 2007 (82.2%).

From 2010 to 2011, the number of men and women who repaid a portion of their benefits decreased by 4.5% and 1.4%, respectively. Between 2010 and 2011, the number claimants aged 25 and under and aged 55 and older who repaid a portion of their benefits increased (+2.6% and 2.5% respectively), while the number of claimants aged 25–44 and aged 24–54 who repaid a portion of their benefits decreased (-5.5% and -8.4% respectively). Differences in benefit repayment between genders and among age groups reflect differences in pre-claim earnings among members of these groups and their likelihood to be repeat users of EI.

Individuals in the Atlantic provinces who had to repay benefits repaid higher amounts than claimants in the rest of Canada. For instance, claimants in Newfoundland and Labrador who repaid a portion of their benefits were on claim for an average of 17.4 weeks and repaid an average of \$1,750, while their counterparts in Ontario had an average claim duration of 10.4 weeks and repaid an average of \$1,051. One factor explaining these differences is that repeat users of EI are overrepresented in Atlantic Canada and underrepresented in Ontario and the Western provinces. Another factor is that even high-income EI claimants require more weeks to find a new job in regions of high unemployment,

which are more prevalent in Atlantic Canada, than in regions of low unemployment, which are more prevalent in Ontario and the Western provinces.

## 6. Entitlement to EI Regular Benefits

In 2012/13, the average entitlement to regular benefits decreased slightly from 33.0 weeks in 2011/12 to 32.2 weeks (Table 14). Starting in 2011/12, the average regular benefit entitlement returned to pre-recession levels, i.e. 32.5 weeks in 2006/07. Average entitlement to regular EI benefits was higher from 2008/09 to 2010/11. This was attributable to two factors: automatic adjustments to the EI program, which increased entitlement to regular benefits to reflect higher unemployment rates in local labour markets; and (2) a temporary EI measure that provided 5 additional weeks of regular benefits up to a maximum of 50 weeks (the Extension of EI Regular Benefits measure). Therefore, the return of the average regular entitlement to pre-recession levels in 2012/13 was expected, considering the overall decline in regional unemployment rates and the end of the temporary EI measure.

**TABLE 14**  
Regular Benefit Entitlement and  
Proportion Used, 2002/03 to 2012/13

Year	Average Regular Entitlement	Proportion of Average Regular Entitlement Used
	(Weeks)	(%)
2002/03	32.6	61.3
2003/04	32.8	60.9
2004/05	33.3	59.8
2005/06	32.9	59.7
2006/07	32.5	59.7
2007/08	31.8	60.6
2008/09	36.5	59.7
2009/10	42.8	58.1
2010/11	36.0	62.1
2011/12	33.0	62.2
2012/13	32.2	NA

Source: EI administrative data.

<sup>69</sup> As benefit repayments are administered through the tax system, the most recent data available are for the 2011 taxation year.

Regular benefit claimants have, on average, consistently used between 58% and 62% of their entitlement since 2002/03. This suggests that, despite changes in Canada's economic performance, the program has responded well to the needs of unemployed workers. After remaining almost unchanged for years, the proportion of entitlement used for claims established in 2010/11 increased by 4.1 percentage points, from 58.1% in 2009/10 to 62.2%. This recent increase is the result of sustained usage levels combined with the recent drop in entitlement levels discussed above. In 2011/12, the proportion of entitlement usage increased slightly from 62.1% to 62.2%.

As in previous periods, the average percentage of EI benefit entitlement used for regular claims established in 2011/12 was highest in the Atlantic provinces, ranging from 65.3% in New Brunswick to 69.7% in Prince Edward Island. Among provinces, claimants in Saskatchewan used the least (57.8%) of the regular benefits to which they were entitled. The entitlement usage in British Columbia (64.3%), Ontario (62.0%) and Quebec (60.6%) was close to the national average of 62.2% in 2011/12.

Historically, women and men have used a similar proportion of their EI entitlement. That was also the case for claims established in 2011/12, when men used an average of 61.7% of their entitlement and women used an average of 62.9%.

Older workers (aged 55 years and older) tend to use more of the regular benefits to which they are entitled. This is due, in part, to the fact that it takes more time for older workers to find a new job, on average, than it does for members of other age groups. In 2011/12, older workers continued to use the highest percentage of their regular benefit entitlement, at 69.2%, compared with 59.7% for youth (aged 15 to 24), 59.9% for claimants aged 25 to 44, and 61.9% for those aged 45 to 54 (see Table 15). In comparison to the previous year, usage among older workers and those aged 45 to 54 years dropped slightly by 0.5 and 0.4 percentage points, respectively, while it rose among youth and those aged 25 to 44 years (+0.8 and 0.1 percentage points, respectively).

As illustrated in Table 15, long-tenured workers tend to use less of their entitlement than occasional and, especially, frequent claimants do.<sup>70</sup> For claims

**TABLE 15**  
**Regular Benefit Entitlement**  
**and Proportion Used, 2011/12**

	Average Regular Entitlement	Proportion of Average Regular Entitlement Used
	(Weeks)	(%)
<b>Canada</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>62.2</b>
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	33.6	61.7
Female	32.2	62.9
<b>Age</b>		
Under 25 years	32.0	59.7
25 to 44 years	33.1	59.9
45 to 54 years	33.5	61.9
55 years and older	32.6	69.2
<b>Province</b>		
Newfoundland and Labrador	40.8	66.2
Prince Edward Island	37.2	69.7
Nova Scotia	36.9	66.7
New Brunswick	37.3	65.3
Quebec	32.3	60.6
Ontario	32.4	62.0
Manitoba	30.1	60.1
Saskatchewan	33.2	57.8
Alberta	28.9	59.7
British Columbia	31.5	64.3
Nunavut	43.9	63.4
Northwest Territories	43.3	60.8
Yukon	43.8	52.5
<b>EI Claimant Category</b>		
Long-tenured workers	35.4	52.6
Occasional claimants	31.8	62.9
Frequent claimants	33.0	71.9
<b>Seasonality<sup>1</sup></b>		
Seasonal claimants	32.7	59.0
Non-seasonal claimants	33.1	63.5

Source: EI administrative data.

<sup>1</sup> Seasonal claimants are individuals who established three or more claims in the previous five years, of which at least two were established about the same time of the year as their current claim. For the purposes of this table, seasonal claimants exclude fishing claimants.

established in 2011/12, long-tenured claimants used 52.6% of their entitlement, while occasional claimants used 62.9% and frequent claimants used 71.9%. In comparison to the previous year, usage among

<sup>70</sup> Note that the definitions of long-tenured workers, occasional claimants and frequent claimants differ from those used in previous years. The analysis reflects the new definitions. Please refer to section II.1.5 for further information on the new claimant category definitions.

long-tenured workers declined by 1.2 percentage points, while it rose among occasional and frequent claimants (+0.8 and +0.5 percentage points, respectively). It suggests that these two groups are continuing to use EI for a significant period while finding suitable employment.

Compared with non-seasonal claimants, seasonal claimants tend to use less of their entitlement. As shown in Table 15, in 2011/12, seasonal workers used 59.0% of the benefits to which they were entitled, while non-seasonal claimants used 63.5% of their entitlement. An evaluation study<sup>71</sup> found that seasonal claimants used, on average, 55.4% of their regular entitlement for claims established in 2009/10 and 56.6% for claims established in 2008/09. In comparison, regular claimants used 58.1% of their entitlement for claims established in 2009/10 and 59.7% for claims established in 2008/09.


## 7. Duration of EI Regular Benefits

On average, regular claimants who established a claim in 2011/12 received 19.9 weeks of regular benefits, a decrease of 1.7 weeks from an average of 21.5 weeks in 2010/11 (Chart 27). This is the

second consecutive year of decreases in the average duration of regular claims after two years of increases, and it reflects the reduced availability of weeks due to the automatic adjustment of the program. It also aligns with improved prospects in the labour market; Canada experienced consecutive years of employment increases, with a net gain of 223,000 employment (+1.3%) in 2011/12 and 293,700 employment (+1.7%) in 2010/11.

A recent evaluation study<sup>72</sup> suggested that the effect of the program's automatic adjustments to regular entitlement, combined with the Extension of EI Regular Benefits temporary measure, led to an increase of 2.1 weeks in the duration of claims established between March 2008 and September 2010.

The average duration of EI regular benefits declined for all age groups in 2011/12 compared to the previous year. As noted earlier, older workers (aged 55 years and older) tend to collect EI regular benefits for longer periods than members of other age groups do. For claims established in 2011/12, older workers received an average of 22.0 weeks of regular benefits, a decrease of 2.3 weeks from 2010/11 and 2.1 weeks more than the national average. In contrast,



<sup>71</sup> HRSDC, *An Evaluation Overview of Seasonal Employment: Update* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Services, 2009).

<sup>72</sup> ESDC, *Extended Duration of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits: Second Evaluation Study Update* (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2012). The evaluation excludes claimants subject to the Extension of Benefits for Long-Tenured Workers temporary measure.


youth received 18.3 weeks of regular benefits on average in 2011/12, a decrease of 0.8 weeks from 2010/11 and 1.6 weeks less than the national average. Those aged 25 to 44 years old received 19.2 weeks on average, while those aged 45 to 54 years old received an average of 20.1 weeks of EI regular benefits (Chart 28).

The average duration of EI regular benefits also declined for all EI claimant categories in 2011/12. Long-tenured workers who claimed regular benefits in 2011/12 received an average of 18.3 weeks of regular benefits, a decrease of 3.8 weeks from 2010/11, and 1.6 weeks less than the national average in 2011/12. Frequent claimants received 22.8 weeks on average, a decrease of 0.8 from 23.6 weeks in 2010/11, and 2.9 weeks more than the national average. Occasional claimants received an average of 19.4 weeks a decrease of 1.0 weeks from 2010/11 and 0.5 weeks below the national average.

### 7.1 Extended EI Benefits Pilot Project

The Extended EI Benefits pilot project was introduced in 2004 for two years in 24 EI economic regions of high unemployment (10% or higher), to test whether providing more weeks of benefits would reduce the number of seasonal workers facing a gap between the exhaustion of their EI benefits and the resumption of their seasonal employment income. It was also designed to determine whether there would be any associated behavioural effects. Under the Extended EI Benefits pilot project, the maximum number of regular weeks of benefits was increased by five weeks, to a maximum of 45 weeks.

The pilot project was re-introduced in 2006 for 18 months in 21 EI economic regions and was later extended until May 31, 2009. The pilot was terminated in February 2009, with the introduction of the Extension of EI Regular Benefits temporary measure, as part of the Economic Action Plan, until September 11, 2010.



The pilot project was then re-introduced, from September 12, 2010, to September 15, 2012, in the same 21 EI economic regions to allow further testing through the period of economic recovery. However the pilot project was allowed to terminate earlier if there was a sustained economic recovery. Consequently, three EI economic regions— St. John's, Chicoutimi-Jonquiere and Sudbury, where the unemployment rates were less than 8% for 12 consecutive months—were excluded from the Extended EI Benefits pilot project on September 24, 2011, March 24, 2012, and June 23, 2012, respectively.

EI administrative data show that in 2011/12,<sup>73</sup> there were 473,930 regular claims established in the 21 pilot regions. Among these regular claims, 31.3% claimants (or 148,320) benefited from the Extended EI Benefits pilot project, and they used an average of 4.2 out of five weeks available to them.

As shown in Table 16, among the 21 pilot regions, the proportion of EI regular claimants who used at least 1 extra week varied widely. For example, in 2011/12, less than 10% of regular claimants in Yukon used at least 1 extra week, while the proportion was 42.8% in St. John's. Despite the differences in the proportion of EI regular claimants who accessed to the pilot project, the average number of extra weeks used was relatively consistent among the 21 regions, at approximately 4 weeks regardless of the regional unemployment rate.

Table 17 shows the demographic distribution of total regular claims and the distribution of EI claimants who benefited from the pilot project in 2011/12. Women, workers aged 55 years and older and frequent claimants were overrepresented among pilot project beneficiaries in 2011/12, while men, core-aged workers (25 to 54 years) and long-tenured workers were underrepresented. For example, in 2011/12 women accounted for 42.5% of regular claimants who used at least one extra week provided by the pilot project, while they represented 36.8% of regular claims established in the 21 pilot regions.

Workers aged 55 years and older represented 27.8% of claimants who benefited from the pilot project, higher than their share of regular claims (23.0%). However, core-aged workers represented 61.4% of claimants who used at least one extra week, lower than their share (66.7%) of regular claims. This indicates that older workers were overrepresented among pilot project beneficiaries and core-aged workers were underrepresented. Youth represented 10.8% of claimants who used at least one extra week, which is comparable to the percentage of regular claims filed by them (10.3%) in 2011/12.

In 2011/12, long-tenured workers accounted for 7.6% of claimants who benefited from the pilot project, 7.9 percentage points lower than their share (15.5%) of regular claims. This suggests that long-tenured workers were significantly underrepresented among pilot project beneficiaries. In contrast, frequent claimants were overrepresented, as they accounted for 49.7% of claimants who used at least one extra week, higher (+7.1 percentage points) than their share of regular claims (42.6%). Occasional claimants represented 42.7% of claimants who used at least one extra week, comparable to the percentage of regular claims they filed (41.9%).

In 2011/12, among all regular claimants (148,320) who used at least one extra week provided by the pilot project, more than half of them (57.3% or 85,050) were non-seasonal claimants, while 42.7% (or 63,270) were seasonal claimants.

As of March 31, 2013, a total of \$371.8 million in additional benefits were paid as a result of the Extended EI Benefits pilot project. Only \$2.6 million in additional benefits were paid in 2010/11, as the pilot project began in September 2010 and claimants needed to exhaust their regular entitlement to receive benefit payments from this pilot project. There were \$170.2 million and \$199.0 million in additional benefits paid in 2011/12 and 2012/13, respectively.

<sup>73</sup> Data and analysis on the Extended EI Benefits pilot project are undertaken by examining claims established in 2011/12 to ensure all claims were completed.

**TABLE 16**

**The Extended EI Benefits Pilot Project – Unemployment Rate, Number of Impacted Claims, Percentage of Impacted Claims and Average Extra Weeks Used, by EI Pilot Region, 2011/12<sup>1</sup>**

Former Pilot Region	Unemployment Rate <sup>2</sup>	Total EI Regular Claims in Pilot Region	Claims with at Least 1 Extra Week	Claims with at Least 1 Extra Week	
				Proportion of Regular Claims	Average Extra Weeks Used
	(%)	(#)	(#)	(%)	(# of Weeks)
<b>Newfoundland and Labrador</b>					
St. John's <sup>3</sup>	6.5	4,700	2,010	42.8%	4.6
Nfld. – Labrador	17.8	57,410	15,420	26.9%	4.0
<b>Prince Edward Island</b>					
Prince Edward Island	11.6	18,590	7,540	40.6%	4.3
<b>Nova Scotia</b>					
Eastern Nova Scotia	16.3	23,600	6,090	25.8%	3.9
Western Nova Scotia	10.0	31,550	12,040	38.2%	4.2
<b>New Brunswick</b>					
Madawaska-Charlotte	11.3	13,700	4,830	35.3%	4.4
Restigouche-Albert	15.1	41,550	11,320	27.2%	3.8
<b>Quebec</b>					
Gaspésie – Îles-De-La-Madeleine	13.7	26,690	10,140	38.0%	4.2
Trois-Rivières	8.5	10,330	3,730	36.1%	4.2
Central Quebec	8.3	83,220	27,860	33.5%	4.3
North Western Quebec	9.9	21,700	7,760	35.8%	4.4
Bas-Saint-Laurent – Côte-Nord	9.9	51,720	16,590	32.1%	4.2
Chicoutimi – Jonquière <sup>3</sup>	6.8	11,320	4,390	38.8%	4.4
<b>Ontario</b>					
Sudbury <sup>3</sup>	6.6	5,800	2,070	35.7%	4.3
Northern Ontario	12.1	30,460	7,610	25.0%	4.4
<b>Manitoba</b>					
Northern Manitoba	28.1	7,550	1,530	20.3%	4.0
<b>Saskatchewan</b>					
Northern Saskatchewan	17.8	10,490	1,500	14.3%	4.1
<b>British Columbia</b>					
Northern British Columbia	11.2	18,780	5,080	27.1%	4.3
<b>Territories</b>					
Yukon	25.0	2,090	200	9.6%	3.9
Northwest Territories	25.0	1,750	420	24.0%	4.0
Nunavut	25.0	930	190	20.4%	4.3
<b>Pilot Regions</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>473,930</b>	<b>148,320</b>	<b>31.3%</b>	<b>4.2</b>

<sup>1</sup> Data and analysis on the Extended EI Benefits pilot project are undertaken by examining claims established in 2011/12 to ensure all claims were completed.

<sup>2</sup> The unemployment rate is an annual average of a 3-month moving average of seasonally adjusted data.

<sup>3</sup> The Extended EI Benefits pilot project ended in St. John's, Chicoutimi-Jonquiere and Sudbury, on September 24, 2011, March 24, 2012, and June 23, 2012, respectively.

**TABLE 17**  
**The Extra Five Weeks Pilot Project, 2011/12<sup>1</sup>**

	Claimants with at Least 1 Extra Week	Distribution of Claimants with at Least 1 Extra Week	Distribution of Regular Claims in Pilot Regions
<b>Total</b>	<b>148,320</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Gender</b>			
Men	85,320	57.5%	63.2%
Women	63,000	42.5%	36.8%
<b>Age</b>			
Under 25 years	15,950	10.8%	10.3%
25 to 44 years	53,610	36.1%	39.5%
45 to 54 years	37,520	25.3%	27.2%
55 years and older	41,240	27.8%	23.0%
<b>EI History</b>			
Long-tenured workers	11,300	7.6%	15.5%
Occasional claimants	63,260	42.7%	41.9%
Frequent claimants	73,760	49.7%	42.6%
<b>Seasonality<sup>2</sup></b>			
Seasonal claimants	63,270	42.7%	44.2%
Non-seasonal claimants	85,050	57.3%	55.8%

Source: EI administrative data.

<sup>1</sup> Data and analysis on the Extended EI Benefits pilot project are undertaken by examining claims established in 2011/12 to ensure all claims were completed.

<sup>2</sup> Seasonal claimants are individuals who established three or more claims in the previous five years, of which at least two were established about the same time of the year as their current claim.

## 8. Exhaustion of EI Regular Benefits

The aim of monitoring exhaustees is to determine whether EI provides adequate temporary income support to those looking for suitable employment. Historically, analysis of exhaustion of regular benefits was based on claimants who used all the regular weeks to which they were entitled.

Analysis of regular benefits exhaustion has been expanded to also consider claims for which the benefit period ends before all potential regular benefit weeks of entitlement are paid.<sup>74</sup> As a result, the analysis of exhaustees comprises two groups—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).

In addition, the analysis of regular benefits exhaustion takes into consideration claimants who requalify for a new EI claim following the exhaustion of their claim.<sup>75</sup>

This type of claimants experiences a relatively short, if any, interruption in EI benefits. Information on these claimants is presented as requalification rates.

In previous reports, analysis of exhaustees was done by examining claims established in a given fiscal year, which resulted in figures being delayed by up to two years. Analysis in this report is based on regular claims completed<sup>76</sup> in 2012/13, which facilitates more timely analysis and reporting of exhaustion rates. Of claims completed in 2012/13, roughly two thirds were established in 2011/12 and the remaining third were established in 2012/13. Consequently, exhaustion rates should not be compared with figures presented for claims established in a given fiscal year, as reported in previous reports. As shown in Table 18, the 2011/12 entitlement exhaustion rate is similar for both methodologies (claims established in a given year, claims completed in a given year); however, the differences are more significant in 2009/10 and 2010/11.

<sup>74</sup> For most EI claimants, the benefit period is 52 weeks, but under certain circumstances, it can be extended.

<sup>75</sup> Claimants establishing a new claim within 4 weeks of exhausting a prior EI claim are deemed re-qualifiers.

<sup>76</sup> A claim is considered completed only if all weeks of entitlement are paid out or if the benefit period ended.


**TABLE 18**  
**Entitlement Exhaustion Rate,**  
**Established Claims and Completed Claims,**  
**2009/10 to 2012/13**

	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10
Established Claims	N/A <sup>1</sup>	30.9%	29.4%	24.8%
Completed Claims	32.6%	32.9%	26.8%	30.5%

<sup>1</sup> Data and analysis on entitlement exhaustion rate for established claims are available for 2011/12 to ensure all claims were completed

### 8.1 Entitlement Exhaustion of EI Regular Benefits

Of all regular claims completed in 2012/13, nearly one third (32.6%) of claimants exhausted their regular benefits. This represents a decrease of 0.3 percentage point compared to claims completed in 2011/12 (32.9%), but an increase of 5.8 percentage points compared to 2010/11 (26.8%). The lower rate of exhaustion for claims completed in 2010/11 is due 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.<sup>77</sup>



Of claimants exhausting their EI regular entitlement in 2012/13, those able to establish a subsequent claim accounted for 7.8%. Taking these re-qualifiers into considerations means that 30.1% of regular claimants exhausted their entitlement and were unable to establish a new claim.

#### 8.1.1 Entitlement Exhaustion by Demographics

While the national entitlement exhaustion rate remained relatively stable in 2012/13, rates varied within provincial and demographic groups. Entitlement exhaustion rates generally increased in the Atlantic provinces and Quebec while they decreased in Ontario and the Western provinces. British Columbia exhibited the highest entitlement exhaustion rate (37.4%) while New Brunswick exhibited the lowest rate (26.5%). The Atlantic provinces and Quebec exhibited the highest requalification rates at over 10%, while rates were below 6% in Ontario and the Western provinces. Table 19 presents entitlement exhaustion rates by various demographic groups for 2012/13.

The Extended EI Benefits pilot project, ended in September 2012. It still affected entitlement exhaustion rates in 2012/13, as more than 90% of completed claims in the pilot regions, mainly in Atlantic Canada, were still eligible for the additional weeks. Refer to subsection 7.1 of section II of this chapter for further analysis of the Extended EI Benefit pilot project.

Men have lower entitlement exhaustion rates than women, because women, on average, accumulate fewer insurable hours and so have shorter regular benefit entitlements. 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 claims completed in 2012/13, occasional claimants (35.4%) had a significantly higher exhaustion rate than frequent claimants (31.8%) and long-tenured workers (27.4%), as shown in Table 19. However, one in five frequent claimants who exhausted their entitlement were able to re-qualify for a new EI claim.

<sup>77</sup> Refer to the *Monitoring and Assessment Report 2012* for analysis of Economic Action Plan measures.



**TABLE 19****Exhaustion Rates for Completed Claims, by Demographics Groups, 2010/11 to 2012/13 (%)**

Demographics	Entitlement Exhaustion Rate			Benefit Period Exhaustion Rate		
	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11
<b>Province/Territory</b>						
Newfoundland and Labrador	27.0	26.0	24.1	43.4	45.9	41.2
Prince Edward Island	35.3	31.9	26.8	31.8	33.1	30.1
Nova Scotia	32.9	32.1	28.0	30.2	31.6	29.7
New Brunswick	26.5	28.5	25.2	41.0	40.8	37.3
Quebec	30.7	30.0	24.2	27.8	30.4	29.5
Ontario	35.3	36.1	27.3	17.9	22.6	20.7
Manitoba	31.8	32.5	27.0	17.4	19.1	19.7
Saskatchewan	26.9	28.6	25.1	18.7	20.4	19.4
Alberta	32.8	35.6	28.7	13.5	16.4	15.3
British Columbia	37.4	37.8	32.2	18.3	20.6	22.0
Nunavut	36.7	29.9	23.5	25.8	33.9	24.2
Northwest Territories	32.7	26.5	26.4	27.1	31.4	28.3
Yukon	15.2	13.7	12.3	32.0	27.9	30.3
<b>Gender</b>						
Men	30.4	31.1	25.0	26.1	28.3	26.7
Women	35.9	35.6	29.5	21.1	24.9	23.0
<b>Age</b>						
Under 25 years	31.4	30.9	27.5	19.0	18.6	19.3
25 to 44 years	30.9	31.6	25.9	21.6	23.6	22.7
45 to 54 years	31.3	31.1	24.7	27.6	32.4	29.1
55 years and older	38.7	39.5	31.5	28.0	33.2	30.5
<b>EI Claimant Category</b>						
Long-tenured worker	27.4	29.8	19.0	19.7	27.9	24.3
Occasional claimants	35.4	35.6	31.2	19.6	20.4	20.5
Frequent claimants	31.8	29.4	25.2	39.5	40.0	39.7
<b>Seasonality<sup>1</sup></b>						
Seasonal claimants	22.0	21.0	16.7	37.2	38.8	35.8
Non-seasonal claimants	37.1	37.5	30.3	18.7	22.5	21.6
<b>Canada</b>	<b>32.6</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>24.1</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>25.3</b>

<sup>1</sup> Seasonal claimants are individuals who established three or more claims in the previous five years, of which at least two were established about the same time of the year as their current claim.

### 8.1.2 Entitlement Exhaustion by the Variable Entrance Requirement

The variation in entitlement exhaustion rates is negatively correlated with regular benefits entitlement, which is a function of both the number of insurable hours accumulated and the regional unemployment rate.<sup>78</sup>

As illustrated in Table 20, entitlement exhaustion rates decrease significantly as the number of accumulated insurable hours increases. For instance, 58.7% of

claimants with 420 to 769 hours in 2012/13 exhausted their entitlement, compared to 21.7% of claimants with 1,470 to 1,819 hours. The entitlement exhaustion rate for claimants with more than 1,820 hours was slightly higher (25.8%), 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.

<sup>78</sup> 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>.

Table 20 also shows that entitlement exhaustion rates vary significantly based on the regional unemployment rate. For instance, for regular claims completed in 2012/13, claimants in regions with an unemployment rate of 10.0% or lower were more likely to have entitlement exhaustion rates of 30% or higher while claimants in regions with an unemployment rate of 12.1% or higher had entitlement exhaustion rates below 25%.

Analyzing cross-sectional entitlement exhaustion rates by insurable hours and unemployment rates amplifies the variance. For instance, the entitlement exhaustion rate for claimants with less than 769 insurable hours in region where the unemployment rate was 10.0% or lower was above 60% in 2012/13. In comparison, claimants in regions where the unemployment rate was between 12.1% and 16.0% and with 1,120 to 1,469 insurable hours had an entitlement exhaustion rate of 10.3%.

The rate at which claimants who exhausted their entitlement but established a subsequent claim—the requalification rate—varied significantly. For instance, 15.6% of claimants who exhausted their entitlement with less than 769 insurable hours directly established a subsequent claim. In comparison, claimants who established a claim with more than 1,470 hours of insurable employment were far less likely (less than 2%) to establish a subsequent claim soon after exhausting their entitlement. Similarly, nearly 20% of claimants who established a claim in a region with an unemployment rate of 12.1% or more established a near subsequent claim, versus around 7% of claimants who established a claim in a region with an unemployment rate of 10.0% or lower.

### 8.1.3 Entitlement Exhaustion of EI Regular Benefits – Seasonal Claimants and Seasonal Gappers

Historically, exhaustion rates have always been lower for seasonal claimants than for non-seasonal claimants. That held true for claims completed in 2012/13, as 22.0% of seasonal claimants used all the weeks of regular benefits to which they were entitled while the exhaustion rate was nearly double (37.1%) for non-seasonal claimants.

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, thus they are 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 people who completed claims in 2012/13, there were 13,360 seasonal gappers, representing less than 1% of all regular claimants who completed a claim in 2012/13. The number of seasonal gappers has been moving upward since the historical low of 6,790 in 2009/10. Seasonal gappers who completed claims in 2012/13 averaged 18.4 weeks of work and 27.1 weeks of EI benefits, including the waiting period, resulting in an average gap of 6.5 weeks, which is

**TABLE 20**  
**Regular Entitlement Exhaustion Rate, 2012/13 (%)**

Number of Hours of Insurable Employment	Regional Unemployment Rate (%)					Average
	0.1 to 8.0	8.1 to 10.0	10.1 to 12.0	12.1 to 16.0	16.1+	
420 to 769	62.0	68.0	61.2	52.8	42.2	<b>58.7</b>
770 to 1,119	54.4	49.2	35.9	19.9	20.0	<b>45.4</b>
1,120 to 1,469	32.8	26.3	19.6	10.3	13.8	<b>26.8</b>
1,470 to 1,819	24.1	22.0	14.9	11.7	16.2	<b>21.7</b>
1,820 or more	27.5	27.2	19.4	13.8	16.8	<b>25.8</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>35.1</b>	<b>33.8</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>23.9</b>	<b>23.6</b>	<b>32.6</b>

equivalent to the average gap experienced for claims completed in 2011/12. Nearly half (49.3%) of seasonal gappers experienced a gap of 5 weeks or less, 30.8% a gap of 6 to 11 weeks and 19.9% a gap of 12 weeks or more.

As mentioned in previous reports, the likelihood of becoming a seasonal gapper is higher in regions of high unemployment, where claimants require fewer hours to qualify for benefits, and there can be extended periods of unemployment between seasons. Quebec (43.2%) and the Atlantic provinces (17.8%) are overrepresented in regard to seasonal gappers; they accounted for 61.0% of seasonal gappers in 2012/13, while representing 32.4% and 16.1% of all regular claims completed in 2012/13, respectively. In the same period, Ontario accounted for a large proportion of seasonal gappers (18.7%), but was actually underrepresented, as Ontario accounted for 29.1% of regular claims.

## 8.2 Benefit Period Exhaustion of EI Regular Benefits

Among all regular claims completed in 2012/13, 24.1% of claimants exhausted their benefit period before receiving their full entitlement to regular benefits. This is a decrease from the proportions in 2011/12 (27.0%) and 2010/11 (25.3%). Benefit period exhaustion is 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 sub-section 8.2.4.

### 8.2.1 Benefit Period Exhaustion by Demographics

As stated previously, benefit period exhaustion refers to claims that reach the final week of the benefit period before all eligible regular benefits are paid. All provinces and territories (except New Brunswick and Yukon) and most demographic groups (except claimants under 25 years old) experienced a decrease in benefit period exhaustion rates for regular claims completed in 2012/13 compared with the previous year, as shown in Table 19 in subsection 8.1.1. Among provinces, Newfoundland and Labrador exhibited the highest benefit period exhaustion rate (43.4%), while Alberta exhibited the lowest rate (13.5%).

Men tend to have higher benefit period exhaustion rates than women, as they are generally entitled to more weeks of regular benefits and are more likely to work while on claim and to defer EI benefits. Claimants aged 45 and older tend to have a higher benefit period exhaustion rate than younger claimants.

The likelihood of exhausting the benefit period before full entitlement was paid varies greatly for different categories of EI claims history. For claims completed in 2012/13, 19.6% of occasional claimants and 19.7% of long-tenured workers exhausted their benefit period, while 39.5% of frequent claimants exhausted their benefit period as shown in Table 19.

Although the average duration of regular benefits for seasonal claimants is shorter than that for non-seasonal claimants, 37.2% of seasonal claimants exhausted their benefit period in 2012/13 compared to 18.7% of non-seasonal claimants. The benefit period exhaustion rate for seasonal claimants remained stable for three years after it increased from 25.4% in 2009/10 to 35.8% the next year. The stability of variables affecting the duration of a claim over that period, such as the number of regular weeks claimed or the number of weeks worked while on claim, suggests that seasonal claimants had a higher propensity to accumulate insurable hours working while off-claim<sup>79</sup> and to exhaust their benefit period since 2010/11.

### 8.2.2 Benefit Period Exhaustion by the Variable Entrance Requirement

As illustrated in Table 21, benefit period exhaustion rates are moderately correlated with the number of insurable hours. For instance, claimants who accumulated between 420 and 769 hours in 2012/13 experienced an 18.5% benefit period exhaustion rate, compared to roughly 27% of claimants who accumulated between 1,120 and 1,819 hours, and 22.7% of claimants with more than 1,820 hours.

Benefit period exhaustion rates vary more significantly by unemployment rates than by insurable hours. For claims completed in 2012/13, claimants from regions with an unemployment rate of 8.0% or lower experienced an average exhaustion rate of less than 20%, while claimants in regions with unemployment rates of 12.1% or higher faced average benefit period exhaustion rates twice as high at around 40%.

<sup>79</sup> Claimants may opt to not claim benefits during their benefit period and stop reporting their work and earnings on a bi-weekly basis for that period "off-claim".

**TABLE 21**  
**Benefit Period Exhaustion Rate, 2012/13 (%)**

Number of Hours of Insurable Employment	Regional Unemployment Rate (%)					Average
	0.1 to 8.0	8.1 to 10.0	10.1 to 12.0	12.1 to 16.0	16.1+	
420 to 769	8.1	11.6	12.9	29.7	34.8	<b>18.5</b>
770 to 1,119	11.3	19.4	27.0	50.7	48.7	<b>22.2</b>
1,120 to 1,469	19.1	27.9	33.1	48.8	46.3	<b>27.2</b>
1,470 to 1,819	22.2	27.2	35.6	43.5	39.1	<b>27.1</b>
1,820 or more	18.9	21.4	32.6	38.7	38.2	<b>22.7</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>29.1</b>	<b>42.5</b>	<b>41.6</b>	<b>24.1</b>

Higher benefit period exhaustion rates in regions with high unemployment rate reflects a greater proportion of claimants living in these regions worked while on claim. While approximately 55% of all regular claimants worked while on claim, the figure was significantly higher (65%) for claimants residing in regions with an unemployment rate over 10.1%. As outlined in subsection 4.1 of section II of this chapter, 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.

**8.2.3 Benefit Period Exhaustion and Requalification Rates**

Compared to entitlement exhaustees whose requalification rate was around 8% in 2012/13, benefit period exhaustees had an average requalification rate of 67.7%, as shown in Table 22. The requalification rate increased from 61.5% in 2011/12 and 57.6% in 2010/11. When considering these re-qualifiers, 7.8% of regular claimants who exhausted their benefit period did not establish a new claim in 2012/13.

Requalification rates vary by demographic, as nearly 85% of frequent claimants and seasonal claimants who exhausted their benefit period re-qualified for a new EI claim, in comparison to 53% of long-tenured workers.

Moreover, as shown in Table 22, benefit period exhaustees who had accumulated more insurable hours and/or who lived in a region with a lower unemployment rate were less likely to requalify for a new EI claim.

**8.2.4 Profile of Claimants by Exhaustion Type**

As stated previously, approximately two thirds of benefit period exhaustees re-qualified for a new EI claim in 2012/13. To do so, these claimants had to accumulate sufficient insurable hours during their qualifying period, which corresponded to the benefit period that they exhausted. As reported in subsection 4.1 of section II of this chapter, approximately 54% of regular claimants worked while on claim. However, nearly three-quarters of benefit period exhaustees worked while on claim and they

**TABLE 22**  
**Requalification Rate for Benefit Period Exhaustees, 2012/13 (%)**

Number of Hours of Insurable Employment	Regional Unemployment Rate (%)					Average
	0.1 to 8.0	8.1 to 10.0	10.1 to 12.0	12.1 to 16.0	16.1+	
420 to 769	64.0	63.4	68.8	80.0	83.0	<b>75.2</b>
770 to 1,119	68.3	77.1	73.7	82.8	80.6	<b>76.9</b>
1,120 to 1,469	73.8	76.4	70.7	80.5	76.8	<b>75.6</b>
1,470 to 1,819	64.2	64.9	58.0	73.9	72.7	<b>65.2</b>
1,820 or more	47.5	47.4	52.3	62.3	64.3	<b>50.4</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>62.4</b>	<b>66.4</b>	<b>64.3</b>	<b>77.7</b>	<b>76.9</b>	<b>67.7</b>

averaged 18.5 weeks of work. The extent to which claimants work while on claim is under-reported, as some claimants opt to suspend their EI claim rather than report their work and earnings bi-weekly. This is referred to as working off-claim.

On average in 2012/13, non-exhaustees used 13.2 weeks of regular benefits, while entitlement exhaustees used 28.9 weeks. Benefit period exhaustees used 20.1 weeks of regular benefits, a figure that was comparable to that for all regular claimants (19.9 weeks).

Of all benefit period exhaustees, 16.1% received special benefits in 2012/13, a figure that was significantly higher than that for non-exhaustees (9.0%). This variance can be explained by the fact that when special benefits are combined with regular benefits, the probability of reaching the 52 weeks benefit period threshold is increased.

Working while on claim and receiving special benefits influence the benefit period exhaustion rate, since they lengthen claim duration. Those who used special benefits were far less likely to requalify for

a new EI claim. For instance, a third of benefit period exhaustees who claimed special benefits re-qualified for a new claim in 2012/13.

By definition, entitlement exhaustees use all of their regular entitlement. In 2012/13, on average, non-exhaustees used 40.1% of their regular benefits entitlement with 62.1% of claimants using less than 50% of their regular benefit entitlement. In comparison, benefit period exhaustees used 57.1% of their regular benefits entitlement, with 33.0% of claimants using at least 75% of their regular benefits entitlement.

### 8.3 Aggregated Exhaustion of EI Regular Benefits

The aggregated exhaustion of EI regular benefits reflects all claims for which the claimants ceased to receive EI regular benefits payments because all entitlement was paid up or because the benefit period exhausted. In 2012/13, the aggregated exhaustion rate was 56.7%, which compares to 59.9% in 2011/12. The requalification rate for all exhaustees combined was 33.4%. As a result, taking claimants that are able to requalify for EI into consideration, the aggregate rate of exhaustion declines to 37.9%.

**TABLE 23**  
**Profile of Claimants, by Exhaustion Type, 2012/13**

	All Regular Claims	Non-Exhaustees	Entitlement Exhaustees	Benefit Period Exhaustees
Exhaustion Rate	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	32.6%	24.1%
Gap to Next Claim				
Re-qualifiers (new claim)	18.8%	1.1%	7.8%	67.7%
Non re-qualifiers (no new claim)	81.2%	98.9%	92.2%	32.3%
Adjusted Exhaustion Rate	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	30.1%	7.8%
Worked While on Claim	54.3%	54.5%	37.4%	76.2%
Average Weeks Working While on Claim	12.6	9.2	12.2	18.5
Average Weeks of Regular Benefits Paid	19.9	13.2	28.9	20.1
Mixed Claims (Use of Special Benefits)	10.9%	9.0%	9.9%	16.1%
Percentage of EI Entitlement Used				
<25%	18.6%	33.8%		13.9%
25% to <50%	18.5%	28.3%		24.1%
50% to <75%	15.7%	19.3%		28.9%
75% to 100%	47.2%	18.5%	100.0%	33.0%
Averaged Entitlement Used	62.3%	40.1%	100.0% <sup>2</sup>	57.1%

<sup>1</sup> By definition, exhaustion rates are only applicable for exhaustees populations (entitlement and benefit period exhaustees).

<sup>2</sup> By definition, entitlement exhaustees have used all their regular benefits entitlement.

## 9. Connecting Canadians to Available Jobs (CCAJ) Provision

As part of Canada's Economic Action Plan 2012, the Connecting Canadians to Available Jobs (CCAJ) initiative assists EI beneficiaries in returning to work as quickly as possible. The CCAJ initiative came into force on January 6, 2013, and comprises 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";<sup>80</sup>
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 signed with British Columbia and Manitoba to make employment supports available to EI claimants earlier in their claim.

### 9.1 Enhanced Job Alerts (EJA)

EI claimants may, on a voluntary basis, sign up to receive daily Job Alerts, which include job postings and other labour market information. An enhanced Job Alerts system, which incorporates job postings from private sector job boards, provides a more comprehensive list of available jobs in an individual's chosen occupation(s) and community(ies). Claimants will also receive additional information, such as other occupations for which they may be qualified, that can help them decide how and when to expand their job search. The EJA system 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 such as the Working in Canada (WiC) website that provides valuable labour market information to help unemployed or underemployed individuals in making career decisions.

From January 6 to March 31, 2013, there were 2.1 million job alerts sent to 35,511 subscribers. In addition, 61,417 employers created 243,949 new job postings that were available through the WiC web site. As more data become available, future *EI Monitoring and Assessment Report(s)* will provide a more comprehensive analysis.

### 9.2 EI Claimants' Responsibilities

New EI Regulations clarified the responsibilities of EI claimants<sup>81</sup> by defining reasonable job search and suitable employment. Claimants are required to undertake a reasonable job search for suitable employment in their region, and 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; and, hours of work and personal circumstances. Requirements regarding the type of work and wages vary based on the claimant's category.<sup>82</sup> For more information regarding the national distribution of the regular claims by EI claimant category, please refer to section 1.5 of Chapter 2.

#### *Claimant Information (CI) sessions*

Starting in February 2013, after the new EI Regulations were in place, Claimant Information (CI) sessions became tailored to each of the three EI claimant groups: frequent claimants, occasional claimants and long-tenured workers. Moreover, claimants directed to CI sessions are identified using standardized filtering criteria and job-demand in their previous occupation.

<sup>80</sup> For more information regarding the definitions of reasonable job search and suitable employment, please refer to <http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/sc/ei/ccaj/suitableemployment.shtml>.

<sup>81</sup> New definitions apply to individuals receiving EI regular and fishing benefits and not to those receiving special benefits (sickness, compassionate, maternity and parental).

<sup>82</sup> For more information on the work that EI claimants are required to seek and accept by the three EI claimant categories, according to the new EI Regulations, please visit [www.servicecanada.ca/eichanges](http://www.servicecanada.ca/eichanges).

A department assessment is currently underway to examine the impact of the revamped CI sessions in connecting EI claimants with available jobs. The evaluation will compare claimants who are directed to information sessions to a random sample of claimants with similar attributes who are not directed to information sessions (e.g., control group). Indicators such as the average duration of regular benefit will be compared. Preliminary results of the evaluation will be provided in future *EI Monitoring and Assessment Reports*.

### 9.3 Collaborations with Provinces and Territories

The Government has been collaborating with the provinces of British Columbia and Manitoba during the 2013/14 to proactively provide employment supports to EI clients earlier in their claim period. Collaboration projects have been using existing authorities and funding from the Labour Market Development Agreements (LMDAs) in these provinces to test approaches for early interventions to support faster returns to work. An assessment of the collaboration projects will be available in fall 2014.

## 10. Income Redistribution of EI Regular Benefits

In a similar manner to the analysis of income redistribution for total EI income benefits, this report also examines the income redistribution of EI regular benefits. The amount of total regular benefits payments that each province or territory, industry, and demographic group received was divided by the total amount of EI premiums collected. These ratios were then adjusted so that the ratio for Canada equalled 1.0.<sup>83</sup> The resulting ratio for each jurisdiction indicates whether it received more in benefits than it contributed to the program, relative to Canada as a whole.

### 10.1 EI Regular Benefits-to-Contributions (B/C) Ratios, by Province and Territory<sup>84</sup>

The Atlantic provinces and Quebec<sup>85</sup> continued to be net beneficiaries of regular benefits from the EI program in 2011, as they were in previous years, with adjusted ratios greater than 1.0, while Ontario and the Western provinces remained net contributors, with adjusted ratios below 1.0 (see Chart 30).<sup>86</sup> Generally, provinces with higher regular benefits-to-contributions ratios also have higher unemployment rates. In 2011, 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.

---

<sup>83</sup> In the absence of this adjustment, the ratio for Canada would be lower than 1.0, mostly because the numerator takes into account only regular benefits and, therefore, does not include other EI payments. If all EI payments were considered, the ratio for Canada would be higher than 1.0.


<sup>84</sup> Provincial and Territorial benefit to contribution (B/C) ratios are determined by the location of employers for premiums and of claimants for benefits. As a result, it is possible that some provincial/territorial B/C ratios may be under/overstated if contributions are being accredited to a province/territory, while the employment is actually situated in another province/territory.

<sup>85</sup> The calculation of Quebec's regular benefits-to-contributions ratio and adjusted regular benefits-to-contributions ratio takes into consideration the fact that employers and employees in the province do not pay EI premiums for maternity and parental benefits, due to the presence of the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP). To account for this, the EI contribution from Quebec, which is the denominator of the two ratios, has been modified upward to estimate how much employers and employees in Quebec would pay in EI premiums if they had to contribute to EI maternity and parental benefits.

<sup>86</sup> The most recent tax data available are for the 2011 taxation year.

**CHART 30**

Adjusted Regular Benefits-to-Contributions (B/C) Ratio and Unemployment Rate, by Province, 2011



Sources: Canada Revenue Agency, 2011 T-4s with employment income; EI administrative data; and Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

### 10.2 EI Regular Benefits-to-Contributions Ratios, by Sector and Industry

In 2011, the goods sector was a net beneficiary of regular benefits from the EI program, with an adjusted regular benefits-to-contributions (B/C) ratio of 1.8, while the service sector was a net contributor of regular benefits, with an adjusted ratio of 0.8. As described in Chapter 1, in 2012/13, the goods sector comprised 36.3% of all EI regular claims and 22.0% of employment, indicating that it was overrepresented among EI regular claims. Conversely, the service sector comprised 58.8% of all EI regular claims and 78.0% of employment, indicating that the service sector was underrepresented among EI regular claims.

The goods sector includes some industries with a large share of seasonal workers such as agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting (regular B/C ratio of 4.2), and construction (2.8). Therefore, the goods sector continued to be a significant net beneficiary of the program, as it was in 2010.

As shown in Table 24, within the service sector, three industries were net beneficiaries of regular benefits from the EI program, with an adjusted regular (B/C) ratio larger than 1.0. These three industries were the arts, entertainment and recreation industry (B/C ratio of 2.0), the administrative support, waste management

**TABLE 24**  
Adjusted Regular Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio, by Sector and Industry, 2011<sup>1</sup>

<b>Goods Sector</b>	<b>1.8</b>
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting	4.2
Mining, and oil and gas extraction	0.8
Utilities	0.4
Construction	2.8
Manufacturing	1.2
<b>Service Sector</b>	<b>0.8</b>
Wholesale trade	0.9
Retail trade	0.8
Transportation and warehousing	0.9
Information and cultural industries	0.6
Finance and insurance	0.4
Real estate, and rental and leasing	1.0
Professional, scientific and technical services	0.8
Management of companies and enterprises	0.8
Administrative and support, waste management and remediation services	1.4
Educational services	0.7
Health care and social assistance	0.4
Arts, entertainment and recreation	2.0
Accommodation and food services	1.3
Other services	1.0
Public administration	0.5
<b>All Industries</b>	<b>1.0</b>

<sup>1</sup> For ease of analysis, the benefits-to-contributions ratios have been adjusted so that the national figure equals 1.0.



and remediation services industry (B/C ratio of 1.4), and the accommodation and food services industry (B/C ratio of 1.3).

### 10.3 EI Regular Benefits-to-Contributions Ratios, by Gender and Age

Older workers were net beneficiaries in 2011, with adjusted regular benefits-to-contributions ratios greater than 1.0. This is consistent with the findings of an evaluation study,<sup>87</sup> which showed that older workers (aged 55 and older) were generally more likely to be net beneficiaries of EI regular benefits.

Men (B/C ratio of 1.2) were net beneficiaries with an adjusted regular B/C ratio greater than 1.0. However, women (B/C ratio of 0.8) were net contributors to the EI program in 2011 when considering regular benefits only, in contrast to their status when considering all EI income benefits (B/C ratio of 1.1).

## 11. EI Regular Benefits and Seasonal Workers

### 11.1 Seasonal Workers

According to the Labour Force Survey (LFS), there were 456,100 seasonal workers<sup>88</sup> in 2012/13, a 0.1% decrease from 2011/12. Seasonal workers represented 22.5% of all temporary workers and 3.1% of all employees in 2012/13.

The number of seasonal workers has increased over the past 10 years, rising by 15.8% since 2002/03, but the proportion of seasonal workers among all temporary workers has remained stable (between 22% and 24%) throughout the period. Among all employees, the proportion of seasonal workers has also remained stable (close to 3%) over the last 10 years.

A recent study<sup>89</sup> of seasonal workers found that they 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.

These findings were supported by another recent study.<sup>90</sup> This study also found that the number of seasonal workers grew steadily and more rapidly than total employment between 1997 and 2011; that the seasonal worker population was aging more rapidly than the total Canadian labour force; and that seasonal workers were more frequently found in firms with fewer than 20 employees.

### 11.2 Seasonal Claims Made by EI Regular Benefit Claimants

The number of EI seasonal claims<sup>91</sup> increased by 1.5% to 448,220 claims in 2012/13. Of these claims, 419,930 were from EI regular claims and 28,290 were from EI fishing claims.<sup>92</sup> The analysis in the subsections on seasonality will focus on regular claims.

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. However, the late-2000s recession and subsequent growth contributed to a drop in the share of seasonal claims as a proportion of all EI regular claims in 2008/09, and the subsequent increases from 2009/10 to 2012/13, as shown in Chart 31.

EI administrative data show that the number of seasonal claims from EI regular claims increased by 1.9% to 419,930 in 2012/13. These seasonal regular claims represented 30.9% of regular claims established in 2012/13, an increase from 29.0% in the previous year. The share of seasonal claims in 2012/13 is in line with the trend observed before the late-2000s recession, when seasonal claims accounted for about 30% of all EI regular claims.

As illustrated in Table 25, seasonal claims are more common among workers 45 and older, in the Atlantic provinces and Quebec, and in the goods sector. The construction, manufacturing and education industries account for about half of all EI seasonal claims.

<sup>87</sup> HRSDC, *EI Payments and the GIS System* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2008).

<sup>88</sup> The Labour Force Survey (LFS) defines a seasonal worker as an "employee working in an industry where employment levels rise and fall with the seasons, such as farming, fishing, logging and the tourist industry."

<sup>89</sup> HRSDC, *An Evaluation Overview of Seasonal Employment: Update* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2009).


<sup>90</sup> HRSDC, *A Profile of Seasonal Workers in 2011: A Complement to a Profile of Temporary Workers* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2012).

<sup>91</sup> Seasonal claimants are claimants who have established at least three claims in the last five years and started two of these claims at about the same time of year as the current claim.

<sup>92</sup> For the purposes of this report, all EI fishing claims are considered seasonal claims.

**CHART 31**

Seasonal Regular Claims as a Proportion of Total Regular Claims, 2000/01 to 2012/13

**TABLE 25**

EI Regular Benefits Claims and EI Seasonal Regular Benefits Claims, 2012/13

	EI Seasonal Regular Claims	EI Regular Claims	Seasonal Regular Claims as a % of Regular Claims	Distribution of EI Seasonal Regular Claims	Distribution of EI Regular Claims
<b>Canada</b>	<b>419,930</b>	<b>1,356,810</b>	<b>31.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	259,690	814,090	31.9%	61.8%	60.0%
Female	160,240	542,720	29.5%	38.2%	40.0%
<b>Age</b>					
15 to 24 years (youth)	11,980	138,910	8.6%	2.9%	10.2%
25 to 44 years	154,550	594,800	26.0%	36.8%	43.8%
45 to 54 years	128,020	339,570	37.7%	30.5%	25.0%
55 years and older (older workers)	125,380	283,530	44.2%	29.9%	20.9%
<b>Province/Territory</b>					
Newfoundland and Labrador	32,430	62,720	51.7%	7.7%	4.6%
Prince Edward Island	9,000	16,370	55.0%	2.1%	1.2%
Nova Scotia	26,980	62,440	43.2%	6.4%	4.6%
New Brunswick	35,110	73,140	48.0%	8.4%	5.4%
Quebec	161,190	436,640	36.9%	38.4%	32.2%
Ontario	91,870	404,400	22.7%	21.9%	29.8%
Manitoba	10,680	37,750	28.3%	2.5%	2.8%
Saskatchewan	8,180	27,360	29.9%	2.0%	2.0%
Alberta	12,390	84,700	14.6%	3.0%	6.2%
British Columbia	31,100	146,720	21.2%	7.4%	10.8%
Nunavut	80	900	8.9%	0.0%	0.1%
Northwest Territories	280	1,610	17.4%	0.1%	0.1%
Yukon	640	2,060	31.1%	0.2%	0.2%
<b>Sector</b>					
Goods sector	182,000	492,460	37.0%	43.3%	36.3%
Service sector	224,280	797,760	28.1%	53.4%	58.8%

In general, about half of all seasonal regular claims are established in the third quarter of the fiscal year, between October and December. In 2012/13, 48.2% of all new seasonal regular claims were established between October and December. This fact mainly reflects seasonal patterns in the construction and manufacturing industries. On the other hand, the education services industry exhibits a different seasonal trend, as 93.1% of new seasonal claims in this industry are made in the first and second quarters of the fiscal year, between April and September.

Although seasonal regular claims are established in all provinces, the incidence of these claims is higher in provinces where a large portion of employment is concentrated in seasonal industries. Quebec has the highest incidence of seasonality; the province accounted for 38.4% of total seasonal regular claims in 2012/13, compared with 32.2% of all regular claims. Conversely, Ontario accounted for 21.9% of seasonal regular claims, but 29.8% of total regular claims. The disparity is partially explained by differences in the seasonality of their construction industries. For instance 46,670 (or 50.4%) of all regular claims in Quebec's construction industry were seasonal in 2012/13. In comparison, 21,040 (or 31.9%) of all regular claims in Ontario's construction industry were seasonal. Nationally, 99,980 (or 38.7%) of all construction claims were seasonal.

The Atlantic provinces, which rely heavily on seasonal industries, also had high incidences of seasonal regular claims. Collectively, the four Atlantic provinces accounted for 24.7% of seasonal regular claims but only 15.8% of total regular claims in 2012/13. British Columbia and Alberta, on the other hand, had a lower incidence of seasonal regular claims (these provinces accounted for only 7.4% and 3.0% of total seasonal regular claims, compared to 10.8% and 6.2% of all regular claims, respectively).

### 11.3 Access to EI Regular Benefits Among Seasonal Claimants

The Employment Insurance Coverage Survey (EICS) shows that access to regular benefits for seasonal workers is higher than that for other non-standard workers<sup>93</sup> but lower than that for full-time, permanent workers. A recent study,<sup>94</sup> based on the Canadian

Out-of-Employment Panel Survey (COEP), further confirmed that seasonal workers are less likely than full-time permanent job separators (by 12 percentage points) to be eligible for EI regular benefits. In 2011, 81.2% of unemployed seasonal workers who had been paying premiums and then were laid off or quit with just cause were eligible for regular benefits. On the other hand, 60.0% of other non-standard workers and 91.2% of full-time permanent workers in that same situation were eligible for regular benefits in 2011.

EI administrative data show that the difference in access to regular benefits between seasonal and full-time permanent workers is due to the lower number of insurable hours seasonal claimants accumulate. In 2011/12, of claims for EI regular benefits, 94.5% had a minimum of 700 hours of insurable employment, which is the maximum number of hours required to qualify for EI benefits. The proportion for seasonal regular claims was slightly lower (92.4%). Moreover, the above-mentioned study also found that the average number of insurable hours accumulated by seasonal workers was 34.6% lower than that accumulated by full-time permanent workers.

### 11.4 Entitlement to EI Regular Benefits Among Seasonal Claimants

In 2012/13, the average entitlement per seasonal regular claim was 31.3 weeks of regular benefits, a drop from 32.7 weeks in 2011/12. The number of weeks of entitlement has been decreasing since the recession, when it reached 39.0 weeks in 2009/10. With the recent decreases, the average entitlement to regular benefits is once again close to the pre-recession level, which was 31.9 weeks in 2007/08.

Compared with all regular claimants, seasonal regular claimants tend to use less of their entitlement. The gap in the percentage of entitlement usage between seasonal regular and regular claimants increased in 2011/12 in comparison to the gap in 2010/11. On a per-claim basis, on average, seasonal regular claimants used 59.0% of their regular entitlement for claims established in 2011/12 and 60.5% for claims established in 2010/11.<sup>95</sup> In comparison, regular claimants used 62.2% of their entitlement for claims established in 2011/12 and 62.1% for claims established in 2010/11.

<sup>93</sup> The EICS defines 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.

<sup>94</sup> HRDSC, *EI and Non-Standard Workers: Part-Time, Short-Term and Seasonal Workers* (Ottawa: HRDSC, Evaluation Directorate, 2012).

<sup>95</sup> Data analysis is based on all completed claims initiated in 2010/11 to ensure that all claims in question have been completed.

### 11.5 Duration of EI Regular Benefits Among Seasonal Claimants

Correspondingly, the average duration of regular benefits among seasonal regular claimants is also shorter than that for all regular claimants. The average seasonal regular claim established in 2011/12 received 18.5 weeks of benefits, while regular claims received an average of 19.9 weeks. The same holds true for claims established in 2010/11, as seasonal regular claims received an average of 19.9 weeks of benefits, while regular claims received an average of 21.5 weeks.

## 12. EI 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 late-2000s recession, which suggests that geographical rigidity exists in the Canadian labour market, 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 willing to move. This situation contributes to regional pockets of higher unemployment.

### 12.1 Labour Mobility Within Canada

Demographic estimates<sup>96</sup> from Statistics Canada on interprovincial labour mobility in 2012/13 showed that only three provinces—Alberta (+47,224), Saskatchewan (+1,779), and Newfoundland and Labrador (+519)—had positive net migration flows of population within the country, as shown in Chart 32. Ontario (-21,366), British Columbia (-7,165), and Quebec (-7,025), Canada’s three largest provinces, had the highest negative net migration flows of population.

In 2012/13, Alberta attracted 102,206 in-migrants, more than any other province, followed by Ontario with 63,321, and British Columbia with 47,056. Alberta has experienced positive net migration every year since 2000/01 except 2009/10 (-2,343). Over the past 10 years combined, only Alberta (+226,517), British Columbia (+67,339), and Yukon (+1,955) have had positive net migration flows, while all other provinces and territories experienced negative net migration flows.

Two current trends in labour mobility in Canada are movement from east to west, and movement toward Alberta. According to analysis of migration data from Statistics Canada, the majority of workers (61.2%)



<sup>96</sup> Demographic estimates from Statistics Canada are from the Estimates of Total Population, Canada, Provinces, and Territories. Figures for 2012/13 are preliminary.

who moved from the Atlantic provinces in 2012/13 relocated to either Alberta (33.3%) or Ontario (27.9%). Most of the workers moving from Quebec relocated to Ontario (57.7%), while those leaving Ontario moved primarily to Alberta (40.3%), as well as to Quebec (17.1%) and British Columbia (15.6%).

Alberta was the preferred destination among all provincial out-migrants, with the exception of out-migrants leaving Quebec and Prince Edward Island. Alberta was particularly popular among out-migrants from Ontario, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan, which combined to account for 71.9% of all Alberta in-migrants. The majority of individuals who left Alberta migrated to either British Columbia (36.0%) or Ontario (23.7%).

In 2012/13, Alberta registered a 4.5% unemployment rate, well below the national average of 7.2%, which is consistent with data from the past several years. Job opportunities could partially explain the influx of migration to Alberta in recent years. Future *Monitoring and Assessment Reports* will continue to examine provincial labour mobility.

### 12.2 Impact of EI on Labour Mobility

A number of studies in the past decade have looked at the determinants of labour mobility and whether EI plays a role in the decision to migrate for employment. Results of these studies indicate that factors such as personal and labour market characteristics, as well as moving costs, play a key role in mobility decisions,<sup>97</sup> while EI generosity does not seem to affect mobility decisions.<sup>98</sup>

A recent research paper<sup>99</sup> concluded that among EI regular claimants, those in higher unemployment regions (with an unemployment rate of 12.1% or higher) were more likely to commute to work from one economic region to another but less likely to migrate to another economic region; however, the overall effect of EI entitlement on geographical attachment was very minimal.

Another recent study<sup>100</sup> compared 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 30 kilometres 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 kilometres away.

Furthermore, a study<sup>101</sup> estimated that eliminating regional EI extended benefits and regional EI differences in the VER would increase the volume of migration by less than 1%. In general, the available evidence suggests that EI is generally not a barrier to mobility.

## III. EI FISHING BENEFITS

EI fishing benefits are paid to eligible self-employed fishers, who do not meet the eligibility requirements for EI regular benefits in their region. The majority of EI fishing beneficiaries who rely on the fishing industry reside in rural communities. There are two separate benefit periods for fishing benefits: a winter qualifying period, for which a benefit period can be established starting in April; and a summer qualifying period, for which a benefit period can be established starting in October.

Fishing claims represent a significant part of the economy in many coastal communities. Fishing benefits are administered either directly or indirectly by three federal organizations: Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC)/Service Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO), and the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA). DFO grants fishing licenses; CRA determines who is eligible as a self-employed fisher; and ESDC/Service Canada determine eligibility for and pay EI fishing benefits, which are based on insurable earnings rather than insurable hours.

<sup>97</sup> André Bernard, Ross Finnie and Benoît St-Jean, *Interprovincial Mobility and Earnings* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2008).

<sup>98</sup> HRSDC, *The Impact of EI Regional Boundary Revisions on Mobility in New Brunswick: Evidence from the LAD* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2010).

<sup>99</sup> HRSDC, *Regional Out-Migration and Commuting Patterns of Employment Insurance (EI) Claimants* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2012).

<sup>100</sup> HRSDC, *Commuting and Mobility Patterns of Employment Insurance (EI) Recipients and Non-Recipients* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2011).

<sup>101</sup> Kathleen M. Day and Stanley L. Winer, *Policy-Induced Internal Migration: An Empirical Investigation of the Canadian Case* (Munich, Germany: CESifo Group, 2005).

## 1. EI Fishing Claims and Benefits

In 2012/13, the number of new fishing claims decreased by 4.1%, to 28,290 new claims (see Chart 33). Along with a decrease in the number of fishing claims, fishing benefits paid to self-employed fishers fell by 2.5% (-6.4 million) in 2012/13, after an increase of 7.2% in the previous year.

In 2012/13, EI fishing benefits comprised 1.7% of total EI income benefits, the same proportion as in previous year. For the majority of self-employed fishers who reside in fishing-dominated communities, EI benefits are an important part of their annual income.

### 1.1 EI Fishing Benefits, by Province and Territory

The Atlantic provinces accounted for 81.1% of all fishing claims established in 2012/13. Within the region, the number of new fishing claims decreased in three out of four provinces, led by a decrease of 4.9% in Newfoundland and Labrador. The only exception was New Brunswick, where the number of new fishing claims increased by 0.2%. Quebec also saw a decrease of 2.7% in fishing claims in 2012/13, while fishing claims in British Columbia decreased by 10.7%.

Fishing claims in Newfoundland and Labrador represented 41.8% of all EI fishing claims in 2012/13, decreasing slightly from 42.2% in 2011/12. Since their peak in 2004/05, fishing claims in Newfoundland and Labrador have dropped significantly (-33.3%).


Fishing claims in British Columbia accounted for 9.9% of the national total, compared with 10.6% in the previous year. Similar to Newfoundland and Labrador, fishing claims in the province have dropped significantly (-36.2%) since their peak in 2003/04.

Among major fishing provinces, EI fishing benefits decreased in British Columbia (-6.8%), Newfoundland and Labrador (-4.3%), Prince Edward Island (-2.2%), and New Brunswick (-0.3%), while they increased in Manitoba (+3.1%), and Nova Scotia (+1.5%).

### 1.2 EI Fishing Benefits, by Gender and Age

In 2012/13, the number of fishing claims established by men decreased by 4.4% (-1,076), while those established by women decreased by 2.7% (-140). Men made 82.1% of EI fishing claims, a figure 0.2 percentage points lower than that in the previous year.

Core-aged fishers (those aged 25 to 54), who accounted for 62.9% of all new fishing claims, established 6.0% (-1,137) fewer fishing claims in 2012/13 than in the previous year. The number of new fishing claims registered by youth (aged 15 to 24) decreased significantly by 9.0% (-122) in 2012/13; consequently, their share of all EI fishing claims decreased by 0.2 percentage points to 4.4%.



Older workers (aged 55 and older) made slightly more fishing claims (+0.5%, +43) than they did in 2011/12. Canada's aging demographics have affected the fishing workforce in recent years, with the share of fishing claims made by older workers increasing from 28.6% in 2008/09 to 32.7% in 2012/13.

## 2. Eligibility for EI Fishing Benefits

EI fishing benefits are based on earnings from self-employment in fishing. To qualify for benefits, fishers need to earn between \$2,500 and \$4,200 from self-employment in fishing (depending on the regional unemployment rate)<sup>102</sup> in their qualifying period (generally 31 weeks prior to claim). Any claimant who qualifies for fishing benefits may receive a maximum entitlement of 26 weeks, with the possibility of establishing two claims a year, one in the winter and one in the summer.

However, if an individual has 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, he or she is considered a new-entrant/re-entrant (NERE) and must earn \$5,500 in insurable earnings to qualify for fishing benefits. Individuals who


have received one week or more of maternity or parental benefits in the 208 weeks preceding the labour force attachment period<sup>103</sup> are not considered NEREs.

Historically, over 90% of all fishers who claim fishing benefits have qualified with earnings above \$5,500, which is the minimum eligibility requirement for NERE fishers. In 2012/13, this figure was 98.2%, which is consistent with the figures recorded in the last five years.

## 3. Accessibility to EI Fishing Benefits

Among the 28,290 new fishing claims in 2012/13, claimants established 10,973 fishing claims based on the winter qualifying period, a 0.5% decrease over the previous year. The number of claims established based on the summer qualifying period also decreased (-6.3%), to 17,317 claims.

There were 20,080 fishers who made fishing claims in 2012/13, a decrease of 3.9% from 2011/12. The difference between the number of fishing claims and the number of fishers making these claims can be attributed to the fact that some fishers are active in both fishing seasons and are eligible to claim fishing benefits twice a year.



<sup>102</sup> More information on self-employed fishing earnings required to qualify for EI fishing benefits can be found in the Service Canada publication *Employment Insurance Benefits for Fishers*, at <http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/ei/publications/fishing.pdf>.

<sup>103</sup> The labour force attachment period is the 52 weeks preceding the start date of the qualifying period.

In the major fish-producing provinces, the number of fishers claiming benefits declined in British Columbia (-10.9%), Newfoundland and Labrador (-4.5%), Prince Edward Island (-2.9%), Nova Scotia (-2.7%), and Quebec (-2.6%), while New Brunswick (+2.2%) experienced an increase in the number of fishers claiming benefits.

In 2011/12, a total of 8,207 (40.9%) fishers who established a claim made multiple fishing claims, while 11,871 (59.1%) fishers made one fishing claim. The number of claims made by fishers who made multiple fishing claims (16,417) accounted for over half of all fishing claims. The number of fishers who made a single claim declined by 3.3%, while the number of fishers who made multiple claims decreased by 4.7%.

The Atlantic provinces accounted for 90.8% of all fishers who made multiple fishing claims. Nevertheless, the number of fishers who made multiple claims declined in all four provinces in 2012/13, as follows: Newfoundland and Labrador (-6.0%), Nova Scotia (-4.3%), Prince Edward Island (-3.8%), and New Brunswick (-2.6%). Fishers in Newfoundland and Labrador were the most likely to be active in both seasons, as 69.5% of claimants in the province established multiple fishing claims in 2012/13.

#### 4. Level of EI Fishing Benefits

The average weekly fishing benefit increased by 2.9%, from \$439 in 2011/12 to \$452 in 2012/13. With this increase, the average weekly benefit for fishing claims was \$57 higher than that for regular claims (\$395). Moreover, the average weekly benefit for fishers remained close to the maximum weekly benefit of \$485 in 2012.

A fisher's maximum weekly benefits are calculated by dividing the fishing insured earnings obtained during the qualifying period (generally 31 weeks prior to claim) by the divisor associated with the claimant's regional unemployment rate (see Table 26).

In 2012/13, almost two-thirds (60.3%) of self-employed fishers resided in regions with an unemployment rate higher than 13.1%, and they represented 65.0% of all fishing claims.

**TABLE 26**  
**Divisor Used to Calculate Fishing Benefits Based on the Regional Rate of Unemployment**

Regional Rate of Unemployment	Divisor
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

The proportion of fishing claimants who received the maximum weekly benefit increased from 78.1% in 2011/12 to 78.8% in 2012/13. This proportion is much higher than the proportion of regular claimants who received the maximum weekly benefit (41.6% in 2012/13).

#### 5. Duration of EI Fishing Benefits

In 2011/12, the average duration of all fishing claims was 20.6 weeks, a slight increase from 20.3 weeks in 2010/11. Women claimed 2.2 weeks more than men did (22.4 weeks compared with 20.2 weeks).

Fishers in British Columbia, who tend to have only one fishing season, had the longest average benefit duration, at 23.1 weeks. Benefit durations in the Atlantic provinces varied slightly between 19.6 and 20.9 weeks.

Fishers who established one claim in 2011/12 received an average of 24.6 weeks, while fishers who established two claims received an average of 20.3 weeks on their first claim and 17.8 weeks on their second claim, for an average total of 38.1 weeks of benefits.



## IV. EI SPECIAL BENEFITS

### 1. Overview and Legislative Changes

In addition to assisting those who are unemployed, EI plays an important role in supporting employees and self-employed individuals (including fishers) who are too sick to work, who stay at home with a newborn or newly adopted child, or who take a temporary leave from work to provide care or support to a gravely ill family member.

As of January 31, 2010, EI special benefits, including maternity, parental, sickness and compassionate care benefits, were extended to self-employed people, who could opt into the EI program for the first time. Benefits were payable as of January 1, 2011.

Effective July 4, 2010, the EI benefit period may be extended for Canadian Forces members who cannot collect all their parental benefits because of an imperative military requirement that either defers or interrupts their parental leave.

On December 14, 2012, the *Helping Families in Need Act* received Royal Assent, creating a new type of EI benefit for parents of critically ill children (PCIC). Under the PCIC benefits, up to 35 weeks of EI benefits are available, to be shared among eligible parents who are unable to work while providing care or support to one or more children under the age of 18 with a life-threatening illness or injury. This benefit became available on June 9, 2013, to eligible EI insured workers and to self-employed individuals, who have contributed to EI.

Access for employees to the new PCIC benefits is consistent with the existing eligibility requirements for EI special benefits, requiring 600 insurable hours in the shorter of the 52 weeks prior to the start of their claim or since the start of their last claim. Self-employed persons who have opted into the EI program need to have earned a minimum level of income in the previous calendar year (\$6,515 earned in 2013 for claims in 2014) to be eligible for the benefit.<sup>104</sup> In addition, to qualify for the PCIC benefits, a claimant needs to provide a medical certificate attesting that the child is critically ill or injured.

The *Helping Families in Need Act* also amends the *Employment Insurance Act* to allow insured persons who fall ill or are injured while receiving EI parental

benefits to qualify for EI sickness benefits despite not being “otherwise available for work” or, for self-employed persons who would be “otherwise be working”. This new measure came into force on March 24, 2013. Future reports will analyse the impact and effectiveness of these new initiatives.

The following sections do not include data on maternity and parental benefits in Quebec, for either employees or self-employed individuals, as these benefits are offered under the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP). Data on sickness and compassionate care benefits in Quebec are included in their respective sections.

#### 1.1 EI Special Claims and Benefits

The numbers of special claims and benefits paid are less likely to be affected by the economic cycle than those related to regular benefits. In 2012/13, there were 510,040 special claims in Canada, which represented a 0.3% increase from 2011/12, which followed a 1.8% increase from 2010/11 to 2011/12.

Total special benefits increased by 4.7% to \$4.48 billion in 2012/13, from \$4.28 billion in 2011/12. It was the second consecutive year that special benefits had increased (they rose by 2.5% in 2011/12).

Women accounted for 67.1% of total special claims and received 83.1% of special benefits. Two main factors may explain why women received a larger proportion of special benefits than men did. First, only women are eligible for maternity benefits, which comprised 21.9% of total special benefits. Second, when compared to men, women tend to be on parental benefits for a longer duration. For example, in 2012/13, the average duration of biological parental benefits was 31.8 weeks for women and 17.1 for men. Similarly, the average duration of adoptive parental benefits was 29.8 weeks for women and 16.1 weeks for men.

##### 1.1.1 EI Special Benefits for Self-Employed Individuals

As of January 31, 2010, EI special benefits—including maternity, parental, sickness and compassionate care benefits—were extended to self-employed people, who could opt into the EI program for the first time. These benefits were payable as of January 1, 2011.<sup>105</sup>

<sup>104</sup> For fishers, access to the new PCIC benefit will be based on the rules for existing EI special benefits for fishers (sickness, maternity, parental and compassionate care benefits).

<sup>105</sup> For more information on EI special benefits for self-employed individuals, please visit <http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/sc/ei/sew/index.shtml>.

Between the opt-in date of the measure and March 31, 2013, a total of 17,153 self-employed individuals opted into the EI program. Of these, a total of 4,289 individuals subsequently opted out of the EI program.

Between January 2011, when self-employed individuals were first eligible to claim EI special benefits, and March 2013, self-employed individuals made 1,561 claims and received \$12.82 million in benefits, with 259 claims in 2010/11, 617 claims in 2011/12 and 685 claims in 2012/13. In 2012/13, self-employed women made 662 special claims (96.6% of all special claims), and self-employed women aged 25 to 44 years old making 619 special claims (90.4% of all special claims).

In 2012/13, of the 685 claims from self-employed individuals, 497 received EI maternity benefits, representing an increase of 9.2% (+42 claims) from 2011/12. These claims, accounted for \$1.91 million in maternity benefits in 2012/13. Moreover, 540 of the 685 claims resulted in EI parental (biological) benefits, accounting for \$3.43 million in biological parental benefits in 2012/13. In addition, 8 of the 685 claims resulted in EI parental adoptive benefits, accounting for \$67,300 in adoptive parental benefits in 2012/13.

Results of the 2011 Evaluation Survey of Self-Employed People<sup>106</sup> found that self-employed individuals who had registered for EI special benefits were more likely than self-employed individuals who did not register for special benefits: to be women; to be under 45 years of age; to report post-secondary education; to be self-employed with employees; to work in the government, education or health care industries; and to report fewer years of self-employment.

### 1.1.2 EI Parental Benefits for Military Families

Effective July 4, 2010, the eligibility period was extended for Canadian Forces members who could not collect all their parental benefits during the standard eligibility period because of an imperative military requirement that either deferred or interrupted their parental leave. The eligibility period during which EI parental benefits can be paid may be extended

by one week for each week that an eligible claimant is unable to collect EI parental benefits. The extension is subject to a maximum eligibility period of 104 weeks.<sup>107</sup>

As of March 31, 2013, there have been 64 parental claims that have utilized this provision: 39 from Ontario, 21 from the Western provinces and 4 from the Atlantic provinces. Canadian Forces members residing in Quebec can apply for parental benefits under the QPIP.

### 1.2 Level of EI Special Benefits

As shown in Table 27, growth in the average weekly benefit rate was positive across special benefits and genders in 2012/13. Average weekly special benefits increased by between 2.6% and 3.8% for all benefit types and genders. This general increase is in line with the increase in average weekly wages and the increase in the maximum insurable earnings (MIE) from 2011 to 2012. MIE increased by 3.8%, from \$44,200 in 2011 to \$45,900 in 2012.

Another way to assess the level of benefits support is to look at the proportion of special benefits claimants receiving the maximum weekly benefit. In 2012/13,

**TABLE 27**  
**Average Weekly Benefit, by Special Benefit Type**

		2012/13 (\$)	2011/12 (\$)	Growth (%)
Parental (Biological)	Men	443	427	3.8
	Women	396	382	3.5
	Both	402	388	3.5
Parental (Adoption)	Men	481	466	3.2
	Women	438	426	2.8
	Both	449	437	2.6
Maternity	Men	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Women	394	380	3.7
	Both	394	380	3.7
Sickness	Men	404	390	3.5
	Women	336	326	3.1
	Both	365	353	3.5
Compassionate Care	Men	426	412	3.4
	Women	375	363	3.3
	Both	389	376	3.6

<sup>106</sup> HRSDC, *Results of the 2011 Evaluation Survey of Self-employed People* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2012). The evaluation study is based on a sample of 499 participants (self-employed individuals who registered for special benefits) and 502 non-participants (self-employed individuals who did not register for special benefits).

<sup>107</sup> For more information on EI parental benefits for military families, please visit [http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/sc/ei/military\\_families.shtml](http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/sc/ei/military_families.shtml).

37.8% of special benefits claimants received the maximum weekly benefit, which was 0.2 percentage points higher than the figure in 2011/12. While this proportion has remained relatively stable between 37% and 38% over the last few years, it is lower than the proportion of regular benefits claimants who received the maximum weekly benefit in 2012/13 (41.6%). There are two reasons for this: men were overrepresented among regular claims (60.0%), while women (67.1%) were overrepresented among special claims; and the average weekly wage for men was higher than that for women. According to the Labour Force Survey, in 2012/13, the average weekly wage for men (\$1,086) was 21.8% higher than that for women (\$892).

### 1.3 Combining EI Special Benefits

Different types of special benefits can be combined within a single claim, under certain circumstances, to a potential maximum duration of 104 weeks.<sup>108</sup>

Among new special claims established in 2011/12,<sup>109</sup> the majority (68.1%) of claimants used only one type of special benefit, while nearly one third (31.6%) of them combined more than one special benefit in a single claim; 27.2% combined two special benefits and 4.4% combined three special benefits. The vast majority (97.5%) of those combining two special benefits combined maternity and parental benefits.

An evaluation study<sup>110</sup> found that the majority of maternity/parental claimants do not combine their maternity/parental benefits with other types

of benefits (i.e., regular benefits, sickness benefits, fishing benefits and compassionate care benefits). However, if they do, women outside of Quebec, often combine maternity/parental benefits with sickness benefits, while men outside of Quebec, often combine parental benefits with regular benefits.

### 1.4 Premium Reduction Program

The Premium Reduction Program (PRP) reduces EI premiums for employers if their employees are covered by a registered employer-based short-term disability plan that meets or exceeds the requirements set by the EI Commission in the Employment Insurance Regulations. In this context, for an employer's sickness benefits plan to be eligible for a premium reduction under the PRP, employees must have at least equivalent protection provided by EI sickness benefits. Additionally, participating employers must return the employee share of the premium reduction to workers, which may be done via another employee benefit such as dental coverage, or other methods in place between employee and employer.

In 2012, there were 33,500 employers participating in the PRP, representing a decrease of 800 employers from the previous year (Table 28). The insurable earnings of employees who were eligible for premium reductions were \$247.8 billion, or 49% of total insurable earnings in Canada. In 2012, participating employers received a total of \$918 million in premium reductions, an increase of \$36 million from the previous year, representing 4.3% of annual gross EI premiums.<sup>111</sup>

**TABLE 28**  
**Historical Statistics on Premium Reduction Program Between 2006 and 2012**

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Number of Employers Participating in the PRP	34,000	32,700	32,500	32,100	33,800	34,300	33,500
Total Amount of Premium Reductions Received by Participating Employers (\$ Million)	\$628M	\$714M	\$793M	\$816M	\$864M	\$882M	\$918M
Amount of Premium Reduction as a % of Annual Gross EI Premiums	3.7%	4.0%	4.4%	4.6%	4.7%	4.4%	4.3%

<sup>108</sup> Claimants who have given birth can combine weeks of special benefits to reach the maximum of 71 weeks if the weeks of special benefits are consecutive and uninterrupted by any period of regular benefits. Otherwise, special benefits can be combined and paid for up to 50 weeks in a 52-week benefit period.

<sup>109</sup> Data and analysis on duration relate only to claims established in 2011/12 to ensure all claims were completed. Note that many claims established in 2011/12 were completed in 2012/13.

<sup>110</sup> ESDC, *Use of EI Regular and Special Benefits by Maternity or Parental Claimants* (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2013).

<sup>111</sup> Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board (CEIFB), 2013 Actuarial Report on the Reduction in EI Premiums for Employers with Wage-Loss Plans (Ottawa: CEIFB, November 2012).

## 2. EI Maternity and Parental Benefits

EI maternity benefits are offered to biological mothers, including surrogate mothers, who cannot work because they are pregnant or have recently given birth. A maximum of 15 weeks of EI maternity benefits is available. The 15 weeks can start as early as eight weeks before the expected date of birth and can end as late as 17 weeks after the actual date of birth.

EI parental benefits are offered to parents who are caring for a newborn or newly adopted child. A maximum of 35 weeks of parental benefits is available to biological or adoptive parents, which can be shared between the two parents.

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 duration of EI parental benefits, only claims established in the first half of 2012/13 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 2012/13 were used.

### 2.1 EI Maternity and Parental Claims and Benefits

#### 2.1.1 EI Maternity Claims and Benefits

The number of new maternity claims increased by 1.9%, from 167,540 in 2011/12 to 170,680 in 2012/13. Similarly, maternity benefits increased by 5.2% to \$982.0 million in 2012/13. Self-employed women made 497 maternity claims, accounting for \$1.91 million in maternity benefits in 2012/13.

As in previous years, the vast majority of maternity claims were made by women aged 25 to 44, who accounted for 89.0% of all maternity claims in 2012/13. Women under 25 accounted for 10.8% of total maternity claims.

From 2011/12 to 2012/13, the number of maternity claims decreased by 6.8% in the Atlantic provinces, while it increased by 1.2% and 4.8% in Ontario and the Western provinces, respectively. The change observed in the number of maternity claims is in line with the change in the number of live births. For example, according to Statistics Canada's Annual Demographic

Estimates, from 2011/12 to 2012/13, the number of live births in Ontario and the Western provinces increased by 1.1% and 2.3%, respectively, while the Atlantic provinces experienced a 0.7% decrease over the same period.

Of the 170,680 maternity claims in 2012/13, the majority (162,920 or 95.5%) were followed by biological parental claims. In addition, among the 164,680 biological parental claims made by women, 98.9% or 162,920 were preceded by maternity claims.

#### 2.1.2 EI Parental (Biological) Claims and Benefits

In 2012/13, the number of parental claims made by biological parents increased by 1.9% to 190,610. Parental benefits for biological parents rose by 3.3% to \$2.28 billion in 2012/13. Self-employed individuals made 540 parental claims, which accounted for \$3.43 million in biological parental benefits in 2012/13.


As in previous years, women made the vast majority (86.4%) of biological parental claims in 2012/13. The number of biological parental claims rose for women (+2.0%) and men (+1.5%) between 2011/12 and 2012/13.

The majority of biological parental claims are made by women aged 25 to 44, and in 2012/13 they accounted for 77.2% of all biological parental claims. Men aged 25 to 44 accounted for 12.4% of all biological parental claims. Combined, men and women under 25 also accounted for 9.7% of biological parental claims.

The number of parental claims made by biological parents increased significantly in the Western provinces (+4.8%) and in Ontario (+1.2%) in 2012/13, while it decreased in the Atlantic provinces (-6.8%). As shown in Chart 35, the fluctuation in the number of parental claims made by biological parents was consistent with the fluctuation in the number of maternity claims among the four regions.

**CHART 35**

Changes in the Number of Parental (Biological) and Maternity Claims, by Region, Between 2011/12 and 2012/13



\* Quebec is excluded as this province has administered its own maternity and parental benefits since January 2006.

### 2.1.3 EI Parental (Adoptive) Claims and Benefits

The number of parental claims made by adoptive parents increased in 2012/13 to 1,860 (+1.1%). Adoptive parents received a total of \$22.9 million in benefits. There were no parental adoptive claims from self-employed individuals in 2012/13.

The average duration of EI adoptive parental claims was 26.6 weeks per claim in 2012/13, slightly higher than the duration in 2011/12 (25.1 weeks). Parents who adopted used 91.7% of the full 35 weeks available to them, on average, up from 85.2% in 2010/11. The average duration and proportion of all weeks used for adoptive parental claims were lower than those for biological parental claims. In 2012/13, the average duration of biological parental claims was 29.9 weeks per claim, 3.3 weeks higher than adoptive parental claims.

### 2.2 Accessibility to EI Maternity and Parental Benefits

According to the 2012 Employment Insurance Coverage Survey (EICS), the number of mothers with a child up to 12 months old decreased by 1.5% in 2012, to 395,990, compared with to 401,930 in 2011. In 2012, 77.9% of these mothers had insured income

before giving birth to, or adopting their child, compared with 76.6% in 2011. Among these insured mothers, 88.2% received maternity or parental benefits, virtually unchanged from 2011 (88.6%). Overall, nearly two-thirds (62.4%) of all mothers with a child up to 12 months old received special benefits in 2012.

For all provinces combined, the proportion of fathers who claimed or intended to claim parental benefits decreased to 25.4% in 2012, from 29.3% in 2011, and 29.6% in 2010.

Since the introduction of the QPIP on January 1, 2006, the proportion of fathers in Quebec who took or intended to take parental leave has almost tripled, from 27.8% in 2005 to 80.1% in 2012. The QPIP has had a major impact on the number of fathers who claimed or intended to claim parental benefits. It includes leave that applies exclusively to fathers. The proportions reported above originate from the EICS and include parents in Quebec receiving benefits from the provincial program.

### 2.3 Level of EI Maternity and Parental Benefits

The average weekly benefit for maternity benefits continued to rise in 2012/13, reaching \$394 (+3.7%), up from \$380 in 2011/12.

Similarly, the average weekly benefit for parental (biological) benefits rose by 3.5% to \$402 in 2012/13, compared with \$388 in the previous year. The proportion of parental benefit claimants who received the maximum weekly benefit was 48.6% similar to the proportion in 2011/12 (48.9%).

The average weekly benefit for adoptive parental claims rose by 2.6% to \$449 in 2012/13. In 2012/13, 69.9% of adoptive parental claimants received the maximum weekly benefit, an increase of 1.4 percentage points from 68.5% in 2011/12.

### 2.4 Duration of EI Maternity and Parental Benefits

As in previous fiscal years, in 2012/13, parents used almost all of the EI maternity and parental weeks to which they were entitled. Although the vast majority of mothers received the full 15 weeks to which they were entitled, the average duration of maternity benefits remained around 14.6 weeks.

The average duration for parental benefits, as calculated on a per-claim basis, was 29.9 weeks for biological parents and 26.6 weeks for adoptive parents in 2012/13.

However, the average duration of parental claims can be adjusted to reflect the fact that parents often share the 35 weeks of parental benefits available to them. The average duration of biological parental claims, as calculated on a per-child basis, was 32.3 weeks for parents who decided to share the parental benefits, and this has remained stable over several years.<sup>112, 113</sup>

Claimants who received both maternity and parental benefits used 46.9 weeks, or 93.7% (see Chart 36), of the 50 weeks of maternity and parental benefits available to them on average in 2012/13, a proportion similar to that in the previous year (93.5%).

Low-income claimants receiving maternity and parental benefits as well as the Family Supplement collected an average of 46.2 weeks of maternity and parental benefits, relatively similar to the number of weeks collected by higher-income claimants (46.9 weeks) not receiving the Family Supplement.

Similarly, the decision to share parental (biological) benefits has a limited effect on the average duration of the claim, as parents who shared parental benefits used 33.1 weeks of benefits combined, compared with 32.2 weeks used by parents who did not share parental benefits in 2012/13.


### 3. EI Sickness Benefits

EI provides up to 15 weeks of sickness benefits to help claimants who are unable to work due to a short-term illness, injury or quarantine.

#### 3.1 EI Sickness Claims and Benefits

In 2012/13, the number of new sickness claims decreased by 0.4% from 331,220 in 2011/12 to 329,750. Despite the decrease in sickness claims, benefits paid increased by 6.6% to \$1.2 billion in 2012/13. The increase in sickness benefits paid in 2012/13 is partially attributable to an increase of 3.1% in the average duration of sickness benefits and an increase of 3.5% in average weekly sickness benefit rate. In 2012/13, self-employed individuals made 135 sickness claims, and received \$270,000 in sickness benefits.

Women made 57.4% of EI sickness claims, which was similar to the proportion in previous years. Older workers represented 23.9% of all EI sickness claims, while they represented only 18.6% of national employment. The proportion of sickness benefits claims made by older workers continued to increase,



<sup>112</sup> Data on the duration of parental benefits cover claims that began during the first half of 2011/12 to ensure data are based on completed claims. This analysis also assumes that the same number of men and women share the parental benefits available to them.

<sup>113</sup> Figures presented in Annex 2.11 and 2.12 are still presented on a per-claim basis to permit year-over-year comparisons.

up from 21.7% in 2010/11 and 23.0% in 2011/12. Older workers were also overrepresented among those who collected the maximum 15 weeks of benefits.

The 55 and older group showed the largest increase in sickness claims (+3.4%) in 2012/13, reflecting the continued increase in employment for workers in this age group and, more generally, the aging of Canada's population. In 2012/13, their share of employment increased by 0.7 percentage points from 17.9% in 2011/12 to 18.6% in 2012/13. Claims from those aged 25 to 44 decreased by 1.8 percentage points, while claims from those aged 45 to 54 dropped by 1.3 percentage points, respectively in 2012/13.

Three provinces saw increases in the number of sickness claims in 2012/13, with the sharpest increases in Alberta (+7.6%) and Quebec (+3.4%). Among the provinces that experienced decreases in the number of sickness claims, Prince Edward Island (-12.1%) and Nova Scotia (-8.2%) reported the largest decreases on percentage basis.

### 3.2 Level of EI Sickness Benefits

The average weekly benefit for sickness claims rose by 3.5% to \$365 in 2012/13, compared with \$353 in the previous year. This increase was consistent with the increase in average wages in 2012/13 which increased by 2.5%.

### 3.3 Duration of EI Sickness Benefits

In 2012/13, sickness claimants received benefits for an average of 9.7 weeks, comparable to the average (9.4 weeks) in 2011/12 and representing 64.7% of the maximum entitlement of 15 weeks. In addition, 33.8% of sickness claimants collected the maximum 15 weeks of benefits, 2.7 percentage points higher than the proportion observed in 2011/12 (31.1%).

## 4. EI Compassionate Care Benefits

The EI program provides six weeks of EI compassionate care benefits<sup>114</sup> to persons who have to be away from work temporarily to provide care or support to a family member who is gravely ill with a significant risk of death.

### 4.1 EI Compassionate Care Claims and Benefits

In 2012/13, there were 6,102 claims for EI compassionate care benefits, a 2.1% increase over 2011/12. Compassionate care benefits amounted to \$11.6 million in 2012/13, a 5.2% increase from 2011/12.

In 2012/13, women made 71.9% of compassionate care claims, a decrease of 2.6 percentage points from 2011/12 (74.5%), while men made 28.1%, an increase of 2.6 percentage points from 2011/12 (25.5%). From 2011/12 to 2012/13, the number of compassionate care claims made by women decreased by 1.4%, while the number of claims made by men increased by 12.4%. The number of claims made by those aged 55 and older increased slightly (+4.5%) in 2012/13, similar to the increase in previous year (+4.4%), while those made by people aged 45 to 54 increased by 6.7% in 2012/13.

### 4.2 Accessibility to EI Compassionate Care Benefits

To apply for compassionate care benefits, claimants must indicate their relationship with the family member that they are caring for, and provide a medical certificate proving the family member is gravely ill and at significant risk of death. An evaluation study found that<sup>115</sup> the vast majority (81.1%) of the applicants filed for compassionate care benefits to take care of their gravely ill parent (56.1%) or spouse or partner (25.0%) in 2011/12. Individuals applied for compassionate care benefits to take care of gravely ill child (their own child, the child of a spouse or the child of a common-law partner) in 7.3% of all cases. These proportions were consistent with those reported in 2010/11. In 2011/12, the percentage of compassionate care claimants receiving benefits was highest for individuals caring for a gravely ill spouse or partner (69.3%), followed by those caring for a mother or father (67.8%).

In June 2006, a regulatory change broadened the definition of “family member” to allow siblings, grandparents, grandchildren, in-laws, aunts, uncles, nieces, nephews, foster parents, wards and any other individuals considered family members by the gravely ill person—or his or her representative—to be eligible for compassionate care benefits. Administrative data show that the broadened eligibility resulted in additional applications in 2011/12 (the “other” and “sister or brother” categories in Table 29), representing

<sup>114</sup> Claimants require either 600 hours of insurable employment or over \$6,222 in self-employed income to qualify for up to six weeks of CCBs (with a two-week waiting period).

<sup>115</sup> ESDC, *Compassionate Care Benefits* (Ottawa: ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2013).

**TABLE 29**  
**Compassionate Care Claimants by Type of Relationship to Gravely Ill Person, 2011/12**

Type of Relationship	Distribution of Compassionate Care Claimants (%)	Percentage of Compassionate Care Claimants Receiving Benefits (%)
Mother or Father	56.1	67.8
Spouse or Partner	25.0	69.3
Other	7.3	58.8
Child	7.3	57.3
Sister or Brother	4.3	64.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

approximately 11.6% of all compassionate care benefit applicants, an increase of 0.3 percentage points from 2010/11. Since the implementation of the broadened eligibility criteria, both the number and proportion of applicants in these two categories have increased every year.

#### 4.3 Level of EI Compassionate Care Benefits

In 2012/13, the average weekly benefit for compassionate care benefits increased to \$389 (+3.6%). As mentioned in previous sections, this general increase is in line with the increase in average weekly wages and the increase in maximum insurable earnings (MIE) from 2011 to 2012. The MIE for 2012 was \$45,900, up 3.8% from \$44,200 in 2011.

#### 4.4 Duration of EI Compassionate Care Benefits

On average, claimants used 4.7 weeks of compassionate care benefits or 78.3% of the maximum entitlement of 6 weeks in 2012/13. The proportion of compassionate care claimants who used all of their entitlement was 73.1% in 2012/13, slightly lower than the proportion in 2011/12 (74.0%), and 26.9% used part of their compassionate care benefits entitlement, similar to the proportion observed in 2011/12 (26.0%). Although family members can share the 6 weeks of entitlement, 97.5% chose not to do so in 2012/13, a proportion similar to that of the previous year (97.7%).

According to a recent study,<sup>116</sup> the main reason a claimant does not receive the entire six weeks of benefits is that the care recipient passes away while the claimant is receiving compassionate care benefits. The study also found that those caring for a spouse are more likely to use the entire six-week period than those caring for another type of family member, and those living with the a gravely ill care recipient are more likely to use the entire six-week period than those who do not live with the care recipient. Finally, claimants who combine compassionate care benefits with another type of EI benefit are less likely to use the full six weeks available to them than are those who only receive compassionate care benefits.

## V. EI WORK-SHARING BENEFITS

### 1. Recent Legislative Changes

The Work-Sharing program is designed to help employers and workers avoid layoffs when there is a temporary reduction in the normal level of business activity that is beyond the control of the employer. Layoffs are avoided by offering Employment Insurance Part I income support to workers willing to work a reduced work week while their company recovers. The goal is for all 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 costs of recruiting and training new employees when business returns to normal levels. It also helps employees maintain their skills and jobs while supplementing their wages with EI benefits for the days they are not working.

As discussed in the following subsections, in 2012/13, the number of new Work-Sharing agreements, the volume and duration of Work-Sharing claims, and the amount of Work-Sharing benefits paid remained low compared to levels at the height of the late-2000s recession but still above pre-recession levels. Previously, these figures had increased significantly in 2009/10, due to the recession and to temporary changes to the Work-Sharing program as part of the Economic Action Plan.

<sup>116</sup> ESDC, Compassionate Care Benefit (Ottawa, ESDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2013).



Work-Sharing agreements are signed for a minimum of 6 weeks to a maximum of 26 weeks, with a possible 12-week extension to a total of 38 weeks. Recognizing the level of uncertainty employers and workers faced during the most recent recession, the federal government—through the Economic Action Plan—introduced temporary changes to the Work-Sharing program to mitigate the effects of the recession on workers and employers.


The temporary measures introduced under Economic Action Plan 2009 extended agreement durations, streamlined the administrative process, and eased eligibility requirements for employers. Temporary measures were also introduced in Budget 2010, Budget 2011, and the Economic and Fiscal Update 2011. All temporary Work-Sharing measures concluded in October 2012.

Budget 2011 introduced new permanent policy adjustments to make Work-Sharing more flexible and efficient for employers. The changes included a simplified recovery plan, more flexible utilization rules, and technical amendments to reduce administrative burden. In order to determine how effective the temporary measures and the new policy were in supporting employers and workers during and after the recession, a departmental evaluation is currently underway, with results expected in 2014/15.

Under the 2011 policy, the Work-Sharing program developed a standard response to disasters and states of emergency, which was used in 2013 to assist employers facing layoff situations as a result of the extensive flooding in Alberta and Manitoba in June and the train explosion in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec in July. Special measures in response to these disasters eased certain criteria related to the programs' application, administration and recovery plan in order to make it easier for employers to access Work-Sharing under challenging circumstances. This response can help employers keep valuable skilled workers while focusing on clean-up efforts and returning to normal operations.

## 2. EI Work-Sharing Claims and Benefits

Work-Sharing usage and expenditures are countercyclical: they increase during a contraction in the labour market and decline during an expansion.<sup>117</sup> As illustrated in Chart 37, the number of Work-Sharing claims peaked in 2009/10, reaching 127,880 claims as a result of the late-2000 recession. As the recovery took hold, the number of Work-Sharing claims started to decline. In 2012/13, there were 13,890 new Work-Sharing claims established, representing a decrease of 41.5% compared to the previous year. With an improving economy, the number of Work-Sharing claims is edging closer to pre-recession levels as less employers require support to keep their business afloat.



<sup>117</sup> ESDC, *Usage of the Work-Sharing Program: 1990/91 to 2011/12* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2013).

Work-Sharing benefits grew substantially during the late-2000s recession. In 2012/13 Work-Sharing benefits amounted to \$26.1 million, a decrease from \$31.7 million in 2011/12 and the \$294.7 million peak reached in 2009/10.

The significant amount of Work-Sharing benefits paid in recent years can be explained by the higher volume of claims, as discussed earlier, coupled with the temporary increases in the maximum duration of Work-Sharing agreements introduced as part of the Economic Action Plan. Despite the recent decline in Work-Sharing benefits paid, the amount paid in 2012/13 remained above pre-recession levels.

The average duration of Work-Sharing claims established in 2011/12 was 12.8 weeks,<sup>118</sup> a decrease from levels of claims established in 2010/11 (13.3 weeks) and 2009/10 (19.3 weeks). The current average duration is shorter than the average of 13.1 weeks for claims established in 2007/08, before the recession.

### 3. EI Work-Sharing Claims, by Industry, Province, Gender and Age

The manufacturing industry benefits significantly from the Work-Sharing program. For instance, this industry accounted for 77.0% of EI Work-Sharing claims and 73.2% of EI Work-Sharing benefits paid in 2012/13.

As illustrated in Table 30, Quebec accounted for 45% of Work-Sharing claims and benefits paid in 2012/13, while Ontario accounted for 38.9% of Work-Sharing claims and benefits paid. Together, these provinces accounted for 84.2% of the claims and 84.0% of the benefits paid under Work-Sharing. British Columbia and Alberta together accounted for another 9.4% of the Work-Sharing claims.

Men and workers aged 25 to 54 are over-represented among Work-Sharing claims. The fact that both of these groups are over-represented in the manufacturing industry seems to explain their high participation in the Work-Sharing program.

**TABLE 30**  
**EI Work-Sharing Claims and Benefits, 2012/13**

	Work-Sharing Claims	Work-Sharing Benefits	Employment Share
<b>Canada</b>	<b>13,890</b>	<b>\$26,140,530</b>	<b>17,579,100</b>
<b>Province</b>			
Newfoundland and Labrador	0.04%	0.6%	1.32%
Prince Edward Island	0.08%	0.2%	0.42%
Nova Scotia	1.95%	1.9%	2.59%
New Brunswick	0.57%	0.9%	2.00%
Quebec	45.28%	45.0%	22.81%
Ontario	38.90%	39.0%	38.71%
Manitoba	3.73%	2.6%	3.60%
Saskatchewan	0.09%	0.3%	3.09%
Alberta	3.55%	3.0%	12.29%
British Columbia	5.82%	6.4%	13.17%
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	69.07%	71.10%	52.45%
Female	30.93%	28.90%	47.55%
<b>Age</b>			
Under 25 years	5.46%	4.00%	13.90%
25 to 54 years	73.96%	71.90%	67.60%
55 years and older	20.58%	24.10%	18.60%

Source: EI administrative data; Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

<sup>118</sup> Duration of Work-Sharing claims was based on claims established in 2011/12 to ensure all claims were completed.

## 4. EI Work-Sharing Agreements

### 4.1 EI Work-Sharing Agreements Overview

As in the case of Work-Sharing claims and benefits paid, Work-Sharing agreements follow a counter-cyclical pattern. Up until the recent recession, which began in late 2008, the number of new Work-Sharing agreements had remained relatively low (see Chart 38). However, the number of multiplied by over five-fold in 2008/09 and over three-fold in 2009/10.

More recently, there were 830 Work-Sharing agreements that began in 2012/13, a 30.7% decrease from the 1,198 agreements that commenced the year before.<sup>119</sup> While the number of agreements has decreased significantly from the peak of 7,717 in 2009/10, it remains above pre-recession levels. This is consistent with the higher level of Work-Sharing benefits paid and a direct result of the more flexible and efficient Work-Sharing program and the fragile economic recovery.


### 4.2 EI Work-Sharing Agreements, by Province, Industry and Enterprise Size

In 2012/13, there were 374 Work-Sharing agreements launched in Ontario and 261 in Quebec, comprising 45.1% and 31.4% of all Work-Sharing agreements, respectively. Together, British Columbia (117 agreements), Alberta (26 agreements) and Manitoba (20 agreements) accounted for 19.6% of all Work-Sharing agreements, while the rest of the provinces accounted for 3.9% of all agreements.

Small and medium-sized enterprises continued to make up the majority of Work-Sharing agreements.<sup>120</sup> In 2012/13, more than three-quarters (79.0%) of established agreements involved small enterprises (fewer than 50 employees). A further 20.4% of agreements established in 2012/13 involved medium-sized enterprises (51 to 499 employees) and only 0.6% of agreements were established with large enterprises (500 or more employees).

**CHART 38**

Work-Sharing Agreements, 2007/08 to 2012/13



Source: ESDC, Common System for Grants and Contributions.

<sup>119</sup> Data on Work-Sharing Agreements were taken from the Common System for Grants and Contributions.

<sup>120</sup> Small-sized enterprises are defined as those that employ 1 to 50 employees. Medium-sized enterprises have between 51 and 499 employees. Large-sized enterprises have 500 employees or more. The categories for the size of enterprises reflect those found in *Employment, Earnings and Hours*, a Statistics Canada publication.

Of all Work-Sharing agreements established in 2012/13 (830), the manufacturing industry accounted for 512 or 61.7%, compared with a share of 60.7% in 2011/12. As in the case of Work-Sharing claims and benefits paid, Work-Sharing agreements in manufacturing were over-represented among all industries, as manufacturing represented 10.1% of total employment in Canada in 2012/13. In comparison, the professional, scientific and technical services industry represented the second-highest proportion of Work-Sharing agreements, with 76 agreements or 9.2% of all agreements, while representing 7.4% of national employment in 2012/13.

Of the 830 Work-Sharing agreements established in 2012/13, a total of 346 were terminated earlier than their scheduled end date, accounting for 41.7% of all agreements (see Chart 39). Of the 346 agreements that ended earlier than anticipated, 91.0% concluded because the firm returned to a normal level of employment.<sup>121</sup>


The proportion of Work-Sharing agreements that ended ahead of schedule in 2012/13 (41.7%) was higher than the corresponding proportion in 2011/12 (34.7%) but lower than the peak proportion in 2009/10 (54.0%).<sup>122</sup>

## VI. EI INCOME BENEFITS AND FIRMS

### 1. Firms and EI Utilization

In 2010, of the 986,650<sup>123</sup> firms operating in Canada, 314,800 (31.9%) had at least one employee in receipt of EI income benefits.<sup>124</sup> These firms employed 86.9% of the employees in Canada.<sup>125</sup>

In Table 31, firms with at least one employee in receipt of EI income benefits are separated into two categories—net contributors and net beneficiaries—based on their benefit-to-contribution (B/C) ratio.<sup>126</sup> In a firm with a



<sup>121</sup> Data on business recovery are obtained only at the end of a Work-Sharing agreement, and there are no further follow-ups.

<sup>122</sup> Given slight adjustments in calculations used to identify early termination of agreements, the numbers reported in this report differ slightly from those reported in the *2012 EI Monitoring and Assessment Report*.

<sup>123</sup> 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 T-4 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.

<sup>124</sup> EI income benefits include regular benefits, special benefits, work sharing benefits and fishing benefits, as well as EBSM participants (Self-Employment, Job Creation Partnerships, and Skills Development) under Part I of the EI program.

<sup>125</sup> The number of workers in a firm is the number of individuals paid employment income by that firm, as indicated on a T-4 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 worked full time for six months at two firms at the same wage, then he or she was recorded as 0.5 employees at the first firm and 0.5 employees at the second firm.

<sup>126</sup> The comparison is based on EI premiums paid with respect to employment in the 2010 calendar year versus EI income benefits paid during the 2010 calendar year, regardless of the year in which a claim for EI income benefits commenced. The focus of this analysis was EI income benefits in order to be consistent with the analysis of benefits-to-contributions ratios in other sections of this Monitoring and Assessment Report.

**TABLE 31****EI Utilization in Firms with EI, by Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio, 2010**

	Number of Firms with EI (000s)	% Distribution of Firms with EI	% Distribution of Workers in Firms with EI	EI Claimants (000s)	% Distribution of Claimants	% Claimants to Workers of Firms with EI	Frequent Claimants (000s)	% Distribution of Frequent Claimants	% Frequent Claimants to EI Claimants
Net Contributors (B/C < 1)	105.9	33.7	73.3	680.3	39.0	6.3	88.4	19.9	13.0
Net Beneficiaries (B/C ≥ 1)	208.8	66.3	26.7	1,062.3	61.0	27.2	356.5	80.1	33.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>314.8</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1,742.6</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>444.9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>25.5</b>

Source: EI and CRA administrative data.

B/C ratio of less than 1, the employer and employees pay more in EI premium contributions than employees of that firm receive in EI benefits, so the firm is a net contributor to the EI program. Conversely, in a firm with a B/C ratio greater than 1, employees receive more in EI income benefits than the employer and employees pay in EI premiums, so the firm is a net beneficiary of the EI program.

Nearly two thirds (66.3%) of firms with employees receiving EI income benefits, or 208,850 out of 314,800 firms, were net beneficiaries of the EI program. However, these 208,850 firms only represented about a quarter (26.7%) of the workers employed in firms with employees receiving EI income benefits. Compare this with the 73.3% of workers who were employed in the 105,950 (33.7%) of firms with an employee receiving EI income benefits that were net contributors to the EI program. Of the firms that have employees receiving EI income benefits, nearly twice as many are net beneficiaries of the EI program than are net contributors, yet they have about one third the number of workers. These findings indicate that among firms that utilize EI income benefits, firms that are net beneficiaries of the EI program have a significantly higher degree of EI utilization than firms that are net contributors to the EI program.

In 2010, 11.9% of workers in firms with at least one employee in receipt of EI income benefits were receiving EI income benefits. Among firms that were net beneficiaries of the EI program, 27.2% of workers were receiving EI income benefits, more than four times higher than the 6.3% of workers in firms that were net

contributors to the EI program. While it is expected that firms which are net beneficiaries of the EI program would have a higher proportion of employees receiving EI benefits than firms which are net contributors would, it is the amount of the disparity between net beneficiary and net contributor firms that is notable.

Out of 1,742,600 EI claimants, 444,900<sup>127</sup> (25.5%) were frequent claimants. The highest proportion of frequent claimants, 80.1%, was found in firms that were net beneficiaries. That figure is 19.2% higher than the 61.0% proportion of total EI claimants found in these firms. The ratio of frequent claimants to total EI claimants was 33.6% among these firms, nearly three times the 13.0% rate for firms that were net contributors.

These findings show a high concentration of frequent claimants among a large number of firms representing a small proportion of employment. While disparities in EI income benefit utilization are expected, it is the degree to which EI utilization are concentrated among a small segment of employees that is significant.

### 1.1 Firms and EI Utilization, by Firm Location

In most provinces and territories (P/Ts),<sup>128</sup> the majority of the firms that operated in 2010 did not utilize EI income benefits. The exceptions were Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nunavut, although their proportions of firms with an employee in receipt of EI income benefits were all below 60%.

<sup>127</sup> Based on the previous EI claimant history definition of a "frequent claimant" as an Individual who has had three or more EI regular or fishing claims in the five years prior to his or her current EI claim.

<sup>128</sup> A firm's province is determined by the location of the firm's headquarters.

As Table 32 shows, relative to their distribution of firms, Atlantic Canada, Quebec and the territories all have higher distributions of firms with at least one employee in receipt of EI income benefits, indicating they were overrepresented in their EI utilization. Quebec was overrepresented the most of the P/Ts, accounting for 21.2% of firms yet 28.5% of firms with employees receiving EI income benefits. Quebec was also overrepresented in the distribution of firms that were net beneficiaries of the EI program, 31.1%, relative to firms with employees receiving EI income benefits. Ontario, the Prairies and British Columbia were underrepresented in both the distribution firms with employees in receipt of EI income benefits and the distribution of firms that were net beneficiaries of the EI program.

Table 33 shows the distribution among P/Ts of workers in firms which had at least one employee receiving EI income benefits divided between firms that were net contributors and firms that were net beneficiaries. For Atlantic Canada, Quebec and British Columbia, there were higher proportions of employees from net beneficiary firms compared to the net contributor firms, with the largest variance between the two distributions being observed

in Quebec (21.1% of employees were in net beneficiary firms compared to 27.0% in net contributor firms).

In Ontario and the Prairies, the opposite pattern was observed. Of firms with at least one employee in receipt of EI income benefits, there were higher proportions of employees in net contributor firms compared to net beneficiary firms. The largest variance between the two distributions is observed in Ontario, with 46.1% of these employees in net contributor firms compared to 34.2% of these employees in net beneficiary firms, an 11.9 percentage-point variance.

Similar results were observed in the distribution of EI claimants between net contributor firms and net beneficiary firms. Atlantic Canada and Quebec had higher distributions of employees in net beneficiary firms than net contributor firms. Quebec had the largest variance, 31.0% versus 20.1%, a difference of 10.9 percentage points. Ontario and the Prairies had higher distributions of employees in net contributor firms relative than in net beneficiary firms. Ontario had the largest variance between the two (45.1% in net contributor firms compared to 27.1% in net beneficiary firms, a difference of 18.0 percentage points). British Columbia and the territories had approximately equal distributions of claimants between net contributor and net beneficiary firms.

**TABLE 32**  
**Distribution of Firms and EI Utilization, by Province and Territory, 2010**

Province and Territory	% Firms Without EI	% Firms with EI	% Distribution of Total Firms	% Distribution of Firms with EI	% Firms with EI Less % Total Firms	% Firms that Were Net Beneficiaries	% Net Beneficiaries Less % Firms with EI
Newfoundland and Labrador	43.6	56.4	1.5	2.7	1.2	3.6	0.9
Prince Edward Island	43.2	56.8	0.5	0.9	0.4	1.2	0.3
Nova Scotia	51.0	49.0	2.6	4.0	1.4	4.7	0.7
New Brunswick	47.0	53.0	2.2	3.7	1.5	4.6	0.9
Quebec	57.0	43.0	21.2	28.5	7.4	31.1	2.6
Ontario	72.2	27.8	34.9	30.4	-4.5	27.7	-2.7
Manitoba	70.2	29.8	3.2	3.0	-0.2	2.5	-0.5
Saskatchewan	74.0	26.0	3.4	2.8	-0.6	2.5	-0.3
Alberta	79.1	20.9	14.2	9.3	-4.9	7.9	-1.4
British Columbia	71.5	28.5	15.8	14.1	-1.7	13.6	-0.5
Yukon	64.2	35.8	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0
Northwest Territories	56.3	43.7	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0
Nunavut	41.1	58.9	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
Outside Canada	72.0	28.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0
<b>Canada</b>	<b>68.1</b>	<b>31.9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Source: EI and CRA administrative data.

**TABLE 33****Firms with EI Income Benefits: Distribution of Workers, EI Claimants and Frequent Claimants, by Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio and by Province and Territory, 2010**

Province and Territory	Distribution of Workers of Firms with EI Benefits			Distribution of EI Claimants			Frequent Claimants		
	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total
Newfoundland and Labrador	0.6%	2.8%	1.2%	0.8%	5.3%	3.6%	1.3%	8.3%	6.9%
Prince Edward Island	0.1%	1.0%	0.3%	0.1%	1.5%	1.0%	0.2%	2.2%	1.8%
Nova Scotia	2.8%	4.1%	3.1%	3.0%	5.3%	4.4%	3.2%	7.2%	6.4%
New Brunswick	1.3%	4.5%	2.1%	1.4%	6.0%	4.2%	1.5%	9.5%	8.0%
Quebec	21.1%	27.0%	22.7%	20.1%	31.0%	26.7%	29.7%	40.9%	38.7%
Ontario	46.1%	34.2%	42.9%	45.1%	27.1%	34.2%	41.3%	18.4%	23.0%
Manitoba	3.6%	2.5%	3.3%	4.2%	2.2%	3.0%	4.7%	1.3%	2.0%
Saskatchewan	2.5%	1.8%	2.3%	2.7%	1.6%	2.1%	3.5%	1.2%	1.7%
Alberta	10.7%	9.6%	10.4%	10.6%	8.1%	9.1%	6.4%	4.5%	4.8%
British Columbia	10.4%	11.6%	10.7%	11.1%	11.0%	11.0%	7.4%	5.9%	6.2%
Yukon	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
Northwest Territories	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Nunavut	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Outside Canada	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
<b>Canada</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: EI and CRA administrative data.

As shown in Table 34, for firms with an employee in receipt of EI income benefits, all P/Ts had more firms that are net beneficiaries of the EI program than are net contributors. However, in Atlantic Canada, Quebec, Yukon and Nunavut, the ratio of net beneficiary firms to net contributor firms was greater than the national average while in Ontario, the Prairies and British Columbia this ratio was below the national average. In the Northwest Territories it was at the national average.

The proportion of employees in firms with employees in receipt of EI benefits was higher in net contributor firms than in net beneficiary firms in all P/Ts except for Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. However, compared to the national average of 73.3% of employees in net contributor firms and 26.7% in net beneficiary firms, Atlantic Canada, Quebec, and the territories had relatively higher proportions of employees in firms that were net beneficiaries and Ontario and the Prairies had relatively higher proportions of employees in firms that were net contributors. British Columbia was very close to the national averages.

Table 35 illustrates that for firms with employees receiving EI income benefits, Atlantic Canada, Quebec, the territories and British Columbia had above-average ratios of EI claimants to workers. The highest ratio was in Newfoundland and Labrador (35.1%), followed by Prince Edward Island (34.7%), which both had ratios of claimants to workers nearly three-times as high as the national average. The third highest proportion of workers receiving EI income benefits was in New Brunswick (23.6%), which was double the national average. The lowest ratio was in Ontario (9.5%), followed by Alberta (10.3%), Saskatchewan (10.6%) and Manitoba (10.7%).

In relation to firms that were net beneficiaries of the EI program, the highest proportions of workers receiving EI income benefits were again in Newfoundland and Labrador (51.7%), Prince Edward Island (42.2%) and New Brunswick (36.4%). The territories all had low proportions of workers receiving EI income benefits in net beneficiary firms. Nunavut had the lowest ratio at 20.3%. Ontario, the Prairies and British Columbia all had ratios below the national average.

**TABLE 34**

**Firms with EI Income Benefits: Distribution of Firms, Employees and EI Claimants, by Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio and by Province and Territory, 2010**

Province and Territory	Firms with EI Income Benefits		Workers of Firms with EI Income Benefits		EI Claimants		Frequent Claimants	
	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1
Newfoundland and Labrador	12.3%	87.7%	38.3%	61.7%	9.1%	90.9%	3.8%	96.2%
Prince Edward Island	12.4%	87.6%	22.4%	77.6%	5.7%	94.3%	2.1%	97.9%
Nova Scotia	21.4%	78.6%	64.9%	35.1%	26.6%	73.4%	10.1%	89.9%
New Brunswick	17.4%	82.6%	43.8%	56.2%	13.3%	86.7%	3.8%	96.2%
Quebec	27.6%	72.4%	68.3%	31.7%	29.4%	70.6%	15.3%	84.7%
Ontario	39.6%	60.4%	78.8%	21.2%	51.6%	48.4%	35.8%	64.2%
Manitoba	44.6%	55.4%	79.9%	20.1%	54.4%	45.6%	46.2%	53.8%
Saskatchewan	40.9%	59.1%	79.5%	20.5%	51.8%	48.2%	41.5%	58.5%
Alberta	43.8%	56.2%	75.5%	24.5%	45.5%	54.5%	26.3%	73.7%
British Columbia	35.9%	64.1%	71.3%	28.7%	39.4%	60.6%	23.8%	76.2%
Yukon	24.6%	75.4%	64.6%	35.4%	41.1%	58.9%	34.4%	65.6%
Northwest Territories	33.7%	66.3%	65.5%	34.5%	38.1%	61.9%	19.2%	80.8%
Nunavut	26.3%	73.7%	55.8%	44.2%	32.3%	67.7%	9.4%	90.6%
Outside Canada	48.7%	51.3%	72.7%	27.3%	36.6%	63.4%	19.3%	80.7%
<b>Canada</b>	<b>33.7%</b>	<b>66.3%</b>	<b>73.3%</b>	<b>26.7%</b>	<b>39.0%</b>	<b>61.0%</b>	<b>19.9%</b>	<b>80.1%</b>

Source: EI and CRA administrative data.

**TABLE 35**

**Firms with EI Income Benefits: Ratios of EI Claimants and Frequent Claimants, by Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio and by Province and Territory, 2010**

Province and Territory	Ratio of Total Claimants to Workers of Firms with EI			Ratio of Frequent Claimants to Total Claimants		
	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total
Newfoundland and Labrador	8.3%	51.7%	35.1%	20.9%	52.5%	49.6%
Prince Edward Island	8.8%	42.2%	34.7%	17.7%	49.3%	47.5%
Nova Scotia	6.8%	34.8%	16.7%	14.0%	45.4%	37.0%
New Brunswick	7.1%	36.4%	23.6%	13.8%	53.1%	47.9%
Quebec	6.0%	31.2%	14.0%	19.2%	44.3%	36.9%
Ontario	6.2%	21.6%	9.5%	11.9%	22.8%	17.2%
Manitoba	7.3%	24.3%	10.7%	14.5%	20.2%	17.1%
Saskatchewan	6.9%	25.0%	10.6%	16.8%	25.4%	20.9%
Alberta	6.2%	23.0%	10.3%	7.9%	18.4%	13.6%
British Columbia	6.8%	25.8%	12.2%	8.6%	18.0%	14.3%
Yukon	8.4%	21.9%	13.2%	21.2%	28.3%	25.4%
Northwest Territories	7.2%	22.1%	12.3%	10.7%	27.7%	21.2%
Nunavut	7.7%	20.3%	13.3%	6.9%	31.4%	23.5%
Outside Canada	5.8%	26.7%	11.5%	8.9%	21.5%	16.9%
<b>Canada</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>27.2%</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>25.5%</b>

Source: EI and CRA administrative data.



Atlantic Canada and Quebec had higher-than-average shares of frequent claimants, relative to total EI claimants, both among all firms with employees receiving EI income benefits and firms that were net beneficiaries of the EI program. The highest proportions were in Newfoundland and Labrador (49.6% and 52.5%, respectively) and New Brunswick (47.9% and 53.1%, respectively) while the lowest proportions were in Alberta (13.6% and 18.4%, respectively) and British Columbia (14.3% and 18.0%, respectively). Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and the territories were all below the national average for both firms with employees receiving EI income benefits and net beneficiary firms.

The findings in Table 35 show that, among P/Ts that were overrepresented in EI utilization, there were disproportionate amounts of EI claimants and frequent claimants in net beneficiary firms.

## 1.2 Firms and EI Utilization, by Firm Size

It was previously observed that nationally the large majority of firms do not utilize EI. When examining EI utilization by firm size,<sup>129</sup> as illustrated in Table 36, we see that the majority of small-sized firms (73.9%) do not utilize EI benefits. However, in all other categories of firms, a large majority (from 82.4% of small-to-medium sized firms to 99.6% of large-sized firms) do have at least one employee in receipt of EI income benefits.

Small firms were underrepresented in EI utilization, as they account for 90.2% of firms in operation yet only 26.1% of firms with at least one employee in receipt of EI income benefits. However, among firms

that did utilize EI, a higher proportion of small-sized firms (83.5%) were net beneficiary firms. This indicates that among firms with employees who received EI income benefits, small-sized firms were overrepresented in EI utilization.

The category of firms most overrepresented in EI utilization were small-to-medium sized firms, which accounted for 8.0% of firms yet 20.6% of firms with at least one employee in receipt of EI income benefits. Medium-to-large and large-to-medium sized firms were also overrepresented. However, in all three of these categories, the proportion of net beneficiary firms was lower than the proportion of firms with employees receiving EI benefits.

These findings illustrate that while small-sized firms are less likely to utilize EI benefits than all other categories of firms, those small-sized firms that do have a high degree of EI utilization.

Among firms with at least one employee in receipt of EI income benefits, Table 37 shows that small-sized firms were the most overrepresented category of firms in EI utilization, as their proportion of EI claimants (27.7%) and frequent claimants (32.7%) was greater than their proportion of employees (9.4%). They were followed by small-to-medium sized firms. Large-sized firms were the most underrepresented category of firms in terms of EI utilization, having over half the employees (53.4%) yet less than a third of the claimants (32.8%) and the frequent claimants (29.4%). Medium-to-large firms were also underrepresented in EI utilization. Among net beneficiary firms, small-sized firms were overrepresented in EI utilization while large-sized firms

**TABLE 36**  
**Distribution of Firms and EI Utilization, by Firm Size, 2010**

Firm Size	% Firms Without EI	% Firms with EI	% Distribution of Total Firms	% Distribution of Firms with EI	% Firms with EI Less % Total Firms	% Firms that Were Net Beneficiaries	% Net Beneficiaries Less % Firms with EI
Small	73.9	26.1	90.2	73.9	-16.3	83.5	9.6
Small - Medium	17.6	82.4	8.0	20.6	12.6	14.0	-6.6
Medium - Large	2.6	97.4	1.5	4.5	3.0	2.1	-2.4
Large	0.4	99.6	0.3	1.0	0.7	0.3	-0.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>68.1</b>	<b>31.9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Source: EI and CRA administrative data.

<sup>129</sup> 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.

were underrepresented. Small-to-medium sized firms and medium-to-large sized firms were overrepresented and underrepresented, respectively, among net beneficiary firms, however the variances between distributions of workers, claimants and frequent claimants were minor.

Table 38 illustrates that small-sized firms had the highest proportion of net beneficiary firms, employees, claimants and frequent claimants, while large-sized firms had the highest proportion net contributor firms. In small-to-medium and medium-to-large sized firms, most firms were net contributors and the majority of employees for firms with at least one employee in receipt of EI income benefits were with net contributor firms. However, in these categories of firms, the majority of claimants and frequent claimants were associated with net beneficiary firms. While this trend reflects the mathematical law of small numbers in the case of analyzing small-sized firms, it points to a useful measure of EI regular benefit utilization with regards to large firms.

Table 39 illustrates that large-sized firms, followed by medium-to-large sized firms, had the lowest ratios of claimants to employees (7.3% and 10.6%, respectively) and frequent claimants to total claimants (22.9% for both). All of these figures were below the national average. Small-sized firms, followed by small-to-medium sized firms, had the highest ratios of claimants to employees (35.2% and 14.7%, respectively) and frequent claimants to total claimants (30.2% and 25.7%, respectively). Among net beneficiary firms, small-sized firms were the only category of firms to have a ratio of claimants to employees (44.6%) above the national average. Small-sized and large-sized firms had slightly higher-than-average ratios of frequent claimants to total EI claimants (34.4% and 34.2%, respectively) while small-to-medium and medium-to-large sized firms had slightly lower-than-average ratios (32.9% and 32.1%, respectively). However, there was little variation among these categories of firms. These findings show that, among firms that are net beneficiaries

**TABLE 37**  
**Firms with EI Income Benefits: Distribution of Workers, EI Claimants and Frequent Claimants, by Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio and by Firm Size, 2010**

Firm Size	Distribution of Workers of Firms with EI Benefits			Distribution of EI Claimants			Frequent Claimants		
	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total
Small	4.4%	23.1%	9.4%	11.8%	37.8%	27.7%	8.2%	38.8%	32.7%
Small - Medium	14.4%	29.7%	18.4%	16.4%	26.8%	22.7%	9.2%	26.2%	22.9%
Medium - Large	17.9%	21.2%	18.8%	16.6%	16.9%	16.8%	10.6%	16.2%	15.1%
Large	63.4%	26.0%	53.4%	55.2%	18.5%	32.8%	72.0%	18.8%	29.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: EI and CRA administrative data.

**TABLE 38**  
**Firms with EI Income Benefits: Distribution of Firms, Employees and EI Claimants, by Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio and by Firm Size, 2010**

Firm Size	Firms with EI Income Benefits		Workers of Firms with EI Income Benefits		EI Claimants		Frequent Claimants	
	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1
Small	25.0%	75.0%	34.2%	65.8%	16.7%	83.3%	5.0%	95.0%
Small - Medium	54.8%	45.2%	57.1%	42.9%	28.2%	71.8%	8.0%	92.0%
Medium - Large	68.5%	31.5%	69.9%	30.1%	38.5%	61.5%	13.9%	86.1%
Large	79.2%	20.8%	87.0%	13.0%	65.7%	34.3%	48.7%	51.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>33.7%</b>	<b>66.3%</b>	<b>73.3%</b>	<b>26.7%</b>	<b>39.0%</b>	<b>61.0%</b>	<b>19.9%</b>	<b>80.1%</b>

Source: EI and CRA administrative data.

**TABLE 39****Firms with EI Income Benefits: Ratios of EI Claimants and Frequent Claimants, by Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio and by Firm Size, 2010**

Firm Size	Ratio of Total Claimants to Workers of Firms with EI			Ratio of Frequent Claimants to Total Claimants		
	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total
Small	17.2%	44.6%	35.2%	8.9%	34.4%	30.2%
Small - Medium	7.2%	24.5%	14.7%	7.3%	32.9%	25.7%
Medium - Large	5.9%	21.7%	10.6%	8.3%	32.1%	22.9%
Large	5.5%	19.4%	7.3%	17.0%	34.2%	22.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>27.2%</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>25.5%</b>

Source: EI and CRA administrative data.

of the EI program, while small-sized firms have higher proportions of workers receiving EI income benefits and large-size firms have lower proportions, all categories of firm have more-or-less an equal proportion of frequent claimants.

### 1.3 Firms and EI Utilization, by Industry

As shown in Table 40, the industry with the lowest proportion of firms utilizing EI income benefits was the management of companies and enterprises industry, followed by the professional, scientific and technical services industry and the finance and insurance industry. The industries with the highest proportions were public administration, manufacturing and accommodation and food services.

The construction industry was the most overrepresented industry in terms of EI utilization, as shown both by the variance between the distributions of firms and firms with at least one employee in receipt of EI income benefits (5.1 percentage points) and the variance between the distributions of net beneficiary firms and firms utilizing EI (3.0 percentage points). Based on its variance between the distribution of firms and firms with EI income benefits, the professional, scientific and technical services industry was the most underrepresented in terms of overall EI utilization. The trade industry was the most underrepresented in distribution of net beneficiary firms relative to its distribution of firms utilizing EI.

Table 41 further illustrates the overrepresentation of the construction industry in EI utilization by the variance between the distribution of workers and the distribution of EI claimants among all firms with at least one employee receiving EI benefits (16.2% compared to 6.2%, a 10.0 percentage-point variance) and among

net beneficiary firms (23.0% compared to 16.1%, a 6.9 percentage-point variance). Also, in terms of distribution of frequent claimants relative to total EI claimants, the construction industry was again overrepresented among all firms with at least one employee receiving EI benefits (25.8% compared to 16.2%, a 9.6 percentage-point variance) and among firms that were net beneficiaries of the EI program (30.4% compared to 23.0%, a 7.4 percentage-point variance). Among firms with employees receiving EI income benefits, the trade industry was most underrepresented in both its proportion of EI claimants relative to its proportion of workers (11.9% compared to 16.7%, a 4.8 percentage-point variance) and its proportion of frequent claimants relative to its proportion of EI claimants (5.3% compared to 11.9%, a 6.6 percentage-point variance). Trade was similarly underrepresented among net beneficiary firms.

As shown in Table 42, the agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting industry had the highest proportions of firms (88.4%), employees (75.9%), claimants (94.9%) and frequent claimants (97.6%) that were net beneficiaries of the EI program compared to net contributors. The construction industry and the arts, entertainment and recreation industry also had higher-than-average proportions of firms, employees, claimants and frequent claimants within the industries that were net beneficiaries. Utilities had the lowest proportions of firms (42.1%), employees (1.7%), claimants (8.7%) and frequent claimants (11.5%) that were net beneficiaries of the EI program. Other industries with lower-than-average representation among firms that were net beneficiaries compared to firms that were net contributors were the finance and insurance industry, the public administration industry, the information and culture industry and the educational services industry.

**TABLE 40****Distribution of Firms and EI Utilization, by Industry, 2010**

Industry	% Firms Without EI	% Firms with EI	% Distribution of Total Firms	% Distribution of Firms with EI	% Firms with EI Less % Total Firms	% Firms that Were Net Beneficiaries	% Net Beneficiaries Less % Firms with EI
Accommodation and Food Services	54.0	46.0	6.2	8.9	2.7	8.4	-0.5
Administrative and Support, Waste Management and Remediation Services	61.7	38.3	4.8	5.7	0.9	6.3	0.6
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	64.1	35.9	5.2	5.9	0.6	7.8	2.0
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	61.0	39.0	1.7	2.0	0.4	2.4	0.4
Construction	54.8	45.2	12.3	17.4	5.1	20.4	3.0
Educational Services	62.0	38.0	1.2	1.4	0.2	1.2	-0.2
Finance and Insurance	82.2	17.8	2.9	1.6	-1.3	1.1	-0.5
Health Care and Social Assistance	71.1	28.9	8.3	7.5	-0.8	6.5	-1.0
Information and Culture	73.7	26.3	1.1	0.9	-0.2	0.7	-0.2
Management of Companies and Enterprises	86.0	14.0	1.3	0.6	-0.7	0.5	-0.1
Manufacturing	49.8	50.2	4.9	7.7	2.8	7.1	-0.5
Mining	76.0	24.0	0.9	0.7	-0.2	0.6	-0.1
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	84.0	16.0	12.7	6.3	-6.3	5.7	-0.6
Public Administration	29.5	70.5	0.5	1.1	0.6	1.0	-0.2
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	81.7	18.3	4.2	2.4	-1.8	2.3	-0.1
Trade	64.2	35.8	14.7	16.4	1.8	14.2	-2.2
Transportation and Warehousing	71.6	28.4	4.7	4.1	-0.5	4.4	0.2
Utilities	60.4	39.6	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
Other Services (except Public Administration)	76.9	23.1	12.6	9.1	-3.5	9.2	0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>68.1</b>	<b>31.9</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Source: EI and CRA administrative data.

Table 43 illustrates that the agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting industry had the highest proportions of both EI claimants and frequent EI claimants among firms with EI utilization (41.8% and 47.7%, respectively) and among net beneficiary firms (52.3% and 49.1%, respectively). These observations reflect the seasonal nature of this industry. The construction industry and the arts, entertainment and recreation industry (two industries previously identified as being overrepresented in EI utilization) also had high proportions of frequent claimants relative to all EI claimants, both among firms with employees receiving EI benefits (40.6% and 39.4%, respectively) and among firms that were net beneficiaries of the EI program (44.4% and 46.9%, respectively).

The finance and insurance industry, underrepresented in EI utilization, had the lowest proportion of EI claimants who were frequent claimants, both among firms with an employee in receipt of EI benefits (3.8%) and among net beneficiary firms (9.5%), followed by the information and culture industry (7.0% and 13.2%, respectively) and the health care and social assistance industry (7.6% and 12.8%, respectively).

Overall, this analysis shows that among industries that are overrepresented in EI utilization, there are higher proportions of workers receiving EI benefits and frequent claimants with firms that are net beneficiaries of the EI program.

**TABLE 41****Firms with EI Income Benefits: Distribution of Workers, EI Claimants and Frequent Claimants, by Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio and by Industry, 2010**

Industry	Distribution of Workers of Firms with EI Benefits			Distribution of EI Claimants			Frequent Claimants		
	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total
Accommodation and Food Services	5.7%	8.8%	6.5%	4.5%	6.4%	5.6%	1.6%	5.5%	4.8%
Administrative and Support, Waste Management and Remediation Services	3.7%	11.4%	5.8%	3.8%	8.4%	6.6%	1.7%	5.3%	4.6%
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	0.5%	4.3%	1.5%	0.7%	8.3%	5.4%	1.2%	12.2%	10.0%
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	1.3%	2.8%	1.7%	1.2%	2.9%	2.2%	0.9%	4.0%	3.4%
Construction	2.7%	16.1%	6.2%	5.8%	23.0%	16.2%	7.3%	30.4%	25.8%
Educational Services	9.8%	5.6%	8.7%	14.6%	4.5%	8.4%	37.3%	5.8%	12.1%
Finance and Insurance	5.3%	0.9%	4.1%	3.5%	0.7%	1.8%	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%
Health Care and Social Assistance	10.9%	4.9%	9.3%	9.8%	4.0%	6.3%	3.2%	1.5%	1.9%
Information and Culture	2.5%	1.0%	2.1%	1.8%	0.6%	1.1%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%
Management of Companies and Enterprises	0.5%	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%
Manufacturing	9.6%	13.9%	10.8%	11.1%	13.5%	12.6%	11.3%	11.8%	11.7%
Mining	1.4%	1.3%	1.4%	1.1%	1.4%	1.3%	1.1%	1.9%	1.7%
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	5.3%	3.7%	4.9%	4.6%	3.8%	4.1%	1.7%	2.3%	2.2%
Public Administration	12.9%	3.3%	10.3%	11.4%	2.8%	6.2%	18.4%	3.7%	6.6%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	1.3%	1.4%	1.3%	1.4%	1.3%	1.3%	0.6%	0.8%	0.8%
Trade	18.4%	12.0%	16.7%	16.0%	9.3%	11.9%	4.7%	5.4%	5.3%
Transportation and Warehousing	4.4%	3.8%	4.2%	4.3%	4.4%	4.4%	4.7%	5.8%	5.6%
Utilities	1.1%	0.1%	0.8%	0.9%	0.1%	0.4%	1.6%	0.1%	0.4%
Other Services (except Public Administration)	2.5%	4.5%	3.1%	3.1%	4.3%	3.8%	1.4%	2.7%	2.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: EI and CRA administrative data.

**TABLE 42****Firms with EI Income Benefits: Distribution of Firms, Employees and EI Claimants, by Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio and by Industry, 2010**

Industry	Firms with EI Income Benefits		Workers of Firms with EI Income Benefits		EI Claimants		Frequent Claimants	
	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1
Accommodation and Food Services	37.6%	62.4%	64.1%	35.9%	30.9%	69.1%	6.8%	93.2%
Administrative and Support, Waste Management and Remediation Services	26.8%	73.2%	47.4%	52.6%	22.3%	77.7%	7.5%	92.5%
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	11.6%	88.4%	24.1%	75.9%	5.1%	94.9%	2.4%	97.6%
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	20.4%	79.6%	56.9%	43.1%	20.6%	79.4%	5.4%	94.6%
Construction	22.3%	77.7%	31.3%	68.7%	13.9%	86.1%	5.6%	94.4%
Educational Services	43.3%	56.7%	82.7%	17.3%	67.5%	32.5%	61.5%	38.5%
Finance and Insurance	53.6%	46.4%	94.4%	5.6%	77.0%	23.0%	43.5%	56.5%
Health Care and Social Assistance	42.9%	57.1%	85.9%	14.1%	61.3%	38.7%	34.4%	65.6%
Information and Culture	49.6%	50.4%	87.6%	12.4%	64.7%	35.3%	33.1%	66.9%
Management of Companies and Enterprises	43.8%	56.2%	84.7%	15.3%	44.4%	55.6%	9.9%	90.1%
Manufacturing	38.4%	61.6%	65.5%	34.5%	34.6%	65.4%	19.1%	80.9%
Mining	42.5%	57.5%	74.8%	25.2%	33.3%	66.7%	12.9%	87.1%
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	40.3%	59.7%	79.6%	20.4%	43.8%	56.2%	15.4%	84.6%
Public Administration	42.7%	57.3%	91.6%	8.4%	72.3%	27.7%	55.0%	45.0%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	35.4%	64.6%	71.6%	28.4%	39.4%	60.6%	14.1%	85.9%
Trade	42.6%	57.4%	80.9%	19.1%	52.5%	47.5%	17.7%	82.3%
Transportation and Warehousing	29.7%	70.3%	76.1%	23.9%	38.4%	61.6%	16.8%	83.2%
Utilities	57.9%	42.1%	98.3%	1.7%	91.3%	8.7%	88.5%	11.5%
Other Services (except Public Administration)	32.8%	67.2%	61.0%	39.0%	31.4%	68.6%	11.4%	88.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>33.7%</b>	<b>66.3%</b>	<b>73.3%</b>	<b>26.7%</b>	<b>39.0%</b>	<b>61.0%</b>	<b>19.9%</b>	<b>80.1%</b>

Source: EI and CRA administrative data.

**TABLE 43****Firms with EI Income Benefits: Ratios of EI Claimants and Frequent Claimants, by Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio and by Industry, 2010**

Industry	Ratio of Total Claimants to Workers of Firms with EI			Ratio of Frequent Claimants to Total Claimants		
	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total	B/C < 1	B/C ≥ 1	Total
Accommodation and Food Services	5.0%	19.8%	10.3%	4.7%	29.1%	21.6%
Administrative and Support, Waste Management and Remediation Services	6.4%	20.2%	13.7%	5.9%	21.0%	17.6%
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	8.8%	52.3%	41.8%	22.2%	49.1%	47.7%
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	5.4%	27.7%	15.0%	10.4%	46.9%	39.4%
Construction	13.7%	38.8%	31.0%	16.5%	44.4%	40.6%
Educational Services	9.4%	21.8%	11.6%	33.2%	43.2%	36.5%
Finance and Insurance	4.2%	21.1%	5.1%	2.2%	9.5%	3.8%
Health Care and Social Assistance	5.7%	22.0%	8.0%	4.3%	12.8%	7.6%
Information and Culture	4.6%	17.7%	6.2%	3.6%	13.2%	7.0%
Management of Companies and Enterprises	6.2%	43.0%	11.8%	3.5%	25.0%	15.4%
Manufacturing	7.3%	26.3%	13.9%	13.1%	29.5%	23.8%
Mining	4.9%	29.2%	11.0%	13.1%	44.2%	33.9%
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	5.5%	27.3%	9.9%	4.8%	20.7%	13.7%
Public Administration	5.6%	23.4%	7.1%	20.9%	44.5%	27.4%
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	6.7%	26.0%	12.2%	5.4%	21.2%	15.0%
Trade	5.5%	21.1%	8.5%	3.8%	19.7%	11.3%
Transportation and Warehousing	6.2%	31.8%	12.3%	14.2%	44.0%	32.6%
Utilities	4.9%	26.8%	5.3%	24.1%	33.1%	24.9%
Other Services (except Public Administration)	7.7%	26.3%	14.9%	5.9%	21.2%	16.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>27.2%</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>25.5%</b>

Source: EI and CRA administrative data.

## VII. EI FINANCES

The EI program is financed entirely by contributions from employees and employers, via premiums paid on insured earnings up to the maximum insurable earnings threshold (MIE). Under the *Employment Insurance Act*, the MIE is indexed annually based on the average industrial earnings published by Statistics Canada. The MIE also represents the maximum amount considered in applications for EI benefits. The EI program is based on the principle of universal coverage of all employees in insurable employment, which helps ensure that premiums remain low and relatively stable over time.

Employee premiums apply to every \$100 of insurable earnings, up to the MIE. Employers pay premiums that are 1.4 times those of employees. Employee premiums increased in 2013 to \$1.88 per \$100 of insurable earnings, from \$1.83 in 2012 and \$1.78 in 2011. Accordingly, employer premiums increased in 2013 to \$2.63 per \$100 of insurable earnings, increasing from \$2.56 in 2012.<sup>130</sup>

According to the 2013 Public Accounts of Canada, in 2012/13, EI revenues (\$20.872 billion) exceeded EI expenditures (\$18.887 billion) resulting in a surplus of \$1.985 billion. The cumulative deficit in the EI Operating Account was reported to be \$5.964 billion as of March 31, 2013. Annex 5 summarizes EI expenditures and revenues, as credited to the EI Operating Account and consistent with the financial statements in the Public Accounts of Canada.

---

<sup>130</sup> 2013 Actuarial Report on the Employment Insurance Premium Rate (Ottawa: Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board, Chief Actuary, 2012), [http://www.ceifb-ofaec.ca/en/PDF\\_Reports/Rate%20Setting/CA%20English%20Report%202013%20FINAL.pdf](http://www.ceifb-ofaec.ca/en/PDF_Reports/Rate%20Setting/CA%20English%20Report%202013%20FINAL.pdf).



## CHAPTER 3

# IMPACTS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND SUPPORT MEASURES (EBSMs—EI PART II)



*Activities delivered under Part II of the Employment Insurance Act help unemployed individuals in Canada to prepare for, find and maintain employment. These activities include Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSMs), pan-Canadian programming, and functions of the National Employment Service (NES).*

This chapter presents program results obtained under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* during the 2012/13 reporting period. A national overview of EBSM-similar programming delivered under Labour Market Development Agreements (LMDAs) is provided in section I of this chapter. The analysis includes EI Part II results obtained by Aboriginal Skills and Employment Training Strategy (ASETS) agreement holders. Provincial and territorial employment

programming activities are presented in section II, with a description of each jurisdiction's labour market and employment priorities. Section III reviews the net impacts and outcomes of EBSM programs by analyzing medium-term net impacts. Section IV presents Employment and Social Development Canada's (ESDC's) delivery of pan-Canadian activities and the administration of certain NES functions.

### Notes to Reader

- 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 continue 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, the 2008/09 fiscal year is used as the reference period for pre-recession comparisons. References to average levels of activity, and highs and lows use the 10-year period from 2002/03 to 2012/13 as a frame of reference.
- iii. Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey is the source of labour market data reported herein. Data for Canada and the provinces are fiscal-year averages, calculated using unadjusted data, while monthly references are seasonally adjusted. Data for the Northwest Territories, Yukon and Nunavut are calculated using four points of three-month moving average data. In discussions of employment trends by industry, standard industry titles are taken from the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS).

# I. NATIONAL OVERVIEW

## Key Priorities

Budget 2012 focused on job creation, with an emphasis on employment supports and skills training. El Part II provides an essential means to connect Canadians with available jobs by ensuring unemployed people can access skills training and employment assistance support to fill vacancies and address skills shortages across the Canadian labour market.

In a context of both skills mismatches and geographic mismatches, most jurisdictions identified addressing skills shortages as a key priority for their labour market programming in 2012/13. Canadian employers agreed this was one of Canada's top challenges over the next three years, along with motivation and retention of qualified talent.<sup>1</sup> Provinces and territories continued to adapt their design and delivery of LMDA programming to respond to the needs of employers in their respective labour markets.

## Labour Market Context

For a third consecutive year, overall labour market conditions continued to improve in Canada. Employment levels reached a high of 17,579,100, or 540,900 more people employed than in 2008/09.

## Client Trends

According to provincial and territorial annual plans, many jurisdictions focused on supporting a growing number of multi-barriered clients. ESDC's administrative data support this focus. The non-insured client category was the only one to expand (+12.7%), while the volume of insured clients decreased slightly year over year. The share of non-insured clients reached 36.5%, higher than in any year since 1996/97. Ten years ago, the non-insured client category was significantly lower at 23.8% (see Chart 2).

## Trends in Program Delivery

Given the changes to client segments, noticeable variations were observed in the mix of EBSM interventions that provinces, territories and Aboriginal organizations delivered. The Employment Assistance Services (EAS) share of total interventions increased by 2.6 percentage points, while Employment

Benefits' share decreased at the same rate, marking a growing use of shorter-term interventions as the economy continued to improve. The number of EAS interventions increased by 14.2% to 901,062, while the number of Employment Benefits interventions fell by 6.1% to 149,521, a 10-year low. Overall, expenditures by provinces and territories shifted from Employment Benefits (-7.5%) to EAS (+1.6%).

## 1. Main Results

During the 2012/13 reporting period, provinces, territories and Aboriginal organizations helped a total of 662,260 clients prepare for, obtain and maintain employment, a 2.5% increase year over year. Unemployed individuals in Canada benefited from a total of 1,076,271 EBSM interventions, an 11.8% increase compared with 2011/12. As a result, the number of interventions per client reached 1.63 compared with 1.49 last year, reflecting growing individual demand for EBSM support. A 1.7% decrease in unpaid benefits paralleled the decline in the number of active claimants served (-2.1%).

### 1.1 Canada's Labour Market

#### Key Labour Market Indicators

At 1.4%, employment levels grew slightly faster than in 2011/12, as most provincial and territorial labour markets improved year over year. Unemployment levels reached a four-year low, decreasing 1.4% over the year. Consequently, the unemployment rate decreased to 7.2%, its lowest level since the late 2000s recession.

For a second consecutive year, national employment gains were concentrated in full-time employment opportunities, a sign of a more robust labour market. Employment levels peaked in 12 jurisdictions across the country, while unemployment rates decreased in 7 jurisdictions, indicating improved labour market results across the country. The employment rate rose for the third consecutive year, reaching 61.9%, 0.5 percentage point higher than 2009/10, but still lower than the pre-recession level of 63.5%. The participation rate reached 66.7%, which was 0.8 percentage point lower than pre-recession levels.

<sup>1</sup> Deloitte Canada, 2013 Top Five Employer Rewards Priorities Survey (Toronto: Deloitte Canada, 2013). [http://www.deloitte.com/view/en\\_CA/ca/services/consulting/human-capital/6e52b18128dd0410VgnVCM300000345670aRCRD.htm](http://www.deloitte.com/view/en_CA/ca/services/consulting/human-capital/6e52b18128dd0410VgnVCM300000345670aRCRD.htm).

## Canada

### EBSM Key Facts

Clients Served: 662,260		
EI	Non-Insured	Pan-Canadian
420,426 ↓	241,834 ↑	15,133 ↑
Active	Former	Non-Insured
48.3% ↓	15.2% ↓	36.5% ↑
Youth (15-24) <sup>1</sup>	Core Age (25-54)	Older Workers (55+)
19.4% ↓	69.5% ↓	11.0% ↑
Interventions: 1,076,271		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	149,521	6.1% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	901,063	14.2% ↑
Pan-Canadian	25,687	75.8% ↑
Relative Share		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	14.2%	2.6 ↓
Support Measures: EAS	85.8%	2.6 ↑
Allocation: \$2,115.5 Million		
	2012/13 (\$ Million)	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	\$1,128.5	7.5% ↓
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$574.7	1.6% ↑
· LMPs and R&I	\$168.9	13.3% ↑
Pan-Canadian	\$153.4	2.2% ↓
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$2,025.5</b>	<b>3.2% ↓</b>
Managing for Results		
Indicator	Total	
Active Claimants Served	319,904	
Returns to Employment	161,993	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$985.44	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

## Labour Market Tightness

Statistics Canada's Business Payroll Survey confirmed that the Canadian labour market was tighter than it was in 2011/12. The survey reported an average of 245,200 job vacancies in 2012/13,<sup>2</sup> up 3.4% from the previous reporting period; meanwhile, the number of unemployed people decreased by 1.9%. For every job vacancy advertised, 5.6 individuals sought employment, down from 5.9 a year earlier.

An increase in the number of vacancies and the contraction in the number of unemployed people caused a decrease in the unemployment-to-job-vacancies ratio, making it more challenging for employers to fill their vacancies. The retirement of many specialized workers compounded the trend in the ratio. In Canada, the manufacturing and energy sectors reported the largest shortages of skilled labour.

## Skills in Demand

According to Wanted Analytics' data, job postings have increased by 5.5% since 2011/12.<sup>3</sup> The following five broad occupational groups recorded an average of 84% of all vacancies in 2012/13:<sup>4</sup>

- sales and service occupations (23%);
- occupations in business, finance and administration (18%);
- natural and applied sciences, and related occupations (17%);
- trades, transport and equipment operators, and related occupations (14%); and
- management occupations (12%).

Year-over-year, shares of broad occupations related to health (+13.9%); primary industry (+12.3%); management (+11.9%); natural and applied sciences (+8.7%); social sciences, education, government services, and religion (+7.1%); and sales and service (+5.1%) grew most rapidly. Demand for occupations related to the services sector was higher than those related to the goods-producing sector.


<sup>2</sup> After anonymous postings were removed, total vacancies in the Wanted Analytics dataset added up to 276,525. That number was 12.8% higher than the LFS vacancies, which implies that the number of duplicated advertisements is minimal.

<sup>3</sup> This year, ESDC has chosen Wanted Analytics to provide insightful information on the Canadian labour market. This company has been collecting hiring data for Canada and the U.S. since June 2005 and is the exclusive data provider for the Conference Board's Help Wanted Online Data Series.

<sup>4</sup> March 2013 has been selected as the most representative data point for the 2013 reporting period. The Wanted Analytics dataset has also been cleaned to remove anonymous job postings.

**CHART 1**

Share of Vacancies by Broad Occupations, (2012/13, %)



## 2. Client Profile and Participation

The number of EBSM clients increased 2.5%, reaching a total of 662,260, due to continued growth in the number of non-insured clients (+27,247) receiving employment services.

### 2.1 Client Types

Three client types can access EBSMs: Active claimants, Former claimants and Non-insured clients. In 2012/13, the distribution of client types continued to reveal a growing demand from non-insured clients. The number of displaced workers has also remained higher than it was before the recession, which contributed to the growing number of multi-barriered clients that many jurisdictions reported. Overall, it was much harder for former EI claimants and non-insured clients to return to work than it was in the previous year.

Over the past 10 years, the volume of non-insured clients increased by 52.0%, while the number of active claimants declined at a slower pace (-24.3%). During the same period, former claimants increased by 17.3%. Normally, former and non-insured clients have weaker labour market attachment and require additional support to return to employment.

**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.


The number of active claimants served continued to drop, decreasing 2.1% to 319,904. Over the past 10 years, the share of active EBSM clients declined from a high of 63.3% in 2003/04 to a low of 48.3% in 2012/13. The proportion of active claimants returning to work declined 3.3 percentage points year over year 45.1%.

**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.<sup>5</sup> 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 extensive Part II support while completing their return-to-work action plan. The additional support provided in some jurisdictions may result in proportionately variable expenditures for EBSM-similar programs.

<sup>5</sup> A detailed definition of former claimants can be found in section 58 of the *Employment Insurance Act*.

**CHART 2**

Volumes by EBSM Client Types, (2003/04 - 2012/13)



During the 2012/13 reporting period, the number of former claimants fell 4.1% to 100,522, and their share of all EBSM clients declined by 1.0 percentage point to 15.2%. Despite these decreases, the share of former claimants supported under EI Part II remained 2.3 percentage points higher than it was in 2003/04. The number of former claimants returning to work decreased 34.0% between 2011/12 and 2012/13, reaching a total of 17,734.

**Non-insured clients** are unemployed individuals who are neither active nor former EI clients. Usually, non-insured clients have no 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 2012/13, the volume of non-insured clients grew 12.7% to reach a high of 241,834. Consequently, the share of non-insured clients increased 12.7 percentage points from a low of 23.8% in 2003/04 to 36.5% in 2012/13. Overall, 34,928 non-insured clients returned to work in 2012/13


following their EBSM participation, a 23.2% decline since the previous year. A total of 14.4% of all non-insured clients found work following their EBSM participation.<sup>6</sup>

## 2.2 Age Distribution<sup>7</sup>

Client volumes by age category increased in proportions similar to increases in the previous year. Consistent with the aging of Canada's population, the older workers category (55 years and older) grew the fastest, up 12.4% year over year. Older workers' share of the total age distribution was the only one to grow year over year, increasing by 0.8 percentage point to a high of 11.0%. While the number of core-aged workers grew the most (+14,164), their relative share dropped slightly year over year. The core-aged client segment continued its downward trend for the second consecutive year, reaching 69.5% in 2012/13, at par with the 2003/04 reporting period. At 7.2%, 50- to 54-year-old clients were the fastest growing subcategory of the core-age workers, followed by 30- to 34-year-old clients at 5.4%. Youth participation increased by 2.1%.

<sup>6</sup> Returns to work for non-insured clients depend on confirmation by a case manager. The level of follow-up may vary significantly by jurisdiction.

<sup>7</sup> Date of birth is not collected for clients in Skills Development-Apprentices and Group Services. As a result, client data in Chart 1 do not match the client total in Annex 3.5.



**2.3 Designated Groups<sup>8</sup>**


ESDC collected information on the EBSM participation of women, Aboriginal people, members of visible minorities and persons with a disability in support of employment equity principles.

- Women participated in a total of 472,758 EBSM interventions in 2012/13, a 9.8% increase compared with the previous year. Women represented 45.4% of all participants, slightly lower than their share in 2011/12; however, that figure was still slightly higher than their share of national unemployment (45.0%). While the vast majority of women (90.3%) accessed EAS interventions, their male counterparts had a lower rate of EAS participation (80.8%). This trend is largely explained by a lower participation of women in the skills development apprenticeship program. Women were more likely than men to have worked in part-time occupations, which resulted in lower EI eligibility rates and, therefore, less access to Employment Benefits available through EI Part II. Overall, 45.9% of female EBSM participants were non-insured this year compared with 37.6% of male EBSM participants.
- A total of 92,851 EBSM participants self-identified as persons with a disability. The share of persons with a disability increased by 2.9 percentage points to 8.9%. Non-insured clients represented 55.0% of this client segment, an increase of 8.6 percentage points, year over year.

- Aboriginal people participated in 70,004 EBSM interventions, 24.3% more than the previous year. Aboriginal people also participated in 6.7% of all EBSM interventions delivered in 2012/13, including programming delivered through ASETS. A total of 56.9% of Aboriginal clients participated as non-insured clients. Aboriginal participation in Employment Benefits fell from 4.6% to 4.0% year over year.
- Members of visible minority groups participated in 41,784 interventions, a 15.7% decrease year over year. At 4.0%, the visible minority segment's share of total EBSM participation fell to an 11-year low. Representation rates can be influenced by changes in self-identification.

**3. 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).



<sup>8</sup> This information is collected at the intervention level and comes from the participant dataset for LMDA programming. Participants voluntarily self-identify, so year-over-year fluctuations may be due in some degree to changes in self-identification.

Total Employment Benefits interventions declined for a second consecutive year, reaching a low of 149,521. However, Employment Benefits interventions lasted an average of nine days longer, a 8.5% increase compared with the previous reporting period. At 14.2% of EBSMs, the share of Employment Benefits reached a ten year low, reflecting a focus on shorter-term interventions to help unemployed people return to work quickly, as well as greater support for multi-barriered clients. Employment Benefits expenditures fell by 7.5% to \$1.13 billion.

### 3.1 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. The use of SD-R interventions fell by 10.0% to an 11-year low of 58,696, while the average duration of SD-R interventions increased by 11.0% year over year. The number of SD-A interventions decreased slightly by 0.5% to a five-year low of 61,292. SD-A volumes have remained the most consistent of all Employment Benefits volumes, due to steady demand for skilled trades. SD expenditures fell by 8.6% to \$914.8 million, mirroring the year-over-year declines in the number of interventions delivered by provinces and territories. Despite this decline, SD-R continued to account for the largest proportion of Employment Benefits interventions and expenditures.

#### **EBSMs in Action: Skills Development-Regular**

##### **New Brunswick**

New Brunswick delivers its Training and Skills Development program through Department of Post-Secondary Education, Training and Labour (PETL) regional offices located throughout the province. PETL participates in various regional and provincial committees with its economic partners, community organizations and other government departments. New employers are consulted on their labour needs. At the local level, PETL communicates with economic partners, school districts, community organizations and others. Local labour market information allows the province to respond to local employment and training needs in a timely manner. Pilot projects are often developed in partnership with appropriate stakeholders to address emerging needs.

#### **EBSMs in Action: Skills Development-Regular**

##### **Northwest Territories**

Building Essential Skills (BES) provides short-term training or education opportunities to help EI clients return to the labour market quickly. The maximum duration of enrolment in the program is 52 weeks. Students are expected to make a minimum financial contribution toward their training. Amounts may vary, depending on the program type. Participants may be eligible for financial assistance for the costs of tuition, books, special equipment, childcare and transportation, for example. BES also helps apprentices obtain certification in their chosen trade.

#### **EBSMs in Action: Skills Development-Apprentices**

##### **Saskatchewan**

Saskatchewan consults directly with stakeholders through the industry-led Saskatchewan Apprenticeship and Trade Certification Commission (SATCC) Board. The board includes representation from various trade boards and sectors, including the construction sector; agriculture, tourism and service sector; motive repair sector; and production and maintenance sector. Government is represented on the board and plays an active part in policy and program development. In addition, the board receives guidance and input from approximately 400 individuals who sit on trade boards, as well as curriculum and examination development boards. Apprentices in Saskatchewan are charged a minimal tuition fee for training. All apprentices, other than those receiving full or partial wages from their employer, are required to apply for EI benefits to assist with their income support needs while they are in training. Apprentices are also eligible to apply for a training allowance when living away from home.

### **EBSMs in Action: Skills Development-Apprentices**

#### Alberta

Historically, Alberta has limited its support to the delivery of apprenticeship technical training at public post-secondary institutions. Effective August 1, 2012, Alberta can now support apprentices taking recognized technical training at union training centres. This gives individuals and employers more options for improving their skills. Apprentices with low incomes can receive Part II assistance to supplement their Part I benefits.

#### Nunavut

The Training on the Job (TOJ) program is now more accessible to employers, particularly employers who hire apprentices in its two busiest regions. In addition to automating the process for notifying the Apprenticeship Unit, Nunavut assists employers with paperwork. The territory worked with early childhood officers (Government of Nunavut employees) to promote this program to the childcare sector, which resulted in more applications and take-ups.

### **EBSMs in Action: Targeted Wage Subsidies**

#### Nova Scotia

START, Nova Scotia's TWS-similar programming, encourages employers to hire Nova Scotians requiring work experience, and to register and employ apprentices. TWS provides a financial incentives to employers willing to support ready-to-work Nova Scotians. Incentives vary, depending on the type of employment offered and the skill level of the employee, and may also include a retention bonus. The program focuses on small to medium-sized businesses, but makes exceptions where labour market or economic conditions warrant.

#### British Columbia

B.C. Wage Subsidy Work Experience Placements (Wage Subsidy) pay a wage subsidy to eligible employers as an incentive to hire—and provide work experience and skills enhancement to—EI clients who need work experience, as determined through a formal needs assessment. Employers are expected to provide ongoing employment to clients when they complete the wage subsidy placement. Service providers deliver three major services: pre-placement, agreement and monitoring/close-out.

### **3.2 Targeted Wage Subsidies**

Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS) encourage employers to hire individuals they would not normally hire, giving them a chance to complete a successful career transition. In 2012/13, TWS interventions decreased by 6.1% to 12,585, contributing to an 18.3% decrease since 2008/09. TWS' share of all Employment Benefits interventions remained unchanged at 8.4%. Noticeable increases in TWS interventions occurred in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba and Nunavut, while other jurisdictions recorded stable levels or declines year over year.

TWS expenditures increased by 5.4% to \$67.9 million, reflecting a slight increase in the average cost per intervention in most jurisdictions. On average, the duration of TWS interventions increased by 14.2% year over year.

### **3.3 Self-Employment**

The Self-Employment intervention helps insured clients start their own businesses, through counselling and development related to launching a new business. Participation in SE increased by 3.7% in 2012/13, reaching a total of 8,261 interventions. That is still lower than pre-recession levels, as is often the case when economic conditions improve.

While SE's share of total EBSM interventions increased by 0.5 percentage point to 5.5%, related expenditures decreased by 1.3% to \$118.3 million.



### **EBSMs in Action: Self-Employment**

#### **Ontario**

Ontario administers the Ontario Self-Employment benefit through coordinators to provide entrepreneurial skills, business advice and support (including workshops, coaching and mentoring) to approved participants, who receive financial assistance while they participate in the program. The duration of support is up to 42 weeks for all participants. Ontario provides financial assistance for basic living expenses to participants who are not receiving EI benefits. Participants may also receive support for disability costs related to program participation. Based on financial need, they may also get assistance for the incremental costs of dependent care and/or travel during the business plan development phase of the program.

### **3.4 Job Creation Partnerships**

Job Creation Partnerships provide insured clients with work experience while helping the community and local economy. In 2012/13, provinces and territories delivered 2,906 JCP interventions, a decrease of 16.1% year over year. JCPs' share of total benefits interventions dropped from 5.6% in 2003/04 to a low of 1.9% in 2012/13 and JCP interventions have declined 71.6% since 2003/04. Year-over-year JCP expenditures fell by 23.2% to \$24.5 million.

### **EBSMs in Action: Job Creation Partnerships**

#### **Newfoundland and Labrador**

The Newfoundland and Labrador Job Creation Partnerships (JCPs) employment program is accessed through an application process, delivered through formal agreements between the Department of Advanced Education and Skills (AES) and organizations and administered by AES regional offices. The province's JCP provides opportunities for eligible jobseekers to gain meaningful work experience and to develop and maintain the employment skills needed to successfully find long-term employment. Projects support communities and local economic development. JCPs in Newfoundland and Labrador are designed to respond to a range of labour market needs and priorities including strategic initiatives to respond to labour shortages in specific occupations and/or sectors and initiatives to increase labour force participation among underrepresented groups.

### **3.5 Targeted Earnings Supplements**

Targeting Earning Supplements provide insured clients with incentives to accept employment. Quebec offers TES-similar programming through its Return to Work Supplement program. This TES-similar benefit supported 5,781 participants in 2012/13, a 24.3% decrease year over year. Quebec's total expenditure for this benefit fell 17.5% to \$3.0 million.

### **EBSMs in Action: Targeted Earnings Supplements**

#### **Quebec**

Low-income job seekers have additional costs associated with starting a job. The Return to Work Supplement aims to help them overcome potential barriers to finding employment, by encouraging them to intensify their job search and helping defray expenses at the beginning of employment, such as supplies, work clothes or a bus pass. Individuals eligible for the Return to Work Supplement can receive \$500 to help cover those expenses.

## **4. 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 IV). 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. Some jurisdictions do support employer-sponsored training through LMPs. 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.

#### 4.1 Employment Assistance Services (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 2012/13, a total of 901,063 EAS interventions were delivered, which represents a 14.2% year-over-year increase. They reached levels comparable to those seen during the late 2000s recession. However, EAS expenditures increased more slowly, rising by 1.6% to \$574.7 million.

##### 4.1.1 Employment Services

Interventions similar to Employment Services continued to be the most common EAS intervention type at 61.1% of all EAS interventions in 2012/13. A total of 550,846 Employment Services interventions were provided to unemployed people in Canada, 11.9% more compared with 2011/12. The number of Employment Services interventions was 7.5% higher than that in 2008/09, a year during which provinces and territories were addressing a surge of unemployment at the beginning of the recession.

#### **EBSMs in Action: Employment Assistance Services**

##### **Alberta**

Transition to Employment Services (TES) provides comprehensive and individualized services that enable individuals to acquire workplace and occupation related skills that will facilitate their rapid attachment or re-attachment to the labour market. TES includes:

- Employment Placement and Supports (connects an individual with an employer and provides on-site mentoring)
- Job Matching (placed with an employer based on transferrable skills if work in an usual field is unavailable)
- In addition, supplementary support includes: short courses (i.e. First Aid/CPR, Confined Spaces, H2S Alive)

#### **EBSMs in Action: Employment Assistance Services**

##### **British Columbia**

The Employment Program of British Columbia provides case management to clients who require more intensive services and support than self-serve services alone. The main goal is to support the client in achieving the highest level of labour market participation possible. The case management process includes assessing client's employment readiness; action planning; employment counselling; job coaching and job maintenance/retention during the follow-up period; and a client needs assessment for specialized employment needs. Qualified case managers with expertise in delivering employment services to specialized populations ensure that employment services are integrated with other needed community services.

##### 4.1.2 Group Services

Group Services was the only EAS-similar intervention whose use decreased in 2012/13, falling 15.2% year over year to a total of 34,242 interventions. This contraction is linked in part to the decrease in the number of active claimants participating in EBSM interventions. Additionally, most of the recently devolved jurisdictions have stopped reporting on this intervention type. The number of Group Services interventions declined for a second consecutive year for a cumulative 33.4% decline since 2010/11. Group Services' share of total EAS interventions was significantly lower at 3.8% compared with 5.1% in the previous year.

##### 4.1.3 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 315,975 individuals sought employment counselling support this year, a 23.4% increase year over year. Individual Counselling represented 35.1% of all EAS interventions, a three-year high. Greater use of the employment counselling function is consistent with provinces' and territories' reports of a growing number of multi-barriered clients. While short-term unemployment

has receded since the late-2000s recession, the long-term unemployment levels remained higher than pre-recession levels, indicating a higher level of displaced workers.<sup>9</sup>

#### 4.2 Labour Market Partnerships

The LMP measure facilitates the collaboration of employers, employee and employer associations, community groups, and communities to develop and implement labour force adjustment strategies to deal with human capital challenges, such as skills shortages and the displacement of workers when businesses close. In 2012/13, provinces and territories invested \$156.7 million in LMPs, a 6.4% year-over-year increase. All jurisdictions implemented LMPs in 2012/13 with Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick and Manitoba making the largest LMP investments.

#### **EBSMs in Action: Labour Market Partnerships**

##### PEI

In PEI, LMP funding helped to promote labour market intelligence, improve career awareness, develop training curricula related to industry requirements and identify best practices for investing in worker training. The province also encouraged industry and community involvement in identifying and addressing labour market issues.

##### Manitoba

Manitoba works closely with its labour market stakeholders to establish annual priorities and to ensure programs and services address provincial labour market needs. The Minister's Advisory Council on Workforce Development undertook a Labour Market Information survey of more than 600 companies, in conjunction with the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, then held five industry-specific focus group sessions throughout the province. These engagement activities produced essential information on current and relevant business conditions, human resources requirements, and training and skills development needs that continues to help Manitoba develop its labour market plans and priorities.

#### **EBSMs in Action: Labour Market Partnerships**

##### Yukon

The Business Training Fund, jointly funded from Yukon's Community Training Funds and CanNor, helped the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce assist businesses with their training needs. The Business Training Fund improved access to training and development for employees and potential employees in the business community, and increased the ability of Yukon residents to benefit from the current economic climate. In addition, businesses are better positioned to compete by increasing the capacity of employees in the business sector.

#### 4.3 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. The total provincial and territorial investment in R&I initiatives reached \$12.2 million in 2012/13, almost six times more than in the previous year. Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan all invested in R&I, but the most significant investment was in British Columbia (\$10.3 million) where the province launched the BC Centre for Employment Excellence and several projects to inform program design and delivery approaches.

<sup>9</sup> 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: Research and Innovation

### British Columbia

British Columbia established a Centre for Employment Excellence in September 2012 to support the employment services sector, including employers and service providers, and to help improve employment outcomes for all unemployed job seekers in the province. The Centre is funded over three years. In addition, a research fund was also set up for three years to support innovative approaches to the delivery of employment services. Community consultations and stakeholder engagement determine research projects under this fund.

The BC Centre for Employment Excellence provides a single coordination point for employment research and innovation, tools and training. Resources include a research and development program, website, and system by which to share best practices throughout the sector. Also, activities include the design and testing of new and innovative approaches in employment and training, and promoting the implementation of promising programs and practices.

## EBSMs in Action: EBSMs in Remote Areas

### Manitoba

Manitoba addresses the needs of clients in remote areas by partnering with local employers, Aboriginal communities and educational institutions to provide integrated service. For example, the province delivers the Employment Partnerships Program in the Hollow Water Training-to-Employment Project, an innovative approach to preparing Aboriginal individuals in a remote First Nation community for employment in industrial positions, while addressing recruitment and retention challenges in the region. This program includes essential skills assessments, life skills and essential skills training, introduction to industry training, work experience and mentorship guidance, and support to participants. In addition, Manitoba delivers LMP-similar programming through a partnership with the Construction Association of Rural Manitoba Inc., a strategy to provide individuals with the opportunity to upgrade their skills or challenge the interprovincial certification examination in welding, carpentry, plumbing, or painting. To date, Trades Qualification Training has been very successful with an 80% pass rate. Finally, AccessManitoba is a citizen-centric website that allows rural and northern businesses, entrepreneurs, and individuals to register for programs and submit applications online.


## 5. Expenditures

In 2012/13, expenditures under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* decreased by 3.2% to \$2.03 billion, due to under-spending by a few jurisdictions and a reduction in spending within the pan-Canadian portion of the programming. In addition to EBSM programming to unemployed individuals, expenditures included two Support Measures—LMPs and R&I—that are not delivered directly to clients and the pan-Canadian activities described in section IV of this chapter.

Expenditures on Employment Benefits and pan-Canadian programming both decreased in 2012/13. While Employment Benefits remained the largest category of expenditures, representing 55.7% of the total, its relative share decreased 2.6 percentage points, from 58.3% last year. Similarly, pan-Canadian expenditures dropped 2.2% year over year but its share remained almost unchanged at 7.6% compared with 7.5% in the previous year.

LMPs and R&I increased by 13.3% to a total of \$168.9 million. EAS expenditures increased 1.6% and represented a greater share of overall expenditures (+1.3 percentage points).

**CHART 5**  
EBSM Expenditures, 2012/13 (\$ Million)



## 6. Key Performance Indicators<sup>10</sup>

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;<sup>11</sup>
- the number of EI clients who return to employment following an intervention;<sup>12</sup> and
- the amount of unpaid EI Part I benefits resulting from the returns to employment.

In 2012/13, the three main performance indicators declined year over year, with results continuing the pre-recession trends except for unpaid benefits (see Chart 6). Compared with 2007/08, the unpaid benefits were \$118.5 million higher, even though the number of active claimants served was 5.1% lower. Year over year, unpaid benefits decreased by 1.7%, and the number of returns to work dropped by 12.4%. Longer benefits interventions (+8.5%) decreased the potential duration for realizing unpaid benefits. The decrease in the number of active claimants (-2.1%), skills shortages in specific occupations, displacement of specialized workers and a higher level of multi-barriered clients all influenced the number of insured clients


returning to work. The average Employment Benefit intervention was eight days longer, which also increased the time required to return to work.

Overall, the decrease in unpaid benefits (-1.7%) mirrored the reduction in active claimants served (-2.1%).

## 7. Budget Commitments

As part of the Connecting Canadians with Available Jobs initiative, Budget 2012 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 officials signed memoranda of understanding for collaboration projects with British Columbia and Manitoba officials in 2013. These projects started during the 2013/14 reporting period and will test the impact of early intervention in the delivery of active measures on EI claimants.

In Budget 2013, the federal government announced that LMDAs would be renegotiated with provinces and territories to reorient training toward labour market demand.



<sup>10</sup> Data completeness issues in newly implemented information management systems could affect year-over-year comparisons at the provincial, territorial and national levels.

<sup>11</sup> Quebec includes former claimants in its key performance indicator for clients served.

<sup>12</sup> EI clients include both active claimants and former claimants.

## II. PROVINCIAL AND TERRITORIAL EBSM ACTIVITIES

*This section analyzes provincial and territorial EBSM-similar activity in 2012/13, linking trends in clients served, interventions and expenditures to local labour market conditions and employment programming priorities.*


To address their unique labour market challenges, provinces and territories deliver employment programming under LMDAs 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 *Employment Insurance Act*.<sup>13</sup> Provinces and territories design and deliver virtually all EI-funded employment programming, with the exception of the pan-Canadian activity discussed in section IV of this chapter.

Provinces and territories continued to identify skills and labour shortages as the key labour market challenges they planned to address with EBSM-similar programming in 2012/13. They placed a priority on developing and delivering skills training to meet current and future skills requirements, and optimizing the existing labour supply by working to increase the labour force participation of underrepresented groups, including new immigrants.

The Managing for Results section presents highlights of key findings from the Cycle I summative evaluations and actions undertaken to address them. The EBSMs under the LMDAs are implemented within a framework for evaluating their success in assisting persons to obtain or keep employment. Two rounds of LMDA evaluations have been undertaken to date to assess the effectiveness and relevance of EBSMs. Cycle I LMDA evaluations completed in 2011 and Cycle II LMDA evaluations began in 2012. Cycle I consisted of a two-phased approach: formative evaluations completed between 1999 and 2002, and summative evaluations undertaken over a 10-year period, with the last evaluation completed in 2011. During this period, ESDC and the provinces and territories generally shared program delivery or delivered directly by Service Canada

(see Annex 3.1 for the implementation dates of each LMDA). The Cycle I summative evaluations measured the short-term net impacts and outcomes of EBSMs, and assessed its success, relevance and cost-effectiveness. The summative evaluations generated lessons learned and best practices that informed the planning and development of the currently underway Cycle II LMDA evaluations. To conclude the Cycle I summative evaluations, ESDC consulted provinces and territories regarding the key findings of their respective summative evaluations and progress made to date in addressing them.

A new Delivery Model sub-section highlights the service delivery approaches in each province and territory. All jurisdictions across Canada are moving toward integrated, client-centred and cost-effective program delivery models. Some jurisdictions (e.g., Nova Scotia, Ontario and British Columbia) have completely transferred service delivery to third-party service providers, while other jurisdictions (e.g., Newfoundland and Labrador, Nunavut and Quebec) emphasize government's role in service delivery. Some jurisdictions (e.g., Nunavut, Yukon, and Newfoundland and Labrador) have launched new case management systems to improve service delivery and to enable integrated client management. Overall, the delivery strategies in most jurisdictions are becoming more streamlined.



<sup>13</sup> 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.

Either together or independently, jurisdictions and third-party service providers deliver a suite of EBSM-similar programming to clients. There are three basic models for EBSM delivery (see Chart 7):

- services are delivered primarily by provinces/territories;
- services are delivered by both provinces/territories and third-party service providers; and
- services are delivered primarily by third-party service providers.

## 1. Newfoundland and Labrador

Newfoundland and Labrador's labour market conditions improved for the third consecutive year. At 232,300, employment levels (200,000 full-time and 32,300 part-time jobs) were 6,700 higher than the 225,600 peak recorded last year. In terms of volume, the services-producing industries grew more (+5,100) than the goods-producing industries did (+1,500); however, both industries grew at almost the same pace (+3.0% and +2.9%, respectively). In goods-producing industries, significant gains were made in utilities (+26.1%) and manufacturing (+5.6%). In the services-producing sector, the most significant gains occurred in other services (+21.2%); business, building and other support services (+20.3%); and finance, insurance, real estate and leasing (+9.5%). Accordingly, unemployment levels decreased at a similar pace (-3.3%), bringing Newfoundland and Labrador's unemployment rate to a new low since 1973 of 12.2%.

The most significant labour market challenges facing Newfoundland and Labrador in 2012/13 included labour shortages associated with population aging; labour shortages related to a shrinking labour force, due partly to a high rate of net out-migration—especially among youth—and low rates of attraction and retention of immigrants; labour force adjustments; slow growth in skills; shifts in demand; and limited human resources planning capacity among employers. To address employers' continued concerns about their capacity to find and keep the skilled workers they need to remain competitive, and labour supply pressures that could restrain economic and labour market growth, the province identified a number of priorities in its 2012/13 annual plan, including improving employment and training outcomes for EI clients; aligning LMDA investments with provincial labour market priorities; and strengthening capacity for regional and local labour market development.

The number of clients participating in EBSM-similar programming in Newfoundland and Labrador in 2012/13 fell to 13,162, a decrease of 9.0% year over year. In particular, active claimants declined significantly to a 10-year low of 9,124. Their share of all clients remained stable at 69.3%, though that figure is well below the peak of 79.8% in 2003/04. The number of former claimants declined notably

### Newfoundland and Labrador EBSM Key Facts

Clients Served: 13,162		
EI	Non-Insured	
11,116 ↓	2,046 ↑	
Active	Former	Non-Insured
69.3% –	15.1% ↓	15.5% ↑
Youth (15-24) <sup>1</sup>	Core Age (25-54)	Older Workers (55+)
26.0% ↑	63.4% ↓	10.5% ↑
Interventions: 19,052		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	6,683	12.7% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	12,369	1.9% ↓
Relative Share		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	35.1%	2.7 ↓
Support Measures: EAS	64.9%	2.7 ↑
Allocation: \$130.4 Million		
Expenditures	2012/13 (\$ Million)	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	\$104.3	1.9% ↓
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$16.8	19.2% ↓
· LMPs	\$6.4	36.1% ↑
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$127.5</b>	<b>3.3% ↓</b>
Managing for Results		
Indicator	Total	
Active Claimants Served	9,124	
Returns to Employment	6,114	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$30.42	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

to 1,992, dropping in share slightly to 15.1%. Conversely, the number of non-insured clients edged up slightly to reach 2,046 and a 10-year high share of 15.5%. The total number of interventions delivered in the province in 2012/13 fell to 19,052 (-5.9%), consistent with a reduction in the demand for employment programming. Employment Benefits accounted for a slightly smaller share (35.1%) of this total, while EAS represented a growing share (64.9%) of interventions. A total of 6,114 EI clients returned to employment following participation in the program. Expenditures for EBSM-similar programming totalled \$127.5 million of \$130.4 million allocated.

### 1.1 Employment Benefits

Employment Benefits interventions totalled 6,683, a decrease of 12.7% year over year. SD-R fell significantly to 3,006, while SD-A remained stable at 1,981. Combined, SD continued to account for the majority of benefits interventions, reaching a five-year high of 74.6%, as the province focused on improving workers' skills to meet labour market demand in growing sectors. Newfoundland and Labrador has steadily reduced its use of TWS (- 43.3%) and JCPs (-71.1%) over the last 10 years. The use of SE grew (+7.5%) year over year. Employment Benefits expenditures fell by 1.9% to \$104.3 million.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR EBSM-SIMILAR PROGRAMMING	
Employment Benefits	
TWS	Newfoundland and Labrador Wage Subsidies
SE	Newfoundland and Labrador Self-Employment Assistance
JCPs	Newfoundland and Labrador Job Creation Partnerships
SD	Newfoundland and Labrador Skills Development
Support Measures	
EAS	Newfoundland and Labrador Employment Assistance Services
LMPs	Newfoundland and Labrador Labour Market Partnerships

### 1.2 Support Measures: EAS

Newfoundland and Labrador delivered 12,369 EAS interventions, a modest 1.9% decrease from the previous year. Individual Counselling was the sole type of EAS intervention reported in 2012/13. EAS expenditures fell sharply to \$16.8 million from a high of \$20.9 million in 2011/12.

### 1.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs

Newfoundland and Labrador's total expenditure for LMPs rose to \$6.4 million, a significant year-over-year increase of 36.1%. This rise reflected an increase in LMP activities, which included partnering with the Operating Engineering College to ensure a supply of qualified tower operators; with the Shorefast Foundation to train individuals in the hospitality and tourism sector; and with Labrador Aboriginal Training Partnerships to meet demand for qualified workers for the province's Lower Churchill Project. LMP expenditures accounted for 5.0% of the total EBSM-similar expenditures compared with 3.6% in 2011/12.

### 1.4 Managing for Results

Key findings from Newfoundland and Labrador's summative evaluation highlighted a need to improve links to the demand side of the labour market with TWS in particular, and to ensure that JCPs benefit the host community, given that they increase EI use among participants. To address these findings, the province:

- developed a framework for responding to emerging skills and labour shortages, including:
  - established a tripartite committee with business, labour and government representatives; and
  - ensured Labour Market Development Officers (LMDOs) worked and engaged with employers regarding the use of specific interventions (e.g., TWS) to address labour shortages;
- increased participation of underrepresented groups and helped small businesses develop human resources planning expertise, as shown by
  - employers' increased access to and use of the NL HR Toolkit, and
  - the provision of SmartForce NL online training courses to employers;
- improved employment outcomes for EI clients by making strategic JCP funding allocations to ensure recipients gained experience and skills.

### 1.5 Delivery Model

In 2013, the Department of Advanced Education and Skills (AES) established a network of 26 service delivery locations that provide a single entry point for individuals to access EBSM-similar programming. AES had relied on a combination of internal and external case-managed employment services to serve individuals seeking career planning, employment and



training supports. In an effort to streamline and improve employment services, AES decided in February 2013 to integrate and internalize the delivery of employment services within AES. The province has plans to further enhance its service delivery model.

## 2. Prince Edward Island

Prince Edward Island's labour market conditions were relatively unchanged in 2012/13. Unemployment increased (+3.3%) at a faster pace than employment gains (+1.7%). Consequently, the unemployment rate increased by 0.1 percentage point to 11.5%. Most employment gains were observed in the services-producing industries (+1,500), led by professional, scientific and technical services (+12.9%). The goods-producing industries were relatively unchanged (-400) year over year.

PEI identified addressing labour and skill shortages, population aging, and youth out-migration as key labour market priorities in 2012/13. The province also placed increased emphasis on helping small and medium-sized enterprises create employment opportunities and growth for Islanders, as well as on supporting labour market integration of newcomers. Additionally, PEI planned the review and implementation of key recommendations identified in its Labour Market Review commissioned in the previous year to evaluate labour market development programs, policies and service delivery. To ensure LMDA programs and services reflected labour market needs, SkillsPEI consulted with service providers, educators, clients and industry on an ongoing basis to address current labour market challenges related to the availability of skilled labour, and the employability and labour market participation of under-represented groups.

In 2012/13, the number of clients served on the Island reached a 10-year high of 5,056, an increase of 4.6% year over year. The numbers of both active (+3.8%) and former claimants (+23.3%) increased, while the number of non-insured clients declined by 1.8% to 1,316. Despite the year-over-year decrease in the number of the non-insured clients, its share of all clients remained significantly above the low of 15% in 2003/04. Proportions of clients continued to follow 10-year trends, with the share of active claimants decreasing by 13.8 percentage points, the share of non-insured clients growing by 11 percentage points and former claimants' share increasing by 2.8 percentage points to a 10-year high of 14.0%.

### Prince Edward Island

#### EBSM Key Facts

Clients Served: 5,056		
EI	Non-Insured	
3,740 ↑	1,316 ↓	
Active	Former	Non-Insured
60.0% ↓	14.0% ↑	26.0% ↓
Youth (15-24) <sup>1</sup>	Core Age (25-54)	Older Workers (55+)
26.7% –	63.8% ↓	9.4% ↑
Interventions: 7,646		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	2,120	4.7% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	5,526	11.0% ↑
Relative Share		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	27.7%	3.1 ↓
Support Measures: EAS	72.3%	3.1 ↑
Allocation: \$26.5 Million		
Expenditures	2012/13 (\$ Million)	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	\$19.2	5.9% ↓
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$4.9	0.1% ↓
· LMPs	\$2.3	29.8% ↑
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$26.5</b>	<b>2.5% ↓</b>
Managing for Results		
Indicator	Total	
Active Claimants Served	3,032	
Returns to Employment	1,939	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$7.53	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

In total, PEI delivered 7,646 EBSM-similar interventions in 2012/13, an increase of 6.1%. Employment Benefits' share of total interventions dropped to a 10-year low of 27.7%. A total of 1,939 EI clients returned to employment following participation in the program. Expenditures totalled \$26.5 million.

## 2.1 Employment Benefits

The province delivered 2,120 Employment Benefits interventions in 2012/13, a 4.7% decrease year over year. SD-A (301) was the sole benefits intervention reporting an increase. Conversely, JCPs, SE, TWS and SD-R all shifted down. SD-R (1,154) represented 54.4% of all Employment Benefits interventions and continued to be the most frequently used intervention on the Island, reflecting the province's commitment to meeting the demand for skilled workers in an expanding labour market. Employment Benefits expenditures totalled \$19.2 million, a significant reduction of 5.9%.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND EBSM-SIMILAR PROGRAMMING	
<b>Employment Benefits</b>	
TWS	Employ PEI
SE	Self-Employ PEI
JCPs	Work Experience PEI
SD	Training PEI—Individual Training PEI—Apprentice
<b>Support Measures</b>	
EAS	Employment Assistance Services
LMPs	Labour Market Partnerships

## 2.2 Support Measures: EAS

The number of EAS interventions delivered on the Island expanded by 11.0%, reaching 5,526 in 2012/13. Employment Services edged up to 3,978 (+17.4%), continuing to be the most-used EAS intervention. This could be attributed to the increase in non-insured clients, mainly related to international migration and growth in the number of post-secondary graduates accessing this intervention. On the other hand, Individual Counselling fell by 2.8%, to 1,548. EAS expenditures remained stable at \$4.9 million.

## 2.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs

The total expenditure for LMPs increased significantly by 29.8% year over year to a 10-year high of \$2.3 million. This figure accounted for 8.8% of total expenditures for EBSM-similar programming. The program was mainly used to develop and promote labour market intelligence, career awareness, training curricula related to industry requirements and best practices for investing in worker training. The province also engaged industry and communities in identifying and addressing labour market issues.

## 2.4 Managing for Results

The PEI LMDA summative evaluation was completed in 2011. During the reference period it covered, the LMDA was co-managed, and programs and services were delivered by Service Canada. Key findings from PEI's summative evaluation highlighted a need to improve EBSM delivery in order to address changing labour market needs and ensure that programming assists clients with low literacy. To address these findings, the province:

- consulted with stakeholders to identify labour market needs;
- improved accountability and monitoring to ensure accurate and timely reports;
- streamlined administrative processes by building on the strategy *Island Prosperity: A Focus for Change*, which links innovation and learning more closely to the development of a productive economy and skilled labour force;
- used EBSMs to complement other employment programs; and
- considered a number of factors in developing plans (e.g., emerging labour market trends and employer needs, including socio-economic conditions, demand occupations, sectors in growth and decline, and literacy skills).

## 2.5 Delivery Model

SkillsPEI, a division of the Department of Innovation and Advanced Learning, manages and administers labour market development programs and the delivery of EBSM-similar programming. This division monitors, assesses and streamlines administrative processes. SkillsPEI offers internal case management to help unemployed clients connect to the labour market. Third-party service providers provide external case management to assist with client intake and assess clients interested in pursuing employment services. EAS are primarily delivered through third-party service providers, while SkillsPEI provides Employment Benefits. SkillsPEI continues to partner with stakeholders—including other departments and levels of government, employers, industry groups, and community organizations—to identify gaps in service critical to enhancing delivery of relevant programs and services to meet local labour market demand.

### 3. Nova Scotia

Nova Scotia's labour market conditions weakened slightly in 2012/13. Unemployment levels increased by 9.2% year over year, partially due to an increase in the number of people participating in the labour force (+4,400) while employment opportunities remained stable (+400), bringing the unemployment rate up 0.7 percentage points to the 10-year high of 9.3% last observed in 2010/11. Employment gains in services-producing industries (+1,500)

were offset by losses in the goods-producing industries (- 1,100). The ratio of unemployment to job vacancies was nearly double the national average.

Nova Scotia continued to face a number of labour market challenges in 2012/13, including an aging and shrinking labour force, an underrepresentation of marginalized groups, and a decrease in the number of young people entering the workforce. To address these challenges, and increase productivity and economic growth, the province identified the LMDA as an integral resource for the support of a continued implementation of the *JobsHere*, Nova Scotia's economic development strategy, and its three interrelated priorities (fostering the right skills for good jobs, growing the economy through innovation, and helping businesses compete globally). Nova Scotia also worked with employers, training providers, unions and workers across the province to develop and maintain a competitive workforce.

The number of clients receiving EBSMs increased to 17,889. The volume of active claimants dropped by 1.7% year over year. Their share has declined steadily over the last decade, from 63.3% in 2003/04 to 56.3% in 2012/13. Conversely, the volume of former claimants increased between 2011/12 and 2012/13 by 10.0% to 3,339, and the volume of non-insured clients increased by 3.8% to 4,410. The shares of these two client types increased as well. The province delivered a total of 35,686 EBSM interventions (+1.1%). While Employment Benefits' share of total interventions increased to 17.1%, EAS represented 82.9%, up significantly from 58.2% in 2003/04. A total of 5,259 EI clients returned to employment following participation in the program. EBSM expenditures totalled \$79.6 million.

Nova Scotia EBSM Key Facts		
<b>Clients Served: 17,889</b>		
<b>EI</b>		<b>Non-Insured</b>
13,479 ↑		4,410 ↑
<b>Active</b>	<b>Former</b>	<b>Non-Insured</b>
56.3% ↓	19.0% ↑	24.7% ↑
<b>Youth (15-24)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Core Age (25-54)</b>	<b>Older Workers (55+)</b>
20.6% ↓	69.8% ↓	9.6% ↑
<b>Interventions: 35,686</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
Employment Benefits	6,088	19.0% ↑
Support Measures: EAS	29,598	1.9% ↓
<b>Relative Share</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change (p.p.)</b>
Employment Benefits	17.1%	2.6 ↑
Support Measures: EAS	82.9%	2.6 ↓
<b>Allocation: \$79.6 Million</b>		
	<b>2012/13 (\$ Million)</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
Employment Benefits	\$51.7	11.0% ↓
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$26.0	22.8% ↑
· LMPs	\$1.9	85.8% ↑
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$79.6</b>	<b>0.8% ↓</b>
<b>Managing for Results</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Active Claimants Served	10,080	
Returns to Employment	5,259	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$25.75	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

#### 3.1 Employment Benefits

Following a sudden drop in 2011/12, Nova Scotia delivered 6,088 (+19.0%) Employment Benefits interventions in 2012/13. Volumes for four of the five Employment Benefits experienced notable growth. TWS increased most dramatically (+265.0%) to a new 10-year high of 668, in keeping with recent improvements, including a redesign of the program to better engage employers and respond to their needs. The number of JCP interventions nearly doubled (+94.1%), reaching 196. And the number of SD-A interventions increased significantly (+23.4%), rising to 1,642.

While SD-A's share of remained stable, SD-R's share declined to a 10-year low of 51.4%. As a human capital intervention, SD remains a significant means of enhancing clients' long-term labour market attachment and reducing their reliance on EI. Combined, SD-A and SD-R represented 78.4% of all Employment Benefits interventions, reflecting the province's commitment to addressing labour and skills shortages, and helping Nova Scotians transition to new employment in an increasingly knowledge-based economy. Employment Benefits expenditures fell 11.0% to \$51.7 million.

NOVA SCOTIA EBSM-SIMILAR PROGRAMMING	
<b>Employment Benefits</b>	
TWS	START
SE	Nova Scotia Self-Employment Benefit
JCPs	Nova Scotia Job Creation Partnerships
SD	Nova Scotia Skills Development
<b>Support Measures</b>	
EAS	Nova Scotia Employment Assistance Services
LMPs	Nova Scotia Labour Market Partnerships

### 3.2 Support Measures: EAS

For the second consecutive year, Nova Scotia delivered fewer EAS interventions in 2012/13. Both the volume (29,598) and the share (82.9%) of EAS interventions declined moderately. The province used EAS to help job-ready clients meet a growing demand for skilled labour, as well as to assist multi-barriered clients with more intensive services. Participation in Employment Services increased significantly (+43.2%) to a 10-year high of 22,400 and participation in Group Services expanded dramatically (+593.8%) to 1,346. However, Individual Counselling participation declined sharply (-59.2%) to an eight-year low of 5,852, reflecting a more strategic approach, with recognized providers delivering fewer interventions of higher quality. EAS expenditures increased significantly to \$26.0 million from \$21.2 million in 2011/12.

### 3.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs

Nova Scotia's total expenditures for LMPs rose to a five-year high of \$1.9 million, a substantial year-over-year increase of 85.8%. The province continues to support Sectoral Council engagement to foster cooperative labour market planning and identification of priorities.

### 3.4 Managing for Results

Key findings from Nova Scotia's summative evaluation recommended further improvements in a number of areas, including adapt to the changing mix of clients seeking programming; targeting EBSMs to demand occupations; and improving labour market information (LMI) and EI client information to support planning. To address these recommendations, the province:

- integrated LMDA/LMA delivery to reflect the changing client mix;
- consulted with stakeholders and service providers to monitor trends;
- developed an LMI strategy to monitor emerging needs; and
- introduced the Labour Market Program Support System (LaMPSS) to maximize efficiency while enhancing program delivery excellence.

### 3.5 Delivery Model

Employment Nova Scotia has established programs to fund the management and operation of Careers Nova Scotia Centres to deliver EBSM-similar programming across the province. These centres' services agreements provide funding to organizations to deliver self-serve and assisted employment-related activities from a standard menu of services that will help unemployed individuals to prepare for and maintain employment. Participating organizations include businesses, municipalities, band/tribal councils, and public health and educational institutions. In 2012/13, Nova Scotia launched a new case management system called LaMPSS<sup>14</sup> to support the delivery of labour market programs. LaMPSS helps the province make the most efficient use of staff and financial resources, while enhancing program delivery.

<sup>14</sup> LaMPSS became operational in July 2012.

## 4. New Brunswick

In 2012/13, labour market conditions in New Brunswick deteriorated for a third consecutive year, due to higher unemployment (+9.0%) combined with consistent employment levels. Consequently, the unemployment rate increased by 0.7 percentage points to 10.4%, the highest annual unemployment rate since the 2001/02 reporting period. Employment gains in the services-producing sector (+3,500) were offset by losses in the goods-producing sector (-3,400).

New Brunswick EBSM Key Facts		
<b>Clients Served: 15,543</b>		
<b>EI</b>		<b>Non-Insured</b>
11,699 ↓		3,844 ↓
<b>Active</b>	<b>Former</b>	<b>Non-Insured</b>
60.3% ↓	15.0% ↑	24.7% –
<b>Youth (15-24)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Core Age (25-54)</b>	<b>Older Workers (55+)</b>
32.5% ↓	59.1% ↑	8.3% ↑
<b>Interventions: 31,758</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
Employment Benefits	7,901	16.6% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	23,857	1.9% ↓
<b>Relative Share</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change (p.p.)</b>
Employment Benefits	24.9%	3.2 ↓
Support Measures: EAS	75.1%	3.2 ↑
<b>Allocation: \$90.1 Million</b>		
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2012/13 (\$ Million)</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
Employment Benefits	\$55.8	24.9% ↓
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$10.2	4.8% ↓
· LMPs and R&I	\$7.9	76.4% ↑
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$73.9</b>	<b>17.4% ↓</b>
<b>Managing for Results</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Active Claimants Served	9,365	
Returns to Employment	8,015	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$27.65	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

New Brunswick continued to face low labour force participation rates and shortages of skilled workers with required literacy skills, as well as demographic shifts—a shrinking of the youth cohort and a decreasing birth rate. To address these challenges and help citizens secure and maintain full-time employment, the province planned to make strategic investments through innovative programs, services and partnerships; work with employers to enhance adult literacy; promote continuous learning; assist workers with job matching; and collaborate with stakeholders to meet their workforce training needs.

The province served 15,543 clients with EBSM-similar interventions, a decline of 8.8% overall. The number of active claimants declined 10.5% to 9,365. Similarly, the number of former (2,334) and non-insured (3,844) clients also decreased. While the share of active claimants fell slightly to 60.3% of all clients served, former claimants' share increased moderately, reaching 15.0%—the highest level in seven years. Clients participated in 6.0% fewer interventions, marking a 10-year low of 31,758 interventions. Several factors contributed to the decrease in clients served, including the fact that fewer people accessed EBSM-similar programming and changes to eligibility criteria, primarily those for SD-R benefits.

Employment Benefits' share of all interventions decreased to a 10-year low of 24.9%. EBSM-similar programming expenditures totalled \$73.9 million from an LMDA allocation of \$90.1 million.

### 4.1 Employment Benefits

Participation in Employment Benefits declined 16.6% year over year to 7,901 interventions. SD-R (4,263) and SD-A (2,338) both dropped significantly but, combined, SD continued to represent the majority (83.5%) of all Employment Benefits interventions in 2012/13—consistent with New Brunswick's commitment to supporting workers in acquiring new skills. Employment Benefits expenditures fell to \$55.8 million (-24.9%).

## NEW BRUNSWICK EBSM-SIMILAR PROGRAMMING

### Employment Benefits

TWS	Workforce Expansion—Employer Wage Subsidy
SE	Workforce Expansion—Self-Employment Benefit
SD	Training and Skills Development Program

### Support Measures

EAS	Employment Assistance Services
LMPs	Adjustment Services
R&I	Research and Innovation

#### 4.2 Support Measures: EAS

EAS interventions totalled 23,857 in 2012/13, a slight year-over-year decrease of 1.9%. Employment Services (9,163) represented 38.4% of all EAS interventions compared with 39.6% in 2011/12. Individual Counselling remained stable at 14,694, while its share of all EAS interventions edged up to 61.6%. The province's extensive use of EAS reflected a continued commitment to assisting job-ready individuals who were actively seeking employment and extensive support of multi-barriered clients. New Brunswick clients participated in an average of 2.04 interventions each in 2012/13. Total expenditures for EAS fell to \$10.2 million (-4.8%).

#### 4.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&I

New Brunswick's expenditures for LMPs and R&I totalled \$7.9 million compared with \$4.5 million in 2011/12. This represented a substantial year-over-year increase of 76.4%. Both LMP (\$7.6 million) and R&I (\$307,000) increased sharply (+74.8% and +130.8%, respectively), reflecting a continued commitment to helping employers in expanding sectors to manage their human resources needs and advance the innovation agenda.

#### 4.4 Managing for Results

Key findings from New Brunswick's summative evaluation ending in 2009 highlighted a need to improve the province's client case management information system; strengthen the quality and dissemination of LMI; and improve policy and program delivery. To address these findings, New Brunswick:

- implemented a new client case management information system (**ContactNB.net**), and improved data input and reporting;

- made strategic investments in innovative programs, services and partnerships to help citizens secure and maintain full-time employment;
- focused on maximizing participation rates, addressed the demand for skilled workers, and ensured programs and services were more focused on clients' needs;
- conducted a program review to ensure program design and delivery was evidence based; and
- continued improving LMI by developing tools such as occupational profiles.

#### 4.5 Delivery Model

New Brunswick's Department of Post-Secondary Education, Training and Labour (PETL) coordinates the delivery of EBSM-similar programming aimed at helping New Brunswickers acquire the skills and employment experience necessary to secure and maintain full-time employment. The PETL manages 19 career information centres located in seven regional offices. These centres deliver employment benefits either directly or through third-party service providers. Third-party service providers deliver specialized services and EAS.

### 5. Quebec

In 2012/13, labour market conditions improved for a fourth consecutive year in the province of Quebec, with significant employment gains (+63,700) and a decline in the number of individuals looking for work (-7,500). Consequently, the unemployment rate decreased by 0.3 percentage points to 7.6%, its lowest level since the late-2000s recession. While significant full-time opportunities were generated (+61,900), the number of part-time opportunities changed little (+1,900). Led by the health care and social assistance (+39,100), information, culture and recreation (+21,300), and educational services (+14,500) sectors, Quebec's services-producing industries grew by 36,300 jobs (+1.2%). The goods-producing sector grew more rapidly (+3.3%), with the most gains in construction (+16,600) and manufacturing (+14,800).

Slow population growth and an aging workforce, combined with labour and skills shortages, continued to be the main challenges facing Quebec. To address these issues, the province focused on preventing layoffs; enhancing employment recovery and gains; increasing labour market participation; improving productivity;

and enhancing the capacity of businesses to adapt to change. In February 2013, the province launched a new labour market strategy, *Tous pour l'emploi: une impulsion nouvelle avec les partenaires*, to improve its support for underrepresented groups.

Quebec EBSM Key Facts		
<b>Clients Served: 199,371</b>		
<b>EI</b>	<b>Non-Insured</b>	
144,852 ↓	54,519 ↑	
<b>Active</b>	<b>Former</b>	<b>Non-Insured</b>
60.1% ↓	12.6% ↓	27.3% ↑
<b>Youth (15-24)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Core Age (25-54)</b>	<b>Older Workers (55+)</b>
17.0% ↑	70.5% ↓	12.5% ↑
<b>Interventions: 237,744</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
Employment Benefits	41,321	4.5% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	196,423	7.8% ↑
<b>Relative Share</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change (p.p.)</b>
Employment Benefits	17.4%	1.8 ↓
Support Measures: EAS	82.6%	1.8 ↑
<b>Allocation: \$584.0 Million</b>		
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2012/13 (\$ Million)</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
Employment Benefits	\$335.8	5.0% ↓
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$139.7	8.0% ↑
· LMPs and R&I	\$108.6	2.1% ↑
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$584.0</b>	<b>0.9% ↓</b>
<b>Managing for Results</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Active Claimants Served	144,852 <sup>3</sup>	
Returns to Employment	49,757	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$230.49	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

<sup>3</sup> Quebec includes both active and former claimants in its target for client served.

A total of 199,371 Quebecers participated in EBSM-similar programming, representing a 3.2% increase since 2011/12 and a 9.9% rise over the last 10 years. Active clients (119,771) continued to account for the majority of all clients served (60.1%), despite a decline of 2.6 percentage points in relative share from the previous year. Former clients remained relatively stable at 25,081, while non-insured clients edged up 15.9% to 54,519, representing a growing share (27.3%) of total clients served. Overall, clients participated in a total of 237,744 interventions (+5.5%). Employment Benefits represented 17.4% of the total interventions delivered in the province, while EAS accounted for 82.6% of all interventions. In 2012/13, a total of 49,757 EI clients returned to employment following participation in the program. Given the volume of returns to employment, a total of \$230.5 million in savings to the EI Account were estimated. Expenditures totalled \$584.0 million.

### 5.1 Employment Benefits

In 2012/13, the number of Employment Benefits interventions fell by 4.5% to reach a 10-year low of 41,321. The distribution of Employment Benefits interventions changed slightly due to uneven variation in participant volumes. SD-R, a priority for Quebec, edged up 0.4% to 27,199, and its share increased by 3.2 percentage points to account for 65.8% of all benefits. SE dropped by 5.1% to 1,918, and TWS declined by 1.6% to 6,423. TES fell by 24.3% to 5,781.<sup>15</sup> Employment Benefits expenditures dropped by 5.0% to \$335.8 million.

QUEBEC EBSM-SIMILAR PROGRAMMING	
<b>Employment Benefits</b>	
SD	Manpower Training Measure Job Readiness
TWS	Wage Subsidy
SE	Support for Self-Employment Measure
TES	Return to Work Supplement
<b>Support Measures</b>	
EAS	Labour Market Information Job Placement Job Research and Assistance Services
LMPs	Job Cooperation Services Manpower Training Measure for Enterprises
R&I	Research and Innovation Strategy

<sup>15</sup> Quebec does not offer LMDA-funded programming similar to SD-A.

## 5.2 Support Measures: EAS

In 2012/13, the use of EAS in Quebec reached a 10-year high of 196,423, reflecting two factors: the province's efforts to reach out to individuals from occupations with skills in demand, by targeting them via EI Part I data; and the substantial increase in non-insured clients. Employment Services interventions totalled 118,494, a year-over-year increase of 1.4%. At 60.3%, Employment Services continued to account for the majority of EAS interventions. Individual Counselling increased significantly to a 10-year high of 45,590, as the province implemented personalized job placement and LMI services in June 2011. These services continued to grow and became fully established in 2012/13. Their share of total EAS interventions followed suit, edging up to 23.2% of all EAS compared with 14.1% in 2011/12. Group Services declined, reaching a 10-year low of 32,339. EAS expenditures totalled \$139.7 million, an increase of 8.0% year over year.

## 5.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&I

The province supported the skills development of workers at risk of employment loss, as well as the improvement of a variety of human resources management functions. Quebec's total expenditure for LMPs increased to \$108.3 million, up from \$92.3 million in 2003/04. LMPs' expenditures represented 18.5% of the province's total expenditures for EBSM-similar programming. Total funding for R&I fell by 37.0% to an eight-year low of \$264,000.

## 5.4 Managing for Results

Quebec's last summative evaluation, completed in 2003, recommended that the province review the methods used to select clients for EBSM participation and for interventions, in order to improve cost effectiveness. In addressing these findings, Quebec:

- worked with Service Canada to implement a Targeting, Referral and Feedback (TRF) application that proactively targets EI claimants likely to face employment barriers and those in demand occupations;
- implemented the *Pacte pour l'emploi* in 2008, designed to increase EAS participation, better identify and target client needs, and expand access to SD and TWS;

- implemented its 2011–14 strategic plan supporting greater participation by individuals, companies and partners in the development and prosperity of the province; and
- completed a series of studies on vulnerable groups to ensure they can access universal services through a welcoming environment, and that LMI and job placement reflect their needs.

## 5.5 Delivery Model

Emploi-Québec, an agency of the Ministère de l'Emploi et de la Solidarité sociale, coordinates the province's public employment services, delivered by 130 local employment centres and points of service in 17 administrative regions. The agency also works with 17 regional councils of labour market partners, comprising employers' representatives, workers, training institutions, service delivery partners and other key stakeholders. The councils examine labour market issues specific to their regions and recommend an action plan addressing local needs to the Commission des partenaires du marché du travail. The councils also adapt Emploi-Québec measures and services to regional needs. Emploi-Québec delivers, in conjunction with its labour market partners, general and specialized public employment services, as well as services for employers.

## 6. Ontario

In 2012/13, growth in unemployment (+1.9%) outpaced employment gains (+0.9%). The unemployment rate rose slightly (+0.1%) to 7.8%. Full-time and part-time employment grew at the same pace. Employment gains were concentrated in the province's services-producing sector (+71,300), with educational services (+32,100), accommodation and food services (+30,500), and finance, insurance, real estate, and leasing (+13,800) leading all employment growth across industries. Information, culture and recreation (-23,000) and public administration (-11,800) led employment loss. Ontario's goods-producing industries (-12,800) also lost employment, with the largest decline reported in construction (-14,500).

Ontario's economy continues to grow and create jobs within a challenging global environment. The province seeks to increase labour force participation and labour market integration of under-represented groups such as immigrants, youth, persons with disabilities, and Aboriginal peoples by providing skills development opportunities and employment services. Long-term



unemployment remains a concern for Ontario, as the share of people unemployed for 27 weeks or more is much higher than the pre-recession level.

Ontario made strategic investments in skills development and employment services to further enhance its programs and better prepare Ontarians for current and future jobs; promoted apprenticeship completion to increase the supply of skilled workers; and maintained support for the Second Career program, established to help laid-off workers access training and find jobs in growing sectors.

A total of 154,158 clients participated in EBSM-similar programming in Ontario in 2012/13, a significant 16.8% year-over-year increase. The province also provided approximately 300,000 additional individuals—not captured in the total clients served—with such services as access to online employment sites and job search information. Two out of the three client types increased: active claimants grew by 4.7% to 66,748, and non-insured clients rose significantly (+44.5%), reaching a total of 66,703. Meanwhile, former claimants decreased by 6.2% to 20,707. The significant growth in the number of non-insured clients shifted the client mix—the shares of active (43.3%) and former (13.4%) claimants both declined moderately year over year, while the share of non-insured clients grew significantly to 43.3% compared with only 35.0% in the previous year. Clients participated in 173,713 (+19.1%) EBSM-similar interventions. EAS interventions accounted for 81.9% of all interventions, up significantly from 74.5% in the previous year. A total of 36,111 EI clients returned to work following participation in EBSM programming. EBSM expenditures totalled \$560.0 million.

<b>Ontario</b>		
<b>EBSM Key Facts</b>		
<b>Clients Served: 154,158</b>		
<b>EI</b>		<b>Non-Insured</b>
87,455 ↑		66,703 ↑
<b>Active</b>	<b>Former</b>	<b>Non-Insured</b>
43.3% ↓	13.4% ↓	43.3% ↑
<b>Youth (15-24)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Core Age (25-54)</b>	<b>Older Workers (55+)</b>
19.9% ↑	69.3% ↓	10.8% ↑
<b>Interventions: 173,714</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
Employment Benefits	31,490	15.5% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	142,223	31.0% ↑
<b>Relative Share</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change (p.p.)</b>
Employment Benefits	18.1%	7.4 ↓
Support Measures: EAS	81.9%	7.4 ↑
<b>Allocation: \$560.0 Million</b>		
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2012/13 (\$ Million)</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
Employment Benefits	\$286.8	12.0% ↓
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$258.4	19.4% ↑
· LMPs and R&I	\$14.8	41.1% ↑
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$560.0</b>	<b>1.3% ↑</b>
<b>Managing for Results</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Active Claimants Served	66,748	
Returns to Employment	36,111	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$227.71	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

### 6.1 Employment Benefits

Ontario delivered 31,490 Employment Benefits interventions in 2012/13 (-15.5%). Volumes for all benefits declined, with SD-R decreasing the most (-29.7%), followed by SE (-26.0%), JCPs (-13.3%), TWS (-10.5%) and SD-A (-2.3%). Despite the moderate decline in SD-A interventions, its share of all benefits increased, reaching a 10-year high of 52.7%—reflecting a continued focus on skills development. Employment Benefits expenditures totalled \$286.8 million in 2012/13 (-12.0%).

<b>ONTARIO</b>	
<b>EBSM-SIMILAR PROGRAMMING</b>	
<b>Employment Benefits</b>	
TWS	Job Placement with Incentive
SE	Ontario Self-Employment Benefit
JCPs	Ontario Job Creation Partnerships
SD-R	Second Career
SD-A	Skills Development-Apprenticeship
<b>Support Measures</b>	
EAS	Ontario Employment Assistance Services/Employment Service
LMPs	Ontario Labour Market Partnerships
R&I	Research and Innovation

## 6.2 Support Measures: EAS

Ontario delivered 142,223 EAS interventions in 2012/13, an increase of 31.0% year over year. All EAS interventions were recorded under Individual Counselling.<sup>16</sup> EAS expenditures totalled \$258.4 million, a significant year-over-year increase of 19.4%.

## 6.3 Other Support Measures

Ontario's total expenditures for LMPs and R&I reached \$14.8 million (+41.1%) in 2012/13. Total expenditure for LMP rose by approximately \$4.0 million year over year. Despite this increase, LMP funding represented only 2.6% of total EBSM expenditures compared with the 10-year high of 4.0% in 2003/04.

Ontario partnered with several sectors to further LMP initiatives. The Ontario Construction Secretariat offered a three-day career exposition entitled Future Building 2012 to profile the construction industry as a rewarding career option. The Cultural Careers Council Ontario created research opportunities for improving the traditional and digital business skills that cultural workers need to take greater advantage of prospects for economic growth, both domestically and globally. The Ontario Nonprofit Network assisted in capacity-building by addressing some of the key human resources challenges facing the not-for-profit sector, including a leadership deficit for senior positions and a lack of diversity in its workforce.

## 6.4 Managing for Results

Key findings from Ontario's summative evaluation recommended increasing client awareness of programs and services, and enhancing information for client program selection and training decision-making. The summative evaluation covered a reference period during which EBSMs were delivered by the federal government. A complete transfer of EBSMs to Ontario became effective as of January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2007. Since the conclusion of the evaluation, Ontario has:

- increased client awareness of its wide range of programs and services by introducing a one-stop service delivery network model, and integrating provincial program offerings with federally funded employment programming;

- improved information available to clients by strengthening performance contracting with third-party delivery agents; and
- increased use of the Internet as part of a multi-faceted approach to promoting employment programming and job growth (e.g., promoting apprenticeship completion and maintaining support for Second Career training to increase the supply of skilled workers).

## 6.5 Delivery Model

Employment Ontario's Employment Service provides access to many EBSM-similar programming in one location. These services include information on local training and employment opportunities; access and referrals to other Employment Ontario programs and services, including training benefits such as Second Career, Literacy and Basic Skills, and the Self-Employment Benefit; and coordinated client service planning and supports that provide job placement and matching services, support to assist clients with job retention and training completion, and structured and individualized support for conducting a successful job search. The Employment Service network consists of 171 third-party service providers with more than 400 points of service across Ontario.

## 7. Manitoba

In 2012/13, Manitoba's labour market improved slightly, with both significant unemployment decreases (-1,300) and noticeable employment gains (+8,100), primarily in full-time opportunities (+7,000). The services-producing sector registered three quarters of Manitoba's employment gains (+5,900), while the balance came from the goods-producing sector (+2,200), led by gains in construction (+2,400).

Manitoba's labour market challenges included labour and skills shortages throughout many regions and sectors of the province; changing demographics (e.g., increased immigration, an aging workforce and an Aboriginal population with lower levels of educational attainment); and issues related to labour force attachment despite a resilient economy.

<sup>16</sup> 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 only counts one Individual Counselling intervention per EAS client.

Manitoba established a number of priorities for 2012/13 to address these challenges, including boosting the participation of the existing labour supply; assisting those who face barriers (Aboriginal people, underemployed workers and income assistance recipients) to enter and remain in the labour market; and supporting the successful integration of immigrants into the labour market. The province also sustained its focus on providing adequate training across all of its regions to help Manitobans meet employers' requirements for skilled workers in rural, northern

and remote communities (e.g., by enhancing and expanding the Red Seal apprenticeship system to meet the demands of its changing labour market).

The total number of the clients participating in EBSM-similar programming in Manitoba in 2012/13 declined slightly to 28,957 (-1.2%), as the province's economy continued to improve. Active claimants decreased slightly (-0.8%) to 11,744, and non-insured clients declined to 13,369 (-2.4%), while former claimants edged up 1.8% to 3,844. The proportions of these clients, however, remained relatively stable. Manitoba delivered a total of 52,671 interventions in 2012/13, a significant expansion over the last 10 years (+19.3%), reflecting changes to Manitoba's client composition of short-term unemployed and non-insured clients, who require more assistance to re-enter the workforce. The proportion of Employment Benefits (12.8%) and Support Measures (87.2%) remained stable—consistent with the province's economic stability. A total of 8,056 EI clients returned to employment following participation in the program. EBSM expenditures totalled \$44.1 million.

<b>Manitoba</b>		
<b>EBSM Key Facts</b>		
<b>Clients Served: 28,957</b>		
<b>EI</b>		<b>Non-Insured</b>
15,588 ↓		13,369 ↓
<b>Active</b>	<b>Former</b>	<b>Non-Insured</b>
40.6% ↑	13.3% ↑	46.2% ↓
<b>Youth (15-24)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Core Age (25-54)</b>	<b>Older Workers (55+)</b>
22.1% ↑	69.3% ↓	8.5% ↑
<b>Interventions: 52,671</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
Employment Benefits	6,755	1.8% ↑
Support Measures: EAS	45,916	2.0% ↑
<b>Relative Share</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change (p.p.)</b>
Employment Benefits	12.8%	0.0 -
Support Measures: EAS	87.2%	0.0 -
<b>Allocation: \$44.1 Million</b>		
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2012/13 (\$ Million)</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
Employment Benefits	\$26.0	10.4% ↓
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$10.3	0.2% ↓
· LMPs and R&I	\$7.8	41.9% ↑
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$44.1</b>	<b>1.6% ↓</b>
<b>Managing for Results</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Active Claimants Served	11,744	
Returns to Employment	8,056	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$43.51	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

### 7.1 Employment Benefits

Employment Benefits interventions increased (+1.8%) year over year, reaching a total of 6,755. SD-A increased to a 10-year high of 3,775 (+2.3%) and accounted for the largest share (55.9%) of all benefits, as Manitoba focused on addressing skills and labour shortages, and increasing apprenticeship opportunities to meet labour market demand. The use of TWS more than doubled (+119.5%), while SE increased by 14.0% and JCPs grew by 7.4%. Conversely, SD-R fell by 2.0% and its share of benefit interventions declined to 36.9% compared with 38.3% in 2011/12. The decline in SD-R follows the decrease in active claimants served and the ongoing focus on SD-A. Combined, SD continued to account for the majority of benefits (92.8%). Employment Benefits expenditures totalled \$26.0 million compared with \$29.0 million in 2011/12.

**MANITOBA**  
EBSM-SIMILAR PROGRAMMING

**Employment Benefits**

TWS	Wage Subsidies
SE	Self-Employment
JCPs	Employment Partnerships
SD	Skills Development

**Support Measures**

EAS	Employment Assistance Services
LMPs	Labour Market Partnerships
R&I	Research and Innovation

**7.2 Support Measures: EAS**

EAS interventions delivered in Manitoba reached a 10-year high of 45,916 in 2012/13, a significant upward shift of 22.8% compared with 2003/04 levels, reflecting a growing emphasis on employment preparation services. Employment Services remained stable at 28,218, while Individual Counselling increased significantly (+6.9%) year over year, reaching 17,698. Total expenditures for EAS remained stable at \$10.3 million.

**7.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&I**

Manitoba's LMPs and R&I total expenditures increased significantly (+41.9%) year over year, reaching \$7.8 million in 2012/13 and representing a greater proportion (17.7%) of total expenditures for EBSM-similar programming. Expenditures for LMPs rose by 47.5% to \$7.0 million. Manitoba continued to prioritize demand-driven interventions to better respond to industry and employers' workforce requirements. LMP funding supported workforce adjustment activities, human resources planning, labour market analysis and training infrastructure development.

**7.4 Managing for Results**

Key findings from Manitoba's summative evaluation completed in 2012 called for further improvements, such as addressing concerns about EBSM access in rural and remote areas; and addressing concerns related to adequacy of financial support given variable client or participation characteristics. In response to these findings, Manitoba:

- developed a new integrated labour market service delivery model and provided an integrated service response for multi-barriered individuals, by augmenting existing employment and skills development programs, and providing customized supports;
- increased training opportunities for apprentices under the *Rural and Northern Apprenticeship Strategy*;
- implemented the *Training to Employment Pathway* across the province and aligned skills training with employer demand for skilled workers;
- worked collaboratively with stakeholders to help people connect to the labour force by developing industry-driven and community-based partnerships; and
- continued to monitor EI Part II levels related to identified client needs and placed greater emphasis on engaging clients earlier in their EI claim to support quicker returns to work.

**7.5 Delivery Model**

In late 2012/13, Manitoba implemented a new and fully integrated service delivery model that provides single-window access to the full suite of employment and training services for all Manitobans, including job seekers and employers. This new model strengthens the emphasis on connecting individuals with job opportunities through provincially funded sector councils, and close connections with industry and employers. Manitoba continues to integrate its apprenticeship, employment, and workforce development services and programs to provide a common client-centred experience across all of its service delivery branches. Manitoba manages 14 employment centres that offer direct services, as well as referrals to third-party service providers for particular interventions (e.g., skills development, employer human resources and community capacity). Employment services are available through partnerships with community and employer groups that also provide project-based and workplace training.

## 8. Saskatchewan

In 2012/13, Saskatchewan's labour market strengthened for a second consecutive year. Employment levels increased significantly (+16,200) with most gains in full-time employment (88.0%), while unemployment levels decreased (-6.0%). As a result, Saskatchewan's unemployment rate dropped by 0.4 percentage points to 4.4%, its lowest level since 2008/09. Employment in the goods-producing sector of the province grew at a rapid pace (+7.7%), with construction, utilities and agriculture leading the trend. The services-producing sector also grew, but at a slower rate (+1.5%). Employment gains were slightly favourable to males in the labour force.

Strength in the province's economy created a solid demand for skilled and trained workers in an already tight labour market that tightened further in 2012/13. Saskatchewan's labour market challenges included growing concerns about labour and skills shortages, and further pressure on the labour market due to an aging workforce and increased competition for skilled workers. To address these challenges, the province established a number of key priorities, including advancing regulation for responsible resources development; developing strategies for attracting and retaining skilled workers; and enhancing economic growth and competitiveness, immigration, energy and resources management, and First Nations, Métis, and northern economic development. Saskatchewan also identified the following activities as important to improving its labour market: finding qualified skilled workers to ensure sustained economic growth; supporting job transitions for students and the unemployed; lowering the unemployment rate for Aboriginal groups; and closing the educational gap between the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal populations).

A total of 13,697 clients accessed EBSM-similar interventions in Saskatchewan in 2012/13, a decrease of 7.2% year over year. The numbers for all client types declined. Active claimants fell moderately (-4.4%), while both former claimants (-14.7%) and non-insured clients (-14.0%) declined significantly. In addition, the distribution of these clients changed slightly. Active claimants' share increased to 74.2%, while the proportions of former claimants (20.4%) and non-insured clients (5.5%) both declined. Clients participated in 18,529 interventions (-10.4%). The share of Employment Benefits of total interventions rose to 43.4%, while EAS' share dropped to 56.6%. A total of 5,784 EI clients returned to employment

### Saskatchewan

#### EBSM Key Facts

Clients Served: 13,697		
EI	Non-Insured	
12,949 ↓	748 ↓	
Active	Former	Non-Insured
74.2% ↑	20.4% ↓	5.5% ↓
Youth (15-24) <sup>1</sup>	Core Age (25-54)	Older Workers (55+)
14.2% ↓	78.2% ↑	7.5% ↑
Interventions: 18,529		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	8,034	4.3% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	10,495	14.6% ↓
Relative Share		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	43.4%	2.8 ↑
Support Measures: EAS	56.6%	2.8 ↓
Allocation: \$37.1 Million		
Expenditures	2012/13 (\$ Million)	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	\$28.3	4.8% ↓
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$6.8	24.1% ↑
· LMPs and R&I	\$2.0	22.6% ↓
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$37.1</b>	<b>1.8% ↓</b>
Managing for Results		
Indicator	Total	
Active Claimants Served	10,161	
Returns to Employment	5,784	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$55.56	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

following participation in the program. EBSM-similar programming expenditures remained stable at \$37.1 million.

#### 8.1 Employment Benefits

In 2012/13, the number of Employment Benefits interventions delivered in Saskatchewan fell to 8,034, a moderate year-over-year decline of 4.3%, consistent with the decline in active claimants. Employment Benefits trends varied. SDA remained almost unchanged

at 6,652 and continued to account for an increasing share (82.8%) of total benefits, reflecting a continued emphasis on skills training opportunities to meet the demand for skilled trades. Conversely, the number of SD-R interventions fell by 17.3% to a nine-year low of 1,295. Similarly, SE dropped to a four-year low of 87 (-32.0%). Overall, expenditures for Employment Benefits fell by 4.8% to \$28.3 million.

SASKATCHEWAN EBSM-SIMILAR PROGRAMMING	
Employment Benefits	
TWS	Job Start/Future Skills
SE	Self-Employment Program
JCPs	Employment Programs
SD	Skills Training Benefit Provincial Training Allowance
Support Measures	
EAS	Workforce Development
LMPs	Sector Partnerships Regional Planning and Partnerships
R&I	Research and Innovation

## 8.2 Support Measures (EAS)

Saskatchewan delivered a total of 10,495 EAS interventions in 2012/13, a significant year-over-year decline of 14.6%. Employment Services fell 9.3% to 5,491 interventions but its share increased to 52.3% of total EAS interventions. Similarly, Individual Counselling declined by 20.7% to 4,447 and Group Services declined by 12.1% to 557. Despite these declines in interventions, EAS expenditures totalled \$6.8 million, a significant year-over-year increase of 24.1% and 186.7% higher than the 2003/04 level.

## 8.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&I

Saskatchewan's total expenditure for LMPs and R&I decreased notably (-22.6%) to a 10-year low of \$2.0 million. Funding for LMPs fell by 17.2% to \$1.7 million, while the \$0.3-million balance funded R&I initiatives, representing a decline of 46.1%.

## 8.4 Managing for Results

Key findings from Saskatchewan's summative evaluation identified areas for further improvement, including a need to enhance service to employers related to workforce planning, recruitment and retention; ensure

progress on data-sharing; and increase the timeliness of delivery of program information to clients. To address these findings, Saskatchewan:

- expanded its work with employers to enhance recruitment and retention. Also, the province and Canada worked with industry and relevant sister ministries (Enterprise Saskatchewan and Industry Canada) to address region-specific needs identified through collaborative planning tables;
- created single-window access to employment services; and
- developed new labour market strategies to address labour market development needs and to determine the measurement and reporting of results.

Since the completion of the summative evaluation, the province has continued to enhance its service delivery model, the relevance of its employment programs and services, and its accountability in the context of current labour market needs.

## 8.5 Delivery Model

The Labour Market Division of the Ministry of the Economy manages the delivery of a wide range of employment programming, career development and training services through 19 Canada-Saskatchewan Labour Market Service delivery points. The province is divided into five employment regions, with unique geographic and demographic characteristics, to expedite and enhance delivery of employment services, including self-services, assisted services and **Saskjobs.ca**. The ministry is responsible for training and employment supports for EI clients. Funding under the Skills Training Allocation supports industry-led training at public training institutions. In addition, training directly related to jobs is available to EI clients through the Skills Training Benefit program. These demand-driven programs ensure the needs of Saskatchewan employers are being met in the sectors of greatest labour market demand.

## 9. Alberta

Labour market results in Alberta improved during 2012/13 for a third consecutive year, with employment levels reaching a new high of 2,160,700, representing an increase of 50,000 year over year (+2.4%). A total of 55,600 full-time positions were generated, along with a slight shift away from part-time employment (-5,700). At the same time, unemployment levels dropped by 13.1%. Consequently, the province's unemployment rate decreased by

0.7 percentage points. More than 39,900 employment opportunities were added to Alberta's goods-producing sector, with the largest gains observed in the extraction (+14,300), construction (+13,200), and agriculture (+5,100) sectors. The trades, transport and equipment operators, and related occupations recorded the largest employment gains in 2012.

Skills and labour shortages, and low labour market participation of underrepresented groups (e.g., Aboriginal people, immigrants, persons with disabilities, youth and mature workers) continued to be the main challenges facing Alberta's labour market—issues that could hinder the province's economic and labour market growth if left unaddressed. Alberta established a number of key labour market priorities for 2012/13, including increasing opportunities for Albertans to make successful transitions from school to work; assisting immigrants to access labour market opportunities; continuing collaboration with other levels of government to advance foreign qualification and credential recognition strategies; ensuring Albertans continue to enhance their skills through collaborative efforts with industry, employers and community groups; and supporting program planning, delivery and management, including systems design and evaluations.

Alberta's strong labour market conditions resulted in lower demand for employment programs and services for a third consecutive year. A total of 120,461 clients participated in EBSM-similar programming, a year-over-year decrease of 5.5%. All client types decreased. Active claimants fell to 39,823 (-3.8%), former claimants dropped to 18,234 (-13.0%) and non-insured clients declined by 4.1% to 62,404. The mix of client types remained stable but reflected a shift away from active claimants (-8.4 percentage points) to former (+1.9 percentage points) and non-insured (+6.5 percentage points) clients over 10 years. Clients participated in 256,558 interventions in 2012/13 (-10.2%). Despite this year-over-year decline, intervention volumes have expanded by 48.6% since 2003/04. Employment Benefits' share of all interventions was only 8.3%, while EAS accounted for the balance (91.7%). A total of 23,686 EI clients returned to employment following participation in EBSM-similar programming. Expenditures totalled \$108.7 million in 2012/13.

## Alberta EBSM Key Facts

Clients Served: 120,461		
EI	Non-Insured	
58,057 ↓	62,404 ↓	
Active	Former	Non-Insured
33.1% ↑	15.1% ↓	51.8% ↑
Youth (15-24) <sup>1</sup>	Core Age (25-54)	Older Workers (55+)
22.6% ↓	68.1% ↑	9.2% ↑
Interventions: 256,558		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	21,383	0.6% ↑
Support Measures: EAS	235,175	11.1% ↓
Relative Share		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	8.3%	0.9 ↑
Support Measures: EAS	91.7%	0.9 ↓
Allocation: \$108.7 Million		
Expenditures	2012/13 (\$ Million)	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	\$78.8	3.0% ↑
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$28.1	5.1% ↓
· LMPs	\$1.8	113.8% ↑
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$108.7</b>	<b>1.6% ↑</b>
Managing for Results		
Indicator	Total	
Active Claimants Served	39,823	
Returns to Employment	23,686	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$219.63	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

### 9.1 Employment Benefits

In 2012/13, the number of Employment Benefits interventions remained stable at 21,383. The mix of intervention types, however, changed. SD-A increased by 3.2% and accounted for 86.3% of all benefits, reaffirming Alberta's continued commitment to supporting apprenticeship training. In contrast, the volumes for other benefits declined notably year over year: TWS decreased the most (-34.2%),

while SE declined by 18.6%. Similarly, JCPs fell (-14.5%) and SD-R dropped by 11.7%. In 2012/13, Alberta increased the monthly benefits provided to SD program participants. Employment Benefits expenditures totalled \$78.8 million.

ALBERTA EBSM-SIMILAR PROGRAMMING	
Employment Benefits	
TWS	Workplace Training
SE	Self-Employment Training
JCPs	Integrated Training
SD	Occupational Training Work Foundations
Support Measures	
EAS	Career Information
LMPs	Workforce Partnerships

### 9.2 Support Measures: EAS

Alberta's EAS interventions declined for the third consecutive year, reaching 235,175 in 2012/13, a significant year-over-year decrease of 11.1%. EAS expenditures totalled \$28.1 million (-5.1%).

### 9.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs

Expenditures for LMPs more than doubled (+113.8%) to \$1.8 million. LMPs' share of total expenditures also increased, reaching 1.6%, up from 0.8% in 2011/12.

### 9.4 Managing for Results

Key findings from its summative evaluation recommended that the province address persistent skills shortages and prepare for significant future labour market shortages. In response to these findings, Alberta:

- co-chaired a policy realignment group—Building and Educating Tomorrow's Workforce: Alberta's 10-Year Strategy—to provide context for the Skill Investment Strategy Framework (examples of supported initiatives included the Mature Workers Strategy and Connecting the Dots: Aboriginal Workforce and Economic Development in Alberta);
- implemented changes to LMPs to improve collaboration with sectoral groups and employers; and
- conducted ongoing stakeholders' consultations to help people connect to the labour force.

### 9.5 Delivery Model

The Department of Human Services delivers EBSM-similar programming through 53 Alberta Works Centres across the province and through other partners, including community groups, non-profit and volunteers' organizations, municipal representatives, Aboriginal service organizations, immigrant service agencies, and Alberta post-secondary institutions, including public and private training providers. In addition, other contracted service providers help deliver training and employment programming.

## 10. British Columbia

Following a stable year in 2011/12, employment grew by 1.3% in 2012/13 (+29,900), with full-time employment adding 41,600 jobs, while part-time employment shed 11,700 jobs. Unemployment levels also decreased significantly (-10,900). As a result, British Columbia's unemployment rate dropped 0.5 percentage points to 6.6%, its lowest level since 2008/09. Interestingly, employment gains were almost 1.6 times greater for the female population of the province. Overall, the services-producing sector produced over 80% of all new employment opportunities (+24,900).

British Columbia continued to face labour market challenges, including an aging workforce, persistent skills shortages among vocational skills, and low labour market participation of underrepresented groups (i.e., Aboriginal people, immigrants, youth, older workers and people with disabilities).

The province advanced the following key labour market priorities in 2012/13: enhancing British Columbians' skills levels and labour market success; ensuring access to employment and labour market programs and services for underrepresented groups; and partnering with employers and communities to address regional and sector-specific labour market needs. British Columbia also planned to continue developing and improving its LMI services to help support both the supply and demand sides of the labour market and to help clients make well-informed decisions regarding labour market attachment and re-attachment, including community attachment.

British Columbia served 76,778 clients (-2.7%) with EBSM-similar programming in 2012/13. The mix of clients shifted from active claimants to non-insured clients, while the program mix shifted away from benefits to a much greater use of EAS.



## British Columbia

### EBSM Key Facts

Clients Served: 76,778		
El	Non-Insured	
45,256 ↓	31,522 ↑	
Active	Former	Non-Insured
41.6% ↓	17.3% ↑	41.1% ↑
Youth (15-24) <sup>1</sup>	Core Age (25-54)	Older Workers (55+)
14.8% ↓	70.8% ↓	14.5% ↑
Interventions: 214,651		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	16,975	1.6% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	197,676	92.5% ↑
Relative Share		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	7.9%	6.5 ↓
Support Measures: EAS	92.1%	6.5 ↑
Allocation: \$280.0 Million		
Expenditures	2012/13 (\$ Million)	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	\$136.8	3.3% ↓
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$71.2	38.0% ↓
· LMPs and R&I	\$14.8	36.5% ↑
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$222.9</b>	<b>16.6% ↓</b>
Managing for Results		
Indicator	Total	
Active Claimants Served	31,953	
Returns to Employment	16,777	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$112.51	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

The intervention-to-client ratio jumped from 1.52 to 2.8 interventions per client. Active claimants declined to 31,953 (-13.4%) and its share fell 5.1 percentage points to 41.6% of total clients served. Conversely, former claimants increased to 13,303 (+2.5%) and their share edged up slightly. Non-insured clients reached 31,522 (+8.4%) and their share also rose (+4.3 percentage points). British Columbia delivered a total of 214,651 interventions in 2012/13, a substantial year-over-year increase of 78.9% and a 10-year high. Employment Benefits accounted for

a decreasing 7.9% share of all interventions compared with 14.4% in 2011/12, while EAS (92.1%) represented the highest share for the province. A total of 16,777 clients returned to employment after participation in the program. Expenditures totalled \$222.9 million of \$280.0 million allocated.

### 10.1 Employment Benefits

As the economy and labour market continued to improve in 2012/13, the number of Employment Benefits interventions and EI Part I recipients both declined. For a third consecutive year, Employment Benefits decreased, reaching a 10-year low of 16,975 in 2012/13. While participation in SD-R grew by 2.1%, volumes decreased significantly for all other benefits—TWS (-45.8%), JCPs (-39.1%) and SD-A (-5.0%). SD-A continued to account for 54.3% of Employment Benefits interventions (9,211), an indication of a sustained commitment to apprenticeship. British Columbia's expenditures for Employment Benefits totalled \$136.8 million in 2012/13 compared with \$141.6 million in the previous year.

### BRITISH COLUMBIA EBSM-SIMILAR PROGRAMMING

#### Employment Benefits

TWS	Wage Subsidies
SE	Self-Employment
JCPs	Job Creation Partnerships
SD	Skills Development Employment Benefit

#### Support Measures

EAS	Employment Assistance Services
LMPs	Labour Market Partnerships Employer-Sponsored Training
R&I	Research and Innovation

### 10.2 Support Measures: EAS

While most Employment Benefits decreased in volume, the number of EAS interventions in the province almost doubled (+92.5%) to 197,676. EAS expenditures totalled \$71.2 million, as the province increased services to non-insured clients and growth in the economy created opportunities for quicker returns to employment.

### 10.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&I

British Columbia established a three-year fund for the BC Centre for Employment Excellence to engage and support both BC employment services sector and employers with research projects and information on employment and training programs, practices and resources. Following the establishment of the Centre and the implementation of the new service delivery model, BC's LMP expenditures fell significantly to \$4.5M million (-58.2%) and the province invested \$10.3 million in new R&I projects to support innovative approaches to the delivery of employment services in 2012/13.

### 10.4 Managing for Results

Key findings from British Columbia's summative evaluation highlighted a need to address lower participation rates in EBSMs among specialized populations; close service gaps for groups such as youth and multi-barriered clients; and improve data capture related to client activity. In response to these key findings, British Columbia:

- established an External Expert Advisory Panel on Specialized Populations to
  - examine the issue of program access,
  - identify potential gaps in services and emerging trends to better understand the extent to which program services are appropriate to the needs of specialized populations, and
  - consider best practices in recommending innovative changes to improve program access and service delivery;
- established an External Expert Advisory Panel for the overall performance of the Employment Program of British Columbia (EPBC) to
  - recommend enhancements to EPBC policy to improve outcomes for job seekers in British Columbia,
  - identify potential gaps in service and emerging trends, including those related to new populations, and
  - engage in initiatives that complement the annual priorities of the EPBC;
- measured outcomes against specific performance criteria; and
- developed a new service delivery model, integrated B.C. employment programming and introduced a new case management system.

### 10.5 Delivery Model

The EPBC was launched in April 2012. It is administered by the Employment and Labour Market Services Division of the Ministry of Social Development. Third-party service providers deliver the EPBC through WorkBC Employment Services Centres (WorkBC ESCs) in 73 locations. WorkBC ESCs give all job seekers equitable access to program services; operate the EPBC in accordance with policies and procedures to provide a consistent client experience and service quality; and tailor service delivery to specific needs.

## 11. Northwest Territories

Labour market conditions remained stable for the Northwest Territories in 2012/13. Employment and unemployment levels changed very little. Consequently, the unemployment rate remained unchanged at 8.1%.

The Northwest Territories faced a number of ongoing labour market challenges, including skills shortages, workforce mobility issues and insufficient growth in employment opportunities needed to drive down the unemployment rate. To address these challenges, the territory worked with Training Partnership Committees to establish plans to enhance skills development; facilitate workforce mobility and self-employment; foster opportunities for gaining work experience; support local labour market partnerships; initiate training programs to develop work-readiness skills; and set clear goals for new apprentices. Other key priorities included building capacity through LMDA programs and services and by working closely with Aboriginal governments.

In 2012/13, the overall number of clients accessing EBSM-similar programming in the Northwest Territories remained stable at 918. While the numbers of both active (314) and former (144) claimants declined (-4.0% and -5.9%, respectively) year over year, the number of non-insured clients continued to rise, reaching a 10-year high of 460 (+5.3%). N.W.T. delivered 1,221 interventions in 2012/13, a decline of 4.1%. Employment Benefits' share of this total represented a 10-year low (26.9%), while the proportion of EAS interventions increased to 73.1% compared with 68.1% in 2011/12. A total of 185 EI clients returned to employment following participation in EBSM-similar programming. EBSM expenditures totalled \$2.6 million of \$3.2 million allocated.

Northwest Territories EBSM Key Facts		
<b>Clients Served: 918</b>		
<b>EI</b>		<b>Non-Insured</b>
458 ↓		460 ↑
<b>Active</b>	<b>Former</b>	<b>Non-Insured</b>
34.2% ↓	15.7% ↓	50.1% ↑
<b>Youth (15-24)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Core Age (25-54)</b>	<b>Older Workers (55+)</b>
35.0% –	61.3% ↓	3.7% ↑
<b>Interventions: 1,221</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
Employment Benefits	329	19.0% ↓
Support Measures: EAS	892	2.9% ↑
<b>Relative Share</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change (p.p.)</b>
Employment Benefits	26.9%	4.9 ↓
Support Measures: EAS	73.1%	4.9 ↑
<b>Allocation: \$3.2 Million</b>		
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2012/13 (\$ Million)</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
Employment Benefits	\$1.4	23.1% ↓
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$0.9	8.1% ↑
· LMPs	\$0.3	32.7% ↑
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$2.6</b>	<b>8.8% ↓</b>
<b>Managing for Results</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Active Claimants Served	314	
Returns to Employment	185	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$2.16	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

### 11.1 Employment Benefits

The number of Employment Benefits interventions delivered in N.W.T. declined for the third consecutive year, down 19.0%. SD-R (-34.8%) and SD-A (-12.2%) declined for a second year, while SE and TWS remained almost unchanged in volume. SD-A participation declined in part because employers paid the wages of apprentices while they were on training. Total Employment Benefits expenditures fell significantly to \$1.4 million (-23.1%).

## NORTHWEST TERRITORIES EBSM-SIMILAR PROGRAMMING

### Employment Benefits

TWS Training on the Job  
Apprenticeship Training on the Job  
Youth Employment

SE Self-Employment Option

SD Building Essential Skills  
Building Essential Skills-Apprenticeship

### Support Measures

EAS Employment Assistance Services  
Career Development Service

LMPs Labour Market Partnerships

### 11.2 Support Measures: EAS

In 2012/13, the Northwest Territories delivered a total of 892 (+2.9%) EAS interventions—mainly Individual Counselling. EAS expenditures totalled \$932,000, a significant year-over-year increase of 8.1%.

### 11.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs

Expenditures for LMPs increased for a second year, reaching \$345,000 in 2012/13 (+32.7%), as the number of LMP initiatives doubled compared with the figure in 2011/12. LMP expenditures represented 13.0% of the territory's total expenditures for EBSM-similar programming compared with only 9.0% in 2011/12. The increase in LMP expenditures could be attributed to greater support for the coordination of Regional Training Partnership Committees to develop strategic training plans addressing community employment needs. In addition, the Department of Education, Culture and Employment (ECE) provided support to promote programs and services for trades and the mining industry.

### 11.4 Managing for Results

Key findings from the Northwest Territories summative evaluation highlighted a need to ensure the success of the client case management approach; address concerns about the adequacy of financial support; identify clients' multiple employment barriers and next steps; and address high staff turnover rates that led to uneven front-line service. In response to these findings, the territory:

- reviewed levels of financial assistance, and examined financial and other barriers to participation;

- provided additional training for front-line staff to address the impact of high turnover rates;
- implemented a range of flexible labour market programming, including literacy and community-based programs to address varied client needs; and
- explored ways to strategically tie LMPs to long-term labour force development plans, while responding to short-term local labour market needs.

### 11.5 Delivery Model

The ECE provides employment services through a combination of six ECE Service Centres and third-party service providers (community and Aboriginal organizations). The majority of employment services are delivered through ECE Service Centres, while third-party providers work mainly in rural areas and as small satellite providers, under the umbrella of the Northwest Territories government. Employment officers assist residents with career development needs and work in partnership with community leaders, organizations and governments. N.W.T. partnered with some Aboriginal organizations and governments to provide coordinated services. These organizations also receive funding directly from the Government of Canada to deliver employment services.

## 12. Yukon

Yukon's labour market conditions weakened for a second consecutive year. Employment decreased slightly (-0.5% or -100), while unemployment levels increased at a faster pace (+5.9% or +100). Consequently, the unemployment rate increased by 0.4 percentage points to 6.7% and the employment rate dropped by 1.6 percentage points.

To address labour market challenges, Yukon continued to focus on attracting skilled workers; increasing the workforce participation of its underrepresented and multi-barriered groups (e.g., social assistance recipients, persons with disabilities, older workers, youth, First Nations members, women in the trades, and immigrants); enhancing the quality of training and skills development, particularly in the growing sectors of the economy; facilitating workforce mobility; and improving labour market information to help workers make informed labour market choices. The territory also continued to provide support and guidance to its ongoing community-driven initiative, the *Disability Employment Strategy*, and to foster community

Yukon EBSM Key Facts		
<b>Clients Served: 705</b>		
<b>EI</b>		<b>Non-Insured</b>
431 ↑		274 ↑
<b>Active</b>	<b>Former</b>	<b>Non-Insured</b>
47.9% ↑	13.2% ↓	38.9% ↓
<b>Youth (15-24)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Core Age (25-54)</b>	<b>Older Workers (55+)</b>
23.2% ↑	62.8% ↑	13.8% ↓
<b>Interventions: 879</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
Employment Benefits	266	27.3% ↑
Support Measures: EAS	613	18.3% ↑
<b>Relative Share</b>		
	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change (p.p.)</b>
Employment Benefits	30.3%	1.5 ↑
Support Measures: EAS	69.7%	1.5 ↓
<b>Allocation: \$3.5 Million</b>		
<b>Expenditures</b>	<b>2012/13 (\$ Million)</b>	<b>Year-Over-Year Change</b>
Employment Benefits	\$2.1	0.9% ↑
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$1.2	0.4% ↓
· LMPs	\$0.1	40.7% ↓
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$3.5</b>	<b>1.7% ↓</b>
<b>Managing for Results</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Active Claimants Served	338	
Returns to Employment	256	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$2.14	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

engagement through the recently launched five labour market strategies, as part of the Yukon government's commitment to build on its Labour Market Framework.

A total of 705 clients accessed EBSM-similar programming in Yukon in 2012/13, an increase of 5.4% year over year. In addition to growing, the client mix shifted: active claimants rose by 10.8% and non-insured clients also increased (+2.6%), while former claimants fell (-4.1%). Clients participated in 879 interventions, a significant increase of 20.9%. Yukon served both highly employable individuals

requiring short-term interventions and clients with multiple employment barriers requiring more than one intervention. Employment Benefits accounted for 30.3% of interventions (+1.5 percentage points). Accordingly, EAS's share declined slightly to 69.7%. A total of 256 EI clients returned to employment following participation in EBSM-similar programming. EBSM expenditures remained stable at \$3.5 million.

### 12.1 Employment Benefits

Employment Benefits interventions delivered in Yukon increased by 27.3% year over year to a 10-year high of 266. All Employment Benefits activities increased in 2012/13. SD-A (+31.0%) and SD-R (+12.5%) both rose significantly. Additionally, SD-A participation reached a 10-year high, as the territory targeted the demand for skilled trades. Expenditures for Employment Benefits totalled \$2.1 million.

YUKON EBSM-SIMILAR PROGRAMMING	
Employment Benefits	
TWS	Targeted Wage Subsidies
SE	Self-Employment
SD	Skills Development Employment Benefit
Support Measures	
EAS	Employment Assistance Services
LMPs	Labour Market Partnerships Employer-Sponsored Training

### 12.2 Support Measures: EAS

Yukon delivered 613 EAS interventions in 2012/13, an increase of 18.3% year over year. Yukon's labour force comprises individuals with significant professional skills requiring little assistance beyond the labour exchange services delivered under EAS interventions. Employment Services made up 99.5% of all EAS, and total EAS expenditures remained stable at \$1.2 million.

### 12.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs

Yukon's total expenditures for LMPs fell to \$108,000 in 2012/13 (-40.7%). This figure accounted for a lower share (3.1%) of total EBSM expenditures compared with 5.1% last year.

### 12.4 Managing for Results

Key findings from Yukon's summative evaluation recommended the territory increase employer awareness of LMDA programs and address weaknesses in the client case management required to administer data and evaluate programming. To address these findings, Yukon:

- improved the labour market information available to clients;
- engaged stakeholders in developing a new approach to raising awareness of LMDA programs and services;
- enhanced the quality of skills development to better facilitate workforce mobility, and increase the participation of underrepresented groups and immigrants in the workforce, to meet labour market requirements;
- implemented a new case management system (Genie) to enhance administrative and data collection systems and processes; and
- reviewed programming to ensure program design and delivery is evidence based.

### 12.5 Delivery Model

Yukon's EBSM-similar programming is delivered mainly by EAS providers (community and non-governmental organizations). The Department of Education is working to fully integrate labour market programming by implementing Genie to unify the case management and program delivery model across all programs. The department is also streamlining EAS in Whitehorse by using a new service model with fewer providers and less duplication of administrative costs.

## 13. Nunavut

Labour market conditions improved in Nunavut for a second consecutive year. Compared with 2011/12, employment increased at a faster pace (+3.0%) than unemployment (+2.2%). Consequently, the territory's unemployment rate decreased by 2.0 percentage points to 14.0%.

Nunavut continued to face several major labour market challenges: low labour force participation and high unemployment rates, coupled with seasonal employment; skills shortages, low levels of literacy and educational attainment; and capacity issues related to delivering employment programming. The territory focused on the following key priorities in 2012/13: delivering skills development, particularly

## Nunavut

### EBSM Key Facts

Clients Served: 432		
EI	Non-Insured	
213 ↑	219 ↑	
Active	Former	Non-Insured
23.1% ↓	26.2% ↓	50.7% ↑
Youth (15-24) <sup>1</sup>	Core Age (25-54)	Older Workers (55+)
35.5% ↑	62.1% ↓	1.9% ↓
Interventions: 475		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	176	25.7% ↑
Support Measures: EAS	299	74.9% ↑
Relative Share		
	2012/13	Year-Over-Year Change (p.p.)
Employment Benefits	37.1%	8.0 ↓
Support Measures: EAS	62.9%	8.0 ↑
Allocation: \$2.9 Million		
Expenditures	2012/13 (\$ Million)	Year-Over-Year Change
Employment Benefits	\$1.5	2.2% ↓
Support Measures		
· EAS	\$0	0.0% –
· LMPs and R&I	\$0.1	917.9% ↑
<b>Total Expenditures<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$1.7</b>	<b>0.6% ↑</b>
Managing for Results		
Indicator	Total	
Active Claimants Served	100	
Returns to Employment	53	
Unpaid Benefits (\$ Million)	\$0.40	

<sup>1</sup> Age distribution does not equal 100%, as the "unknown" category is not reported here. Date of birth is not collected for clients in SD-A and Group Services.

<sup>2</sup> Totals may not add up precisely due to rounding. Figures do not include accounting adjustments.

for trades and trades-related preparation programs; providing literacy and upgrading support; providing career development, education and training, and employability services to new and young workers; and improving service delivery capacity through additional training and support.

A total of 432 clients accessed EBSM-similar programming in Nunavut in 2012/13, an increase of 56.5% year over year. Both the mix and number of interventions shifted. The number of non-insured clients increased significantly (+146.1%) and

represented 50.7% of all clients, up significantly from 32.2% in 2011/12. Former claimants' number also rose (+41.3%), but their share declined to 26.2% from 29.0% in 2011/12. Conversely, both the number and share of active claimants (23.1%) declined from last year's levels. Clients participated in 475 interventions, a remarkable year-over-year increase of 52.7%. Nunavut increased awareness of its employment services and expanded outreach efforts to promote its EBSM-similar programming. The territory also aligned its programming to meet the needs of major industrial development projects in the North Baffin Region. Employment Benefits represented a declining share (37.1%) of total interventions. A total of 53 EI clients returned to employment after participating in the program. Expenditures for EBSM-similar programming totalled \$1.7 million of \$2.9 million allocated.

### 13.1 Employment Benefits

The number of Employment Benefits interventions delivered in Nunavut rose by 25.7% to 176. TWS increased significantly (+62.9%) and accounted for a growing share (32.4%) of total benefits, up from 23.5% in 2003/04. This reflected the territory's focus on making its Training on the Job (TOJ) program more accessible to employers, particularly employers who hire apprentices. SD-R also increased (+17.7%), but its share fell significantly to 41.5% from 60.6% in 2003/04. Conversely, the share of SD-A (26.1%) was almost double its 14.2% share in 2003/04, despite a year-over-year decline. Combined, SD continued to account for the majority of Employment Benefits (67.6%). The observed shifts in benefits interventions could be attributed to changes in the implementation timelines of major industrial projects in 2012/13, including the activation of sub-contractors and human resources activities in the North Baffin Region. Employment Benefits expenditures totalled \$1.5 million (-2.2%).

## NUNAVUT

### EBSM-SIMILAR PROGRAMMING

#### Employment Benefits

TWS Training on the Job

SD Building Essential Skills

#### Support Measures

EAS Employment Assistance Services

LMPs Labour Market Partnerships

R&I Research and Innovation

### 13.2 Support Measures: EAS

For the second consecutive year, EAS interventions increased significantly. Employment Services, the sole EAS intervention reported in 2012/13, rose 74.9% (+128) to 299. The significant increase in EAS interventions resulted from greater use of EAS as the gateway to all programs.

### 13.3 Other Support Measures: LMPs and R&I

Nunavut invested in LMP initiatives for the first time since 2005/06. The territory launched a pilot project with Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation, as well as with the regional Aboriginal Skills and Employment Training Strategy (ASETS) holder, Kakivak Association to assist in capacity-building and in addressing challenges of a cross-cultural work environment in three North Baffin communities. LMP expenditures totalled \$143,000 and represented 8.6% of the territory's 2012/13 total EBSM expenditures.

### 13.4 Managing for Results

Key findings from Nunavut's summative evaluation highlighted a number of areas for further improvements. Recommendations included addressing the underutilization of program funds, the high cost per participant and the inadequacy of administrative data systems, and minimizing overlap between the programs delivered under the LMDA and the ASETS. In response to these findings, the territory integrated a range of flexible labour market programming to address client needs. It is also implementing a new case management system to improve data collection and reporting.

### 13.5 Delivery Model

The Department of Family Services, established in April 2013, delivers the full range of EBSM-similar programming through the offices of Career and Early Childhood Services. Nunavut harmonized programs and services around clients' needs and streamlined funding across several programs. To ensure all clients received EAS, the territory initiated new partnerships with a number of organizations, such as Kakivak and Kitikmeot Inuit associations, the Department of Education and the Nunavut Francophone Society. The territory also implemented a new case management system.

## III. NATIONAL EVALUATION OF EBSM MEDIUM-TERM INCREMENTAL IMPACTS

*The following presents results from an analysis of the medium-term incremental impacts of EBSMs on active and former EI claimants across Canada who participated in EBSMs between 2002 and 2005. It estimated impacts over a period of up to five years after clients' participation. This analysis shows that participating in Skills Development (SD), Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS), Job Creation Partnerships (JCP) and Employment Assistance Services (EAS) generally improved the employment and/or earnings of active and former claimants. As well, active claimants, who represent the majority of EBSM participants, generally decreased their use of EI over the medium term. Overall, these results are generally consistent with the impacts presented in last year's report, which pertained to 10% of active claimants who ended their EBSM participation between 2001 and 2003.*

### 1. Study Objective and Methodology

The objective of the incremental impact analysis is to allow direct attribution of impacts to the EBSMs by assessing the difference participation makes, when compared with non-participation or participation in low intensity return-to-employment assistance.<sup>17</sup>

The analysis covered 100% of active and former claimants from all 13 provinces and territories (P/Ts) who started their participation in TWS, Self-Employment (SE) or JCP between April 1, 2002, and March 31, 2005, as well as 50% of active claimants who started participation in SD and 10% of active claimants who started participation in EAS during the same period. The assessment of SD and EAS impacts was limited to a random sample of active claimants due to the very large number of individuals participating in these interventions.

Incremental impacts were estimated using linked administrative data from EI part I and II and the Canada Revenue Agency. For active claimants, the impacts were measured relative to active claimants who did not participate in the programs during the years 2002 to 2005. In the case of former claimants, it is not

<sup>17</sup> Incremental impacts represent the difference between the participants' outcomes before and after their participation period minus the difference between the non-participants' outcomes before and after the participation period.

## Indicators Covered in the Analysis

- **Average employment earnings** (including earnings from employment and self-employment): An increase in employment 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 earning money 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 services.  
Gains in incidence of employment accompanied by gains in employment earnings indicate that participants improved the duration of their employment.
- **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.

possible to identify an appropriate comparison group of non-participants using administrative data. In this context, the impacts of participating in SD, TWS, SE and JCP for former claimants were measured relative to former claimants who received only EAS. Therefore, for active claimants, the analysis measured the net effects of participating in EBSMs relative to non-participation; for former claimants, it estimated the differential effects of receiving Employment Benefits relative to low-intensity return-to-employment assistance. Because two different comparison groups were used, the results for active claimants are not directly comparable to those for former claimants.

This analysis presents statistically significant results at the 95% confidence level.

## 2. Active Claimants: Incremental Impact Results

### 2.1 Skills Development (SD)

**Active claimants had higher employment earnings, were more likely to be employed and had lower use of EI after participating in SD.**

Due to the very large number of active claimants participating in SD, the analysis was limited to a random sample of 50% of active claimants who started their participation between 2002 and 2005. This represented 64,283 individuals across Canada. The results show that participation in SD increased the employment earnings of active claimants. In particular, active claimants had incremental increases in earnings in each year following participation, and the size of the increases grew continuously over each of the five years, going from \$204 in the first year to \$4,059 in the fifth year post-program. This means that during the five years following participation, the annual employment earnings of active claimants were \$204 to \$4,059 higher than they would have been if the active claimants had not participated. In total, over the five post-program years, active claimants each earned \$13,156 more than they would have if they had not participated.

The incidence of employment of active claimants also increased in each year following participation. As with earnings, the size of the impacts on incidence of employment grew continuously over the five-year period, going from 2.4 percentage points during the first year to 4.4 percentage points in the fifth year. This shows that active claimants were more likely to be employed after participating in SD than they would have been if they had not participated. As well, since the increases in incidence of employment were accompanied by increases in earnings, active claimants appear to have also improved the duration of their employment.

SD also reduced the use of EI for active claimants. The average annual amount of EI benefits collected decreased in all years after participation, but the size of the decrease tended to diminish over time, going from \$470 in the first year to \$69 in the fifth year. In total, over the five years following the end of participation, the active claimants collected \$976 less in EI benefits than they would have if they had not participated. Such decreases were accompanied by small reductions in the number of weeks in receipt of EI benefits, ranging from 1.7 weeks in the first year after participation to 0.3 week in the fifth year. The total reduction after five years was 3.7 weeks.



## 2.2 Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS)

**Active claimants had higher earnings and incidence of employment after participating in TWS. Their use of EI increased modestly after participation, but mainly in the fourth and fifth years after program end.**

The 18,767 active claimants covered by the analysis had increases in their employment earnings in each of the five years following their participation in TWS, and the size of the impact grew steadily over time. Specifically, they had incremental gains in their average annual earnings ranging from \$661 to \$1,930. In total, over the five years after their participation, their earnings were \$7,125 higher than they would have been if the active claimants had not participated. Active claimants were also more likely to be employed after participating in TWS. They had annual incremental increases in their incidence of employment ranging from 4.9 to 5.1 percentage points in each of the five years after participation. Since the increases in earnings were accompanied by an increase in incidence of employment, this suggests that active claimants increased the duration of their employment.

Participation in TWS may not have had any impacts on the use of EI benefits in the first three years after program end. The results are not statistically significant but point to very small decreases or increases representing almost no impact. Such a trend is somewhat confirmed by the results pertaining to the number of weeks in receipt of EI benefits, which increased only slightly during those years (i.e., by 0.3 to 0.5 weeks). The average annual amount of EI benefits collected by active claimants increased by \$104 in the fourth year after participation and by \$146 in the fifth year, while the average number of weeks spent on EI increased by 0.4 and 0.5 weeks during those years, respectively. In total, over the five years after participation, active claimants increased their use of EI benefits by \$339 and the number of weeks in receipt of EI benefits by 2.1 weeks.

## 2.3 Self-Employment (SE)

**The incremental impact results only provide partial evidence of the effectiveness of SE.**

Impacts of SE on participants' earnings were measured using employment and self-employment information available from taxation records of the Canada Revenue Agency. Impacts were assessed based on the personal employment/self-employment income of participants and comparison cases. The results do not necessarily capture the full business income and do not account for all the fiscal advantages that are applicable to self-employed individuals. A study from Statistics Canada showed that 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 households of paid employees, which indicates that some may leave funds within their business for reinvestment purposes.<sup>18</sup> This suggests that personal income may not be a complete indicator of the financial well-being of self-employed people, and a more complete assessment of SE effectiveness would need to account for the net worth of their households and business income.

The focus of the evaluation is on assessing whether the assistance provided under SE is effective at providing participants with sustainable employment; it does not take into account the success of the participants' businesses. However, the ability of participants to generate sustainable employment for themselves also depends largely on how successful their business is.

**Active claimants had lower earnings, incidence of employment and use of EI after their participation in SE.**

The analysis covered 20,688 active claimants who received SE. These participants had lower earnings after participating in SE than they would have if they had not participated. The incremental decrease ranged from \$11,041 in the first year post-participation to \$6,870 in the fifth year, but the size of the impact declined continuously over the years. In total, employment/self-employment earnings decreased by \$43,066 over the post-program period. Active claimants also had incremental decreases in their incidence of employment/self-employment

<sup>18</sup> 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.

ranging from 21.9 percentage points in the first year after participation to 12.3 percentage points in the fifth year. As happened with earnings, the size of the decreases diminished continuously over time.

Active claimants collected less in EI benefits and spent less time on EI after participating in SE. The average annual amount of EI benefits collected decreased by \$1,304 in the first year after participation and by \$712 in the fifth year, while the number of weeks in receipt of EI benefits was reduced by 4.0 to 1.9 weeks in those same years, respectively. For both indicators, the size of the decrease diminished steadily over the period. The decreases totalled \$4,635 and 13.4 weeks over the post-program period. However, such reductions in the use of EI should be interpreted carefully, since self-employment was not insurable under EI during the period covered by the analysis (i.e., 2002 to 2005). The impact results may reflect EI eligibility effects rather than program effects.

#### 2.4 Job Creation Partnerships (JCP)

**Active claimants had higher employment earnings and incidence of employment after participating in JCP. Their use of EI also decreased.**

Incremental impacts were measured for 5,055 active claimants. After these claimants participated in JCP, their employment earnings grew steadily in size. The annual gains in earnings ranged between \$1,899 in the first year after participation and \$4,409 in the fifth year. The incremental gain over the post-program period totalled \$16,552. Along with those increases in earnings, active claimants were also more likely to be employed, as their incidence of employment increased by 5.5 to 6.3 percentage points in each of the five years after participation. The simultaneous increases in earnings and in incidence of employment indicate that active claimants improved their employment duration after participating in JCP.

The amount of EI benefits collected and the number of weeks in receipt of EI benefits decreased in all years after participation, but only the results for the first two years were statistically significant. The incremental decreases were \$549 and 1.6 weeks in the first year, and \$220 and 0.5 week in the second year. Over the five years following participation, active claimants reduced their use of EI benefits by \$893 and the number of weeks in receipt of EI by 2.1 weeks.

#### 2.5 Employment Assistance Services (EAS)

**Active claimants who received only EAS improved their employment and reduced their use of EI after participation. Their employment earnings decreased in the first two years following program end but increased in the following three years.**

EAS are often delivered in combination with Employment Benefits, but some participants may receive only one or more services under EAS without accessing other EBSMs. The incremental impacts were examined for the active claimants who participated only in EAS (referred to as EAS-only). Due to the very large number of active claimants participating in EAS-only, the analysis was limited to a random sample of 10% of active claimants who started their participation between 2002 and 2005. This represented 38,564 individuals across Canada.

Active claimants had incremental decreases of \$1,097 and \$279 in their employment earnings in the first and second year following the end of participation. Their earnings started to increase in the third year following participation, but only the results for the fourth and fifth years—gains of \$645 and \$742, respectively—were statistically significant at the 95% level. The total impact over the post-program period was a small increase in earnings, but the result was not statistically significant.

Active claimants had incremental increases in their incidence of employment ranging between 0.8 and 1.8 percentage points in the second to fifth years after participation. The result for the first year was not statistically significant at the 95% level but still represented an increase in incidence of employment.

The use of EI decreased in all years after participation. The incremental decreases in the average annual amount of EI benefits collected ranged between \$451 in the first year post-program and \$136 in the fifth year. Active claimants also had decreases in the number of weeks in receipt of EI benefits ranging between 1.5 weeks in the first year post-program and 0.4 week in the fifth year. For both indicators, the size of the reduction diminished steadily over the period. In total, over the five years following the end of participation, the average amount of EI benefits collected decreased by \$1,375, while the number of weeks in receipt of EI benefits decreased by 4.3 weeks.

Overall, the increases in incidence of employment and the decreases in EI use indicate that active claimants found employment following their participation in EAS-only. The results also suggest that the employment was sustained over time, since the impacts were maintained over the five years after participation and were accompanied by gains in earnings, starting in the third year post-program. The objective of EAS is to help individuals return to work by providing services such as counselling, job-finding clubs and help in preparing for an interview. Since these services are not focused on human capital development or acquisition of employment-related skills, the primary expected outcome may not relate to improving the earnings of participants in the short term.

### **3. Former Claimants: Incremental Impact Results**

#### **3.1 Skills Development (SD)**

**Former claimants improved their earnings and incidence of employment but generally increased their use of EI benefits after participating in SD.**

Impacts were examined for 42,513 former claimants who participated in SD. As with active claimants, the results show that these individuals improved their employment earnings after participation. Specifically, they had incremental gains in earnings in every year after participation and the size of the impacts grew steadily over time. The increases grew from \$496 in the first year after participation to \$2,521 in the fifth year. In total, over the five years following the end of their participation, former claimants earned \$8,923 more than they would have if they had participated only in EAS.

Their earnings gains were accompanied by increases in incidence of employment in each of the five years after participation, which suggests that former claimants improved the duration of their employment. Incidence of employment rose by 3 percentage points in the first year after participation and by 5 percentage points in each of the four following years. Such increases indicate that former claimants were more likely to be employed after participating in SD than they would have been if they had only received EAS.

In the first year following the end of participation, former claimants reduced the average annual amount of EI benefits collected by \$54 but increased their use of EI benefits in all other years. Those increases ranged between \$171 and \$217 annually. Not surprisingly,

the number of weeks spent on EI decreased modestly by 0.4 weeks in the first year after participation and increased by 0.4 to 0.6 weeks in the remaining years. In total, over the five years following participation, former claimants increased the average amount of EI benefits collected by \$720 and the number of weeks in receipt of EI benefits by 1.5 weeks.

#### **3.2 Targeted Wage Subsidies (TWS)**

**TWS increased the employment earnings and incidence of employment of former claimants. These participants increased their use of EI after participation, which suggests that some may have gone back onto EI after their subsidized employment ended.**

The analysis covered 24,523 former claimants. Like active claimants, these participants increased their earnings and incidence of employment in each of the five years following participation in TWS. The annual increases in earnings ranged between \$1,850 and \$2,180. This resulted in a total gain of \$10,353 over the five years following the end of participation. Such increases in earnings were accompanied by annual increases in incidence of employment ranging between 5.5 and 6.9 percentage points.

Their use of EI increased in all years following participation, but the size of the impacts decreased steadily over time. The increases in the average annual amount of EI benefits collected ranged between \$679 in the first year following participation and \$296 in the fifth year, while the increases in the number of weeks in receipt of EI benefits ranged between 2.4 weeks in the first year and 0.7 week in the fifth year. In total, over the five years following participation, the amount of EI benefits former claimants collected increased by \$2,220, while the number of weeks in receipt of EI benefits increased by 7.1 weeks. Since the subsidized employment provided under TWS is insurable under EI, those results may indicate that some participants may have gone back onto EI after their subsidized job ended.

#### **3.3 Self-Employment (SE)**

**Like active claimants, former claimants saw reductions in earnings, incidence of employment and use of EI following their participation in SE.**

Incremental impacts were examined for 8,882 former claimants. As with active claimants, the incremental impacts for former claimants provide a partial picture of the effectiveness of SE for these participants.

The results show that former claimants saw decreases in their employment/self-employment earnings in each year after participation, but the size of the decreases diminished continuously over time, from \$7,121 in the first year to \$4,506 in the fifth year. In total, over the five years following the end of participation, former claimants earned \$27,939 less from employment or self-employment than they would have if they had not participated. They also saw reductions in their incidence of employment/self-employment ranging from 18.4 percentage points in the first year post-program to 9.8 percentage points in the fifth year.

Former claimants also saw reductions in the annual average amount of EI benefits collected ranging between \$344 and \$736 after participation. Similarly, the decreases in the number of weeks in receipt of EI benefits ranged between 2.4 weeks in the first year after participation and 0.9 week in the fifth year. In total, over the five years following participation in SE, former claimants reduced their use of EI by \$2,341 and 6.8 weeks. As with active claimants, those results should be interpreted carefully, since self-employed individuals were not entitled to EI during the period covered by the analysis.

### 3.4 Job Creation Partnerships (JCP)

#### **Former claimants increased their earnings and incidence of employment, but also increased their EI use, after participating in JCP.**

Incremental impacts were examined for 5,013 former claimants who participated in JCP. According to the results, these participants improved their employment earnings in each year following participation. On an annual basis, they had incremental gains in earnings ranging between \$821 and \$1,151. These totalled \$4,790 over the five years following participation. At the same time, their incidence of employment rose in each year after their participation. The annual incremental increases ranged between 3.8 and 4.9 percentage points. Along with the earnings increases, this suggests that former claimants improved their employment duration in the post-program period.

The participants saw small and statistically non-significant increases in their use of EI benefits and weeks in the first year after program end. Statistically significant increases occurred for both indicators in the remaining years of the post-program period. Those ranged between \$144 and \$284 in EI benefits collected and between 0.5 and 1 week. In total, over the five years following participation, former claimants increased their use of EI benefits by \$1,006 and 3.3 weeks.

## 4. Conclusions and Lessons Learned

In summary, participation in SD, TWS, JCP and EAS-only generally improved the employment earnings and/or the incidence of employment of both active and former claimants. As well, except for TWS and SE recipients, a majority of EBSM participants reduced their reliance on EI over the medium term. TWS participants gained EI eligibility while SE participants were not entitled to EI during the period observed. Specifically, results show post-program use of EI decreased among active claimants, who represented 65% of the EI-eligible EBSM participants during the observed period, while it generally increased among former claimants, who represented 35% of participants. The findings are generally consistent with the international literature on the effectiveness of programming similar to EBSMs. The following presents the key lessons learned from the analysis, as well as areas for future investigation identified for each EBSM type.

### 4.1 Skills Development

SD increased the earnings and incidence of employment of both active and former claimants. Active claimants also saw small reductions in their use of EI after participation. The positive impacts of SD on earnings and employment may be explained by its focus on helping participants obtain credentials. Specifically, survey results from the first cycle of LMDA evaluations showed that most SD participants obtained a certificate or diploma as a result of their participation.<sup>19</sup> As reported in a study from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), such credentials may signal participants' productivity to prospective employers.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>19</sup> The surveys conducted during the summative evaluation in four jurisdictions showed that between 73% and 78% of participants received a certificate or a diploma as a result of their SD participation.

<sup>20</sup> John P. Martin and David Grubb, *What Works and for Whom: A Review of OECD Countries' Experiences With Active Labour Market Policies* (Paris: OECD, 2001).

Overall, the incremental impacts are consistent with those revealed in studies from other OECD countries, which show that public training programs have positive labour market impacts on the employment and earnings of adult participants.<sup>21</sup> Interestingly, a meta-analysis of 97 micro-econometric evaluations of active labour market policies in various countries reported that classroom and on-the-job training programs were more likely to yield better outcomes 12 to 24 months after participation than they were in the shorter term.<sup>22</sup> This is somewhat in line with the analysis of SD, which showed that the increases in earnings and incidence of employment of active and former claimants grew steadily over the five years following participation.

#### 4.2 Targeted Wage Subsidies

TWS increased the earnings and incidence of employment of both active and former claimants. EI use rose among former claimants following their participation, while it may not have changed among active claimants in the first three years after program end and then risen in the following years. These findings are consistent with studies of wage subsidies in other OECD countries, which generally indicate that participation in such programs results in modest gains in employment.<sup>23</sup>

Of all the Employment Benefits, TWS has led to the best impacts for former claimants. This suggests that individuals who have had substantial periods out of the labour force may be gaining the most from this type of programming, since the temporary subsidy reduces employers' costs of getting them "up to speed" in their jobs.<sup>24</sup>

#### 4.3 Self-Employment

Active and former claimants who participated in SE saw reductions in earnings and incidence of employment, as well as reductions in EI use. However, those results just provide a partial picture of the effectiveness of this EBSM, since the analysis did not account for the net worth of the self-employed household and the success of the business created. A detailed study of SE will

be conducted in the second cycle of LMDA evaluations to generate a more complete assessment of its effectiveness.

#### 4.4 Job Creation Partnerships

The incremental impact analysis showed that both active and former claimants improved their earnings and their incidence of employment after participating in JCP. A similar trend was observed for active claimants, but not for former claimants, in the 2012 analysis. Overall, the results may appear a little surprising, since the first cycle of LMDA evaluations did not allow ESDC to draw any clear conclusions about the effectiveness of JCP and often showed mixed impacts. As well, the literature generally showed that public service employment programming similar to JCP is relatively ineffective or has the least favourable impacts of all active labour market programs.<sup>25</sup> This illustrates the need to examine JCP more closely to better understand the characteristics of its participants in comparison to those of participants in other EBSMs, and to better understand how this Employment Benefit is designed and delivered. A more detailed study of JCP will be undertaken as part of the second cycle of LMDA evaluations.

#### 4.5 Employment Assistance Services

Active claimants who received only EAS improved their incidence of employment and reduced their use of EI after participation. Their employment earnings decreased in the first two years following program end but increased between the third and fifth years. These findings reflect general trends identified in studies in other countries, which usually found that employment services similar to EAS could have positive impacts.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>21</sup> HRSDC, *Technical Report on the Literature Review of Active Labour Market Policies* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2011).

<sup>22</sup> David Card, Jochen Kluge and Andrea Weber, *Active Labour Market Policy Evaluations: A Meta-Analysis* (Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labour (IZA), Discussion Paper No. 4002, February 2009).

<sup>23</sup> HRSDC, *Technical Report on the Literature Review of Active Labour Market Policies* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2011).

<sup>24</sup> HRSDC, based on work by Walter Nicholson, Amherst College, *An Overview of the Summative Evaluations of EBSMs Delivered Under the Labour Market Development Agreements in Canada: Summary of Quantitative Results* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2011).

<sup>25</sup> HRSDC, *Technical Report on the Literature Review of Active Labour Market Policies* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2011); David Card, Jochen Kluge and Andrea Weber, *Active Labour Market Policy Evaluations: A Meta-Analysis* (Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labour (IZA), Discussion Paper No. 4002, February 2009).

<sup>26</sup> HRSDC, *Technical Report on the Literature Review of Active Labour Market Policies* (Ottawa: HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate, 2011).

## Incremental Impacts

Indicators	Post-Program Period					Impact Over the Total Post-Program Period
	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	Fourth Year	Fifth Year	
<b>Active Claimants</b>						
<b>Skills Development (n=64,283)</b>						
Employment earnings (\$)	204*	2,052*	3,077*	3,761*	4,059*	13,156*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	2.4*	3.7*	4*	4.2*	4.4*	N/A
El benefits (\$)	-470*	-218*	-128*	-89*	-69*	-976*
El weeks (weeks)	-1.7*	-0.8*	-0.5*	-0.4*	-0.3*	-3.7*
<b>Targeted Wage Subsidies (n=18,767)</b>						
Employment earnings (\$)	661*	971*	1,747*	1,815*	1,930*	7,125*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	5.0*	4.9*	5.1*	5.0*	5.1*	N/A
El benefits (\$)	-2	52	39	104*	146*	339*
El weeks (weeks)	0.5*	0.4*	0.3*	0.4*	0.5*	2.1*
<b>Self-Employment (n=20,688)</b>						
Employment earnings (\$)	-11,041*	-9,331*	-8,376*	-7,449*	-6,870*	-43,066*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	-21.9*	-17.4*	-15.2*	-13.7*	-12.3*	N/A
El benefits (\$)	-1,304*	-1,036*	-809*	-774*	-712*	-4,635*
El weeks (weeks)	-4*	-3.1*	-2.3*	-2.1*	-1.9*	-13.4*
<b>Job Creation Partnerships (n=5,055)</b>						
Employment earnings (\$)	1,899*	2,825*	3,450*	3,969*	4,409*	16,552*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	5.5*	5.6*	6*	5.8*	6.3*	N/A
El benefits (\$)	-549*	-220*	-55	-14	-55	-893*
El weeks (weeks)	-1.6*	-0.5*	-0.1	0.1	0	-2.1*
<b>Employment Assistance Services (EAS) (n=38,564)</b>						
Employment earnings (\$)	-1,097*	-279*	347	645*	742*	358
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	0.6	0.8*	1.7*	1.8*	1.7*	N/A
El benefits (\$)	-451*	-312*	-251*	-222*	-136*	-1,375*
El weeks (weeks)	-1.5*	-0.9*	-0.8*	-0.7*	-0.4*	-4.3*
<b>Former Claimants</b>						
<b>Skills Development (n=42,513)</b>						
Employment earnings (\$)	496*	1,550*	2,029*	2,326*	2,521*	8,923*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	3*	5*	5*	5*	5*	N/A
El benefits (\$)	-54*	171*	217*	203*	183*	720*
El weeks (weeks)	-0.4*	0.5*	0.6*	0.5*	0.4*	1.5*
<b>Targeted Wage Subsidies (n=24,523)</b>						
Employment earnings (\$)	2,134*	1,850*	2,017*	2,173*	2,180*	10,353*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	6.9*	6.2*	5.7*	5.5*	5.7*	N/A
El benefits (\$)	679*	499*	397*	349*	296*	2,220*
El weeks (weeks)	2.4*	1.6*	1.2*	1*	0.7*	7.1*

Continued on next page...

## Incremental Impacts (CONTINUED)

Indicators	Post-Program Period					Impact Over the Total Post-Program Period
	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	Fourth Year	Fifth Year	
<b>Self-Employment (n=8,882)</b>						
Employment earnings (\$)	-7,121*	-5,978*	-5,448*	-4,886*	-4,506*	-27,939*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	-18.4*	-15*	-12*	-11*	-9.8*	N/A
EI benefits (\$)	-736*	-521*	-360*	-344*	-381*	-2,341*
EI weeks (weeks)	-2.4*	-1.5*	-1*	-0.9*	-0.9*	-6.8*
<b>Job Creation Partnerships (n=5,013)</b>						
Employment earnings (\$)	869*	821*	1,151*	942*	1,008*	4,790*
Incidence of employment (percentage points)	4.9*	4.0*	4.8*	4.0*	3.8*	N/A
EI benefits (\$)	44	284*	144*	276*	258*	1,006*
EI weeks (weeks)	0.2	1*	0.5*	0.9*	0.8*	3.3*

\* Statistically significant results at the 95% confidence level or higher.

## IV. PAN-CANADIAN ACTIVITIES AND THE NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

*This section analyzes pan-Canadian activities that ESDC delivers using EI Part II funds.*

Pan-Canadian activities support ESDC's strategic outcomes of creating a skilled, adaptable and inclusive labour force, and an efficient labour market. 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. Expenditures are grouped into three categories: Employment Benefits and Support Measures (EBSMs) for Aboriginal communities, nationally funded Labour Market Partnerships (LMPs), and Research and Innovation (R&I).


In 2012/13, program expenditures in pan-Canadian streams totalled \$153.4 million, delivered through ASETS (\$93.1 million), LMPs (\$48.7 million) and R&I (\$11.6 million).

**Aboriginal Programming** funds Aboriginal groups to deliver programming that improves Aboriginal people's access to employment and skills training. The **Aboriginal Skills and Employment Training Strategy (ASETS)** is the main vehicle for delivering EBSMs to Aboriginal communities.

**Labour Market Partnerships (LMPs)** encourage and support employers, employee and/or employer associations, and communities that are developing and implementing strategies to deal with labour force adjustments and meet human resources requirements. **Investments in workplace skills** fund initiatives (e.g., literacy and essential skills activities) that

**CHART 8**

Pan-Canadian Expenditures, 2012/13 (\$ Million)\*



\* Total percentages may not add up exactly due to rounding.

foster the availability of a national pool of skilled labour and an integrated, efficient national labour market. LMPs include the following:

- Youth Awareness;
- Sectoral Initiatives;
- National Essential Skills (a portion is also under R&I); and
- Reducing Barriers to Labour Market Mobility.

**R&I** supports activities that identify better ways of helping persons prepare for or keep employment, and be productive participants in the labour force.

**Supporting agreements with provinces and territories (P/Ts) and the Labour Market Information (LMI) service** support efforts to modernize and improve the quality, accessibility and client focus of support service delivery and labour market information. This is achieved through initiatives such as;

- a portion of the National Essential Skills;
- research on Financial Assistance for Foreign Temporary Workers; and
- What Works in Career Development Services.

In addition, \$30.6 million was used to support the operational costs of certain pan-Canadian-funded programs and activities in 2012/13.

## 1. Aboriginal Programming<sup>27</sup>

Pan-Canadian funding in the Aboriginal Programming stream is delivered through ASETS. The objective of ASETS is to increase Aboriginal participation in the Canadian labour market, ensuring that First Nations, Inuit and Métis people are engaged in sustainable, meaningful employment.

### Pan-Canadian Programming in Action: Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council

The Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council has a vision of providing equitable social, economic, political and technical support to its 14 Nuu-chah-nulth First Nations. Divided into three regions—southern, central and northern—the Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council delivers education, training and employment services to approximately 8,000 registered members. Based on Vancouver Island along approximately 300 kilometres of the Pacific Coast, from Brooks Peninsula in the north to Point-no-Point in the south, the Nuu-chah-nulth and its affiliated agencies operate out of Port Alberni, British Columbia. In 2012/13, the Nuu-chah-nulth Employment and Training Programs assisted almost 400 clients, placed more than 150 Aboriginal people in employment and supported more than 50 Aboriginal people returning to school.

ASETS aims to improve labour market outcomes by supporting demand-driven skills development, fostering partnerships with the private sector and P/Ts, and increasing accountability and results. It also supports the development of a skilled Aboriginal workforce, which is one of the objectives of the Federal Framework for Aboriginal Economic Development.

ASETS supports a network of 85 Aboriginal service delivery organizations (agreement holders), with more than 600 points of service across Canada. These organizations help develop and deliver training and employment programs and services that are best suited to the unique needs of their clients. These programs and services help Aboriginal clients prepare for, obtain and maintain meaningful and sustainable employment, and assist Aboriginal youth to make the successful transition from school to work, or support their return to school.

Canada's 2012/13 investment in ASETS totalled \$347.6 million, which included expenditures of \$93.1 million in EI Part II funds. ASETS funding helped organizations serve more than 51,000 clients, helping more than 16,000 to find jobs and more than 7,000 to return to school.

<sup>27</sup> The results provided for 2012/13 include EI Part II and the Consolidated Revenue Fund (CRF). Future EI Monitoring and Assessment Reports will only include EI Part II results for the ASETS program. Statistics for clients funded through EI Part II can be found in Annex 3.9 under "Aboriginal Pan-Canadian."



## 2. 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 working toward the following:

- 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; and
- supporting efforts to ensure Canada's learning system responds to employers' skills requirements.

### 2.1 Sectoral Initiatives

In Ottawa on July 6, 2011, ESDC announced the implementation of a new approach to addressing skills shortages by developing better labour market information for employers and job seekers to support more informed human resources, job and learning decisions.

To support this new approach, ESDC refocused the Sector Council Program (SCP) into a new program, launched in March 2013, called the Sectoral Initiatives Program (SIP), based on competitive processes that are open to national partnership-based organizations.

The objectives of the new program are to foster skills matches and improve labour market efficiency by improving the generation and use of labour market intelligence, national occupational standards and certification/accreditation regimes for strategically important economic sectors.

SIP activities receive funding from both the CRF and EI Part II. Activities supported via these funding sources fall under the authority of the SIP terms and conditions, and the EI Part II LMP support measure, respectively. In 2012/13, those EI-funded projects that fell under the authority of LMP were referred to as Sectoral Partnerships Initiative (SPI) projects.

In 2012/13, there were SPI project activities for two different types of organizations: sector councils and skills tables. EI Part II expenditures under SPI agreements totalled \$30.9 million.

### 2.1.1 Sector Council SPI Projects

Sector councils were formal, national, industry-led partnership organizations that brought together business, labour and educational stakeholders. Operating at arm's length from the Government of Canada, sector councils acted as centres of expertise in the development and delivery of human resources and skills development strategies for key sectors of the economy. Councils made human resources and skills development solutions more widely available to Canadian businesses and employers.

In 2012/13, ESDC began to wind down the SCP and implement the SIP to support job seekers, employers, learners and Canadians in general. New projects will begin in 2013/14.

### **Pan-Canadian Programming in Action: Canadian Tourism Human Resource Council (CTHRC)**

The Canadian Tourism Human Resource Council (CTHRC) aims to improve the quality of the Canadian tourism labour force (1.75 million) and to help the 174,000 Canadian tourism businesses meet changing competitive demands. By bringing together corporate executives, owner-operators of smaller firms, employees, union leaders, educators and interested government representatives, the sector council provides forums for developing practical, demand-driven solutions. In 2012/13, the CTHRC produced excellent research on temporary foreign workers in tourism; foreign credential recognition; and its comprehensive suite of training and certification resources marketed under the *emerit* tourism training brand.

### 2.1.2 Sectoral Skills Tables

Skills tables were launched on April 1, 2007, to address strategic skills challenges of national significance within particular regions.

Skills tables are:

- temporary (with an expected lifetime of 18 months to four years), cross-sectoral, issue-specific approaches to human resources and skills issues of national significance;

- partnerships comprising key stakeholders, such as industry, labour, governments (federal and provincial/territorial), training institutions and other groups as required, such as Aboriginal peoples; and
- designed to address skills issues and labour shortages where no Sector Council exists.

There were two skills tables in 2012/13: the Asia Pacific Gateway Skills Table (APGST) and the Yukon Skills Table Committee.

In 2007/08, as part of the LMP support measure, the Asia Pacific Gateway (APG) was established as a not-for-profit society in British Columbia. The APGST is a regional partnership of labour, business and education/training institutions. It responds to human resources and skills development pressures associated with major infrastructure projects supporting the Asia-Pacific Gateway and Corridor, a critical network of intermodal transport systems supporting trade and commerce in Canada and with Asian and North American markets.

Under the auspices of the Government of Canada's Asia-Pacific Gateway and Corridor Initiative, ESDC and Transport Canada have provided close to \$6 million to the APGST since 2008 to fund industry-related labour market information, certification/training strategies and recruitment initiatives. ESDC discontinued core funding to the APGST in March 2013. This not-for-profit society was eligible to submit proposals in response to the SIP's 2012/13 call for concepts.

Similarly, to support the Government of Canada's interest in the northern territories, ESDC officials engaged territorial labour market stakeholders to discuss a skills table to support industry-driven initiatives focusing on labour market intelligence, occupational standards and certification systems.

Established in the fall of 2011, the Yukon Skills Table Committee does cross-sectoral work to address key labour market and skills development priorities. The committee includes representatives from industry/employers, Aboriginal organizations and communities, federal/territorial governments, and the learning system. The Yukon Skills Table Committee complements the priorities of Yukon's Labour Market Framework and enables more effective coordination of programs, services and tools among key labour market partners. Under a short-term contribution agreement, the committee successfully identified four priority areas for continued work. In 2013, the Yukon Skills Table

Committee began work to produce new cross-sectoral supply-demand information on Yukon's labour market, as well as to research the migration trends of seasonal workers.

## 2.2 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. Recognized in the Agreement on Internal Trade (Chapter 7), the program is a well-established means of developing common interprovincial standards for trades. In most P/Ts, the Red Seal examination is used as the certification exam for Red Seal trades.

### The Red Seal Program: The Numbers

According to Statistics Canada, 339,675 apprentices were registered at the end of 2011, an increase of 3.8% compared with 2010. Of that total, 264,447 apprentices (or almost 80%) were in Red Seal trades. A total of 41,163 apprentices completed their program in 2011, representing a significant 14.3% increase over the previous year and a 124% increase since 2000. Of those apprentices who finished in 2011, 31,305 completed a Red Seal trade, representing 76.1% of all completions and an increase of 6.4% since the previous year. In 2011, women accounted for 14% of all registered apprentices.

### The Red Seal Program and Pan-Canadian Research

#### Pan-Canadian Research on the Value-Added of Apprenticeship Completion

ESDC has been involved in a collaborative research project with jurisdictions across Canada exploring the value-added of apprenticeship completion versus alternative pathways into the trades. Preliminary results provide evidence that completing an apprenticeship program leads to better labour market outcomes with significant earnings premiums in many trades.

Under this program, experienced tradespeople and apprentices who have completed their training may challenge 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 for the skilled trades. Each year, more than 40,000 completing apprentices and qualified uncertified tradespeople from across Canada write Red Seal examinations, and almost 25,000 Red Seals are issued. These figures have steadily increased over the past decade. Apprenticeship is closely tied to economic and labour market conditions.

The Canadian Council of Directors of Apprenticeship (CCDA), comprising the apprenticeship authorities from each P/T 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 55 skilled trades, which encompass approximately 80% of registered apprentices.<sup>28</sup> 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 P/T 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.

A key function of the Red Seal Program is to develop interprovincial standards for the trades, which allow for consistent assessment against common standards across Canada. The program also encourages the harmonization of apprenticeship training outcomes through interprovincial program guides (IPGs), which P/Ts use to inform the in-school portion of apprenticeship programs. Red Seal product development service standards ensure that all Red Seal products are up to date and reflect the current skills and knowledge of the trades workforce. In 2012/13, new exam banks were developed for 14 trades, and 11 new NOA standards and three IPGs were published.

To ensure that the Red Seal Program responds to evolving labour market needs, the CCDA has developed its Strategic Directions 2013–16, with input from stakeholders. The four new strategic priorities are enhancing Red Seal standards and assessment; promoting the harmonization of inter-jurisdictional processes and requirements for skilled trades training, certification and standards; increasing awareness of the Red Seal program as a competitive advantage and assurance of quality; and increasing the engagement and participation of partners and stakeholders in the program.

Through the CCDA's Strengthening the Red Seal (SRS) initiative, work is underway to enhance the occupational standards model while maintaining the rigour of the Red Seal program. The CCDA consulted with industry stakeholders and completed short-term activities between October 2011 and March 2013. These included researching an optimal standards format and development process; analyzing the costs of Red Seal product development processes; and studying the feasibility of implementing a multiple assessment framework for the Red Seal Program. Medium-term goals of the initiative include piloting an enhanced occupational standards model that could allow for the development of additional forms of assessment (such as practical tests) in addition to the current Red Seal examination. This will help to ensure that skilled tradespeople have a fair opportunity to demonstrate competency, while maintaining a rigorous assessment process. The model and format for standards will be piloted for two Red Seal trades: construction electrician and steamfitter/pipefitter. Planning activities are underway for these pilots, with development workshops scheduled to take place in the fall of 2013. Development activities and outcomes will be monitored and evaluated in order to adjust the model and standards format and make improvements.

Through the CCDA, work is also underway with P/Ts to develop more streamlined and consistent approaches and tools for assessing and recognizing the qualifications of internationally trained workers so that they can more easily become certified in Red Seal trades.

---

<sup>28</sup> Statistics Canada, 2011 Registered Apprenticeship Information System.

In Economic Action Plan 2013, the Government of Canada announced new measures to support apprentices. To further reduce barriers to accreditation in the skilled trades in Canada and increase opportunities for apprentices, the federal government will work with P/Ts, through the CCDA, to better harmonize apprenticeship training and certification requirements across Canada. Greater harmonization of requirements will help to ensure that more apprentices complete their training; foster the mobility of apprentices across the country; and reduce recruitment barriers for employers. This federal commitment builds on work already underway with P/Ts through the CCDA and re-enforced by the CCDA's strategic priorities for 2013–16.

In 2012/13, the CCDA approved a communications strategy, including promotional and collateral products developed for the Red Seal program with ESDC funding.

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.

### 2.3 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 2012/13, program priorities included raising awareness of skilled trades and technologies among youth, and improving opportunities for youth in small rural communities. Delivered at the national, regional and local levels, Youth Awareness leverages funds from many sources, including P/Ts. In 2012/13, Youth Awareness expenditures supported 145 projects totalling \$8.3 million; half of this money funded skills competitions organized by Skills/Compétences Canada.

### 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 students for excellence, to directly involve industry in evaluating student performance, to keep training relevant to employers' needs and to promote the skilled trades.

The 2012 Skills Canada National Competition was held in Edmonton, Alberta, in May. More than 500 competitors from across Canada took part in more than 40 trades and technologies contest areas. In total, about 20,000 visitors attended the event. Industry, government, business and education worked in partnership to profile the valuable career opportunities in trades and technologies, as well as to provide information about the educational requirements of and supports for these occupations.

### 2.4 National Occupation Classification (NOC)

The National Occupational Classification (NOC) is Canada's occupational standard information infrastructure. It specifies and describes 500 distinct occupations according to skill type and skill level, detailing educational requirements, job functions and titles. The NOC provides students, workers, employers, human resources specialists and others with a common and consistent understanding of the entire range of occupational activity in Canada.

The NOC is revised every five years in conjunction with Census and National Household Survey cycles, in order to reflect the dynamic nature of the labour market. During transitions, people may use the two most recent versions of the NOC for reference. Accordingly, ESDC maintains two current NOC sites: the NOC 2006 and the NOC 2011.

In 2012/13, the NOC 2006 website had more than 850,000 visits from almost 600,000 unique visitors, while the NOC 2011 website had more than 3,650,000 visits from almost 2,000,000 unique visitors.

Following the major revision to the NOC 2006, for the release in January 2015 of the NOC 2011, related tools and infrastructure required updates. Work is proceeding on the Skills and Knowledge Module, which employers use to post advertisements on the Job Bank site, and on the Skills Checklist, which job seekers use to search for jobs on the Job Bank site.

Work has already begun with Statistics Canada on revisions to the NOC for the next release in 2016.

## 2.5 National Essential Skills Initiative (NESI)

The main priority of the National Essential Skills Initiative (NESI) is to contribute to the increased literacy and essential skills of adult Canadians in support of the Government of Canada's commitment to building a highly skilled, adaptable and competitive workforce.

Literacy and Essential Skills (LES) programming contributes to productivity and economic competitiveness.<sup>29</sup> NESI supports the further understanding of the links between LES and economic competitiveness by responding to significant knowledge gaps—specifically, by identifying new ways in which upgrading can help people prepare

### What Are the Benefits of Investing in Essential Skills?

Increased Productivity

Enhanced Workplace Efficiencies

Increased Competitiveness

More Vibrant and Engaged Workforce

Better Workplace Health and Safety

Better Team Performance

More Highly Skilled Workforce

for or keep employment, be productive participants in the labour market, and demonstrate return on investment for employers.

The Office of Literacy and Essential Skills (OLES) has used NESI funding for large demonstration projects that facilitate the integration of literacy and essential skills into job preparation and workplace training. Project funding contributes to systemic change by building the capacity of actors within Canada's adult learning system to improve the skills and economic outcomes

### Social Innovation

#### OLES Is a Key Federal Program to Test Social Finance Models

OLES is advancing two pilots to test social finance approaches in support of the Government of Canada's agenda. The pilots will test the effectiveness of performance-based models supported by social finance in increasing the literacy and essential skills of Canadians with low skills. The following pilots will reach 2,600 low-skilled workers in multiple jurisdictions across the country.

- One pilot will test mechanisms for rewarding organizations that deliver pay-for-performance agreements that bring about desired social results (e.g., skills development, job readiness, participation in further training and job attachment).
- Another pilot will test elements of a social impact bond model, and new ways of generating employer and private investments to improve labour market outcomes for Canadians. This pilot will include three projects.
  - The first will test new incentives for employers to invest in training workers and will examine how a return-on-investment model could result in better outcomes for both employers and workers.
  - The second will test models under which private investors will provide the upfront capital to fund programs to help unemployed people develop the skills they need to better connect to available jobs. In this model, investors can expect to get back their principal investment and a financial return if results are achieved.
  - The third will examine the market viability of social finance models, and optimal conditions that will help these models improve the literacy and essential skills of Canadians.

<sup>29</sup> Statistics Canada, *International Adult Literacy Survey: Literacy Scores, Human Capital and Growth Across Fourteen OECD Countries* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 2004), cat. no. 89-552-MIE.

of Canadians. Through these projects since 2010, OLES has collaborated with more than 3,923 employers and industry stakeholders, 400 training providers, and 27 post-secondary institutions. Beneficiaries of these projects, all of whom have received LES training, include 1,200 Aboriginal people, 7,102 older workers, 80 training providers, and 3,030 workers and job seekers.<sup>30</sup>

In January 2012, OLES launched a call for concepts for R&I projects using a mix of CRF and EI Part II funding, in connection with an expanded research strategy, to address knowledge and research gaps in the area of adult literacy and essential skills. OLES approved 11 of 42 submissions.

## 2.6 Reducing Barriers to Labour Mobility

The Labour Mobility Initiative supports activities and strategies aimed at reducing or eliminating barriers to mobility. This initiative supports efforts to help workers in regulated professions and the trades, including internationally trained individuals, to work in their occupation anywhere in Canada.

In 2012/13, \$1.4 million was spent under this initiative. Sustained federal investments, along with technical expertise, help regulatory authorities and professional associations develop common standards and processes to improve labour mobility, as set out in the amended Chapter 7 (Labour Mobility) of the Agreement on Internal Trade.

In 2012/13, federal funding supported consultation regarding harmonized assessment processes across regulated occupations, as well as research into regulatory pathways and common tools for regulated occupations, such as national exams. Funding also

helped regulatory authorities develop national scope-of-practice documents and performance indicators to inform educational curricula and national examinations, thereby further enhancing mobility across jurisdictions.

## 2.7 Research Project: Financial Assistance to Internationally Trained Workers

In 2012/13, the Foreign Credential Recognition (FCR) Loans pilot project entered the second of its three years. The pilot provides financial assistance to internationally trained individuals undertaking FCR activities, including Canadians who obtained their education abroad. As a research pilot, it is designed to create a strong base of evidence regarding the financial barriers that internationally trained individuals face, including a lack of financial support while undertaking FCR activities. The project also measures the willingness and capacity of community-based partners, financial institutions and governments to work together to provide financial support to internationally trained individuals. These findings will help determine whether there is an appropriate permanent role for the federal government in providing financial assistance to internationally trained individuals.

By the spring of 2013, a total of nine pilot sites had been established in nine provinces. By March 31, 2013, pilot sites had approved more than 500 loans to internationally trained individuals. In 2012/13, expenditures for the FCR Loans pilot totalled \$9.4 million.

The Social Research and Demonstration Corporation has been contracted to coordinate the research and evaluation component of the pilot. A preliminary report on pilot results is expected in the summer of 2013, with a final project report to be released in early 2015.

### **Pan-Canadian Programming in Action: Reducing Barriers to Labour Market Mobility**

Regulatory authorities for psychologists worked together to review options for harmonizing assessment processes for applicants seeking registration as psychologists across Canada. To reduce barriers to labour mobility, they explored options for national standards to evaluate substantial equivalence to Canadian standards of education, training and experience.

## 3. Finding Innovations and Supporting Agreements With P/Ts

This investment stream supports existing LMDAs with P/Ts and agreements with Aboriginal peoples through ASETS. These agreements require Canada to fund activities that support service delivery and labour market development, such as activities that ensure EI systems connectivity, timely access to EI Part II for EI claimants and effective reporting by P/Ts.

<sup>30</sup> In addition to EI Part II funds, the program also receives funding from CRF sources. Results are attributable to both sources of funds.

### 3.1 LMDA Systems Connectivity

Under the LMDAs, Canada and P/Ts exchange client information required for the delivery of EBSM-similar programming. This includes personal information on clients' eligibility for EI and their referral to P/T benefit-based interventions; administrative data related to performance measurement and results; and data used to monitor, assess and evaluate P/T programs. Most of this information is shared electronically in a secure environment. P/Ts access systems provided by the Government of Canada (e.g., the Employment Insurance Business Information System) and exchange data with Canada via various support tools.

### 3.2 LMDA IT Systems Modernization

Modernizing the EI program to respond to evolving economic conditions requires strengthening the links between passive and active employment measures. That, in turn, requires improving the coordination of federally delivered EI Part I benefits (income support) with P/T-delivered EI Part II programs and services (e.g., training and wage subsidies), and enhancing information-sharing between the two areas.

Increased and systematic collaboration between EI Part I (federal) and Part II (P/Ts) is critical in the years ahead to help Canadians return to work quickly; address skills gaps; reduce dependency on EI and social assistance; and strengthen governments' fiscal capacity.

To support this collaboration, ESDC has initiated a two-year project to modernize its LMDA systems platform, including a web portal, a data warehouse, and new enquiries and reporting modules. This project will help the federal and P/T governments work more closely together to move unemployed Canadians back into the workforce more quickly and improve clients' employability to fill skills gaps.

## 4. Labour Market Information (LMI)

The LMI service 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 to recruit, train and retain workers, and make business and investment decisions, by providing information on wages, on labour supply and demand, and on educational programs.

LMI strengthens the economic and social union by helping the labour market function as an integrated national system. 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.

In 2012/13, a new National Work Plan for Regional LMI was implemented, which includes 11 LMI products in five key areas: labour market outlooks, labour market analysis (e.g., bulletins, economic scans and client segment profiles), labour market news, occupational information (e.g., local wages and job requirements) and support to Service Canada operations.

Among the LMI products listed above, wage and employment prospects are the most in demand. Wage data by occupational group and geographic area are determined primarily by using Statistics Canada surveys, ESDC administrative data and data from provincial surveys. Governments use wage information when designing and delivering programs; employers and job seekers use it, too. The adoption of a standardized methodology for determining wages facilitates the comparison of occupational wages at the regional, provincial and national levels. Other key LMI products include local and provincial employment outlooks based on macro-economic, occupational and sectoral analysis. A standardized approach for identifying job trends and prospects is currently being developed. It will permit better comparison of occupational trends information at the regional and provincial levels.

### 4.1 Research: What Works in Career Development Services

In June 2011, ESDC issued a call for concept papers for multidisciplinary research to measure the results of career development services (CDS). This research will examine the factors affecting career development activities aimed at improving the employment situation of people facing obstacles to integrating into the labour market.

In 2012/13, expenditures for this research program totalled \$1.3 million. The Canadian Career Development Foundation conducted two projects: Common Indicators: Transforming the Culture of Evaluation in Career and Employment Services; and Assessing the Impact of

Career Information and Career Development Services Across Employability Dimensions. The Social Research and Demonstration Corporation is conducting the third project, The Motivational Interviewing Pilot Project: Advancing Career Development Services for Income Assistance Clients. This project will be completed in March 2014.

To date, the research program has done the following:

- identified pathways for
  - measuring client progress in a meaningful way,
  - connecting interventions with changes in skills, knowledge and personal attributes, and
  - connecting these changes with successful labour market outcomes;
- highlighted the critical role of evidence in the planning and improvement of career and employment services;
- shown that, while longitudinal data (following clients over time) is important, basic data collection across all provinces and territories is even more important, so policy makers should aim for standardized data collection; and
- demonstrated that the use and measurement of common indicators across different service settings could contribute significantly over time to helping find out what works and for whom.

Other key findings so far include the following:

- Self-help guides provided after a thorough needs assessment and orientation can be an effective first line of intervention. They allow practitioners to focus valuable time on clients who really need it. They may also give clients a useful perspective on online career services.
- In New Brunswick and Saskatchewan, data show that the quality of the “working alliance” between practitioners and clients is correlated with return-to-work results. In Quebec, qualitative analyses of focus groups led to the conclusion that monitoring progress indicators, including those related to the working alliance, can help practitioners develop their intervention skills. Both findings support the importance of progress indicators in transforming the culture of evaluation, as they are not only related to the effectiveness of the intervention (results from New Brunswick and Saskatchewan) but they also promote the development of practitioners’ skills (Quebec results).

As an addendum to this research project, a two-day symposium designed to connect research to practice was held March 13–14, 2013. It included thought-provoking speakers setting context, research panels reporting results, provincial/territorial panels presenting innovations, and working groups. The focus was on practical applications of the research to direct services, particularly services for youth and adults with few skills and/or weak labour market attachment. The main conclusion from the working groups was that we need a national Career Development Strategy to permit sharing of research results across the country, as well as a forum for sharing promising provincial/territorial service innovations.

## **5. National Employment Service Initiatives**

Departmental operating funds also support three national employment services administered by ESDC to help Canadians find suitable employment: Job Bank, Working in Canada (WiC) and Labour Market Information (LMI). These free online services connect job seekers and employers, and help individuals prepare and carry out their return-to-work action plans. Job Bank, WiC and LMI are 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.

Since clients access these services on a self-serve basis with no registration required, data on results for these services can be challenging to collect and to attribute to specific interventions.

### **5.1 Job Bank**

In partnership with P/Ts, ESDC maintains this electronic labour exchange, which fosters efficient and inclusive labour markets by connecting job seekers and employers. Job Bank provides access to job listings as well as specialized online tools, such as Job Match, Résumé Builder and Career Navigator. In addition, the site provides visitors with basic information on how to acquire the skills needed to pursue their chosen career.



In 2012/13, Job Bank hosted more than 69 million visits, representing more than 23 million unique visitors, and provided access to more than 1 million job postings. During the same fiscal period, more than 270,000 new job seekers registered accounts (to access Résumé Builder, Job Match and Career Navigator services). As of March 31, 2013, more than 128,000 employers had used Job Bank for Employers (the job order-taking service) in the previous 18 months. Employers used the Job Match tool 4,777 times to find suitable candidates and job seekers used it 76,720 times to find jobs corresponding to their skills.

In 2012/13, the top five occupational groups advertised on Job Bank were service clerks, truck drivers, labourers in manufacturing and utilities, retail salespersons and sales clerks, and food counter attendants. These five groups accounted for 26.0% of all jobs advertised.

For more information on Job Bank, please visit <http://jobbank.gc.ca>.

## 5.2 Working in Canada

Working in Canada (WiC) is the Government of Canada's single integrated web site for the dissemination of LMI resources. WiC provides visitors with access to job opportunities, as well as occupational and career information, a skill and knowledge checklist, and an educational program search resource.

WiC leverages job market information from 30 sources, including Job Bank and private sector job boards, and can generate more than 32,000 unique LMI reports based on a client's occupation and location. WiC reports provide targeted, 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. Additionally, in an effort to further connect Canadians with available jobs, the Enhanced Job Alerts service was launched on WiC in January 2013. In its first three months, it sent more than 2 million job alerts to 37,463 subscribers.

In 2012/13, more than 9 million job search queries were conducted on WiC and 4.5 million WiC reports were generated.

For more information on WiC, please visit <http://workingincanada.gc.ca>.



## CHAPTER 4

# PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

*This chapter discusses the delivery of Employment Insurance (EI) services to Canadians in 2012/13. Section I briefly examines the context in which EI benefits were delivered. Section II provides an overview of the delivery of EI benefits and related services by Service Canada. Section III explores the quality of EI services, including the accuracy of payments. Lastly, Section IV assesses the integrity of the delivery of the EI program.*

## I. CONTEXT

Since its creation in 2005, Service Canada has been the place where Canadians go to access programs, services, and benefits they need from the Government of Canada. One of the core benefits delivered by Service Canada is EI. Service Canada ensures that Canadians have access to EI benefits and services to which they are entitled to. Service Canada is committed to providing timely and accurate benefit payments and services, thereby ensuring quality and efficiency of business operations.

Service Canada's multi-channel service delivery model – online, by phone or in-person – is designed to meet the day-to-day demands of delivering EI benefits, while consistently and efficiently providing high-quality service to Canadians. While the model faced challenges in 2012/13 as the Government of Canada remained in a period of fiscal restraint, Service Canada continued to respond to higher-than-normal volumes of EI claims.<sup>1</sup> However, by developing workload management tools and strategies, the Department continues to find innovative methods to process EI benefits and effectively manage the program.

Service Canada remains committed to transforming and modernizing its business operations through automation and other process and service improvements. For example, the use of electronic reporting for EI is at 99.9% and has been at this level for the past five years. Service Canada will continue to enhance the electronic services available to individuals and businesses. Through increased automation, benefit modernization and improved service delivery, Service Canada strives to reduce costs and improve the value for money of delivering EI.

## II. SERVICE DELIVERY

Service Canada supports EI clients through every stage of the service delivery process from providing benefit information, responding to enquiries and assisting employers, to processing claims and providing the means to appeal decisions. This section describes each aspect of the service delivery spectrum.

<sup>1</sup> The baseline level for annual EI claim volume, established in 2007/08, is 2.6 million.

## 1. Information and Enquiries

Through a multi-channel service delivery model, Service Canada provides clients access to EI information on the Internet, by telephone or in person.

### 1.1 On the Internet (Click)

The Service Canada web site offers information on a wide variety of government programs and services that are designed to help users access the service that they need. In 2012/13, year over year growth slowed, with a 0.9% increase over the previous fiscal year, bringing the total annual visits to approximately 81 million.<sup>2</sup> On average, visitors viewed 4.1 pages on the Service Canada web site, with 1 in 8 visits (12.5%) associated with eight or more pages viewed. Three of the top four web pages accessed through the Service Canada home page were related to EI: “Complete your EI report” (23.3% of home page traffic), “Apply for EI Benefits” (6.2% of home page traffic) and the EI index page (5.6% of home page traffic). The top link was “Access My Service Canada Account,” which received 35.3% of all home page traffic.

#### 1.1.1 EI: Electronic Services

The EI section of My Service Canada Account (MSCA-EI) enables clients to view information on their current and previous EI claims online. In addition, MSCA-EI provides links to other electronic services, such as EI Application On-line (AppliWeb) and the Internet Reporting Service.

#### My Service Canada Account: EI

Through MSCA-EI, Canadians can perform the following actions on their account:

- 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); and
- register in the EI program for access to special benefits for self-employed persons.

In 2012/13, logins to MSCA on the Service Canada web site decreased by 19% over the previous fiscal year, as Canadians logged onto MSCA 18.9 million times.<sup>3</sup> Much of the decrease in MSCA use was due to the large volumes experienced the previous year as part of the economic downturn. As well, there were more than 776,000 new registrations for MSCA, a decrease of 14% over the previous year, for a total estimated active user base of over 1.65 million. An estimated 88% of the activity on MSCA continued to be related to EI functions.

#### EI Application On-line (AppliWeb)

The EI Application On-line (AppliWeb) allows clients to file for EI benefits from home or anywhere else they have access to the Internet. AppliWeb is available seven days a week, 24 hours a day. Clients can also apply online for benefits by visiting their local Service Canada Centre, where they can access the EI Application On-line.

#### Internet Reporting Service

To receive EI benefits, most claimants must complete and submit biweekly reports to demonstrate their continuing entitlement. The Internet Reporting Service allows claimants to do so easily and securely over the Internet, 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

In addition, the Internet Reporting Service allows claimants to provide information regarding absences from Canada and/or training courses directly, resulting in fewer calls to EI call centres, enabling the auto-adjudication process and decreasing the workloads of processing centres.

The advantages of using the Internet Reporting Service to complete EI reports are as follows:

- faster processing of EI payments;
- availability of service to hearing-impaired claimants and claimants without access to a touch-tone telephone;
- elimination of delays and mailing costs if the claimant subscribes to direct deposit; and
- fast, convenient, simple and secure service.

<sup>2</sup> For a regional breakdown of Service Canada web site visits, please see Annex 4.1.

<sup>3</sup> For more detailed information, please see Annex 4.1.

### **1.1.2 Online Marketing**

In 2012/13, Service Canada supported the promotion of EI initiatives including Connecting Canadians with Available Jobs, Working While on Claim, legislative changes to the Variable Best Weeks measures and changes to EI sickness benefits. To promote these initiatives, Service Canada developed web content, including videos and YouTube, printed and electronic brochures, messages on Service Canada's Digital Display Network, social media content, and electronic kits for stakeholders including emails, web buttons, articles, e-brochures and social media messages.

Service Canada continues to evaluate the following marketing activities:

- Between April 1, 2012, and March 31, 2013, videos pertaining to EI generated 24,500 downloads a month from the Service Canada website. Web videos have proven to be a cost-effective way to help clients use self-serve options and complete transactions.
- The Finding a Job landing page sustained its monthly page traffic (or page activity) in 2012/13, with an average of 421,000 page views per month. The web promo boxes that feature timely and relevant information for clients were used 63,300 times by Canadians in the last quarter of 2012/13.

## **1.2 By Telephone (Call)**

### **1.2.1 Specialized EI Call Centres**

Service Canada's specialized EI call centre network continues to be the public's primary point of contact for client specific enquiries related to the EI program and for resolution of enquiries related to topics such as application process and status, benefit eligibility, and benefit delivery. In 2012/13, specialized call centres implemented a series of initiatives such as the development of a national agent assist line to support call centre agents in resolving complex inquiries and the revision of training products to streamline training for new agents.

When clients contact a call centre, they have access to EI information via an automated telephone information system, as well as through call centre agents. Over the course of a year, demand to the call centre network fluctuates based on a variety of factors such as bi-weekly reporting requirements, renewal of EI claims and processing speed of pay. While the call centre network makes every effort to meet these fluctuations, there are high call volume periods when

the client demand exceeds the call handling capacity of the network, resulting in accessibility challenges and longer wait times to speak with an agent.

EI specialized agents handled 4.4 million client enquiries in 2012/13, which amounted to 925,000 fewer calls than in 2011/12. Agents answered 32% of these calls within 180 seconds, a 2.4 percentage point increase over the same time period but below the goal to answer 80% of calls within 180 seconds. During 2012/13, close to 12 million calls were blocked, which is 2.1 million less than in 2011/12. It is important to note that blocked calls are the total number of attempts to contact a call centre agent and do not represent the number of individual callers. In the majority of instances, if a caller is not successful on their first attempt, they will call back and reach an agent on a subsequent attempt. Further, 1.2 million calls were abandoned in 2012/13, 252,122 less than in 2011/12. An abandoned call occurs when a client hangs up while waiting to speak with an agent. Abandoned calls are partly a result of clients self-managing their time by either choosing to hang up and try calling back at a later time or choosing to hang up to use a self-serve option.

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 handling time. While the department was not able to reach its targets, agents did resolve close to 85% of calls at the first point of contact and no further follow-up was required. More detailed information on call volume can be found in Annex 4.2.

Service Canada is strengthening its ability to effectively manage service demands, with continuous improvements to the way that it does business such as increased automation, improved online services, and a nationally-managed approach to distributing workloads. This also includes migrating clients to self-serve options for simple transactions that frees up call centre agents to resolve more complex cases. Further, current call centre metrics are being reviewed to ensure better alignment to client expectations and available resources.

### **1.2.2 1 800 O-Canada**

The 1 800 O-Canada line is open Monday to Friday for general enquiries and is available to more than 60 countries. For callers in Canada, service is available from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 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. Service is provided in English and French. In 2012/13, agents of 1 800 O-Canada answered 2.036 million calls, a 12% decrease since 2011/12. The total call volume included more than 597,000 general enquiries related to EI which represents a 0.9% decrease from 2011/12.<sup>4</sup> The service delivery standard is to have bilingual agents answer calls within 18 seconds (three rings), 85% of the time. In 2012/13, 1 800 O-Canada met this target.

### 1.3 In Person (Visit)

Service Canada has approximately 600 in-person points of service (Service Canada Centres and Scheduled Outreach sites). In 2012/13, clients made over 4.2 million EI-related visits to an in-person point of service including 77,000 EI related visits to a scheduled outreach site across the country.

Service Canada employees provide general information to citizens on the application process and eligibility criteria, such as how to apply for the EI program, including required documents and proof of identity. They also help clients complete benefit applications, which entails identifying the client, validating supporting documents and verifying information for completeness. Service Canada aims to ensure that 90% of Canadians have access to a Service Canada point of service (Service Canada Centre or Scheduled Outreach site) within a 50-kilometre driving distance from where they live and in 2012/13 it met this service standard. The number or network of offices will be adjusted as necessitated by the demand for service.

Service Canada's in-person points of service fall under two categories.

#### Service Canada Centre (SCC)

A Service Canada Centre (SCC) is a full-time or part-time office, open up to five days a week, managed and occupied by Service Canada staff, offering general information and transactional services. SCCs may stand alone or be co-located with other organizations.

#### Scheduled Outreach Site

A scheduled outreach site is a point of service that is physically located outside an SCC but offers similar services. Service Canada employees (from a nearby SCC) travel to a pre-determined location regularly (for example, one day per week) to deliver services. Scheduled outreach is typically offered in rural or remote locations, offered at partner premises (such as band council, provincial or territorial offices), and managed through service contracts and/or memoranda of understanding.

##### 1.3.1 Mobile Outreach Services

In addition to its network of points of service, Service Canada uses the Mobile Outreach Services (MOS) to connect with communities across the country. MOS complements the services already provided at SCCs and scheduled outreach sites. In addition, they increase awareness of Service Canada programs and service offerings, providing Canadians with information at locations such as job fairs, mass layoff sites, schools, community service organizations and retirement homes.

Between April 2012 and March 2013, through its MOS, Service Canada delivered the following:

- 1,149 EI information sessions to employers, with 2,481 companies and organizations participating;
- 778 EI information sessions to workers facing layoffs, with a total of 16,932 participants; and
- 310 EI information sessions to workers on Work Sharing, with a total of 7,226 participants.<sup>5</sup>

During the same period, citizen services specialists attended the following:

- 15 fairs, exhibits or kiosks for employers, providing EI information to 315 participants; and
- 15 fairs, exhibits or kiosks for workers, providing EI information to 734 participants.

Participation in fairs, exhibits and/or kiosks enables Citizen Service Specialists to reach the broadest range of target audiences in a cost-effective manner. Each region selects which fairs, exhibits and/or kiosks to participate in based on client requests and labour market conditions.

<sup>4</sup> For a regional breakdown of EI-related calls to 1 800 O-Canada, please see Annex 4.2.

<sup>5</sup> For more detailed information, please see Annex 4.3.

## 2. EI Services for Employers

Service Canada works closely with employers to ensure that the EI program is administered fairly and efficiently. As employers issue Records of Employment (ROEs), an essential component in establishing EI claims, Service Canada continues to seek ways to improve the services provided to employers.

### 2.1 Electronic Record of Employment

The ROE is the key document used to process EI benefits, and to determine EI entitlement, rate and claim duration. The electronic ROE (E-ROE) is a major factor in advancing the automation of the EI program.

Service Canada recognizes that the production and submission of ROEs is a challenge for employers, and one that has been raised in employer consultations. In response to the Government of Canada's Red Tape Reduction Commission, Service Canada continues to explore efficient and cost-effective methods to reduce the ROE administrative burden on employers. The E-ROE is a key tool to reduce this burden, as employers no longer need to order or store paper ROE forms, retain copies on file, or send copies to Service Canada or to their employees. E-ROEs have other advantages: employers can issue E-ROEs in alignment with pay cycles, amend them more easily than paper ROEs and submit hundreds of them in one transaction. In addition, E-ROE help minimize errors and improve service to claimants. Employers can still issue paper ROEs however.

In 2012/13, Service Canada implemented the following marketing approaches that encouraged 38,930 businesses to register and raise the proportion of E-ROEs to 70% of all ROEs.

- In January 2013, an ROE Web insert was included with the approximately 1.1 million remittance slips that CRA distributed to all employers across Canada.

- Service Canada implemented the first national ROE Web advertising campaign encouraging employers to register for a webinar on ROE Web. 182 payroll professionals registered for webinars between January and March 2013. Approximately 18% of webinar attendees subsequently signed-up for ROE Web. The campaign included the following components:
  - Print and web advertisements with professional associations including the Chartered Accountants of Canada, Certified General Accountants of Canada, Canadian Management Accountants, Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants and Canadian Payroll Association.
  - For the first time, the Department used LinkedIn Advertising targeted to employer subscribers.<sup>6</sup> This included a web banner on the site as well as an email and polls. The LinkedIn campaign generated a total of 796 clicks and an email open rate of 27.8%. There were 506 responses to polls, averaging a 0.3% engagement rate.
  - Over a period of nine weeks the campaign<sup>7</sup> received 16,573 clicks on its Google AdWords with a click-through-rate (CTR) of 2.2%. Any CTR above 1% is usually considered a success.
- Service Canada pursued an outreach campaign with trade and professional organizations.
- Testimonial videos were created detailing four employers' positive experiences using ROE Web. Additional promotional materials were created to support the cyber-authentication renewal including emails, promotional boxes on the Service Canada website and outreach to stakeholders to ensure a smooth transition.

By the end of 2012/13, a total of 340,885<sup>8</sup> employer businesses—including 39,000<sup>9</sup> new ROE Web registrants—had registered for an E-ROE solution. These include ROE Web and ROE Secure Automated Transfer (SAT), a secure communication line designed to allow large payroll service providers or businesses to submit large volumes of ROEs simultaneously. Consequently, the majority of ROEs (69.7% or 6.2 million)

<sup>6</sup> Employers include: Canadian accountants, controllers, payroll managers and bookkeepers in small companies in the retail, construction, accommodation and food services, and administration and health care industries.

<sup>7</sup> The campaign took place from January 13 to March 24 2013.

<sup>8</sup> Employers may be registered for ROE Web as well as ROE SAT, therefore the number counts are mutually exclusive.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

were submitted to Service Canada electronically, a 5.8% increase over the number submitted the previous fiscal year<sup>10</sup> (see Chart 1).

## 2.2 Employer Contact Centre (ECC)

To enhance service to employers, the Employment Contact Centre (ECC) provides an accessible, national, single point of contact, delivering services such as ROE advice and guidance, ROE orders, and ROE Web technical support.

The ECC plays a key role in the promotion of E-ROEs and ROE Web. 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 inquiries from employers interested in switching to E-ROEs and registering for ROE Web.


In 2012/13, ECCs answered 455,275 calls from employers, compared with 389,164 calls answered from the launch of the ECCs in June 2011 to March 31, 2012.

## 3. EI Services for Individuals

### 3.1 Claims Processing

In 2012/13, Service Canada received 2.76 million EI applications. Although this represented a 3.3% reduction from the previous fiscal year, the volume of claims remained high compared with the pre-recession volume of 2.6 million claims.<sup>11</sup>

Speed of payment, a key performance indicator, is defined as the percentage of initial and renewal claims for which the Department sends a payment or non-payment notification to the claimant within 28 days of the date of filing. Several factors can affect speed of payment, including benefit applications that are missing information or that require clarification of information, and complex applications that require Service Canada to do fact-finding with employers and third parties to render a fair and equitable decision. Claim volumes can fluctuate dramatically from week to week. During peak intake weeks, a large percentage of claims are automated, which causes the performance indicator to rise sharply. Following a peak intake, the residual volume of complex claims requiring manual intervention may result in a dip in the speed of payment results. In 2012/13, with an ongoing high volume of claims and limited resources available for processing,



<sup>10</sup> For more detailed information, please see Annex 4.4.

<sup>11</sup> For a regional breakdown of EI claims processed, please see Annex 4.5.



the Department reached an average speed of payment of 74.5%, up 3.4 percentage points from the previous year but shy of its target of 80%.<sup>12</sup>

### 3.2 EI Special Benefits for Self-Employed People


Since January 2010, self-employed individuals who are Canadian citizens or permanent residents have been able to voluntarily enter into an agreement with the Canada Employment Insurance Commission to participate in the EI program for access to special benefits, including maternity, parental, sickness and compassionate care benefits. Since January 2011, self-employed contributors have been able to apply for EI special benefits. As of March 31, 2013, a total of 12,864 self-employed individuals were registered with the EI program. Claims from self-employed people are processed in one national specialized centre to promote service excellence.

## 4. Service Transformation

In 2012/13, Service Canada continued to invest in the design and use of technologies to support automated application processing and expanded Internet services, thus improving EI service delivery

to Canadians. These enhancements changed the benefits processing network and expanded its ability to respond to workload volumes; and, also contributed to more accurate and consistent services for Canadians.

Since electronic EI applications were implemented in 2001/02, their proportion of all applications steadily increased, from 17% that year to 98.4% in 2012/13. Moreover, in the most recent fiscal year, 99.9% of eligible claimants filed their biweekly reports electronically, and 65.7% of all initial and renewal claims were partially or fully processed by automated means. While the annual amount of benefits paid out increased, and the number of EI applications increased slightly since 1999/2000, the cost per initial and renewal claim processed declined approximately 40%. The gradual increase in electronic services and in claims automation has reduced the amount of manual claims processing, resulting in fewer resources required to process the claims and a lower cost per claim. In 2012/13, employers submitted 69.7% of their ROEs via online services, and 90.9% of clients opted to receive their EI benefit payments via direct deposit<sup>13</sup> (see Chart 2).



<sup>12</sup> Speed of payment is broken down regionally in Annex 4.5.

<sup>13</sup> For more detailed information, please see Annex 4.6.

## 5. Appeals of EI Decisions

The EI appeals process provides claimants and employers with a means to challenge an administrative decision before an independent external authority. There are two levels of appeal under the *Employment Insurance Act*: boards of referees and umpires. Further recourse is available at the Federal Court of Appeal and, finally, at the Supreme Court of Canada.

A board of referees is an independent, impartial tribunal. Each three-member panel consists of a chairperson appointed by the Governor-in-Council, a member appointed by the Commissioner for Employers and a member appointed by the Commissioner for Workers. Approximately 900 part-time board members hear appeals in 83 board centres across Canada.

In 2012/13, boards of referees heard 20,099 appeals, 46.8% of which were scheduled on a hearing date that fell within 30 days of receipt of the appeal notice. Boards' decisions are normally issued within seven days of the hearing. Approximately 20% of the cases heard by boards resulted in a reversal of the Department's decisions.

Claimants, employers, and claimant and employer associations, as well as the Canadian Employment Insurance Commission, can appeal a board of referees decision to an umpire—an independent, administrative tribunal. Some 20 to 40 federal court judges or retired provincial superior court judges sit alone as umpires and hear cases across Canada.

In 2012/13, clients filed 1,309 appeals to umpires. The Department prepared and sent 95.6% of the client appeal dockets to the Office of the Umpire within 60 days of receiving the appeal notice. As this is legislated requirement, the target is 100%. The main factor contributing to the slight variance stems from delays in the routing of paper documentation. In addition to client appeals, the Commission filed 312 appeals to umpires. Approximately 14% of the decisions rendered by umpires were favourable to the client.

Claimants, employers and the Commission can seek judicial review of an umpire's decision at the Federal Court of Appeal. In 2012/13, the Federal Court of Appeal rendered 40 decisions on cases related to EI benefits,

20% of which were favourable to the client.

The Supreme Court of Canada issued 1 decision related to EI. It was not favourable to the client.

On April 1, 2013, the new Social Security Tribunal (SST) came into force as a single decision-making body replacing the four Employment and Social Development Canada tribunals for Employment Insurance (EI), Canada Pension Plan (CPP) and Old Age Security (OAS) appeals. The SST will continue to provide a fair, credible and accessible appeals process for Canadians. On April 1, 2013, a total of 1,070 EI files related to umpire appeals were transferred to the new SST.

## III. QUALITY

### 1. Payment and Processing Accuracy

#### 1.1 EI 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 hovered around the established 95%<sup>14</sup> target (error rate of 5%).<sup>15</sup>

The EI PAAR consists of a random sample of 500 EI claims per year that are reviewed by two separate reviewers. Results from both reviews are compared to ensure the accuracy and impartiality of results, and to ensure the consistency of results among reviewers. Each review provides detailed information on the root causes and 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  $\pm 5$  payments. Errors include overpayments and underpayments attributable to three sources: claimants, employers and Service Canada. In addition to estimating the accuracy of EI benefit payments, the EI PAAR also determines the estimated "most likely" value of incorrectly paid benefits (overpayments and underpayments) through statistical extrapolation. EI PAAR results are used to improve program delivery and sustain program integrity. The Office of the Auditor General (OAG) uses EI PAAR results in its annual financial audit of the EI Account, the results of which are reported each year as part of the Public Accounts of Canada.

<sup>14</sup> 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.

<sup>15</sup> For more detailed information, please see Annex 4.5.

The EI payment accuracy rate decreased from 95.2% (or 4.8% error rate) in 2011/12 to 94.1% (or 5.9% error rate) in 2012/13. The increase in the error rate to 5.9% is attributable to two factors: an increase in both the claimant and employer the error rates.

The Service Canada error rate had been steadily declining since reaching a high of 3.1% following the 1996 EI reforms. This positive trend continued and the error rate decreased by 0.9 percentage points from 1.9% in 2010/11 to 1% in 2011/12. The slight decrease in Service Canada's error rate, between 2011/12 and 2012/13, suggests a stable and effective processing environment (the error rate dropped by 0.1 percentage points, from 1.0% to 0.9%). In 2011/12, Service Canada proactively launched a Quality forum to assess areas for improvement and processing efficiencies (e.g. development and roll out of standardized templates to document decisions taken by processing agents). This forum heightened awareness of quality issues and contributed to the maintenance of the low Service Canada error rate in a rapidly evolving processing environment.

While Service Canada errors decreased from 2011/12 to 2012/13, other components of the error rate increased. Claimant errors increased by 0.3 percentage point compared with last year, from 2.0% to 2.3%. The EI PAAR data reveals that the two types of claimant error – (1) failure to report earnings, and (2) failure to report non-availability

for work while in receipt of benefits – represent 73% and 27% of all claimant errors, respectively. Those proportions are generally consistent with last year's results of 80% and 20% respectively.

Employer errors increased by 0.9 percentage points, from 1.8% to 2.7% compared with last year's results. During the post-audit ROE validation with the employer, 813 ROEs were reviewed and validated (see Table 1). Of these ROEs, 99 were in error (or 12.2%). These incorrect ROEs impacted 18.8% of the PAAR files reviewed compared to 16.6% in 2011/12. Results also suggest that electronic ROEs are more accurate than paper ROEs. Out of the 500 files reviewed this year, 11 more files had ROEs in error compared to last year's sample (see Table 2).

### Profile of Employers

A review of available data suggests that 55% of the employers who made ROE errors, were small business owners (rather than medium or large sized), which is consistent with last fiscal year's small employer profile at 58%.

### Prevalence of ROE Errors by Block/ Estimated Most Likely Value of Mispayments

In 2012/13, the three most frequent employer errors identified on ROEs accounted for 56.9% of all employer errors. They were in the following ROE blocks:

- Block 15B – *Number of insurable earnings* (30 errors – 25.9%; estimated most likely value of \$75M);
- Block 17A – *Monies paid on separation* (20 errors – 17.2%; estimated most likely value of \$115.4M); and
- Block 12 – *Pay Period Ending Date* (16 errors – 13.8%; estimated most likely value of \$99.1K).

**TABLE 1**  
**Accuracy of ROEs Validated as Part of the 2012/13 PAAR Review**

# of ROEs Validated in the PAAR Review	813 ROEs Were Validated
% of incorrect E-ROEs	10% (52 out of 503)
% of incorrect paper ROEs	15% (47 out of 310)

**TABLE 2**  
**Comparison of Number of PAAR Files Containing Incorrect ROEs**

	2012/13	2011/12	% Change
# and % of PAAR files which contain Incorrect ROEs	94 out of 500 files reviewed contained incorrect ROEs (18.8%)	83 out of 500 files reviewed contained incorrect ROEs (16.6%)	2.2%

Based on the estimated most likely value, the three most frequent employer errors, which represent 73.5% of the most likely value of all errors found on ROEs, are:

- Block 15A – *Number of insurable hours* (estimated most likely value of \$121.7M);
- Block 17A – *Monies paid on separation* (estimated most likely value of \$115.40M); and
- Block 15B – *Number of insurable earnings* (estimated most likely value of \$75M).

Service Canada continues to monitor and analyze employer errors and is working to raise awareness amongst the employer community regarding the nature and value of these errors.

### Overall Summary of EI Payment Accuracy Results

Table 3 below summarizes the estimated value of errors identified in the EI PAAR review by error rate and source of error.

## 1.2 EI 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. It verifies that applications for benefits are adjudicated and calculated in accordance with national operational policies and procedures and measures the estimated rate of conformity with them. In 2000/01, the Department first implemented Quality Monitoring now known as EI PRAR to measure the percentage of initial claims “in order” (a claim is considered to be “in order” when all criteria relevant to the review of the claim have been met). In 2005/06, Service Canada set a national EI PRAR target of 80%.<sup>16</sup> Officials continue to examine whether the EI PRAR target should be raised.

In 2012/13, the processing accuracy rate increased by 1.0 percentage point to 86.9% from 85.9% in 2011/12.<sup>17</sup> Each year, Service Canada develops a national quality action plan to ensure continued processing improvements. The plan focuses on the three errors that occurred most frequently across the country, as well as one or two regionally identified areas for improvement.

**TABLE 3**  
EI Payment Accuracy Review Estimated Most Likely Value of Errors and Estimated Error Rate, by Source

	2012/13		2011/12	
<b>Total EI Benefit Payout</b>	\$15.6 billion		\$16.1 billion	
<b>EI Payment Accuracy Rate</b>	94.1%**		95.2%**	
Estimated Total Value of Mispayments* / Estimated Error Rate*	Most Likely Value	Error Rate	Most Likely Value	Error Rate
	\$923.8 million	5.9%**	\$772.3 million	4.8%**
<b>Error Rate broken down by source</b>				
Employer	\$425.0 million	2.7%	\$286.0 million	1.8%
Claimant	\$357.5 million	2.9%	\$325.3 million	2.0%
Service Canada	\$141.3 million	0.9%	\$161.1 million	1.0%

\* Mispayments are the sum of overpayments plus underpayments.

\*\* Results have been rounded to the first decimal.

<sup>16</sup> The 80% target rate for PRAR is a legacy target decided upon through a rationalization and national standardization of quality targets in 2005/06. Prior to this, regions set their own quality rates. A target of 80% was seen as challenging yet realistic and achievable once gradual improvements were seen following the initial 70% target that was set during the initial trial period. The 80% target has been reinforced by PRAR results that continue to hover around this target.

<sup>17</sup> For more detailed information, please see Annex 4.5.

## 2. Information and Transaction Accuracy

The National Quality Assurance Program (NQAP) in EI call centres aims to ensure quality and consistency of service to clients, to identify employee training needs and opportunities for improvement, and to provide ongoing feedback and support to employees. A total of 7,233 calls were monitored in 2012/13, and results for the year were 85% against a target of 80%.

Additionally, since EI call centre agents complete a number of processing activities over the phone with clients, agents are also reviewed as part of the EI Processing Accuracy Review. In 2012/13, the processing accuracy for EI call centre agents was 91%, surpassing the target of 80%.

## 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 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. It does so to ensure that the claimant receives the amount of EI benefits to which he or she is entitled. 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 2012/13, Service Canada requested 10,601 rulings from CRA, a 3% decrease from 2011/12.

## IV. INTEGRITY

Service Canada continues to place significant emphasis on the importance of protecting the information entrusted to it by Canadians.

Given the large scale of the EI program, Canadians expect sound stewardship and accountability for the program's integrity. The Department maintains a balance among detection, deterrence and prevention activities and has management frameworks, processes and risk-based controls in place to strengthen the integrity of its programs and ensure operational and service compliance. The Integrity program focuses on detection activities using a variety of programs and systems, such as Computer Post Audit, the Report on Hirings program and Automated Earnings Reporting Systems. In addition, Service Canada carries out information and prevention activities, such as Claimant Information Sessions. These activities inform claimants, employers and the general public about EI requirements and the consequences of abusing the EI system, such as penalties or prosecutions.


In 2012/13, Service Canada held 7,806 Claimant Information Sessions, to which 132,394 claimants were directed to attend. Service Canada also conducted 337,541 investigations into suspected client error and fraud.<sup>18</sup> Combined, these activities resulted in a total of \$438.5 million in savings for the EI Operating Account (see Chart 3). 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.

---

<sup>18</sup> For more detailed information, please see Annex 4.7.

**CHART 3**

EI Total Savings\*



\* The numbers have been rounded to the nearest hundred thousand. The national amounts (Nat) have been calculated 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 Miramichi, N.B.

Note: "W-T" refers to the Western region and Territories. This includes: the three territories (North-West, Yukon, and Nunavut), British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. "ATL" refers to the Atlantic region. This includes: New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland and Labrador.

Source: EI administrative data.

## 1. Integrity Quality Initiatives

To support the achievement of its mandate to prevent, detect and deter 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. Regular monitoring visits to regional Integrity units are made to evaluate integrity program activity.

Service Canada has taken significant steps to implement a quality management and reporting system for the Social Insurance Number (SIN) program's database, the Social Insurance Register (SIR). Since 2007, it has measured the accuracy rate of all data on the SIR annually. In the 2012 calendar year, the key performance indicators for the SIR were as follows:

- the accuracy rate for birth and deceased data was 98%; and
- the accuracy rate for legitimate SINs in the SIR was greater than 99.9%.

In addition, since 2008, Service Canada has implemented a quality management strategy for new updates to the SIR—specifically, those related to clients applying for a SIN or updating their SIN. In 2012/13, of the updates reviewed, 99.97% were free of critical errors (i.e., no multiple SINs were issued and no date of birth errors were made). Overall, the accuracy of the SIR is fundamental to all SIN-enabled programs, including the EI program, as accurately identifying clients is crucial to ensuring benefits are paid to the correct and eligible individuals.

## 2. Risk Management

Enhancing service integrity is fundamental to delivering citizen-centred service and meeting the expectations of Canadian citizens, improving public trust and confidence in government, and achieving savings through the reduction of incorrect payments and the identification of overpayments.

In 2012/13, Service Canada continued to emphasize the use of risk management strategies in its approach to investigations, to improve the overall integrity of the program and to ensure that correct payments were made to eligible claimants. As part of this activity,

the Department's integrity services has a robust risk analysis function to quantitatively and qualitatively assess program integrity risks and to develop appropriate mitigation strategies to address any identified vulnerabilities.

In 2012/13, EI integrity risk management activities focused significantly on an EI Stewardship Review. This Stewardship Review was undertaken to identify the nature of prominent risks and measure the extent

of incorrect payments in the EI Program due to external error, abuse and fraud. The results of this review will provide the Department with a better understanding of the nature of incorrect payments and help support the identification of new measures to further enhance the integrity of the EI program.





## ANNEX 1

# KEY LABOUR MARKET STATISTICS



<b>Annex 1.1</b>	Labour Force Estimates .....	<b>186</b>
<b>Annex 1.2</b>	Employment, by Province, Gender, Age and Educational Level .....	<b>187</b>
<b>Annex 1.3</b>	Employment, by Industry, Employment Type, Class of Worker and Job Permanency .....	<b>189</b>
<b>Annex 1.4</b>	Unemployment, by Province, Gender, Age, Educational Level, Industry, and Duration of Unemployment .....	<b>191</b>
<b>Annex 1.5</b>	Unemployment Rate, by Province, Gender, Age, Educational Level and Industry .....	<b>194</b>
<b>Annex 1.6</b>	Unemployment Rate, by EI Region (%) .....	<b>197</b>
<b>Annex 1.7</b>	Duration of Unemployment, by Province, Gender and Age .....	<b>200</b>
<b>Annex 1.8</b>	Employment Insurance Economic Regions: Unemployment Rates, 2012/13 .....	<b>201</b>

### Annex 1.1 Labour Force Estimates

	Annual Labour Force Estimates, by Fiscal Year (000s) <sup>2</sup>											
	% Change <sup>1</sup>	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04
Population	1.2	28,400.8	28,066.4	27,743.9	27,391.7	27,006.9	26,613.4	26,239.1	25,871.4	25,515.8	25,180.0	
Labour force	1.1	18,939.3	18,724.0	18,584.2	18,363.9	18,248.3	17,968.1	17,612.5	17,335.7	17,189.7	17,008.0	
Employment <sup>3</sup>	1.4	17,579.1	17,344.3	17,121.3	16,827.6	17,038.2	16,896.3	16,513.3	16,187.5	15,971.1	15,722.8	
Unemployment	-1.4	1,360.2	1,379.7	1,463.0	1,536.3	1,210.1	1,071.8	1,099.2	1,148.2	1,218.6	1,285.2	
	Annual Labour Force Estimates, by Fiscal Year (%) <sup>2</sup>											
	% Point Change <sup>4</sup>	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04
Unemployment rate	-0.2	7.2	7.4	7.9	8.3	6.6	6.0	6.3	6.6	7.1	7.5	
Participation rate	0.0	66.7	66.7	67.0	67.0	67.6	67.5	67.1	67.0	67.4	67.5	
Employment rate	0.1	61.9	61.8	61.7	61.4	63.1	63.5	62.9	62.6	62.6	62.4	

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

<sup>1</sup> Percentage growth between 2011/12 and 2012/13.

<sup>2</sup> Fiscal year data are calculated using annual averages of unadjusted monthly data.

<sup>3</sup> Employment includes those who are self-employed.

<sup>4</sup> Percentage point difference between 2011/12 and 2012/13.

### Annex 1.2 Employment, by Province, Gender, Age and Educational Level

	% Change 2011/12-2012/13	Annual Employment, by Fiscal Year (000s) <sup>1</sup>										
		2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04	
<b>Province</b>												
Newfoundland and Labrador	3.0	232.3	225.6	222.3	213.2	216.8	217.9	215.9	212.5	213.6	212.7	
Prince Edward Island	1.7	73.5	72.3	70.5	69.5	69.1	68.9	68.5	67.9	67.0	66.2	
Nova Scotia	0.1	454.5	454.1	453.2	451.0	452.5	448.5	443.3	441.5	442.0	433.2	
New Brunswick	0.0	351.7	351.6	354.7	359.4	359.0	358.7	350.5	348.8	348.7	342.8	
Quebec	1.6	4,010.0	3,946.3	3,934.6	3,857.1	3,869.6	3,856.5	3,759.1	3,709.7	3,684.6	3,630.6	
Ontario	0.9	6,805.6	6,747.1	6,646.1	6,507.8	6,635.8	6,595.8	6,478.5	6,390.0	6,317.4	6,236.5	
Manitoba	1.3	633.1	625.0	622.7	610.0	609.2	600.9	590.8	582.4	580.4	572.7	
Saskatchewan	3.1	543.3	527.1	524.8	520.3	515.6	505.5	498.4	482.1	485.2	477.6	
Alberta	2.4	2,160.7	2,110.7	2,032.2	2,013.8	2,057.6	2,006.8	1,939.9	1,844.5	1,787.3	1,745.4	
British Columbia	1.3	2,314.4	2,284.5	2,260.1	2,225.4	2,253.0	2,236.8	2,168.4	2,108.0	2,044.9	2,005.2	
<b>Gender</b>												
Men	1.2	9,219.6	9,106.8	8,969.7	8,760.6	8,958.5	8,920.6	8,738.9	8,621.8	8,503.5	8,366.8	
Women	1.5	8,359.5	8,237.5	8,151.5	8,067.0	8,079.7	7,975.7	7,774.5	7,565.8	7,467.6	7,356.0	
<b>Age</b>												
15 to 24 years	-1.0	2,435.2	2,460.9	2,454.7	2,454.5	2,617.8	2,628.9	2,560.6	2,498.5	2,465.4	2,433.8	
25 to 54 years	0.8	11,877.1	11,784.7	11,685.8	11,573.7	11,740.5	11,715.4	11,579.2	11,440.9	11,387.4	11,286.0	
55 years and older	5.4	3,266.8	3,098.7	2,980.8	2,799.4	2,679.8	2,551.9	2,373.5	2,248.1	2,118.3	2,003.0	

Continued on next page...

## Annex 1.2 Employment, by Province, Gender, Age and Educational Level (CONTINUED)

	% Change	Annual Employment, by Fiscal Year (000s) <sup>1</sup>										
		2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04
<b>Educational Level</b>												
Less than high school <sup>2</sup>	-1.4	1,798.9	1,824.5	1,849.2	1,941.1	2,128.7	2,184.0	2,236.9	2,222.9	2,276.9	2,310.8	
High school graduate <sup>3</sup>	-1.5	4,720.4	4,792.1	4,734.5	4,751.9	4,850.0	4,851.2	4,722.6	4,737.1	4,828.6	4,756.4	
Post-secondary certificate or diploma <sup>4</sup>	1.4	6,300.5	6,211.1	6,126.7	5,932.3	5,946.9	5,919.0	5,717.1	5,577.3	5,476.4	5,342.9	
University degree <sup>5</sup>	5.4	4,759.3	4,516.6	4,410.9	4,202.2	4,112.5	3,942.1	3,836.8	3,650.2	3,389.1	3,312.7	
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>17,579.1</b>	<b>17,344.3</b>	<b>17,121.3</b>	<b>16,827.6</b>	<b>17,038.2</b>	<b>16,896.3</b>	<b>16,513.3</b>	<b>16,187.5</b>	<b>15,971.1</b>	<b>15,722.8</b>	

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

<sup>1</sup> Fiscal year data are calculated using annual averages of unadjusted monthly data.

<sup>2</sup> Includes 0 to 8 years of education and some high school.

<sup>3</sup> Includes high school graduation and some post-secondary education (not completed).

<sup>4</sup> Completed a certificate (including a trade certificate) or diploma from an educational institution beyond the secondary level. This includes a certificate from a vocational school, apprenticeship training, community college, college d'enseignement général et professionnel (CEGEP) or school of nursing. Also included are certificates below a bachelor's degree obtained at a university.

<sup>5</sup> Includes at least a university bachelor's degree.

### Annex 1.3 Employment, by Industry, Employment Type, Class of Worker and Job Permanency

	% Change 2011/12-2012/13	Annual Employment, by Fiscal Year (000s) <sup>1</sup>																		
		2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04									
<b>Industry</b>																				
<b>Goods Sector</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>3,874.9</b>	<b>3,805.9</b>	<b>3,770.6</b>	<b>3,701.8</b>	<b>3,962.3</b>	<b>3,978.9</b>	<b>3,982.6</b>	<b>3,999.2</b>	<b>4,003.7</b>	<b>3,932.3</b>									
Agriculture	2.9	312.9	304.2	302.8	313.9	318.8	334.8	343.5	350.5	328.8	329.5									
Forestry, fishing, mining, quarrying, oil and gas	6.0	366.6	345.7	331.7	315.9	342.4	340.6	339.8	317.4	292.1	280.8									
Utilities	1.2	139.4	137.7	148.1	147.3	150.5	143.4	123.1	123.6	129.6	130.8									
Construction	0.8	1,276.1	1,266.5	1,231.4	1,164.0	1,222.4	1,155.1	1,078.1	1,034.8	967.8	915.4									
Manufacturing	1.6	1,779.9	1,751.9	1,756.6	1,760.7	1,928.3	2,004.9	2,098.2	2,172.8	2,285.4	2,275.8									
<b>Service Sector</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>13,704.2</b>	<b>13,538.4</b>	<b>13,350.7</b>	<b>13,125.8</b>	<b>13,075.9</b>	<b>12,917.4</b>	<b>12,530.7</b>	<b>12,188.3</b>	<b>11,967.4</b>	<b>11,790.6</b>									
Trade	-0.1	2,659.9	2,663.6	2,677.1	2,655.1	2,675.9	2,686.5	2,621.2	2,580.2	2,513.9	2,467.5									
Transportation and warehousing	1.3	855.8	844.9	817.4	803.6	845.5	828.7	799.0	798.5	799.0	799.6									
Finance, insurance, real estate and leasing	2.5	1,105.0	1,077.9	1,087.9	1,098.7	1,075.6	1,061.7	1,046.8	989.3	976.7	931.2									
Professional, scientific and technical services	-0.6	1,304.6	1,313.1	1,282.1	1,203.1	1,188.3	1,150.0	1,088.0	1,057.8	1,014.3	1,001.4									
Business, building and other support services	2.6	695.3	677.5	678.0	654.2	671.4	703.6	690.0	659.9	633.1	615.4									
Educational services	5.7	1,296.5	1,226.5	1,218.2	1,203.9	1,181.3	1,183.5	1,161.3	1,120.7	1,041.4	1,033.2									
Health care and social assistance	2.3	2,145.4	2,096.8	2,050.1	1,961.7	1,915.2	1,843.6	1,802.0	1,725.0	1,719.6	1,687.8									
Information, culture and recreation	-0.4	787.3	790.8	769.5	772.1	753.2	776.0	748.9	732.6	733.3	723.5									
Accommodation and food services	0.1	1,107.9	1,106.6	1,052.0	1,057.2	1,087.3	1,069.0	1,031.4	998.0	1,007.2	994.4									
Other services	2.4	789.2	770.8	752.8	782.0	755.8	728.7	707.4	694.2	702.6	709.5									
Public administration	-1.3	957.3	970.1	965.6	934.3	926.4	886.3	834.5	832.2	826.3	827.0									

Continued on next page...

### Annex 1.3 Employment, by Industry, Employment Type, Class of Worker and Job Permanency (CONTINUED)

Employment Type	% Change 2011/12-2012/13	Annual Employment, by Fiscal Year (000s) <sup>1</sup>										
		2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04	
Full-time employment	1.7	14,276.2	14,041.3	13,790.9	13,592.1	13,849.6	13,812.8	13,511.9	13,215.1	13,011.0	12,763.2	
Part-time employment	0.0	3,303.0	3,302.9	3,330.4	3,235.5	3,188.6	3,083.4	3,001.4	2,972.4	2,960.1	2,959.7	
<b>Class of Worker</b>												
<b>Employees</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>14,901.4</b>	<b>14,677.0</b>	<b>14,457.1</b>	<b>14,130.0</b>	<b>14,404.6</b>	<b>14,276.7</b>	<b>14,006.6</b>	<b>13,654.4</b>	<b>13,481.3</b>	<b>13,304.3</b>	
Public sector employees	1.4	3,613.9	3,563.9	3,535.2	3,439.5	3,409.2	3,319.8	3,191.3	3,130.4	3,055.5	2,968.8	
Private sector employees	1.6	11,287.5	11,113.1	10,921.9	10,690.5	10,995.4	10,956.8	10,815.4	10,524.0	10,425.8	10,335.6	
<b>Self-Employed<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>2,677.7</b>	<b>2,667.3</b>	<b>2,664.2</b>	<b>2,697.6</b>	<b>2,633.6</b>	<b>2,619.6</b>	<b>2,506.7</b>	<b>2,533.1</b>	<b>2,489.8</b>	<b>2,418.5</b>	
<b>Job Permanency</b>												
<b>Employees</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>14,901.4</b>	<b>14,677.0</b>	<b>14,457.1</b>	<b>14,130.0</b>	<b>14,404.6</b>	<b>14,276.7</b>	<b>14,006.6</b>	<b>13,654.4</b>	<b>13,481.3</b>	<b>13,304.3</b>	
Permanent employees <sup>3</sup>	1.6	12,871.1	12,665.7	12,518.1	12,322.4	12,640.4	12,453.3	12,174.2	11,850.1	11,748.1	11,653.1	
Temporary employees <sup>4</sup>	0.9	2,030.3	2,011.3	1,939.0	1,807.6	1,764.2	1,823.4	1,832.5	1,804.3	1,733.3	1,651.3	
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>17,579.1</b>	<b>17,344.3</b>	<b>17,121.3</b>	<b>16,827.6</b>	<b>17,038.2</b>	<b>16,896.3</b>	<b>16,513.3</b>	<b>16,187.5</b>	<b>15,971.1</b>	<b>15,722.8</b>	

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

<sup>1</sup> Fiscal year data are calculated using annual averages of unadjusted monthly data.

<sup>2</sup> Includes both incorporated and unincorporated working owners, self-employed persons who do not have a business, and persons working in a family business without pay.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

### Annex 1.4 Unemployment, by Province, Gender, Age, Educational Level, Industry, and Duration of Unemployment

	% Change 2011/12-2012/13	Annual Unemployment, by Fiscal Year (%) <sup>1</sup>										
		2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04	
<b>Province</b>												
Newfoundland and Labrador	-3.3	32.2	33.3	35.0	39.2	35.0	32.6	36.6	38.5	38.8	40.8	
Prince Edward Island	3.3	9.5	9.2	9.1	9.0	8.8	7.8	8.2	8.5	8.3	8.2	
Nova Scotia	9.2	46.4	42.5	46.5	45.7	39.6	38.3	37.6	39.2	42.7	43.5	
New Brunswick	9.0	41.0	37.6	36.9	34.5	34.5	30.2	31.5	36.5	37.3	38.4	
Quebec	-2.2	329.9	337.4	335.7	353.3	316.8	293.8	322.3	335.9	337.3	366.6	
Ontario	1.9	575.3	564.5	610.8	653.0	509.2	447.0	439.6	444.7	460.2	463.0	
Manitoba	-3.6	34.6	35.9	35.1	34.3	27.8	27.3	26.9	27.7	32.6	29.9	
Saskatchewan	-6.0	25.2	26.8	29.5	26.4	22.8	22.1	22.6	26.1	26.2	28.5	
Alberta	-13.2	101.9	117.4	134.7	149.8	88.9	72.9	69.9	72.1	83.1	92.7	
British Columbia	-6.2	164.2	175.1	189.6	191.2	126.8	99.7	103.9	119.0	152.1	173.6	
<b>Gender</b>												
Men	-1.3	755.1	764.9	826.9	918.6	703.3	599.2	606.9	630.4	674.1	721.5	
Women	-1.6	605.1	614.8	636.1	617.7	506.8	472.6	492.2	517.7	544.5	563.7	
<b>Age</b>												
15 to 24 years	-1.0	401.6	405.6	418.2	448.2	367.6	329.4	334.0	347.3	372.3	392.8	
25 to 54 years	-2.2	752.0	769.2	840.4	891.1	686.9	615.4	637.0	681.3	724.7	769.6	
55 years and older	0.8	206.5	204.9	204.3	197.0	155.6	127.0	128.1	119.5	121.6	122.8	
<b>Educational Level</b>												
Less than high school <sup>2</sup>	-4.2	311.8	325.3	344.5	373.3	314.6	296.9	313.7	312.1	347.4	367.5	
High school graduate <sup>3</sup>	-2.4	418.5	428.6	463.8	496.0	379.2	323.7	329.3	353.0	380.9	400.4	
Post-secondary certificate or diploma <sup>4</sup>	-2.9	381.0	392.5	416.2	437.0	331.3	300.1	303.7	312.1	320.3	327.2	
University degree <sup>5</sup>	6.7	248.9	233.3	238.5	230.0	185.0	151.1	152.4	171.0	170.0	190.1	

Continued on next page...

### Annex 1.4 Unemployment, by Province, Gender, Age, Educational Level, Industry, and Duration of Unemployment (CONTINUED)

Industry	% Change 2011/12-2012/13	Annual Unemployment, by Fiscal Year (%) <sup>1</sup>										
		2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04	
<b>Goods Sector</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>252.5</b>	<b>251.7</b>	<b>291.1</b>	<b>381.1</b>	<b>309.0</b>	<b>249.9</b>	<b>261.8</b>	<b>259.6</b>	<b>272.7</b>	<b>292.2</b>	
Agriculture	-12.8	17.0	19.5	19.7	18.3	17.4	16.7	16.9	19.8	20.5	20.7	
Forestry, fishing, mining, quarrying, oil and gas	25.3	30.2	24.1	27.3	40.7	33.9	26.4	27.3	28.1	28.1	32.4	
Utilities	0.0	3.5	3.5	3.2	4.7	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.3	2.9	3.5	
Construction	0.2	106.3	106.1	124.6	140.1	104.0	80.7	86.6	80.0	87.1	91.5	
Manufacturing	-3.2	95.4	98.6	116.5	177.5	151.2	123.8	129.0	129.6	134.4	144.3	
<b>Service Sector</b>	<b>-0.1</b>	<b>591.6</b>	<b>592.3</b>	<b>637.8</b>	<b>692.7</b>	<b>555.7</b>	<b>501.0</b>	<b>490.7</b>	<b>516.6</b>	<b>556.1</b>	<b>592.0</b>	
Trade	-5.4	129.2	136.6	145.0	163.8	131.3	115.6	106.8	119.5	122.9	126.2	
Transportation and warehousing	-3.7	34.1	35.4	39.4	48.6	34.3	28.6	30.7	27.2	35.3	34.0	
Finance, insurance, real estate and leasing	-6.1	27.9	29.7	30.5	38.4	22.8	21.2	20.6	25.1	22.8	25.0	
Professional, scientific and technical services	5.2	44.3	42.1	44.0	54.1	37.2	32.1	32.1	33.3	38.4	42.2	
Business, building and other support services	-2.2	62.7	64.1	74.6	80.5	69.8	58.8	59.1	61.4	64.4	73.7	
Educational services	9.5	53.0	48.4	51.2	49.8	42.1	44.8	39.4	38.0	44.1	43.5	
Health care and social assistance	15.8	46.2	39.9	47.7	41.0	34.8	32.8	32.5	35.8	42.3	38.8	
Information, culture and recreation	-0.9	53.1	53.6	56.8	51.6	47.1	39.6	41.0	42.8	44.8	52.3	
Accommodation and food services	-0.7	82.8	83.4	90.4	99.0	83.9	79.1	76.9	81.7	82.2	93.6	
Other services	1.5	33.4	32.9	34.3	43.3	33.1	27.4	28.9	28.5	33.9	38.3	
Public administration	-4.6	25.0	26.2	23.9	22.7	19.4	20.9	22.7	23.4	24.9	24.6	
Unclassified industries	-3.7	516.0	555.8	534.0	462.5	345.4	320.9	346.7	372.0	389.9	401.0	

Continued on next page...



### Annex 1.4 Unemployment, by Province, Gender, Age, Educational Level, Industry, and Duration of Unemployment (CONTINUED)

	% Change 2011/12-2012/13	Annual Unemployment, by Fiscal Year (%) <sup>1</sup>									
		2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04
<b>Duration of Unemployment<sup>6</sup></b>											
1 to 4 weeks	-1.2	457.8	463.4	464.8	486.8	481.0	431.2	436.2	433.8	454.0	469.6
5 to 13 weeks	-0.2	361.1	361.9	387.9	429.9	338.8	292.1	304.6	318.2	331.8	351.5
14 to 26 weeks	3.2	217.9	211.1	238.5	284.6	176.5	151.6	148.7	169.5	183.0	196.8
27 to 51 weeks	-6.0	101.2	107.7	136.3	144.7	73.5	66.6	63.8	71.8	81.1	87.7
52 weeks or more	-8.8	162.6	178.3	175.9	131.8	80.6	74.2	88.1	100.8	111.6	122.9
Duration unknown	3.8	59.6	57.4	59.6	58.5	59.7	56.0	57.9	54.0	57.1	56.6
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>-1.4</b>	<b>1,360.2</b>	<b>1,379.7</b>	<b>1,463.0</b>	<b>1,536.3</b>	<b>1,210.1</b>	<b>1,071.8</b>	<b>1,099.2</b>	<b>1,148.2</b>	<b>1,218.6</b>	<b>1,285.2</b>

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

<sup>1</sup> Fiscal year data are calculated using annual averages of unadjusted monthly data.

<sup>2</sup> Includes 0 to 8 years of education and some high school.

<sup>3</sup> Includes high school graduation and some post-secondary education (not completed).

<sup>4</sup> Completed a certificate (including a trade certificate) or diploma from an educational institution beyond the secondary level. This includes a certificate from a vocational school, apprenticeship training, community college, collège d'enseignement général et professionnel (CEGEP) or school of nursing. Also included are certificates below a bachelor's degree obtained at a university.

<sup>5</sup> Includes at least a university bachelor's degree.

<sup>6</sup> 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.

### Annex 1.5 Unemployment Rate, by Province, Gender, Age, Educational Level and Industry

	% Point Change <sup>1</sup> 2011/12-2012/13	Annual Unemployment Rate, by Fiscal Year (%) <sup>2</sup>									
		2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04
<b>Province</b>											
Newfoundland and Labrador	-0.7	12.2	12.9	13.6	15.6	14.0	13.1	14.5	15.4	15.4	16.2
Prince Edward Island	0.1	11.5	11.4	11.5	11.4	11.4	10.3	10.8	11.1	11.1	11.1
Nova Scotia	0.7	9.3	8.6	9.3	9.2	8.0	7.9	7.8	8.2	8.8	9.2
New Brunswick	0.7	10.4	9.7	9.4	8.8	8.8	7.8	8.2	9.5	9.7	10.1
Quebec	-0.3	7.6	7.9	7.9	8.4	7.6	7.1	7.9	8.3	8.4	9.2
Ontario	0.1	7.8	7.7	8.4	9.1	7.1	6.3	6.4	6.5	6.8	6.9
Manitoba	-0.2	5.2	5.4	5.3	5.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5	5.3	5.0
Saskatchewan	-0.4	4.4	4.8	5.3	4.8	4.2	4.2	4.3	5.1	5.1	5.6
Alberta	-0.7	4.5	5.2	6.2	6.9	4.2	3.5	3.5	3.8	4.4	5.0
British Columbia	-0.5	6.6	7.1	7.7	7.9	5.3	4.3	4.6	5.3	6.9	8.0
<b>Gender</b>											
Men	-0.1	7.6	7.7	8.4	9.5	7.3	6.3	6.5	6.8	7.4	7.9
Women	-0.2	6.7	6.9	7.2	7.1	5.9	5.6	6.0	6.4	6.8	7.1
<b>Age</b>											
15 to 24 years	0.0	14.1	14.1	14.5	15.4	12.4	11.1	11.5	12.2	13.1	13.9
25 to 54 years	-0.2	5.9	6.1	6.7	7.1	5.5	5.0	5.2	5.6	6.0	6.4
55 years and older	-0.2	6.0	6.2	6.4	6.6	5.5	4.7	5.1	5.0	5.4	5.8
<b>Educational Level</b>											
Less than high school <sup>3</sup>	-0.3	14.8	15.1	15.7	16.1	12.9	12.0	12.3	12.3	13.2	13.7
High school graduate <sup>4</sup>	-0.1	8.1	8.2	8.9	9.5	7.3	6.3	6.5	6.9	7.3	7.8
Post-secondary certificate or diploma <sup>5</sup>	-0.2	5.7	5.9	6.4	6.9	5.3	4.8	5.0	5.3	5.5	5.8
University degree <sup>6</sup>	0.1	5.0	4.9	5.1	5.2	4.3	3.7	3.8	4.5	4.8	5.4

Continued on next page...

**Annex 1.5 Unemployment Rate, by Province, Gender, Age, Educational Level and Industry (CONTINUED)**

	Annual Unemployment Rate, by Fiscal Year (%) <sup>2</sup>												
	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04		
<b>Industry</b>													
<b>Goods Sector</b>													
Agriculture	-0.1	6.1	6.2	7.2	9.3	7.3	5.9	6.2	6.1	6.4	6.9		
Forestry, fishing, mining, quarrying, oil and gas	-0.9	5.2	6.1	6.2	5.6	5.3	4.8	4.8	5.4	5.9	6.0		
Utilities	1.1	7.6	6.5	7.6	11.4	9.0	7.2	7.5	8.2	8.8	10.4		
Construction	0.0	2.5	2.5	2.1	3.1	1.7	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.2	2.6		
Manufacturing	-0.1	7.7	7.8	9.2	10.8	8.0	6.6	7.5	7.2	8.3	9.2		
<b>Service Sector</b>	-0.2	5.1	5.3	6.2	9.1	7.3	5.8	5.8	5.6	5.5	6.0		
Trade	-0.1	4.1	4.2	4.6	5.0	4.1	3.8	3.8	4.1	4.4	4.8		
Transportation and warehousing	-0.3	4.6	4.9	5.1	5.8	4.7	4.1	3.9	4.4	4.6	4.8		
Finance, insurance, real estate and leasing	-0.2	3.8	4.0	4.6	5.7	3.9	3.3	3.7	3.3	4.2	4.1		
Professional, scientific and technical services	-0.2	2.5	2.7	2.7	3.4	2.1	2.0	1.9	2.5	2.3	2.6		
Business, building and other support services	0.2	3.3	3.1	3.3	4.3	3.0	2.7	2.9	3.1	3.6	4.0		
Educational services	-0.4	8.3	8.7	9.9	11.0	9.5	7.7	7.9	8.5	9.3	10.7		
Health care and social assistance	0.0	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.1	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.4	4.2	4.1		
Information, culture and recreation	0.3	2.1	1.8	2.3	2.0	1.8	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.4	2.3		
Accommodation and food services	-0.1	6.3	6.4	6.9	6.3	5.9	4.9	5.2	5.5	5.8	6.7		
	-0.1	6.9	7.0	7.9	8.6	7.2	6.9	7.0	7.6	7.5	8.6		

Continued on next page...

### Annex 1.5 Unemployment Rate, by Province, Gender, Age, Educational Level and Industry (CONTINUED)

	Annual Unemployment Rate, by Fiscal Year (%) <sup>2</sup>											
	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04	
Other services	-0.1	4.0	4.1	4.4	5.3	4.2	3.6	3.9	3.9	4.6	5.1	
Public administration	0.0	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.6	2.7	2.9	2.9	
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>-0.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>7.5</b>	

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

1 Percentage point difference between 2011/12 and 2012/13.

2 Fiscal year data are calculated using annual averages of unadjusted monthly data.

3 Includes 0 to 8 years of education and some high school.

4 Includes high school graduation and some post-secondary education (not completed).

5 Completed a certificate (including a trade certificate) or diploma from an educational institution beyond the secondary level. This includes a certificate from a vocational school, apprenticeship training, community college, collège d'enseignement général et professionnel (CEGEP) or school of nursing. Also included are certificates below a bachelor's degree obtained at a university.

6 Includes at least a university bachelor's degree.

### Annex 1.6 Unemployment Rate, by EI Region (%)<sup>1</sup>

	Mar 2013	Dec 2012	Sep 2012	Jun 2012	Mar 2012	Dec 2011	Sep 2011	Jun 2011
<b>Newfoundland and Labrador</b>								
St. John's	6.7	6.7	7.0	7.6	7.1	7.1	6.3	5.5
Newfoundland and Labrador	15.8	17.8	17.6	16.2	18.2	18.6	18.2	16.5
<b>Prince Edward Island</b>								
Prince Edward Island	11.5	11.4	11.2	11.3	11.5	11.3	12.0	11.5
<b>Nova Scotia</b>								
Eastern Nova Scotia	15.5	16.5	15.7	14.0	14.1	16.6	15.8	17.2
Western Nova Scotia	11.5	10.9	11.1	10.8	9.5	10.0	10.0	10.4
Halifax	6.6	5.6	6.6	6.2	5.7	5.7	6.3	6.4
<b>New Brunswick</b>								
Fredericton-Moncton-Saint John	8.0	7.8	7.4	7.2	7.3	7.0	7.0	7.1
Madawaska-Charlotte <sup>2</sup>	13.3	13.3	12.5	11.0	11.2	10.6	11.4	12.1
Restigouche-Albert	16.3	17.7	14.8	15.5	14.5	15.4	15.3	15.3
<b>Quebec</b>								
Gaspésie-Îles-de-la-Madeleine	18.1	13.9	12.7	14.1	12.9	13.7	13.5	13.9
Quebec	4.7	5.0	5.3	5.2	5.2	4.5	4.9	6.9
Trois-Rivières	8.2	8.0	7.7	8.3	8.0	8.8	8.4	8.3
South Central Quebec	3.8	4.0	5.1	4.9	4.6	5.2	5.1	5.8
Sherbrooke	6.9	7.6	7.9	6.6	7.1	6.3	6.8	7.0
Montréal	6.1	6.3	6.7	6.8	9.1	8.7	6.6	7.0
Montréal	7.6	8.2	8.5	8.9	9.3	8.2	8.5	7.9
Central Quebec	7.7	8.6	7.9	8.8	9.6	8.2	7.8	8.2
Northwestern Quebec	9.6	9.7	9.8	8.3	10.1	9.9	9.2	10.3
Lower St. Lawrence and North Shore <sup>2</sup>	10.0	8.8	9.7	9.5	9.9	9.2	9.3	10.2
Hull	7.1	6.3	5.9	5.4	6.0	7.1	6.3	6.8
Chicoutimi-Jonquière	9.4	8.0	6.8	5.9	6.2	5.7	7.0	7.7

Continued on next page...

### Annex 1.6 Unemployment Rate, by EI Region (%)<sup>1</sup> (CONTINUED)

	Mar 2013	Dec 2012	Sep 2012	Jun 2012	Mar 2012	Dec 2011	Sep 2011	Jun 2011
<b>Ontario</b>								
Ottawa	6.0	6.5	6.3	6.1	6.0	6.0	4.9	5.8
Eastern Ontario	7.4	8.3	7.8	7.9	8.6	8.6	8.5	8.4
Kingston	6.9	7.0	6.5	6.2	6.9	6.0	6.8	7.1
Central Ontario	7.5	8.8	7.7	7.5	7.6	8.8	8.9	8.6
Oshawa	9.4	9.1	8.9	8.4	7.5	7.1	7.5	10.1
Toronto	8.5	8.4	8.5	8.6	8.6	8.5	8.1	8.6
Hamilton	5.7	6.1	7.2	6.8	5.9	6.5	6.9	5.6
St. Catharines	7.3	8.3	8.5	7.8	7.7	7.7	8.4	9.2
London	9.2	8.6	8.5	8.3	8.8	9.9	8.9	8.3
Niagara	10.0	10.5	10.9	9.9	10.2	9.9	10.4	10.1
Windsor	9.4	10.1	9.5	10.1	11.1	11.2	8.7	10.8
Kitchener	7.1	6.3	6.4	6.6	6.7	6.9	6.2	7.1
Huron	7.5	8.0	7.5	8.4	9.7	7.5	7.4	8.1
South Central Ontario	5.5	5.9	5.3	5.2	5.4	5.4	5.9	7.5
Sudbury	7.8	6.2	7.0	7.0	6.5	5.3	6.3	8.1
Thunder Bay	6.1	5.6	6.5	5.8	5.7	7.3	6.7	7.2
Northern Ontario	13.5	13.3	10.6	10.4	11.4	12.1	12.1	12.4
<b>Manitoba</b>								
Winnipeg	5.5	5.5	5.8	5.5	5.8	5.9	5.9	5.7
Southern Manitoba	5.4	6.5	6.4	5.9	5.9	6.2	6.3	6.0
Northern Manitoba	31.0	31.1	31.8	29.3	28.7	28.4	28.1	28.1
<b>Saskatchewan</b>								
Regina	4.0	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.3	3.7	4.7	5.5
Saskatoon	4.8	5.5	5.3	5.6	5.9	5.7	5.2	6.1
Southern Saskatchewan	5.8	6.3	6.9	6.6	6.1	6.7	6.7	6.2
Northern Saskatchewan	17.0	17.4	17.0	17.6	18.5	17.6	17.4	17.7

Continued on next page...

**Annex 1.6 Unemployment Rate, by EI Region (%)<sup>1</sup>** (CONTINUED)

	Mar 2013	Dec 2012	Sep 2012	Jun 2012	Mar 2012	Dec 2011	Sep 2011	Jun 2011
<b>Alberta</b>								
Calgary	5.2	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.1	5.4	6.2	5.8
Edmonton	4.5	4.5	4.7	5.3	5.6	5.6	5.5	6.0
Northern Alberta	8.0	8.4	7.9	8.3	8.8	9.0	8.9	8.7
Southern Alberta	5.5	5.8	5.9	6.0	5.8	6.0	6.6	6.8
<b>British Columbia</b>								
Southern Interior British Columbia	7.5	7.8	6.3	9.3	8.2	8.7	8.4	9.2
Abbotsford	7.2	7.5	7.7	8.3	10.8	8.7	8.4	9.2
Vancouver	6.4	7.1	6.9	6.5	6.8	6.7	7.3	7.7
Victoria	6.2	6.1	6.7	6.0	6.0	6.9	7.0	6.9
Southern Coastal British Columbia	8.4	8.1	8.7	8.1	8.1	8.3	10.0	10.2
Northern British Columbia	10.2	10.9	12.6	11.8	12.0	11.2	11.1	10.4
<b>Territories<sup>3</sup></b>								
Yukon	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Northwest Territories	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Nunavut	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>8.1</b>

Source: HRSDC, EI administrative data; Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.

<sup>1</sup> Unemployment rates used by the EI program are a three-month moving average of seasonally adjusted rates for the ending month.

<sup>2</sup> Unemployment rates for these regions have been determined using a transition formula prescribed in the Employment Insurance Regulations.

<sup>3</sup> Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut unemployment rates are set at 25% for EI purposes.

### Annex 1.7 Duration of Unemployment, by Province, Gender and Age<sup>1</sup>

	Average Weeks Unemployed, by Fiscal Year <sup>2, 3</sup>										
	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04
<b>Province</b>											
Newfoundland and Labrador	-0.9	14.8	15.7	15.6	15.2	14.5	15.1	15.6	16.4	15.8	18.2
Prince Edward Island	1.3	13.6	12.3	13.1	13.5	13.1	12.0	13.4	12.9	12.8	10.7
Nova Scotia	1.0	16.6	15.6	17.7	14.9	13.0	13.6	12.8	13.7	14.8	13.8
New Brunswick	-0.5	15.4	15.9	15.3	13.9	13.5	11.5	12.9	13.4	13.8	13.1
Quebec	-0.3	18.5	18.8	17.5	17.1	16.2	17.0	17.4	17.5	17.8	17.8
Ontario	-0.5	19.9	20.4	21.0	18.5	14.0	13.8	14.1	14.7	15.5	15.5
Manitoba	1.7	15.3	13.6	13.9	11.8	10.2	10.6	11.3	13.5	13.1	12.2
Saskatchewan	-0.4	13.2	13.6	14.0	11.4	9.6	10.4	10.0	12.8	13.8	13.2
Alberta	-2.4	12.4	14.8	16.5	13.9	7.9	8.2	8.0	10.4	10.3	9.4
British Columbia	-1.0	17.8	18.8	18.0	14.7	11.0	12.0	12.4	15.3	15.4	17.7
<b>Gender</b>											
Men	-0.9	18.5	19.4	19.3	17.4	14.3	15.0	14.6	15.6	16.3	16.9
Women	0.1	17.7	17.6	17.8	15.7	12.8	12.6	14.1	14.7	14.7	14.5
<b>Age</b>											
15 to 24 years	0.2	11.1	10.9	10.9	10.3	7.8	7.7	7.9	8.8	8.8	9.3
25 to 54 years	-0.3	20.3	20.6	20.8	18.3	15.5	16.2	16.4	17.2	17.9	17.9
55 years and older	-2.8	23.9	26.7	25.7	23.9	19.8	19.3	21.3	22.7	22.6	24.2
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>-0.5</b>	<b>18.1</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>15.8</b>

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey.


<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Fiscal year data are calculated using annual averages of unadjusted monthly data.

<sup>3</sup> For comparison with data from previous recessions, the data on the duration of unemployment have been coded with a maximum value of 99 weeks.



**Annex 1.8 Employment Insurance Economic Regions: Unemployment Rates, 2012/13**





## ANNEX 2

# INCOME BENEFITS DATA TABLES

<b>Annex 2.1</b>	Total Income Benefits .....	<b>204</b>
<b>Annex 2.2</b>	Regular Benefits .....	<b>206</b>
<b>Annex 2.3</b>	Regular Benefits, by Industry .....	<b>208</b>
<b>Annex 2.4</b>	Regular Benefits, by Regional Unemployment Rate and Insurable Hours of Previous Employment .....	<b>210</b>
<b>Annex 2.5</b>	Regular Benefits, by EI Region .....	<b>211</b>
<b>Annex 2.6</b>	Fishing Benefits .....	<b>214</b>
<b>Annex 2.7</b>	Seasonal Claimants .....	<b>215</b>
<b>Annex 2.8</b>	Special Benefits .....	<b>217</b>
<b>Annex 2.9</b>	Maternity Benefits .....	<b>219</b>
<b>Annex 2.10</b>	Parental Benefits (Biological) .....	<b>220</b>
<b>Annex 2.11</b>	Parental Benefits (Adoptive) .....	<b>221</b>
<b>Annex 2.12</b>	Sickness Benefits .....	<b>222</b>
<b>Annex 2.13</b>	Compassionate Care Benefits .....	<b>223</b>
<b>Annex 2.14</b>	Work-Sharing Benefits .....	<b>224</b>
<b>Annex 2.15</b>	Family Supplement .....	<b>225</b>
<b>Annex 2.16</b>	Working While on Claim .....	<b>227</b>
<b>Annex 2.17</b>	Benefit Repayment Provision .....	<b>229</b>
<b>Annex 2.18</b>	Contributors to the Program, 2011 .....	<b>230</b>
<b>Annex 2.19</b>	Benefits-to-Contributions Ratios, 2011 .....	<b>233</b>

## Annex 2.1 Total Income Benefits

	New Claims <sup>1</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>2</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>2</sup>										
	% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	(000s)			% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	(\$)			% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	(\$ Million)									
		2011/12	2010/11	2009/10		2008/09	2012/13	2011/12		2010/11	2009/10	2008/09							
<b>Province/Territory</b>																			
Newfoundland and Labrador	-6.0	81.5	86.7	85.0	92.3	93.4	3.2	407	394	377	363	360	-5.4	843.0	891.4	884.0	966.0	838.3	
Prince Edward Island	-9.4	21.3	23.5	23.3	24.6	24.4	4.3	397	381	370	364	359	-4.8	214.4	225.2	221.9	227.1	201.9	
Nova Scotia	-6.7	82.3	88.1	86.3	90.7	89.9	3.0	388	377	363	356	349	-3.8	774.8	805.2	791.1	825.9	696.7	
New Brunswick	-2.3	89.8	91.9	91.3	94.1	91.9	4.1	385	370	359	352	347	-1.5	835.3	847.8	833.8	859.5	723.9	
Quebec	-3.9	504.7	525.0	506.3	579.1	571.8	3.3	390	378	364	360	351	-3.3	3,445.4	3,563.7	3,896.4	4,181.3	3,342.9	
Ontario	-2.9	576.4	593.7	566.6	701.4	731.3	3.0	393	382	371	369	366	-2.7	5,064.2	5,202.5	5,874.9	6,917.4	4,922.8	
Manitoba	0.0	58.2	58.2	58.4	66.7	62.0	3.7	381	368	358	352	345	2.3	462.6	452.1	487.8	514.8	390.5	
Saskatchewan	-1.1	43.2	43.7	44.2	49.8	46.2	4.2	408	392	376	369	364	0.8	381.1	378.3	408.0	426.1	321.4	
Alberta	1.0	145.4	144.0	152.0	197.3	166.4	3.1	423	410	400	395	389	-3.2	1,302.2	1,345.6	1,623.9	2,008.9	1,078.6	
British Columbia	-5.3	210.6	222.3	226.8	262.9	255.3	3.2	389	377	367	367	366	-5.0	1,809.9	1,905.8	2,224.1	2,420.7	1,636.2	
Nunavut	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.6	1.4	1.5	6.2	466	439	430	425	403	0.7	17.7	17.6	18.4	17.6	13.0	
Northwest Territories	0.4	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.5	460	449	440	426	420	-0.4	32.3	32.4	31.1	32.6	23.3	
Yukon	0.0	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.0	452	443	434	423	413	8.6	31.0	28.6	27.9	31.9	22.6	
<b>Gender</b>																			
Male	-4.2	982.2	1,024.8	1,010.2	1,228.5	1,232.6	3.3	421	408	395	391	387	-4.6	7,778.8	8,149.7	9,276.0	11,170.9	7,582.9	
Female	-2.5	837.7	858.8	836.6	937.0	906.3	3.4	363	351	340	334	327	-1.5	7,435.2	7,546.6	8,047.5	8,258.8	6,629.4	
<b>Age</b>																			
15 to 24 years (youth)	-5.5	193.2	204.3	218.1	253.3	249.4	3.5	354	342	331	326	325	-5.5	1,347.8	1,426.0	1,595.3	1,962.7	1,418.9	
25 to 44 years	-3.2	873.8	903.0	901.7	1,061.5	1,057.5	3.3	406	393	381	377	370	-1.7	8,128.4	8,268.2	9,057.2	10,323.4	7,807.2	
45 to 54 years	-5.6	410.1	434.4	417.4	508.9	510.3	3.2	399	387	374	372	367	-6.3	3,091.7	3,298.5	3,793.9	4,249.1	2,995.4	
55 years and older (older workers)	0.3	342.9	341.9	309.6	341.8	321.7	3.0	384	373	359	356	351	-2.1	2,646.0	2,703.4	2,877.1	2,894.5	1,990.8	

Continued on next page...

## Annex 2.1 Total Income Benefits (CONTINUED)

	New Claims <sup>1</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>2</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>2</sup>									
	% Change		(000s)		% Change		(\$)		% Change		(\$ Million)							
	2011/12- 2012/13	2011/12 2012/13	2010/11 2011/12	2009/10 2008/09	2011/12- 2012/13	2011/12 2012/13	2010/11 2011/12	2009/10 2008/09	2011/12- 2012/13	2011/12 2012/13	2010/11 2011/12	2009/10 2008/09						
<b>EI Claimant Category<sup>3</sup></b>																		
Long-tenured workers	-11.8	502.6	569.9	536.4	755.6	746.0	3.1	428	415	405	401	396	-6.0	4,937.8	5,252.4	6,501.2	7,288.3	4,870.3
Occasional claimants	0.5	967.3	962.0	971.6	1,079.2	1,069.2	4.1	370	355	344	338	334	-2.6	7,114.5	7,303.4	7,808.1	9,090.8	6,816.2
Frequent claimants	-0.5	350.1	351.8	338.8	330.6	323.7	3.2	414	401	391	380	373	0.7	3,161.6	3,140.4	3,014.2	3,050.6	2,525.8
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>-3.4</b>	<b>1,819.9</b>	<b>1,883.6</b>	<b>1,846.8</b>	<b>2,165.5</b>	<b>2,138.9</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>-3.1</b>	<b>15,213.9</b>	<b>15,696.2</b>	<b>17,323.5</b>	<b>19,429.7</b>	<b>14,212.3</b>

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

<sup>1</sup> Includes claims for which at least \$1 of EI benefits was paid.

<sup>2</sup> Takes into account benefit payments under regular, fishing, special (sickness, maternity, parental, compassionate), employment (section 25 of the *Employment Insurance Act*) and Work-Sharing benefits. Payments under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act* are not included. Dollar figures encompass Family Supplement top-ups paid.

<sup>3</sup> Long-tenured workers are 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 that do not meet the requirements for either long-tenured workers or frequent claimants.

## Annex 2.2 Regular Benefits

Province/Territory	New Claims <sup>1</sup>				Average Duration <sup>2</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>3</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>3</sup>												
	% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	(000s)			% Change 2010/11- 2011/12	(Weeks)			% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	(\$)			% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	(\$ Million)											
		2011/12	2011/12	2010/11		2009/10	2008/09	2012/13		2011/12	2010/11	2009/10		2008/09	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09						
Newfoundland and Labrador	-6.7	62.7	67.3	67.7	73.3	74.1	-4.0	26.6	27.7	28.4	28.7	3.4	400	387	371	360	354	686.7	680.2	628.5	-7.6	759.3	633.9		
Prince Edward Island	-8.3	16.4	17.9	18.0	19.1	18.6	-0.8	25.0	25.2	25.2	24.4	4.3	388	372	361	358	353	159.5	159.3	152.4	-4.3	162.4	143.3		
Nova Scotia	-9.0	62.4	68.6	66.9	70.0	70.2	-3.6	23.9	24.8	25.6	23.9	2.9	385	374	360	353	347	584.4	584.4	552.3	-5.5	608.2	494.3		
New Brunswick	-2.9	73.1	75.3	74.5	76.4	75.2	-1.5	23.7	24.0	24.4	24.2	4.2	386	371	359	353	349	637.5	637.5	627.3	-1.6	655.2	541.1		
Quebec	-5.1	436.6	460.2	441.5	491.4	503.4	-7.0	18.7	20.1	21.7	20.3	3.4	395	382	368	363	355	2,992.0	3,144.5	2,992.0	-4.8	3,657.3	2,926.8		
Ontario	-2.9	404.4	416.5	398.0	484.6	537.5	-10.0	19.6	21.8	25.2	22.4	3.1	395	383	371	368	369	2,957.3	3,151.3	2,957.3	-6.2	3,796.3	2,957.5		
Manitoba	-3.4	37.8	39.1	37.5	42.9	39.6	-5.9	17.6	18.7	20.4	18.7	3.3	382	370	359	355	349	250.2	247.5	250.2	1.1	280.8	199.2		
Saskatchewan	-5.0	27.4	28.8	29.0	34.1	31.1	-5.4	18.5	19.5	21.1	19.7	3.8	412	397	379	374	371	203.0	206.8	203.0	-1.8	261.6	170.2		
Alberta	-3.3	84.7	87.6	96.8	131.1	106.6	-14.3	16.6	19.4	23.3	21.1	3.1	431	418	406	399	398	571.3	671.6	571.3	-14.9	950.5	442.0		
British Columbia	-6.2	146.7	156.5	161.9	188.9	181.4	-9.6	19.5	21.6	24.2	21.6	3.2	392	380	368	369	372	1,070.6	1,174.5	1,070.6	-8.9	1,479.0	939.3		
Nunavut	-3.2	0.9	0.9	1.2	1.0	1.0	-3.8	27.6	28.7	28.5	29.3	6.6	462	433	428	427	414	12.5	11.3	12.5	11.4	12.7	11.3	9.0	
Northwest Territories	-3.0	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.9	1.7	-3.7	26.2	27.2	27.0	27.6	3.3	461	446	441	428	423	20.5	18.7	20.5	9.7	20.4	23.3	15.1	
Yukon	1.5	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.9	22.9	22.7	26.0	25.3	2.5	455	444	431	423	417	20.8	20.2	20.8	2.8	20.2	24.4	17.0	
<b>Gender</b>																									
Male	-4.9	814.1	856.0	847.5	996.4	1,038.6	-7.0	19.8	21.3	23.7	22.3	3.3	422	408	395	390	387	6,517.7	6,911.5	6,517.7	-5.7	7,969.7	6,350.5		
Female	-4.2	542.7	566.3	549.4	620.3	603.9	-8.9	20.0	21.9	23.9	21.2	3.3	358	347	333	330	324	3,540.9	3,796.3	3,540.9	-6.7	4,324.7	3,138.2		
<b>Age</b>																									
15 to 24 years (youth)	-7.0	138.9	149.4	161.6	189.3	184.4	-3.9	18.3	19.1	20.4	20.0	3.6	362	349	337	332	333	873.9	937.5	873.9	-6.8	1,092.1	876.5		
25 to 44 years	-5.2	594.8	627.1	629.4	741.3	763.2	-7.5	19.2	20.7	22.9	21.4	3.4	407	393	381	376	372	4,342.2	4,623.4	4,342.2	-6.1	5,404.5	4,382.0		
45 to 54 years	-6.3	339.6	362.4	349.0	409.9	427.7	-9.4	20.1	22.2	24.5	22.2	3.3	401	388	376	373	369	2,598.1	2,816.0	2,598.1	-7.7	3,282.7	2,539.8		
55 years and older (older workers)	0.1	283.5	283.4	256.9	276.2	267.2	-9.4	22.0	24.3	27.4	24.4	3.0	386	375	362	358	354	2,244.4	2,330.9	2,244.4	-3.7	2,515.1	1,690.4		

Continued on next page...

## Annex 2.2 Regular Benefits (CONTINUED)

EI Claimant Category <sup>4</sup>	New Claims <sup>1</sup>			Average Duration <sup>2</sup>			Average Weekly Benefit <sup>3</sup>			Amount Paid <sup>3</sup>												
	% Change	(000s)		% Change	(Weeks)		% Change	(\$)		% Change	(\$ Million)											
		2011/12-2012/13	2011/12-2010/11		2009/10-2008/09	2010/11-2011/12		2010/11-2009/10	2008/09-2009/10		2009/10-2010/11	2010/11-2011/12	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12-2010/11	2010/11-2009/10	2009/10-2008/09						
Long-tenured workers	-13.0	316.4	363.8	335.4	484.9	519.8	18.3	22.1	26.3	21.7	2.9	429	416	405	402	398	-13.7	2,611.8	3,025.9	4,214.5	4,837.8	2,858.0
Occasional claimants	-2.2	720.8	737.4	752.2	831.4	830.7	19.4	20.4	22.1	21.2	4.0	375	361	349	343	340	-4.7	4,693.9	4,927.8	5,429.3	6,522.6	4,450.8
Frequent claimants	-0.5	319.6	321.0	309.2	300.4	292.0	22.8	23.6	24.4	24.4	3.3	412	399	388	378	371	0.0	2,752.8	2,754.1	2,650.6	2,682.0	2,179.9
<b>Seasonality<sup>5</sup></b>																						
Regular seasonal claimants	1.9	419.9	412.2	381.8	417.4	412.7	18.5	19.9	20.1	19.3	3.5	417	402	391	384	376	0.1	2,905.3	2,903.2	2,919.2	3,042.5	2,602.3
Non-seasonal claimants	-7.2	936.9	1,010.0	1,015.1	1,199.2	1,229.8	N/A	20.4	22.2	25.0	3.0	387	376	363	361	360	-8.9	6,693.1	7,345.5	8,902.7	10,478.1	6,480.9
CANADA	-4.6	1,356.8	1,422.3	1,396.9	1,616.6	1,642.5	N/A	19.9	21.5	23.8	3.3	396	384	371	367	364	-6.1	10,058.6	10,707.8	12,294.4	14,042.4	9,488.7

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

- Includes claims for which at least \$1 of regular benefits was paid.
- Data on duration of regular benefits are presented up to 2011/12, to ensure all claims were completed.
- Takes into account Family Supplement top-ups paid to regular claimants.
- Long-tenured workers are 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.
- Seasonal claimants are individuals who established three or more claims in the previous five years, of which at least two were established about the same time of the year as their current claim. For the purposes of this table, seasonal claimants exclude fishing.

### Annex 2.3 Regular Benefits, by Industry

Industry	New Claims <sup>1</sup>				Average Duration <sup>2</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>3</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>3</sup>											
	% Change		(000s)		(Weeks)		% Change		(\$)		% Change		(\$ Million)											
	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12-2012/13	2009/10-2010/11	2010/11-2011/12	2012/13-2011/12	2010/11-2009/10	2008/09-2009/10	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2010/11	2008/09-2009/10	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2010/11	2008/09-2009/10									
<b>Goods Sector</b>	<b>-7.8</b>	<b>492.5</b>	<b>534.2</b>	<b>529.4</b>	<b>630.9</b>	<b>732.5</b>	<b>-6.9</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>-8.0</b>	<b>3,980.8</b>	<b>4,325.3</b>	<b>4,975.6</b>	<b>6,450.8</b>	<b>4,512.7</b>
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting <sup>4</sup>	-9.2	58.1	64.0	63.5	70.2	73.1	-4.5		22.6	23.6	24.5	23.8	3.6	393	379	368	368	365	-6.2	512.8	546.9	575.6	649.3	573.4
Mining, and oil and gas extraction	2.0	22.2	21.8	20.5	30.4	35.1	-5.2		20.0	21.1	23.5	24.4	3.0	476	462	448	438	430	5.1	204.6	194.7	220.6	414.8	210.1
Utilities	-5.1	4.3	4.5	5.0	5.3	4.5	-7.1		17.7	19.1	21.9	19.6	3.8	477	459	445	432	422	-4.8	36.2	38.0	46.2	43.7	28.1
Construction	-5.2	258.5	272.8	267.8	287.5	279.3	-6.5		18.0	19.2	20.8	20.3	3.8	454	438	425	416	407	-5.2	2,012.8	2,124.2	2,291.5	2,519.7	1,687.7
Manufacturing	-12.7	149.3	171.1	172.7	237.6	340.6	-8.5		20.4	22.2	25.0	23.2	2.7	398	388	377	380	378	-14.6	1,214.5	1,421.5	1,841.6	2,823.4	2,013.4
<b>Service Sector</b>	<b>-5.5</b>	<b>797.8</b>	<b>844.1</b>	<b>823.8</b>	<b>944.0</b>	<b>876.9</b>	<b>-8.4</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>20.1</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>24.3</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>-6.9</b>	<b>5,639.9</b>	<b>6,056.6</b>	<b>6,978.9</b>	<b>7,297.4</b>	<b>4,810.0</b>
Wholesale trade	-5.8	45.6	48.4	50.0	63.2	63.4	-6.5		23.6	25.3	29.6	26.1	3.5	389	376	365	366	355	-10.1	410.8	456.7	588.4	672.7	415.6
Retail trade	-5.5	84.5	89.5	94.7	100.3	93.8	-6.6		23.0	24.6	27.3	24.3	0.4	324	323	313	304	300	-12.2	610.7	695.3	802.1	774.9	514.5
Transportation and warehousing	-6.4	59.0	63.0	61.3	76.0	73.8	-3.6		19.1	19.8	23.0	21.5	1.5	373	367	358	360	360	1.2	427.8	422.6	515.9	644.2	405.3
Information and cultural industries	-6.7	12.4	13.3	13.2	17.2	16.9	-9.5		23.2	25.7	29.2	25.3	3.5	419	405	395	387	381	-8.4	122.8	134.1	172.3	185.5	105.7
Finance and insurance	-1.2	15.9	16.1	16.6	20.8	19.3	-11.1		24.3	27.4	31.4	26.0	2.8	407	396	379	382	370	-9.0	155.1	170.4	220.1	222.5	133.4
Real estate, and rental and leasing	-5.0	17.8	18.7	17.8	21.5	19.7	-6.2		23.3	24.9	28.8	24.9	3.1	382	370	353	348	348	-8.4	147.1	160.6	185.5	201.5	116.7
Professional, scientific and technical services	0.1	53.6	53.5	53.9	65.8	68.7	-5.4		22.0	23.3	26.3	24.2	4.9	426	406	391	387	382	-3.8	460.9	479.2	569.6	729.4	409.2
Management of companies and enterprises	5.1	7.2	6.8	7.4	8.1	9.0	-8.5		22.1	24.1	26.4	24.6	4.7	421	403	394	380	357	-2.1	61.2	62.6	75.0	85.9	54.1
Administrative and support, waste management and remediation services	-8.1	91.1	99.1	95.8	112.8	106.0	-7.9		21.8	23.7	26.3	23.9	4.0	363	349	341	334	331	-7.1	698.2	751.3	856.1	961.2	607.5
Educational services	-0.8	148.1	149.3	126.0	149.0	135.2	-15.1		11.6	13.6	14.6	11.0	3.7	415	400	387	382	372	-1.8	604.5	615.7	664.9	599.3	461.3
Health care and social assistance	-9.1	50.4	55.5	54.3	53.0	45.8	-5.8		21.6	23.0	24.8	21.3	2.9	363	353	343	337	329	-6.9	372.8	400.3	425.5	349.6	254.2

Continued on next page...



### Annex 2.3 Regular Benefits, by Industry (CONTINUED)

	New Claims <sup>1</sup>					Average Duration <sup>2</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>3</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>3</sup>							
	% Change	(000s)				% Change	(Weeks)			% Change	(\$)			% Change	(\$ Million)						
		2011/12-2012/13	2012/13-2011/12	2010/11-2009/10	2008/09-2011/12		2010/11-2012/13	2011/12-2012/13	2009/10-2010/11		2008/09-2011/12	2010/11-2012/13	2011/12-2012/13		2009/10-2010/11	2010/11-2011/12	2011/12-2012/13	2008/09-2009/10	2009/10-2010/11	2010/11-2011/12	2011/12-2012/13
Arts, entertainment and recreation	-8.1	31.3	34.1	34.6	37.1	32.3	20.5	21.5	23.2	21.4	4.2	351	337	328	321	315	213.5	230.7	253.9	243.2	185.2
Accommodation and food services	-7.8	67.4	73.1	76.7	83.3	75.4	23.0	24.4	26.0	24.1	3.5	310	300	285	282	282	458.8	505.7	558.8	572.3	409.0
Other services	-6.9	44.1	47.3	47.7	55.8	50.8	22.1	23.8	26.1	23.9	3.5	362	349	337	329	325	339.5	369.3	438.8	448.2	299.9
Public administration	-9.1	69.4	76.4	74.0	80.5	66.8	20.5	21.6	23.3	20.6	2.6	411	400	388	380	370	556.3	602.3	651.9	606.9	438.5
<b>Unclassified</b>	<b>51.5</b>	<b>66.6</b>	<b>43.9</b>	<b>43.6</b>	<b>41.7</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>22.3</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>25.8</b>	<b>23.9</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>437.9</b>	<b>325.9</b>	<b>339.9</b>	<b>294.2</b>	<b>166.0</b>
<b>All Industries</b>	<b>-4.6</b>	<b>1,356.8</b>	<b>1,422.3</b>	<b>1,396.9</b>	<b>1,616.6</b>	<b>1,642.5</b>	<b>19.9</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>10,058.6</b>	<b>10,707.8</b>	<b>12,294.4</b>	<b>14,042.4</b>	<b>9,488.7</b>

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

<sup>1</sup> Includes claims for which at least \$1 of EI regular benefits was paid.

<sup>2</sup> Data on duration of regular benefits are presented up to 2011/12, to ensure all claims were completed.

<sup>3</sup> Takes into account Family Supplement top-ups paid to regular claimants.

<sup>4</sup> Due to small numbers, regular benefits received under fish harvesting (self-employed) have been counted as part of the agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting industry. Note that the majority of fish harvesting (self-employed) claims are counted toward fishing claims (see Annex 2.6 for fishing claims).

## Annex 2.4 Regular Benefits, by Regional Unemployment Rate and Insurable Hours of Previous Employment

	New Claims <sup>1</sup>				Average Duration <sup>2</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>3</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>3</sup>										
	% Change		(000s)		(Weeks)		% Change		(\$)		% Change		(\$ Million)										
	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2010/11	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2010/11	2008/09-2009/10	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2010/11	2008/09-2009/10	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2010/11	2008/09-2009/10							
<b>Regional Unemployment Rate</b>																							
6.0% or lower	9.5	199.6	182.3	109.7	136.4	433.2	5-2	15.9	16.8	20.2	19.6	2.7	406	396	369	368	367	368	1,219.6	891.3	791.8	2,090.6	2,247.2
6.1%-7.0%	-3.0	159.1	164.0	118.2	137.1	294.4	-4.8	18.0	18.9	22.2	21.5	3.4	392	379	384	372	364	364	1,046.3	1,074.0	853.6	1,695.7	2,001.9
7.1%-8.0%	7.1	177.0	165.3	225.9	180.6	395.5	-9.0	18.3	20.1	22.8	21.2	2.6	384	375	368	375	358	358	998.5	1,273.1	1,884.0	2,309.4	1,697.6
8.1%-9.0%	-4.8	441.4	463.5	332.2	217.7	129.3	-3.5	19.5	20.2	24.2	23.1	4.2	395	379	368	365	363	363	3,129.3	3,115.9	1,877.9	1,812.0	627.4
9.1%-10.0%	-27.6	100.3	138.6	209.4	448.2	48.8	-13.5	20.4	23.6	24.0	22.6	2.2	397	388	364	363	379	379	1,018.6	1,154.5	2,975.2	2,149.8	364.5
10.1%-11.0%	-23.7	49.3	64.7	113.1	123.2	90.9	-6.7	20.0	21.5	24.2	23.6	4.7	404	386	379	363	374	368	379.6	699.5	957.9	957.7	657.0
11.1%-12.0%	-11.6	43.3	49.0	81.1	103.4	26.2	0.9	22.9	22.7	22.5	21.2	-0.1	393	393	379	374	368	366	451.7	536.4	747.3	533.6	163.1
12.1%-13.0%	-25.0	19.9	26.5	40.2	60.5	47.5	-8.6	22.3	24.4	24.5	23.1	1.4	403	398	371	366	366	366	208.8	243.9	468.6	499.0	250.6
13.1%-14.0%	38.4	27.9	20.1	19.3	39.3	15.6	-6.6	26.0	27.8	23.8	25.8	4.3	409	392	365	382	360	360	215.8	188.0	259.8	247.1	239.0
14.1%-15.0%	-12.6	17.7	20.3	20.5	24.0	48.4	-2.4	25.7	26.3	26.4	26.5	2.9	392	381	384	363	351	351	207.6	208.7	181.9	360.8	272.8
15.1%-16.0%	-27.8	21.7	30.1	28.9	32.5	16.9	3.2	27.0	26.1	27.0	26.6	1.6	387	381	372	364	365	365	250.0	306.6	275.6	217.9	108.8
16.1% or higher	1.7	99.6	97.9	98.5	113.6	95.8	-2.1	27.3	27.9	28.7	29.0	4.4	406	389	374	364	360	360	932.8	1,015.7	1,020.7	1,168.8	858.8
<b>Insurable Hours of Previous Employment<sup>4</sup></b>																							
420 - 559 hours	-11.9	17.2	19.5	24.2	29.8	19.9	2.2	28.9	28.3	28.2	28.6	1.9	299	293	287	288	272	288	148.0	173.6	210.7	204.6	140.7
560 - 699 hours	-14.7	57.6	67.5	72.7	81.9	56.0	-2.7	22.3	22.9	24.1	24.3	3.5	335	324	317	314	310	314	446.0	491.7	576.1	550.1	374.7
700 - 839 hours	-10.2	91.4	101.8	102.1	106.2	93.4	-4.2	20.2	21.1	23.3	21.2	2.2	342	334	329	325	315	325	631.2	691.5	762.4	746.6	554.5
840 - 979 hours	-8.2	119.3	129.9	134.6	146.2	133.6	-5.9	20.2	21.5	23.4	21.7	2.1	354	346	337	331	323	331	843.1	915.8	1,037.8	1,060.2	783.1
980 - 1,119 hours	-7.2	130.7	140.8	138.8	152.4	147.5	-4.7	19.6	20.6	22.3	20.7	2.0	366	358	348	340	334	340	902.8	962.4	1,030.7	1,110.8	832.3
1,120 - 1,259 hours	-3.8	130.8	135.9	135.0	147.5	142.9	-6.5	18.5	19.8	21.1	19.8	2.7	381	371	361	353	345	345	859.9	903.4	978.0	1,046.1	776.7
1,260 - 1,399 hours	-7.1	120.1	129.3	123.8	137.9	139.8	-7.9	17.8	19.3	20.6	19.3	2.3	397	388	373	367	358	367	805.6	842.0	903.6	989.1	739.3
1,400 - 1,539 hours	3.4	129.2	125.0	117.4	131.0	131.2	-8.4	17.5	19.1	20.9	19.6	3.9	414	398	382	377	369	377	810.8	815.6	883.8	974.1	707.7
1,540 - 1,679 hours	-4.4	110.7	115.7	109.0	122.9	129.5	-10.4	18.1	20.2	22.0	20.6	2.6	413	402	388	382	376	382	750.7	796.7	893.1	1,018.4	699.5
1,680 - 1,819 hours	-1.5	113.0	114.7	110.7	129.0	137.8	-8.3	19.9	21.7	24.4	22.4	3.5	420	406	395	387	378	387	856.1	914.7	1,045.4	1,201.3	793.9
1,820 or more hours	-1.5	337.0	342.1	328.8	431.8	510.8	-10.6	21.5	24.0	27.2	24.0	3.6	439	424	411	407	400	400	3,004.2	3,200.3	3,971.4	5,140.8	3,086.5
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>-4.6</b>	<b>1,356.8</b>	<b>1,422.3</b>	<b>1,396.9</b>	<b>1,616.6</b>	<b>1,642.5</b>	<b>-7.7</b>	<b>19.9</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>10,058.6</b>	<b>10,707.8</b>	<b>12,294.4</b>	<b>14,042.4</b>	<b>9,488.7</b>

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

- Includes claims for which at least \$1 of EI regular benefits was paid.
- Data on duration of regular benefits are presented up to 2011/12, to ensure all claims were completed.
- Takes into account Family Supplement top-ups paid to regular claimants.
- Benefits paid may not add to the totals shown, due to some missing data on insurable hours.

## Annex 2.5 Regular Benefits, by EI Region

	Unemployment Rate (%) <sup>1</sup>		New Claims <sup>2</sup>		Average Duration <sup>3</sup>		Average Weekly Benefit <sup>4</sup>		Amount Paid <sup>4</sup>															
	2012/13	2012/13 - 2011/12	2012/13	2012/13 - 2011/12	(Weeks)	(Weeks)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$ Million)	(\$ Million)														
	△ <sup>5</sup>	% Change	△ <sup>5</sup>	% Change	2012/13	2012/13 - 2011/12	2012/13	2012/13 - 2011/12	2012/13	2012/13 - 2011/12														
<b>EI Region<sup>6</sup></b>																								
<b>Newfoundland and Labrador</b>																								
St. John's	7.0	-11.4	9,360	10,560	10,690	11,780	11,450	-16.2	18.3	21.9	22.6	21.9	4.7	422	403	387	374	364	68.4	82.2	89.4	96.1	72.7	
Newfoundland and Labrador	17.0	-0.8	53,070	56,870	57,570	61,500	62,640	-2.3	28.2	28.8	29.5	29.9	3.2	397	384	369	357	352	559.0	600.6	599.6	658.3	562.8	
<b>Prince Edward Island</b>																								
Prince Edward Island	11.3	-0.3	16,930	18,380	18,570	19,370	18,590	-0.4	N/A	24.8	24.9	24.9	4.3	389	373	362	359	353	155.3	162.2	161.5	162.0	143.5	
<b>Nova Scotia</b>																								
Eastern Nova Scotia	16.3	-1.1	21,430	23,340	22,820	23,000	23,860	-3.9	27.6	28.8	27.1	25.9	2.8	394	384	371	364	355	225.6	230.0	223.8	233.6	199.0	
Western Nova Scotia	10.0	10.9	28,200	31,290	31,080	32,770	32,970	0.0	N/A	24.6	24.6	22.9	22.4	3.0	382	371	355	348	343	243.2	260.4	257.2	269.7	221.0
Halifax	6.1	6.2	12,530	13,740	12,690	13,730	13,190	-10.1	20.4	22.7	20.4	17.4	2.5	375	366	352	345	340	81.9	93.2	95.1	100.5	73.3	
<b>New Brunswick</b>																								
Fredericton-Moncton-Saint John	7.1	7.5	20,670	20,710	20,020	19,830	18,430	-3.9	19.1	19.9	21.3	18.7	3.3	368	356	343	340	337	136.0	132.3	137.5	130.0	89.5	
Madawaska-Charlotte <sup>7</sup>	11.3	12.4	12,990	13,500	12,760	13,980	13,910	-1.9	N/A	22.8	23.2	22.8	4.4	383	367	358	356	352	104.1	105.3	104.0	112.8	96.2	
Restigouche-Albert	15.1	16.0	39,840	41,210	41,750	42,490	42,760	-0.2	26.3	26.4	26.3	26.9	4.7	397	379	367	358	353	380.7	400.2	388.5	409.2	355.1	
<b>Quebec</b>																								
Gaspésie-Iles-de-la-Madeleine	13.7	14.4	25,250	26,490	26,590	27,790	27,920	-5.2	25.8	27.2	27.2	27.4	3.2	404	392	379	369	361	263.9	263.9	262.8	275.6	256.0	
Québec	5.4	5.1	33,530	35,740	34,530	37,710	38,590	-8.0	15.0	16.3	17.8	16.2	2.6	396	386	369	365	354	174.8	193.8	225.6	213.5	167.2	
Trois-Rivières	8.5	8.0	9,420	10,220	9,950	10,720	10,510	-6.4	19.6	20.9	20.7	19.6	5.3	411	390	377	371	369	66.5	73.0	77.8	72.8	64.1	
South Central Quebec	5.1	4.6	9,220	11,480	10,420	11,760	13,990	-4.2	13.8	14.4	16.5	16.1	3.8	386	372	356	351	344	46.2	53.0	57.7	69.8	59.1	
Sherbrooke	6.8	7.3	8,250	9,400	8,560	9,640	10,110	-11.4	15.9	18.0	18.2	17.5	3.7	383	370	358	356	343	46.2	50.3	54.7	60.2	45.1	
Montréal	7.8	6.6	26,730	32,230	30,400	33,670	35,100	-5.2	17.0	18.0	20.5	19.7	2.8	380	370	356	351	346	166.1	190.2	210.7	235.8	187.6	
Montréal	8.4	8.5	155,350	157,750	150,210	173,440	170,980	-8.9	18.8	20.7	23.4	20.8	3.2	382	370	357	353	345	1,040.0	1,062.5	1,242.3	1,317.2	915.6	
Central Quebec	8.3	8.4	75,520	81,930	75,920	83,990	88,660	-4.3	18.8	19.6	20.3	19.4	3.8	403	389	374	369	360	539.3	555.8	560.6	611.7	517.8	
North Western Quebec	9.9	9.3	20,390	21,390	22,040	24,890	26,640	-4.8	20.2	21.2	22.4	21.9	3.0	419	407	389	379	376	166.2	171.6	184.5	213.3	188.5	
Lower St. Lawrence and North Shore <sup>7</sup>	9.9	9.3	48,710	51,040	50,990	54,220	57,330	-6.9	19.6	21.1	21.5	21.7	3.8	414	399	383	376	366	359.7	397.3	400.3	431.2	396.2	
Hull	6.7	6.1	10,310	11,520	10,540	10,720	10,790	-3.6	17.1	17.7	18.7	17.1	2.8	399	388	378	375	364	68.2	68.6	73.5	68.2	52.6	
Chicoutimi-Jonquière	6.8	7.4	11,080	11,170	11,540	12,820	13,130	-7.6	17.1	18.5	19.7	19.6	3.8	410	395	380	371	363	66.6	74.7	82.6	89.4	79.3	

Continued on next page...

## Annex 2.5 Regular Benefits, by EI Region (CONTINUED)

	Unemployment Rate (%) <sup>1</sup>			New Claims <sup>2</sup>			Average Duration <sup>3</sup>			Average Weekly Benefit <sup>4</sup>			Amount Paid <sup>4</sup>													
	2012/13	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13-2011/12	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09								
																			% Change	% Change	(Weeks)	% Change	(%)	% Change	(%)	
<b>Ontario</b>																										
Ottawa	5.7	6.3	0.6	20,740	21,380	18,840	21,620	19,860	-8.2	18.0	19.6	22.5	19.4	2.3	399	391	372	375	373	-2.4	140.5	144.0	166.6	163.0	105.0	
Eastern Ontario	8.5	8.0	-0.5	19,510	19,130	17,660	18,880	19,560	-11.4	18.7	21.1	22.2	19.5	3.2	383	371	358	354	353	-1.1	129.5	131.0	138.4	139.4	103.1	
Kingston	6.6	6.7	0.1	3,820	4,420	3,990	4,550	4,390	-4.6	17.1	17.9	21.4	17.6	3.8	390	376	358	366	355	-10.7	23.5	26.4	30.4	31.2	20.9	
Central Ontario	8.7	7.9	-0.8	44,740	47,260	42,590	50,680	53,450	-11.3	18.3	20.7	23.4	20.4	3.5	387	373	359	353	358	-6.9	298.2	320.3	354.6	413.3	273.9	
Oshawa	8.2	8.8	0.7	11,510	12,410	10,720	13,100	16,280	-17.6	17.7	21.5	25.4	20.9	3.7	422	407	395	390	394	-6.0	83.8	89.2	111.4	140.8	91.7	
Toronto	8.4	8.5	0.1	147,190	148,580	144,840	180,530	193,090	-10.7	21.1	23.6	27.7	24.1	3.4	392	379	370	367	364	-7.3	1,147.0	1,236.9	1,550.7	1,855.3	1,119.0	
Hamilton	6.2	6.5	0.2	19,680	20,970	20,710	23,430	27,650	-15.2	17.6	20.8	24.6	21.8	2.8	392	381	371	367	370	-10.3	130.3	145.3	186.9	232.7	139.4	
St. Catharines	8.4	8.0	-0.4	16,870	16,880	16,150	19,720	21,960	-7.0	19.4	20.9	24.7	21.3	1.8	389	363	349	353	356	-1.3	112.3	113.8	139.4	170.0	108.7	
London	9.0	8.6	-0.4	13,900	14,490	13,900	17,230	21,340	-0.8	20.4	20.6	23.6	21.2	1.6	383	377	361	368	370	-3.5	101.5	105.1	122.2	161.4	112.7	
Niagara	10.1	10.3	0.2	13,260	13,940	12,850	15,310	17,480	-9.6	20.2	22.4	25.2	23.5	2.4	405	396	382	376	375	-9.7	98.5	109.1	124.4	158.7	92.2	
Windsor	10.3	9.9	-0.4	12,210	11,740	13,180	15,260	24,440	-10.8	17.6	19.8	23.2	22.1	2.6	408	402	389	373	389	-4.1	86.8	90.4	109.7	175.4	130.5	
Kitchener	6.8	6.6	-0.2	14,600	15,150	14,420	17,740	22,350	-9.0	18.9	20.7	24.8	23.0	2.2	391	383	368	366	371	-10.1	99.8	110.9	133.9	191.1	116.4	
Huron	8.2	8.1	-0.1	12,850	14,380	13,600	16,610	20,810	-13.7	18.1	21.0	24.1	22.5	4.1	412	396	390	380	378	-17.9	90.2	110.0	124.5	169.6	108.2	
South Central Ontario	6.2	5.5	-0.7	14,050	15,010	14,580	18,130	25,590	-11.0	16.8	18.9	22.3	20.4	2.9	392	381	368	367	374	-7.2	89.5	96.4	125.9	176.0	126.7	
Sudbury	6.6	6.9	0.4	5,740	5,710	5,930	10,610	7,480	-8.9	18.2	20.0	23.6	21.0	6.6	409	384	377	391	379	-4.3	39.0	40.8	61.8	88.7	39.6	
Thunder Bay	6.9	5.8	-1.0	4,320	4,840	4,310	5,550	6,120	1.7	16.2	15.9	22.1	19.5	3.9	412	396	386	384	387	2.8	27.7	26.9	34.3	49.3	32.8	
Northern Ontario	12.1	11.8	-0.3	29,260	29,960	28,990	34,880	34,920	-2.1	22.4	22.9	24.0	23.9	3.2	415	402	387	380	379	2.2	256.8	251.3	274.0	327.8	233.3	
<b>Manitoba</b>																										
Winnipeg	5.6	-0.2	-2.9	20,440	21,050	19,820	23,230	21,190	-7.8	16.1	17.4	19.2	17.1	2.5	379	370	359	353	349	-0.3	120.7	121.1	143.1	146.0	93.2	
Southern Manitoba	6.1	0.0	-4.0	10,130	10,550	10,270	11,500	10,790	-8.0	14.7	16.0	18.2	16.8	4.2	378	362	358	351	345	-0.7	56.2	56.6	65.4	71.7	48.2	
Northern Manitoba	30.6	2.5	-3.1	7,260	7,490	7,240	7,930	7,550	-0.8	26.1	26.3	27.0	25.5	3.6	396	382	364	364	356	5.1	73.6	70.1	71.0	74.5	57.0	
<b>Saskatchewan</b>																										
Regina	4.2	-0.5	-4.6	3,920	4,110	3,910	5,130	3,920	-9.2	14.7	16.2	19.0	15.6	3.4	416	402	384	379	375	1.3	23.7	23.4	30.1	31.5	17.8	
Saskatoon	5.4	-0.3	-3.8	6,310	6,560	6,540	7,360	6,250	-4.2	16.5	17.2	19.4	16.6	2.8	411	400	385	378	365	-3.0	39.3	40.6	51.6	47.8	26.8	
Southern Saskatchewan	6.4	0.0	-2.3	8,020	8,210	8,480	10,180	9,530	-8.6	15.9	17.4	19.7	17.9	4.0	403	387	369	367	369	-0.4	51.1	51.3	62.7	72.7	45.4	
Northern Saskatchewan	17.4	-0.4	-7.0	9,670	10,400	10,540	12,540	12,400	-2.2	23.7	24.2	24.6	24.4	4.8	421	402	381	378	379	-0.9	95.0	95.8	106.6	123.4	85.0	
<b>Alberta</b>																										
Calgary	4.9	-0.8	2.8	26,820	26,080	29,610	42,560	34,410	-14.3	17.1	19.9	24.6	22.4	4.2	431	414	406	399	399	-13.1	184.3	212.1	310.1	448.7	138.1	
Edmonton	4.9	-0.8	-7.4	27,300	29,490	33,060	39,990	32,840	-19.0	15.5	19.1	22.8	19.8	2.7	437	425	414	404	402	-21.1	174.1	220.5	311.8	376.8	131.2	
Northern Alberta	8.1	-0.7	-15.0	7,060	8,310	8,670	11,270	9,710	-10.8	18.6	20.9	23.5	21.5	2.9	451	438	419	416	413	-16.7	59.2	71.1	91.0	114.6	48.4	
Southern Alberta	5.8	-0.6	-3.6	21,980	22,790	24,720	37,090	28,940	-11.5	16.4	18.6	22.7	21.2	3.0	418	406	394	391	391	-12.0	141.4	160.7	235.9	344.5	118.6	

Continued on next page...

## Annex 2.5 Regular Benefits, by EI Region (CONTINUED)

	Unemployment Rate (%) <sup>1</sup>		New Claims <sup>2</sup>				Average Duration <sup>3</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>4</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>4</sup>												
	2012/13	△ <sup>5</sup>	% Change	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	% Change	2010/11-2011/12	(Weeks)			(\$)			% Change										
											2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	
<b>British Columbia</b>																											
Southern Interior B.C.	7.8	-0.9	-11.1	29,400	33,070	34,220	39,120	39,620	-13.9		18.6	21.6	23.9	21.3	3.4	395	383	368	367	372	-17.4	204.6	247.5	298.5	342.6	203.9	
Abbotsford	8.1	-1.2	-3.5	8,270	8,570	8,680	9,490	8,640	-4.1		20.0	20.8	23.1	20.3	4.1	348	335	322	331	329	-7.8	53.7	58.2	62.5	69.0	37.3	
Vancouver	6.7	-0.6	-4.8	60,470	63,510	66,490	78,510	69,010	-11.5							384	374	362	368	364	-9.7	430.8	476.8	644.7	681.8	331.3	
Victoria	6.2	-0.6	-3.9	8,830	9,190	9,180	10,400	9,290	-9.2	N/A	17.9	19.8	23.0	20.4	5.0	398	379	381	373	368	-1.6	62.0	62.9	75.0	85.0	45.3	
Southern Coastal B.C.	8.3	-1.0	-3.5	22,680	23,510	24,670	26,700	28,990	-4.1		19.3	20.1	22.7	20.6	4.0	394	379	368	368	381	-7.4	159.2	171.9	204.2	230.5	149.7	
Northern B.C.	11.5	0.3	-4.4	17,650	18,460	19,010	24,940	26,150	-4.7		21.4	22.5	24.5	22.7	3.6	432	417	399	392	401	3.4	162.1	156.7	197.3	246.6	173.1	
<b>Territories<sup>6</sup></b>																											
Yukon	25.0	0.0	1.0	2,080	2,060	2,140	2,180	2,120	0.8		22.8	22.6	26.6	25.8	2.7	457	445	432	420	415	2.5	21.2	20.7	20.6	25.2	17.3	
Northwest Territories	25.0	0.0	-7.6	1,590	1,720	1,680	1,910	1,810	-4.0							463	448	440	428	423	7.4	20.9	19.5	20.8	24.1	15.9	
Nunavut	25.0	0.0	-3.2	900	930	1,110	930	990	-5.4		27.6	29.2	28.2	29.3	6.6	462	433	430	427	414	11.4	12.5	11.3	12.7	11.3	9.0	
CANADA	7.8	-0.2	-4.6	1,355,810	1,422,270	1,396,869	1,616,510	1,642,470	-7.7		N/A	19.9	21.5	23.8	21.9	3.3	396	384	371	367	364	-6.1	10,058.6	10,707.8	12,294.4	14,042.4	9,488.7

Note: The local unemployment rates presented in this annex are those of EI economic regions. These regional rates come from the Labour Force Survey with an adjustment made to include unemployment rates for status Indians living on Indian reserves, as per section 54(x) of the *Employment Insurance Act*. If this adjustment was performed on the national unemployment rate, the figure of 7.2% presented in Chapter 1 and Annex 1 for 2012/13 would become 7.8%.

Sources: EI administrative data, Labour Force Survey. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

- 1 Calculated using annual averages of seasonally adjusted data over fiscal years.
- 2 Includes claims for which at least \$1 of regular benefits was paid.
- 3 Data on duration of regular benefits are presented up to 2011/12, to ensure all claims were completed.
- 4 Takes into account Family Supplement top-ups paid to claimants with regular benefits.
- 5 Percentage point difference between 2011/12 and 2012/13.
- 6 The figures for the EI regions do not sum to the exact provincial figure for a specific province, as the administrative data on a claimant's province of residence are subject to change if claimants move to a different province in the middle of their claim. In contrast, the administrative data on a claimant's EI region of residence do not change even if claimants move during their EI claim, as this information is used to determine the duration of the benefit period, which remains fixed throughout the claim.
- 7 Unemployment rates for these regions have been determined using a transition formula prescribed in the *Employment Insurance Regulations*.
- 8 Yukon, Northwest Territories and Nunavut unemployment rates are set at 25% for EI purposes.

## Annex 2.6 Fishing Benefits

Province/Territory	New Claims <sup>1</sup>				Average Duration <sup>2</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>3</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>3</sup>										
	% Change	(Weeks)			% Change	(Weeks)	% Change	(\$)			% Change	(\$ Million)											
		2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2010/11				2012/13	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12		2009/10-2010/11	2012/13	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2010/11	2008/09-2009/10						
Newfoundland and Labrador	-4.9	11,834	12,442	11,295	12,070	13,569	4.6	20.9	19.9	20.7	20.5	1.9	448	440	417	399	404	101.3	105.8	92.5	100.0	107.1	
Prince Edward Island	-3.1	2,876	2,968	3,015	3,104	3,220	-0.3	19.5	19.6	19.6	19.5	4.8	470	449	436	421	415	23.3	23.8	23.9	24.7	25.2	
Nova Scotia	-3.2	5,431	5,611	5,558	5,563	5,518	0.3	19.6	19.6	19.6	19.1	4.3	463	444	432	418	407	50.7	49.9	47.0	46.1	43.4	
New Brunswick	0.2	2,793	2,788	2,718	2,806	2,871	0.1	19.6	19.6	19.5	19.3	4.1	473	454	440	428	419	25.7	25.8	23.2	24.4	23.4	
Quebec	-2.7	1,459	1,499	1,478	1,565	1,601	-1.5	19.4	19.7	19.4	19.4	3.3	475	459	445	431	421	12.2	12.2	11.6	11.8	11.8	
Ontario	-13.4	84	97	90	80	66	1.4	20.8	20.5	20.1	20.2	1.9	411	404	394	390	360	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.7	
Manitoba	2.6	795	775	893	927	809	-3.3	22.1	22.8	22.8	23.5	3.7	390	377	371	376	382	8.1	7.9	9.2	9.1	8.9	
Saskatchewan	5.0	126	120	136	155	111	-2.4	24.1	24.7	23.2	24.4	12.7	385	342	368	351	354	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.3	
Alberta	16.0	29	25	25	22	24	-6.6	20.5	22.0	20.8	19.2	-9.4	389	429	421	387	391	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	
British Columbia	-10.7	2,807	3,142	3,294	2,969	2,701	0.2	23.1	23.0	22.8	22.9	0.1	416	415	411	393	368	28.9	31.0	32.4	27.0	24.9	
Nunavut	46.4	41	28	21	27	28	9.9	18.2	16.6	19.1	17.4	1.4	464	458	426	411	404	261.5	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1
Northwest Territories	20.0	12	10	9	7	10	29.5	25.9	20.0	25.3	25.5	9.0	433	398	399	409	384	82.6	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
Yukon	200.0	3	1	1	3	1	-10.5	17.0	19.0	25.7	14.0	8.3	485	448	457	384	353	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Gender</b>																							
Male	-4.4	23,222	24,298	23,672	24,282	24,963	1.5	20.2	19.9	20.1	19.8	2.9	456	443	428	413	408	209.4	214.3	200.1	202.5	200.5	
Female	-2.7	5,068	5,208	4,861	5,016	5,566	1.8	N/A	22.0	22.2	22.2	2.9	433	421	401	384	386	43.4	44.8	41.6	42.6	45.7	
<b>Age</b>																							
15 to 24 years (youth)	-9.0	1,239	1,361	1,218	1,267	1,414	0.3	20.3	20.2	20.2	19.9	2.2	430	421	405	395	384	0.1	11.3	11.3	9.1	11.2	11.0
25 to 44 years	-7.3	8,987	9,697	9,639	10,375	11,340	2.8	20.2	19.6	19.9	19.8	2.7	453	441	426	412	407	77.6	84.8	84.0	88.6	94.7	
45 to 54 years	-4.6	8,805	9,232	9,029	9,277	9,539	1.2	N/A	20.3	20.1	20.4	3.2	458	444	427	412	407	82.9	83.0	75.5	75.9	74.5	
55 years and older (older workers)	0.5	9,259	9,216	8,647	8,379	8,236	0.7	21.3	21.2	21.3	21.1	2.9	448	435	419	400	399	80.9	80.1	73.1	69.4	65.9	
CANADA	-4.1	28,290	29,506	28,533	29,298	30,529	1.6	N/A	20.6	20.3	20.5	2.9	452	439	423	408	404	252.8	259.2	241.7	245.1	246.2	

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data.

<sup>1</sup> Includes claims for which at least \$1 of fishing benefits was paid.

<sup>2</sup> Data on duration of fishing benefits are presented up to 2011/12, to ensure all claims were completed.

<sup>3</sup> Takes into account Family Supplement top-ups paid to fishing claimants.

## Annex 2.7 Seasonal Claimants<sup>1</sup>

	New Claims <sup>2</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>3</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>3</sup>									
	% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09
<b>Province/Territory</b>																		
Newfoundland and Labrador	-4.5	44,260	46,330	46,380	49,150	49,810	3.2	422	409	394	379	377	-4.7	446.3	468.5	453.3	487.2	446.2
Prince Edward Island	-3.3	11,880	12,290	12,300	12,520	12,670	4.1	416	400	393	383	377	-3.4	108.5	112.4	109.7	111.0	102.3
Nova Scotia	-1.3	32,410	32,840	31,540	32,880	32,020	3.5	412	398	387	377	367	1.0	289.2	286.2	270.9	276.2	247.3
New Brunswick	0.6	37,900	37,690	37,580	38,130	38,040	4.4	409	392	384	375	367	0.9	349.3	346.3	332.4	346.6	305.5
Quebec	0.7	162,650	161,520	152,190	166,660	164,870	3.3	420	406	394	387	378	-1.5	1,052.5	1,068.8	1,093.7	1,128.7	1,001.7
Ontario	5.4	91,950	87,280	75,970	84,920	86,710	3.7	425	410	398	393	388	3.2	501.2	485.7	493.0	528.0	419.6
Manitoba	2.8	11,480	11,170	9,480	11,040	10,080	2.1	396	388	376	372	365	2.4	66.9	65.3	66.3	66.6	55.5
Saskatchewan	2.5	8,310	8,110	7,650	8,830	8,490	2.9	417	405	392	382	372	4.9	54.3	51.8	52.7	54.5	46.5
Alberta	10.5	12,420	11,240	8,960	10,350	10,320	2.9	445	433	423	409	397	7.1	71.2	66.5	68.2	70.8	50.3
British Columbia	5.2	33,910	32,230	27,300	31,310	29,240	2.0	404	396	386	383	376	3.3	206.8	200.3	211.0	207.5	164.2
Nunavut	9.1	120	110	90	130	150	2.0	463	454	437	437	430	22.7	1.4	1.2	0.8	1.4	1.0
Northwest Territories	11.5	290	260	280	250	300	2.7	462	450	447	441	431	28.8	3.9	3.0	3.2	3.5	3.0
Yukon	-5.9	640	680	620	550	490	4.4	469	449	442	432	419	3.8	6.6	6.3	5.6	5.6	5.3
<b>Gender</b>																		
Male	-5.3	264,760	279,440	269,440	283,960	284,760	3.2	444	430	419	409	403	-0.4	2,255.0	2,264.4	2,255.6	2,392.6	2,065.6
Female	16.2	188,530	162,300	140,880	162,750	158,430	3.8	376	362	345	343	334	0.6	903.2	898.0	905.3	895.0	782.9
<b>Age</b>																		
15 to 24 years (youth)	54.9	20,970	13,540	12,570	12,470	12,530	2.0	428	420	408	397	388	3.1	100.5	97.5	94.1	99.0	85.7
25 to 44 years	0.7	163,360	162,280	155,900	170,350	174,430	3.4	435	420	407	398	390	-1.9	1,125.0	1,146.9	1,169.3	1,272.3	1,123.7
45 to 54 years	-1.2	137,280	138,910	130,420	148,140	146,630	3.6	417	403	391	384	376	-3.6	953.1	988.4	1,014.6	1,055.1	920.9
55 years and older (older workers)	21.0	153,670	127,010	111,440	115,760	109,600	3.4	400	387	374	368	361	5.4	979.6	929.4	882.9	861.2	718.2

Continued on next page...

## Annex 2.7 Seasonal Claimants<sup>1</sup> (CONTINUED)

	New Claims <sup>2</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>3</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>3</sup>									
	% Change				% Change		(\$)		% Change		(\$ Million)							
	2011/12- 2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2011/12- 2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2011/12- 2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09			
<b>EI Claim</b>																		
Regular benefits	1.9	419,930	412,230	381,790	417,410	412,660	3.6	417	402	391	384	376	0.1	2,905.5	2,903.2	2,919.2	3,042.5	2,602.3
Fishing benefits	-4.1	28,290	29,510	28,530	29,300	30,530	2.9	452	439	423	408	404	-2.5	252.8	259.2	241.7	245.1	246.2
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>448,220</b>	<b>441,740</b>	<b>410,320</b>	<b>446,710</b>	<b>443,190</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>419</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>-0.1</b>	<b>3,158.2</b>	<b>3,162.3</b>	<b>3,160.9</b>	<b>3,287.6</b>	<b>2,848.5</b>

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

<sup>1</sup> Seasonal claimants are individuals who established three or more claims in the previous 5 years, for which at least two of them were established about the same time of the year as their current claim. All fishing claims are considered seasonal claims.

<sup>2</sup> Includes claims for which at least \$1 of regular or fishing benefits was paid.

<sup>3</sup> Takes into account Family Supplement top-ups paid to seasonal claimants.



## Annex 2.8 Special Benefits<sup>1</sup>

Province/Territory	New Claims <sup>2</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>3</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>3</sup>										
	% Change		2011/12-2012/13		% Change		2011/12-2012/13		% Change		2011/12-2012/13								
	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2012/13	2011/12	2012/13	2011/12	2012/13	2011/12	2012/13	2011/12	2012/13							
Newfoundland and Labrador	-3.1	11,240	11,600	10,740	11,210	10,790	5.1	392	373	357	344	331	88	93.6	86.0	82.9	79.4	71.8	
Prince Edward Island	-16.4	4,900	5,860	5,370	5,210	5,300	4.7	384	367	351	355	341	-7.4	31.1	33.6	29.2	30.4	26.8	
Nova Scotia	-7.2	20,470	22,070	21,480	20,770	22,060	2.8	372	362	348	336	333	2.1	158.1	154.9	144.3	148.7	143.3	
New Brunswick	1.8	25,220	24,780	25,360	24,910	25,100	4.3	379	363	353	340	329	2.0	153.1	150.1	142.6	142.4	134.6	
Quebec	3.5	104,740	101,220	96,480	99,470	99,130	3.9	364	350	340	331	323	10.7	348.7	315.0	300.0	301.5	282.2	
Ontario	-1.3	182,880	185,310	181,220	186,340	188,090	3.0	386	375	366	357	349	3.1	2,001.0	1,939.9	1,915.4	1,924.3	1,829.0	
Manitoba	4.5	19,280	18,450	18,870	19,250	19,140	4.8	373	356	350	340	330	6.9	184.0	172.2	165.2	170.8	153.4	
Saskatchewan	3.8	14,310	13,780	14,250	14,490	14,210	4.4	390	374	360	348	340	5.3	160.1	152.1	147.5	143.6	134.6	
Alberta	7.6	54,510	50,660	50,990	52,420	52,210	3.8	402	387	377	372	361	9.3	661.2	604.7	593.4	611.1	551.1	
British Columbia	-3.0	70,530	72,700	72,720	74,440	76,890	3.6	375	362	354	346	340	2.9	669.5	650.6	636.6	634.8	603.0	
Nunavut	-7.1	390	420	480	470	500	4.6	470	449	430	422	379	-22.0	4.6	5.9	5.4	5.8	3.4	
Northwest Territories	-7.5	860	930	780	680	610	1.1	456	451	439	416	416	-12.7	10.3	11.8	9.3	7.9	6.7	
Yukon	-1.4	710	720	530	640	540	0.3	438	437	441	421	402	33.8	9.5	7.1	6.8	6.2	4.8	
<b>Gender</b>																			
Male	1.6	167,900	165,240	160,700	163,510	168,970	3.4	410	396	386	376	372	7.6	757.6	704.3	682.6	694.8	645.0	
Female	-0.3	342,140	343,260	338,570	346,790	345,600	3.4	366	354	345	336	326	4.1	3,727.0	3,579.5	3,495.8	3,512.4	3,299.7	
<b>Age</b>																			
15 to 24 years (youth)	-3.0	41,810	43,110	45,700	48,350	51,530	4.6	301	288	284	276	271	-2.2	330.9	338.4	350.1	383.5	374.6	
25 to 44 years	0.4	297,860	296,570	294,460	301,150	303,000	3.3	397	384	375	366	357	4.7	3,487.9	3,331.2	3,252.7	3,255.1	3,045.9	
45 to 54 years	-1.1	90,260	91,260	88,460	91,060	93,510	3.2	377	365	355	345	340	6.5	361.0	338.9	325.6	326.1	309.3	
55 years and older (older workers)	3.3	80,110	77,560	70,650	69,740	66,530	3.7	365	352	339	332	326	10.8	304.6	275.3	250.0	242.4	214.8	

Continued on next page...



## Annex 2.9 Maternity Benefits

Province / Territory	New Claims <sup>1</sup>				Average Duration (Weeks)				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>2</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>2</sup>										
	% Change		2010/11-2012/13		% Change		2010/11-2012/13		2010/11-2012/13		% Change		2010/11-2012/13		2010/11-2012/13								
	2010/11-2012/13	2011/12-2010/11	2009/10-2008/09	2010/11-2012/13	2011/12-2010/11	2009/10-2008/09	2010/11-2012/13	2011/12-2010/11	2009/10-2008/09	2010/11-2012/13	2011/12-2010/11	2009/10-2008/09	2010/11-2012/13	2011/12-2010/11	2009/10-2008/09								
Newfoundland and Labrador	-6.2	2,890	3,080	2,790	2,790	3,260	2,790	14.0	14.3	14.3	14.4	5.2	409	389	377	360	341	17.0	17.1	15.6	16.5	14.0	
Prince Edward Island	-20.7	920	1,160	960	960	1,030	960	14.2	14.4	14.3	14.1	5.5	393	373	347	360	351	5.0	6.5	5.2	5.6	4.8	
Nova Scotia	-7.6	5,140	5,560	5,880	6,140	5,580	6,140	14.6	14.5	14.5	14.4	2.3	371	363	350	341	333	1.9	30.4	29.8	28.9	28.7	
New Brunswick	-3.1	4,690	4,840	4,690	4,830	4,970	4,690	14.3	14.5	14.5	14.4	3.0	374	363	356	342	327	-3.6	25.2	26.1	24.9	24.3	
Quebec <sup>3</sup>	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Ontario	1.2	84,910	83,900	84,270	87,930	87,040	87,930	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	3.3	398	385	377	368	356	4.4	493.0	472.1	471.2	472.3	
Manitoba	12.5	8,450	7,510	7,840	7,760	7,910	7,910	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.7	5.7	371	351	348	338	326	13.9	44.9	39.4	39.1	39.2	
Saskatchewan	9.4	7,430	6,790	6,880	7,250	7,070	7,070	14.7	14.6	14.7	14.6	5.7	392	370	362	343	332	12.5	42.2	37.5	37.5	36.9	
Alberta	7.6	29,470	27,390	28,190	28,670	27,920	28,670	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	3.7	400	386	377	370	356	10.4	171.2	155.1	153.8	157.6	
British Columbia	-1.6	25,890	26,310	26,320	26,680	26,170	26,680	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.5	4.2	383	368	361	347	342	2.5	147.1	143.5	139.8	137.7	
Nunavut	-23.8	160	210	230	200	240	200	15.0	12.6	14.8	14.1	0.5	457	455	433	413	356	-3.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	
Northwest Territories	-11.6	380	430	390	420	280	420	14.8	14.6	14.9	14.4	-1.5	447	453	433	409	403	-23.3	2.4	3.1	2.5	2.6	
Yukon	-2.8	350	360	180	280	200	200	14.2	14.7	14.1	14.7	-2.0	432	441	449	415	383	20.4	2.4	2.0	1.2	1.7	
<b>Age</b>																							
15 to 24 years (youth)	-6.1	18,440	19,640	21,340	23,200	25,610	25,610	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	5.5	287	272	268	263	253	-1.2	80.0	81.0	85.3	93.3	94.5
25 years and older	2.9	152,230	147,900	147,270	149,720	146,990	149,720	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	3.2	406	394	386	377	367	5.7	901.0	852.6	836.1	831.6	781.7
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>170,680</b>	<b>167,540</b>	<b>168,620</b>	<b>172,930</b>	<b>172,650</b>	<b>172,930</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>981.9</b>	<b>933.6</b>	<b>921.4</b>	<b>924.9</b>	<b>876.2</b>

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

<sup>1</sup> Includes claims for which at least \$1 of maternity benefits was paid. Includes 497 maternity claims in 2012/13, 455 maternity claims in 2011/12 and 190 maternity claims in 2010/11 established by self-employed individuals.

<sup>2</sup> Takes into account Family Supplement top-ups paid to claimants with maternity benefits.

<sup>3</sup> Quebec is excluded from national calculations. Since January 2006, this province has administered its own maternity benefits.

## Annex 2.10 Parental Benefits (Biological)

Province/Territory	New Claims <sup>1</sup>				Average Duration <sup>2</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>3</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>3</sup>											
	% Change	(Weeks)			% Change	(\$)	% Change	(\$)	% Change	(\$ Million)	% Change	(\$ Million)	% Change	(\$ Million)										
		2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2010/11											2008/09-2009/10	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2010/11	2008/09-2009/10	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2010/11	2008/09-2009/10	
Newfoundland and Labrador	-8.2	2,930	3,190	2,720	3,300	2,980	-4.8	29.2	30.7	29.8	29.1	29.3	6.2	417	393	389	373	353	39.2	36.4	37.9	33.6	30.6	
Prince Edward Island	-28.1	920	1,280	1,060	1,020	1,190	2.8	28.5	27.7	26.4	28.0	27.6	5.2	406	386	363	371	358	12.5	12.7	11.5	12.5	10.2	
Nova Scotia	-7.8	5,900	6,400	6,510	6,220	6,710	2.3	29.1	28.5	28.1	28.3	28.3	1.8	386	379	368	357	349	-0.5	71.5	71.9	65.2	68.1	66.7
New Brunswick	0.2	5,240	5,230	5,330	5,260	5,410	2.2	28.4	27.7	27.7	28.4	28.8	4.2	388	372	372	358	345	5.9	60.0	56.7	55.9	56.8	53.8
Quebec <sup>4</sup>	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ontario	1.2	96,690	95,520	96,180	99,720	99,050	0.4	29.6	29.5	29.3	29.5	29.8	3.1	405	393	386	376	365	2.8	1,158.4	1,127.1	1,122.5	1,129.2	1,068.1
Manitoba	11.8	9,560	8,550	8,830	8,850	9,100	0.5	29.9	29.7	29.8	29.5	30.4	5.1	382	363	360	351	337	3.2	100.1	97.0	92.0	94.5	84.6
Saskatchewan	8.4	8,140	7,510	7,620	7,830	7,810	0.3	30.7	30.6	29.5	30.4	29.5	5.1	401	381	373	354	345	2.7	92.6	90.2	86.0	82.8	79.1
Alberta	8.1	31,520	29,170	29,860	30,180	29,700	1.6	31.0	30.6	30.6	30.8	30.8	3.9	407	392	384	378	364	7.1	365.8	360.3	350.8	359.5	324.6
British Columbia	-1.5	28,640	29,080	29,170	28,730	29,040	0.7	29.8	29.6	29.4	29.9	29.6	4.0	395	380	374	360	354	1.2	342.0	337.9	326.6	325.1	299.5
Nunavut	35.3	230	170	300	200	270	6.7	31.1	29.2	23.1	28.6	26.1	4.4	463	443	433	418	360	-16.1	2.3	2.8	2.9	2.9	1.9
Northwest Territories	-20.7	460	580	470	450	370	2.2	27.1	26.5	27.1	24.4	24.5	-1.1	452	457	438	418	404	-16.1	5.8	6.9	5.0	4.3	4.0
Yukon	-7.3	380	410	200	320	250	12.0	30.1	26.9	26.1	30.6	29.2	0.8	446	442	450	420	397	58.3	5.5	3.5	3.9	3.3	2.8
<b>Gender</b>																								
Male	1.4	25,930	25,560	26,350	25,590	25,820	4.6	17.1	16.3	16.2	16.7	16.8	3.8	443	427	420	407	401	6.4	196.3	184.6	183.9	183.9	170.7
Female	2.0	164,680	161,530	161,900	166,490	166,060	0.5	31.8	31.6	31.5	31.6	31.7	3.5	396	382	375	365	353	3.0	2,080.1	2,018.7	1,976.2	1,988.6	1,855.0
<b>Age</b>																								
15 to 24 years (youth)	-7.4	18,420	19,890	21,250	23,270	25,330	1.6	30.8	30.3	30.1	30.7	31.0	4.5	296	283	283	275	265	-4.3	182.0	190.1	197.0	221.1	213.0
25 years and older	3.0	172,190	167,200	167,000	168,810	166,550	0.7	29.8	29.6	29.3	29.5	29.7	3.1	414	401	394	384	374	4.0	2,094.4	2,013.1	1,963.1	1,951.4	1,812.7
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>190,610</b>	<b>187,090</b>	<b>188,250</b>	<b>192,080</b>	<b>191,880</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>29.9</b>	<b>29.6</b>	<b>29.4</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>29.8</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>2,276.4</b>	<b>2,203.3</b>	<b>2,160.1</b>	<b>2,172.5</b>	<b>2,025.7</b>

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

<sup>1</sup> Includes claims for which at least \$1 of parental benefits was paid. Includes 540 parental claims in 2012/13, 504 parental claims in 2011/12 and 212 parental claims in 2010/11 established by self-employed individuals.

<sup>2</sup> Data on claim duration cover only claims commencing during the first half of the fiscal year to ensure that all claims were completed. Data assigns equal weight to both shared and non-shared parental claims.

<sup>3</sup> Takes into account Family Supplement top-ups paid to claimants with parental benefits (biological).

<sup>4</sup> Quebec is excluded from national calculations. Since January 2006, this province has administered its own parental benefits.

## Annex 2.1.1 Parental Benefits (Adoptive)

Province/Territory	New Claims <sup>1</sup>				Average Duration <sup>2</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>3</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>3</sup>												
	% Change		(Weeks)		% Change		(\$)		% Change		(\$ Million)		% Change												
	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12-2012/13	2009/10-2010/11	2011/12-2012/13	2009/10-2010/11	2011/12-2012/13	2008/09-2009/10	2010/11-2011/12	2008/09-2009/10	2010/11-2011/12	2008/09-2009/10	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2010/11	2011/12-2012/13	2008/09-2009/10										
Newfoundland and Labrador	0.0	20	10	20	10	35.0	19.0	35.0	35.0	0.0	-6.1	436	468	457	447	435	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1		
Prince Edward Island	-100.0	0	30	40	30	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	-100.0	0	453	444	447	439	439	-19.0	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.2	
Nova Scotia	11.1	100	80	110	140	25.0	24.3	25.9	22.6	32.8	22.3	489	400	439	422	383	383	51.3	1.1	0.7	0.9	1.6	1.1	1.1	
New Brunswick	33.3	40	30	50	20	70	-14.1	0.0	20.6	0.0	-5.4	440	465	453	287	403	403	-46.1	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.9	
Quebec <sup>4</sup>	N/A	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Ontario	2.2	950	720	1,040	960	5.5	25.7	23.8	27.2	25.9	5.1	459	437	427	429	412	412	36.5	11.7	8.6	9.3	11.4	11.0	11.0	
Manitoba	-11.1	80	90	50	80	27.8	32.3	23.7	35.0	26.8	-13.7	388	449	370	367	415	399	6.6	1.1	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.5	1.6	
Saskatchewan	50.0	60	40	40	90	11.9	22.0	21.8	33.0	18.7	22.0	436	430	361	449	399	415	607.6	0.7	0.1	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.7	
Alberta	-4.0	240	250	210	250	-1.3	27.4	27.6	22.4	26.0	-0.2	449	449	444	426	424	424	15.5	3.5	3.0	2.4	3.1	3.2	3.2	
British Columbia	11.5	290	260	280	380	5.0	28.6	26.3	25.7	28.0	-4.9	410	431	435	405	396	396	21.7	3.3	2.7	3.2	4.7	4.9	4.9	
Nunavut	-44.4	50	90	60	70	-21.6	31.0	29.8	28.2	23.0	14.2	491	430	419	431	402	402	-50.2	0.5	1.1	0.8	0.8	0.1	0.1	
Northwest Territories	N/A	30	10	0	0	N/A	22.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	490	468	0	0	0	0	N/A	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Yukon	N/A	0	0	10	10	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	0	0	468	457	0	0	-100.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	
<b>Gender</b>																									
Male	-11.5	460	520	360	570	-22.6	16.1	20.3	15.9	19.6	16.9	3.2	481	466	440	444	419	-0.3	3.9	3.9	3.6	5.0	4.1	4.1	
Female	6.1	1,400	1,320	1,180	1,460	7.7	29.8	26.9	28.7	29.0	30.3	2.8	438	426	426	414	404	28.3	19.0	14.8	15.7	20.0	19.6	19.6	
<b>Age</b>																									
15 to 24 years (youth)	N/A	10	0	30	10	N/A	33.0	0.0	35.0	0.0	N/A	182	0	434	172	435	435	-100.0	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	
25 years and older	0.5	1,850	1,840	1,510	2,020	5.6	26.5	25.1	24.8	26.9	26.8	2.9	450	437	429	424	408	22.6	22.8	18.6	18.9	24.9	23.7	23.7	
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1,860</b>	<b>1,840</b>	<b>1,540</b>	<b>2,030</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>26.9</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>18.7</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>23.8</b>	

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

- Includes claims for which at least \$1 of parental benefits (adoptive) was paid.
- Data on claim duration cover only claims commencing during the first half of the fiscal year to ensure that all claims were completed. Data assigns equal weight to both shared and non-shared parental claims.
- Takes into account Family Supplement top-ups paid to claimants with parental benefits (adoptive).
- Quebec is excluded from national calculations. Since January 2006, this province has administered its own parental benefits.

## Annex 2.1.2 Sickness Benefits

Province/Territory	New Claims <sup>1</sup>				Average Duration (Weeks)				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>2</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>2</sup>											
	% Change				% Change				% Change				% Change											
		2011/12-2012/13	2011/12	2010/11		2009/10	2008/09	2011/12-2012/13		2011/12	2010/11	2009/10		2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09					
Newfoundland and Labrador	-3.0	8,970	9,250	8,610	8,710	8,630	6.1	10.0	9.5	9.2	9.2	9.5	5.6	384	364	346	332	321	14.5	36.8	32.1	29.0	29.0	27.0
Prince Edward Island	-12.1	4,210	4,790	4,530	4,350	4,320	5.6	8.0	7.6	7.3	7.5	7.8	4.9	378	360	348	348	335	-5.1	13.3	14.0	12.0	11.6	11.6
Nova Scotia	-8.2	15,330	16,700	15,880	15,490	16,280	6.1	9.4	8.8	9.1	9.1	8.7	3.0	363	352	335	323	322	5.0	54.8	52.2	48.9	50.0	45.7
New Brunswick	1.5	20,980	20,660	21,030	20,570	20,570	3.2	8.4	8.1	8.2	8.0	8.0	4.3	374	359	346	334	323	1.3	67.4	66.6	61.2	60.6	55.9
Quebec	3.4	103,940	100,530	95,590	98,620	98,330	2.8	9.0	8.7	8.8	8.7	8.8	3.9	364	350	340	331	323	10.5	345.9	313.0	296.5	298.8	279.6
Ontario	-3.7	89,230	92,650	88,280	89,920	91,480	2.7	10.3	10.0	10.0	9.9	9.8	2.1	359	352	340	332	328	1.5	332.2	327.3	308.5	308.4	289.5
Manitoba	0.7	10,220	10,150	10,290	10,680	10,370	-0.8	9.7	9.8	9.6	9.6	9.9	5.1	361	344	339	329	317	10.0	37.6	34.2	33.0	35.1	30.2
Saskatchewan	0.3	6,620	6,600	7,020	7,110	6,730	1.0	10.0	9.9	9.4	9.9	9.7	3.8	373	359	339	333	331	0.2	24.1	24.1	22.5	23.1	20.8
Alberta	7.6	24,300	22,590	22,450	23,250	23,710	5.8	10.5	10.0	10.0	10.1	10.1	4.0	389	374	363	358	351	16.6	99.6	85.4	85.4	89.9	79.4
British Columbia	-3.0	45,070	46,450	46,610	48,600	51,120	3.1	10.4	10.1	10.1	9.9	10.1	3.6	358	345	337	333	328	6.6	175.5	164.7	165.3	165.7	166.7
Nunavut	-15.4	110	130	110	190	170	9.9	10.8	9.8	10.8	10.6	10.6	2.3	475	465	428	422	385	-37.8	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.8	0.4
Northwest Territories	14.3	400	350	340	230	230	0.7	10.1	10.0	9.8	11.0	10.3	5.0	460	438	434	417	435	23.2	1.9	1.5	1.6	1.0	1.0
Yukon	0.0	370	370	360	350	280	5.8	9.9	9.4	9.4	8.1	10.6	-0.6	425	428	436	419	405	-2.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.0
<b>Gender</b>																								
Male	1.4	140,380	138,380	133,220	136,290	141,760	3.5	9.4	9.1	9.1	8.9	9.1	3.5	404	390	379	370	367	7.9	553.4	512.9	491.5	502.6	466.9
Female	-1.8	189,370	192,840	187,880	191,780	190,460	2.9	9.9	9.6	9.6	9.6	9.6	3.1	336	326	316	308	298	5.5	637.6	604.3	574.5	572.5	541.9
<b>Age</b>																								
15 to 24 years (youth)	-1.5	26,160	26,560	27,960	28,560	29,760	2.4	8.6	8.4	8.3	8.2	8.5	4.8	303	289	282	275	273	3.3	69.2	67.0	67.2	68.7	66.8
25 to 44 years	-1.8	137,950	140,480	138,460	142,930	146,700	3.2	9.4	9.1	9.1	9.0	9.1	3.2	371	359	349	340	332	4.8	486.0	463.6	448.7	461.5	441.3
45 to 54 years	-1.3	86,700	87,870	85,120	87,860	90,390	3.9	10.0	9.6	9.8	9.5	9.5	3.2	375	364	353	344	339	6.4	335.2	315.0	304.2	305.2	289.2
55 years and older (older workers)	3.4	78,940	76,310	69,560	68,720	65,370	1.8	10.2	10.1	10.1	10.2	10.1	3.8	365	352	338	332	326	10.6	300.6	271.7	245.9	239.8	211.4
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>-0.4</b>	<b>329,750</b>	<b>331,220</b>	<b>321,100</b>	<b>328,070</b>	<b>332,220</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>1,191.0</b>	<b>1,117.3</b>	<b>1,066.0</b>	<b>1,075.2</b>	<b>1,008.8</b>

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

<sup>1</sup> Includes claims for which at least \$1 of sickness benefits was paid. Includes 135 sickness claims in 2012/13, 107 sickness claims in 2011/12 and 41 sickness claims in 2010/11 established by self-employed individuals.

<sup>2</sup> Takes into account Family Supplement top-ups paid to claimants with sickness benefits.

### Annex 2.13 Compassionate Care Benefits

Province/Territory	New Claims <sup>1</sup>				Average Duration (Weeks)				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>2</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>2</sup>											
	% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	2011/12	2011/12- 2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	2011/12	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	2011/12	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09							
																		2011/12- 2012/13	2011/12- 2010/11	2010/11- 2009/10	2009/10- 2008/09			
Newfoundland and Labrador	23.2	69	56	72	62	67	3.9	5.0	4.8	4.7	5.1	4.2	3.8	397	382	362	356	349	-10.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	
Prince Edward Island	27.6	37	29	29	49	27	3.7	4.9	4.7	5.0	4.6	5.0	6.2	401	378	353	342	345	-100.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
Nova Scotia	4.4	165	158	213	205	206	2.5	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.9	4.8	11.3	377	339	343	320	335	-1.1	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3
New Brunswick	11.1	150	135	149	147	115	6.8	5.0	4.7	4.9	4.6	4.5	2.5	356	347	344	318	322	18.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2
Quebec	1.7	1,034	1,017	1,046	1,088	1,081	0.8	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	5.0	378	360	350	339	343	7.5	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.7
Ontario	-1.0	2,711	2,739	2,667	2,570	2,525	0.6	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	3.1	392	380	368	360	357	3.0	5.2	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.4
Manitoba	-13.3	216	249	265	224	236	-4.8	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.8	4.8	2.0	377	369	359	356	335	-12.1	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4
Saskatchewan	-19.6	144	179	190	157	147	1.2	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.8	5.0	1.8	396	389	373	355	338	-14.7	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3
Alberta	16.5	573	492	467	542	518	-1.2	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.1	413	397	386	371	372	15.0	1.2	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9
British Columbia	8.5	978	901	903	914	900	-1.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	2.8	386	375	361	364	349	16.9	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.5
Nunavut	40.0	7	5	7	4	3	29.3	5.4	4.2	5.6	5.0	5.7	0.4	470	468	457	450	439	-100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Northwest Territories	0.0	7	7	9	10	5	23.3	5.3	4.3	5.2	4.5	5.8	-1.7	438	445	420	434	437	-100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Yukon	37.5	11	8	10	6	7	4.9	5.6	5.4	5.6	5.2	4.3	7.1	478	447	451	413	402	-100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Gender</b>																								
Male	12.4	1,714	1,525	1,575	1,594	1,639	-0.2	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	3.4	426	412	400	391	384	10.7	3.6	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.1
Female	-1.4	4,388	4,450	4,452	4,384	4,198	0.4	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	3.3	375	363	351	342	339	2.7	8.0	7.8	7.8	7.1	6.8
<b>Age</b>																								
15 to 24 years (youth)	-3.3	116	120	129	139	123	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.9	4.9	2.6	329	321	309	299	318	16.8	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
25 to 44 years	-3.7	2,115	2,196	2,275	2,341	2,323	0.3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	3.8	403	388	375	367	363	1.2	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.0
45 to 54 years	6.7	2,277	2,134	2,162	2,136	2,119	-0.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	3.2	390	378	368	356	354	9.4	4.3	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.5
55 years and older (older workers)	4.5	1,594	1,525	1,461	1,362	1,272	1.1	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	3.9	373	359	345	337	332	7.4	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.3	2.1
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>6,102</b>	<b>5,975</b>	<b>6,027</b>	<b>5,978</b>	<b>5,837</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>9.9</b>

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data.

<sup>1</sup> Includes claims for which at least \$1 of compassionate care benefits was paid. Includes two compassionate care claims in 2011/12 established by self-employed individuals.

<sup>2</sup> Takes into account Family Supplement top-ups paid to claimants with compassionate care benefits.

### Annex 2.14 Work-Sharing Benefits

Province/Territory	New Claims <sup>1</sup>				Average Duration <sup>2,3</sup>				Average Weekly Benefit <sup>4</sup>				Amount Paid <sup>3</sup>													
	% Change		(Weeks)		% Change		(\$)		% Change		(\$ Million)		% Change													
	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12-2010/11	2009/10-2008/09	2010/11-2011/12	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2009/10	2008/09-2009/10	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2010/11	2008/09-2009/10	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2008/09												
Newfoundland and Labrador	-94.1	5	85	0	20	0	85.9	15.8	8.5	18.0	18.3	294.7	334	85	0	111	0	166.7	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	
Prince Edward Island	-31.3	11	16	40	390	30	61.0	33.0	20.5	13.5	11.2	62.5	167	103	112	91	121	-66.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.0	
Nova Scotia	-20.8	270	341	140	1,740	510	97.7	17.4	8.8	17.1	17.6	3.2	97	94	91	96	112	25.2	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.6	3.3	0.2	0.2	
New Brunswick	16.2	79	68	70	710	240	-26.4	12.0	16.3	17.0	10.2	-9.2	134	147	103	110	86	99.9	0.2	0.1	0.6	0.6	1.3	0.1	0.1	
Quebec	-6.4	6,282	6,713	8,180	33,550	15,900	0.0	13.4	13.4	19.0	20.5	24.4	112	90	99	94	107	23.2	11.8	9.5	28.8	72.3	13.2	13.2	13.2	
Ontario	-59.6	5,397	13,348	7,140	59,700	37,180	-9.5	12.4	13.7	20.2	20.9	-2.7	97	100	93	95	110	-36.3	10.2	16.5	47.1	150.5	27.4	27.4	27.4	
Manitoba	-13.5	518	599	1,760	4,800	3,300	-8.7	10.5	11.5	15.9	25.5	14.6	101	88	100	93	107	-37.3	0.7	1.1	3.2	11.8	2.2	2.2	2.2	
Saskatchewan	-33.3	12	18	310	1,510	530	200.0	22.2	7.4	15.9	16.4	-5.7	156	166	135	130	114	170.4	0.1	0.0	0.9	2.7	0.6	0.6	0.6	
Alberta	-46.4	493	919	950	12,380	1,670	-1.8	11.0	11.2	17.4	20.0	26.7	130	103	106	103	106	-28.7	0.8	1.1	5.5	20.3	0.7	0.7	0.7	
British Columbia	-51.0	808	1,648	2,490	13,080	10,020	-2.0	14.4	14.7	19.8	18.9	21.2	114	94	102	101	117	-37.4	1.7	2.7	11.5	32.1	11.8	11.8	11.8	
Nunavut	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	0.0	0.0	15.0	11.0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Northwest Territories	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	0.0	0.0	35.8	5.7	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Yukon	N/A	15	0	0	0	0	N/A	0.0	0.0	19.3	0.0	N/A	125	0	0	0	0	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<b>Gender</b>																										
Male	-38.1	9,594	15,508	15,340	92,300	50,710	-3.8	12.6	13.1	18.6	20.2	13.6	115	101	103	101	115	-19.5	18.6	23.1	72.5	220.3	42.8	42.8	42.8	
Female	-47.9	4,296	8,247	5,740	35,580	18,670	-4.3	13.2	13.8	21.1	21.7	0.1	88	88	85	85	97	-12.4	7.5	8.6	25.8	74.4	13.6	13.6	13.6	
<b>Age</b>																										
15 to 24 years (youth)	-49.5	759	1,502	1,550	7,070	3,740	-5.0	11.3	11.9	16.3	18.5	0.4	97	96	90	89	101	-39.2	1.0	1.7	3.9	13.0	2.6	2.6	2.6	
25 to 44 years	-45.8	5,689	10,492	9,450	60,910	32,450	-7.8	11.9	12.9	18.3	19.9	11.0	107	96	99	97	109	-23.9	9.9	13.0	39.8	134.1	25.5	25.5	25.5	
45 to 54 years	-39.6	4,584	7,588	6,510	40,210	22,950	-2.9	13.3	13.7	20.1	21.2	10.9	108	97	98	97	112	-16.4	8.9	10.6	33.8	96.9	19.1	19.1	19.1	
55 years and older (older workers)	-31.5	2,858	4,173	3,570	19,690	10,240	2.8	14.7	14.3	21.8	22.6	10.7	108	97	99	98	112	-0.9	6.3	6.4	20.8	50.7	9.1	9.1	9.1	
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>-41.5</b>	<b>13,890</b>	<b>23,755</b>	<b>21,080</b>	<b>127,880</b>	<b>69,380</b>	<b>-3.8</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>19.3</b>	<b>20.6</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>-17.6</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>31.7</b>	<b>98.3</b>	<b>294.7</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>56.4</b>	

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 100% sample of EI administrative data.

1 Includes claims for which at least \$1 of Work-Sharing benefits was paid.

2 Data on duration of Work-Sharing benefits are presented up to 2011/12, to ensure all claims were completed.

3 For the 2012/13 Monitoring and Assessment Report, figures for the measure "Average Duration" of Work-Sharing benefits are based on a 100% sample of data; prior year figures have been restated to reflect this. Prior year figures were previously based on a 10% sample of data.

4 Takes into account Family Supplement top-ups paid to claimants with Work-Sharing benefits.



## Annex 2.15 Family Supplement

	New Claims <sup>1</sup> with Supplement	% of All Claims with Supplement (%)	Average Weekly Top-Up (\$)	Average Weekly Benefit (\$)	Amount Paid (\$ Million)								
					2012/13	2012/13	2012/13	2012/13	2012/13	2012/13	2012/13		
												2011/12-	2010/11
					% Change								
					2011/12-								
					2012/13								
<b>Province/Territory</b>													
Newfoundland and Labrador	2,890	3.5	41	333	-6.4	4.3	4.6	5.3	5.9	5.4			
Prince Edward Island	1,220	5.7	39	332	-8.9	1.6	1.7	2.0	2.2	2.0			
Nova Scotia	5,250	6.4	43	309	-6.1	7.1	7.5	8.1	8.9	8.6			
New Brunswick	4,670	5.2	41	318	-5.8	5.5	5.8	6.3	7.0	7.2			
Quebec	20,650	4.1	41	326	-6.0	17.9	19.0	23.6	26.2	23.7			
Ontario	33,140	5.7	43	303	-4.3	39.3	41.1	45.5	50.1	45.3			
Manitoba	4,960	8.5	51	323	2.3	6.4	6.3	7.1	8.4	7.1			
Saskatchewan	3,280	7.6	50	323	-8.9	4.1	4.5	5.8	6.3	5.3			
Alberta	6,760	4.6	43	318	-3.5	7.2	7.5	9.4	11.1	10.5			
British Columbia	11,800	5.6	41	305	-9.1	12.9	14.2	16.2	16.8	14.8			
Nunavut	70	5.1	34	417	80.4	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1			
Northwest Territories	130	5.3	28	350	-49.8	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1			
Yukon	40	1.5	40	349	-26.5	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0			
<b>Gender</b>													
Male	20,880	2.1	44	356	-7.4	20.1	21.7	26.4	30.0	24.8			
Female	73,980	8.8	42	301	-4.9	86.5	90.9	103.3	113.2	105.3			
<b>Age</b>													
15 to 24 years (youth)	11,870	6.1	37	268	-12.5	15.4	17.6	20.0	22.8	23.0			
25 to 44 years	67,370	7.7	45	320	-5.1	78.9	83.1	95.6	104.7	94.1			
45 to 54 years	13,790	3.4	37	319	3.0	11.0	10.7	12.7	14.2	11.9			
55 years and older (older workers)	1,830	0.5	31	313	6.6	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.5	1.1			

Continued on next page...

**Annex 2.15 Family Supplement (CONTINUED)**

	New Claims <sup>1</sup> with Supplement	% of All Claims with Supplement (%)	Average Weekly Top-Up (\$)	Average Weekly Benefit (\$)	Amount Paid (\$ Million)						
					% Change	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09
<b>EI Claimant Category<sup>2</sup></b>											
Long-tenured workers	8,080	1.6	39	337	4.1	8.3	7.9	11.5	11.3	9.2	
Occasional claimants	76,460	7.9	44	307	-6.4	87.6	93.6	105.8	118.9	109.3	
Frequent claimants	10,320	2.9	38	346	-3.2	10.7	11.1	12.4	12.9	11.7	
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>94,860</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>-5.4</b>	<b>106.6</b>	<b>112.6</b>	<b>129.7</b>	<b>143.2</b>	<b>130.2</b>	

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

<sup>1</sup> Includes claims for which at least \$1 of EI benefits was paid.

<sup>2</sup> Long-tenured workers are 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.

### Annex 2.16 Working While on Claim<sup>1, 2</sup>

Province/Territory	New Regular Claims with Working While on Claim <sup>3</sup>				Average Number of Weeks Worked While on Claim <sup>3</sup>				Average Weekly Earnings Working While on Claim <sup>3, 4</sup>				% of New Regular Claims <sup>3</sup>										
	% Change		% Change		% Change		% Change		% Change		(\$)		% Point Change										
	2010/11-2011/12	2010/11-2010/12	2009/10-2010/11	2008/09-2009/10	2011/12-2011/12	2010/11-2010/11	2009/10-2009/10	2007/08-2007/08	2010/11-2011/12	2010/11-2011/12	2010/11-2010/11	2009/10-2009/10	2007/08-2007/08	2010/11-2011/12	2010/11-2010/11	2009/10-2009/10	2007/08-2007/08						
Newfoundland and Labrador	-2.3	45,880	46,940	49,730	49,660	48,410	-0.9	16.6	16.7	16.5	16.0	15.9	3.8	804	775	703	693	678	67.4	68.8	67.3	66.6	68.5
Prince Edward Island	-3.8	11,590	12,050	12,910	12,290	11,130	4.1	15.5	14.9	15.2	14.0	13.4	11.1	534	480	473	473	454	64.3	66.1	67.5	65.6	62.8
Nova Scotia	2.8	44,640	43,440	46,300	43,870	39,130	-1.1	15.1	15.3	15.5	14.8	14.3	5.9	666	629	584	579	576	64.4	64.2	65.4	62.0	61.8
New Brunswick	1.0	51,100	50,600	53,330	52,070	49,540	1.6	17.6	17.3	17.6	16.7	16.4	4.2	636	611	588	595	587	67.2	67.3	68.8	68.6	68.1
Quebec	4.7	292,240	279,040	314,070	312,130	272,230	-2.6	14.2	14.6	14.8	14.1	13.2	4.6	632	604	588	580	563	62.5	62.2	62.8	61.2	59.7
Ontario	1.3	199,650	197,130	244,040	260,960	173,370	-3.8	9.9	10.3	11.0	11.4	8.6	4.8	543	519	521	603	577	46.8	48.5	49.3	47.6	44.7
Manitoba	2.0	18,570	18,210	22,080	18,190	14,750	-8.4	6.4	7.0	7.0	6.5	5.8	5.2	467	444	443	464	408	46.9	47.6	50.7	45.2	45.2
Saskatchewan	-5.5	13,640	14,430	17,390	14,680	11,970	-3.4	7.1	7.3	7.9	7.1	6.6	11.0	550	495	571	613	548	46.6	49.1	50.1	46.5	45.4
Alberta	-9.5	39,360	43,500	59,190	46,270	26,490	-9.9	7.0	7.8	8.2	7.3	5.6	2.1	741	727	616	645	600	44.1	44.2	44.3	42.4	44.3
British Columbia	-3.2	82,140	84,830	105,030	97,930	62,810	-7.0	10.2	11.0	11.2	10.4	9.1	5.6	584	553	558	587	578	51.7	51.5	54.6	53.0	50.0
Nunavut	-33.9	370	560	470	450	220	42.3	11.2	7.9	6.3	7.4	6.0	37.3	827	603	573	623	488	39.4	48.3	49.5	44.1	34.9
Northwest Territories	-19.3	670	830	910	790	690	-3.1	7.3	7.5	8.4	8.0	6.3	-11.6	637	721	676	628	564	40.1	50.0	46.4	44.9	51.1
Yukon	3.6	1,140	1,100	1,110	1,120	1,000	-13.0	8.0	9.2	8.0	7.2	7.0	10.4	605	548	523	573	502	55.1	50.2	51.6	53.1	54.9
<b>Gender</b>																							
Male	1.2	471,980	466,330	553,610	572,590	421,090	-1.1	12.4	12.5	12.7	12.3	11.4	4.6	762	728	695	716	713	54.1	54.1	54.5	54.2	53.3
Female	0.8	329,010	326,330	372,950	337,820	290,650	-4.1	12.7	13.2	13.2	13.0	11.9	4.6	406	388	382	388	373	57.2	58.5	59.2	55.1	55.2
<b>Age</b>																							
15 to 24 years (youth)	-7.7	81,360	88,100	102,010	94,870	70,410	-0.3	9.8	9.8	9.5	9.2	8.7	6.6	492	462	438	448	448	53.5	53.5	52.9	50.7	50.6
25 to 44 years	-0.6	388,920	360,930	424,110	422,960	333,970	-2.3	11.7	12.0	12.3	12.0	11.1	4.0	624	600	582	603	583	56.3	56.4	56.2	54.6	54.1
45 to 54 years	2.5	224,570	219,120	260,740	260,550	205,390	-2.5	14.2	14.6	14.7	14.3	12.8	4.3	680	652	632	665	635	60.9	61.7	62.4	59.9	59.4
55 years and older (older workers)	9.3	136,140	124,510	139,700	132,030	101,970	-6.4	13.2	14.1	14.2	13.8	12.6	5.5	562	533	509	532	511	47.3	47.8	49.7	48.6	47.5

Continued on next page...

### Annex 2.16 Working While on Claim<sup>1, 2</sup> (CONTINUED)

Weekly Benefit Rate	New Regular Claims with Working While on Claim <sup>3</sup>			Average Number of Weeks Worked While on Claim <sup>3</sup>			Average Weekly Earnings Working While on Claim <sup>3, 4</sup>			% of New Regular Claims <sup>3</sup>														
	% Change	2010/11-2011/12		% Change	2010/11-2011/12		% Change	2010/11-2011/12		% Point Change	2010/11-2011/12													
		2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2008/09		2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2008/09		2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2008/09		2010/11-2011/12	2009/10-2008/09	2010/11-2011/12											
\$100 or Less	-16.9	1,430	1,720	2,600	2,130	2,120	5.8	11.0	10.4	10.9	10.8	11.9	-4.3	172	180	183	187	195	2.8	45.5	42.7	45.5	42.6	44.4
\$101 - \$200	-18.6	35,120	43,140	55,050	53,090	54,170	-1.8	11.7	11.9	12.6	12.5	11.6	-1.1	230	232	227	229	231	-0.9	48.4	49.3	50.0	48.4	48.8
\$201 - \$300	-5.9	137,500	146,080	166,820	159,100	141,910	-2.2	12.2	12.5	12.6	12.0	11.5	2.0	311	304	304	306	311	0.4	51.2	50.8	52.8	50.6	50.7
\$301 - \$400	-2.3	168,290	172,250	198,190	189,980	153,630	-4.4	12.4	13.0	13.0	12.3	11.4	0.7	406	403	402	411	416	-1.4	54.7	56.1	56.5	53.4	52.9
\$401 or More	6.8	458,650	429,470	503,900	506,110	359,910	-2.0	12.6	12.9	13.0	12.9	11.7	2.3	815	797	762	794	800	-0.8	57.7	58.5	58.4	57.2	57.1
CANADA	1.1	800,990	792,660	926,560	910,410	711,740	-2.5	12.5	12.8	12.9	12.6	11.6	4.6	616	588	569	594	574	-0.4	55.4	55.8	56.3	54.6	54.1

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

1 The definition of working while on claim includes all claimants who earned income during their EI benefit period.

2 Includes claims for which at least \$1 of regular benefits was paid. If all EI benefits are considered, then there were 811,200 claims out of 1,901,110 claims (42.7%) in 2011/12 that involved working while on claim.

3 Data on working while on claim are lagged by one year to ensure all claims were completed.

4 Due to a refinement in methodology, "Average Weekly Earnings Working While on Claim" figures for the 2009/10 fiscal year and prior have been restated to more accurately reflect earnings data.

## Annex 2.1.7 Benefit Repayment Provision<sup>1</sup>

	People Who Repaid Benefits										Amount Repaid (\$ Million)			
	% Change		2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	% Change		2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
	2010-2011	2010-2011					2007	2010-2011	2010-2011					
<b>Province/Territory<sup>2</sup></b>														
Newfoundland and Labrador	22.1	24.6	11,303	9,254	8,115	9,835	7,919	24.6	19.8	15.9	13.3	15.2	12.0	
Prince Edward Island	20.0	21.2	1,020	850	751	1,094	1,038	21.2	1.8	1.5	1.2	1.9	2.0	
Nova Scotia	5.1	12.3	7,381	7,022	5,924	6,868	6,328	12.3	12.8	11.4	9.3	10.6	10.2	
New Brunswick	11.3	17.1	5,711	5,130	4,919	5,736	5,246	17.1	9.3	8.0	7.2	7.7	7.1	
Quebec	5.2	5.4	48,670	46,244	42,787	41,242	39,479	5.4	50.1	47.5	41.7	38.5	36.3	
Ontario	-16.4	-10.7	46,060	55,090	59,627	54,754	50,923	-10.7	48.4	54.2	67.1	48.7	40.8	
Manitoba	0.6	5.6	3,113	3,094	2,789	2,225	2,204	5.6	3.7	3.5	3.3	2.3	2.1	
Saskatchewan	2.1	5.7	4,866	4,768	4,430	3,689	3,675	5.7	5.7	5.4	5.2	4.0	3.9	
Alberta	-8.5	-0.8	27,053	29,553	22,491	17,143	17,057	-0.8	36.0	36.4	27.2	17.8	17.4	
British Columbia	-8.2	-5.2	20,451	22,281	19,157	16,189	14,448	-5.2	24.1	25.5	21.3	15.8	13.6	
Nunavut <sup>3</sup>	N/A	N/A	48	0	0	1	0	N/A	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Northwest Territories	-12.2	-14.1	380	433	357	288	338	-14.1	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.4	
Yukon	14.9	20.6	386	336	350	326	321	20.6	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	
<b>Gender</b>														
Male	-4.5	1.6	156,590	163,914	152,912	141,743	132,883	1.6	192.4	189.4	178.6	147.6	132.9	
Female	-1.4	-1.2	19,885	20,165	18,800	17,665	16,106	-1.2	20.5	20.8	19.2	15.6	13.2	
<b>Age</b>														
15 to 24 years (youth)	4.1	9.4	6,741	6,478	4,521	5,158	4,619	9.4	7.6	7.0	4.8	5.0	4.2	
25 to 44 years	-5.5	0.3	75,434	79,814	74,010	68,588	69,298	0.3	81.9	81.7	78.1	63.1	62.4	
45 to 54 years	-8.4	-3.2	49,850	54,400	49,766	43,355	43,355	-3.2	58.2	60.1	62.1	50.2	41.4	
55 years and older (older workers)	2.5	6.1	44,450	43,387	38,878	35,896	31,717	6.1	65.2	61.5	52.8	45.0	38.2	
<b>CANADA<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>-4.1</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>176,475</b>	<b>184,079</b>	<b>171,712</b>	<b>159,408</b>	<b>148,989</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>212.9</b>	<b>210.2</b>	<b>197.8</b>	<b>163.2</b>	<b>146.2</b>	

Source: EI administrative data. Data are based on a 10% sample of EI administrative data.

<sup>1</sup> As benefit repayments are administered through the tax system, the most recent data available are for the 2011 taxation year.

<sup>2</sup> Provincial and territorial figures do not add up to the national total because Canadians working outside of Canada are not accounted for.

<sup>3</sup> Nunavut figures under the measure "People Who Repaid Benefits" have been restated for 2010 and prior years, and do not match previous reports.

### Annex 2.18 Contributors to the Program, 2011<sup>1</sup>

	EI Premiums			Employment Income			Workers			
	Total (\$ Million)	% of National Total	Employers <sup>2</sup> (\$ Million)	Employees (\$ Million)	Total Employment Income (\$ Million)	% of National Total	Number of Workers		Employment Income per Worker (\$)	Insurable Earnings per Worker (\$)
							Number	% of National Total		
<b>Province/Territory of Employer</b>										
Newfoundland and Labrador	290.5	1.5	166.0	124.5	10,342.2	1.3	271,090	1.5	38,151	25,814
Prince Edward Island	78.7	0.4	45.0	33.8	2,496.5	0.3	81,120	0.4	30,775	23,406
Nova Scotia	516.0	2.7	291.8	224.2	17,456.8	2.3	487,260	2.7	35,826	25,862
New Brunswick	420.9	2.2	238.7	182.2	14,015.7	1.8	405,410	2.2	34,572	25,258
Quebec	3,481.4	18.3	1,945.3	1,536.1	153,289.7	19.9	4,136,960	22.9	37,054	26,382
Ontario	7,589.3	40.0	4,290.9	3,298.4	304,708.6	39.5	6,773,480	37.6	44,986	27,378
Manitoba	702.8	3.7	396.6	306.3	24,691.1	3.2	652,730	3.6	37,827	26,372
Saskatchewan	632.0	3.3	355.2	276.8	24,113.7	3.1	566,980	3.1	42,530	27,442
Alberta	2,724.0	14.4	1,536.3	1,187.7	122,448.6	15.9	2,270,030	12.6	53,941	29,422
British Columbia	2,441.9	12.9	1,384.6	1,057.2	94,457.2	12.2	2,304,230	12.8	40,993	25,794
Nunavut	25.7	0.1	14.7	11.1	1,133.1	0.1	22,310	0.1	50,789	28,199
Northwest Territories	41.8	0.2	23.7	18.1	1,892.2	0.2	32,450	0.2	58,310	31,363
Yukon	30.8	0.2	17.5	13.2	1,110.8	0.1	25,570	0.1	43,440	29,064
<b>Gender<sup>3</sup></b>										
Male	10,528.4	55.5	5,947.6	4,580.9	473,980.9	61.4	9,313,960	51.7	50,889	29,011
Female	8,443.3	44.5	4,756.3	3,687.0	297,938.5	38.6	8,708,640	48.3	34,212	24,963
<b>Age<sup>3</sup></b>										
15 to 24 years (youth)	1,612.9	8.5	928.6	684.3	43,392.2	5.6	3,166,130	17.6	13,705	12,740
25 to 44 years	8,953.3	47.2	5,050.8	3,902.5	339,775.2	44.0	7,531,180	41.8	45,116	30,542
45 to 54 years	5,150.2	27.1	2,890.4	2,259.8	235,460.8	30.5	4,113,630	22.8	57,239	32,463
55 years and older (older workers)	3,254.9	17.2	1,833.9	1,421.1	153,250.8	19.8	3,208,340	17.8	47,766	26,088

Continued on next page...

**Annex 2.18 Contributors to the Program, 2011<sup>1</sup>** (CONTINUED)

Industry	EI Premiums			Employment Income			Workers				
	Total (\$ Million)	% of National Total	Employers <sup>2</sup> (\$ Million)	Employees (\$ Million)	Total Employment Income (\$ Million)	% of National Total	Total EI Insurable Earnings (\$ Million)	Number of Workers		Employment Income per Worker (\$)	Insurable Earnings per Worker (\$)
								Number	% of National Total		
<b>Goods Sector</b>	<b>4,274.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>2,423.8</b>	<b>1,850.7</b>	<b>184,118.3</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>109,142.8</b>	<b>3,526,990</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>52,203</b>	<b>30,945</b>
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting	226.7	1.2	130.9	95.8	8,217.6	1.1	5,608.0	323,310	1.8	25,417	17,346
Mining, and oil and gas extraction	404.8	2.1	226.0	178.8	26,752.4	3.5	10,275.3	256,660	1.4	104,233	40,035
Utilities	184.5	1.0	101.1	83.4	10,622.2	1.4	4,927.9	123,680	0.7	85,884	39,844
Construction	1,330.1	7.0	770.9	559.3	52,867.3	6.8	32,769.8	1,126,470	6.2	46,932	29,091
Manufacturing	2,128.4	11.2	1,195.0	933.4	85,658.8	11.1	55,561.8	1,696,870	9.4	50,480	32,744
<b>Service Sector</b>	<b>14,056.9</b>	<b>74.1</b>	<b>7,913.2</b>	<b>6,143.7</b>	<b>562,127.3</b>	<b>72.8</b>	<b>362,115.0</b>	<b>13,684,820</b>	<b>75.9</b>	<b>41,077</b>	<b>26,461</b>
Wholesale trade	971.2	5.1	549.6	421.6	43,143.1	5.6	24,931.1	818,040	4.5	52,740	30,477
Retail trade	1,516.0	8.0	867.8	648.3	50,232.9	6.5	38,233.2	1,982,310	11.0	25,341	19,287
Transportation and warehousing	849.1	4.5	476.8	372.3	32,932.3	4.3	21,914.6	711,560	3.9	46,282	30,798
Information and cultural industries	436.8	2.3	242.5	194.3	19,457.8	2.5	11,496.7	342,170	1.9	56,866	33,599
Finance and insurance	890.3	4.7	488.7	401.5	49,461.9	6.4	23,625.3	708,090	3.9	69,853	33,365
Real estate, and rental and leasing	288.2	1.5	165.3	122.9	12,720.8	1.6	7,204.3	298,070	1.7	42,677	24,170
Professional, scientific and technical services	1,040.5	5.5	588.9	451.6	53,515.7	6.9	26,694.3	919,940	5.1	58,173	29,017
Management of companies and enterprises	142.3	0.7	79.8	62.5	9,315.8	1.2	3,679.7	129,060	0.7	72,182	28,511
Administrative and support, waste management and remediation services	935.3	4.9	535.4	399.8	32,005.6	4.1	23,435.2	1,063,490	5.9	30,095	22,036
Educational services	1,490.5	7.9	823.8	666.7	58,048.7	7.5	39,387.2	1,295,890	7.2	44,794	30,394
Health care and social assistance	1,666.4	8.8	938.0	728.4	59,242.6	7.7	43,504.1	1,462,310	8.1	40,513	29,750

Continued on next page...

### Annex 2.18 Contributors to the Program, 2011<sup>1</sup> (CONTINUED)

	EI Premiums			Employment Income			Workers			
	Total (\$ Million)	% of National Total	Employers <sup>2</sup> (\$ Million)	Employees (\$ Million)	Total Employment Income (\$ Million)	% of National Total	Number of Workers		Employment Income per Worker (\$)	Insurable Earnings per Worker (\$)
							Number	% of National Total		
Arts, entertainment and recreation	204.5	1.1	117.4	87.1	7,120.8	0.9	289,060	1.6	24,634	17,798
Accommodation and food services	687.4	3.6	398.8	288.6	19,828.0	2.6	1,231,360	6.8	16,103	13,763
Other services	648.0	3.4	373.2	274.7	22,686.6	2.9	697,970	3.9	32,504	23,075
Public administration	2,290.6	12.1	1,267.0	1,023.5	92,414.9	12.0	1,735,500	9.6	53,250	34,463
<b>Unclassified</b>	<b>644.4</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>369.2</b>	<b>275.2</b>	<b>25,910.4</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>817,810</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>31,683</b>	<b>20,114</b>
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>18,975.8</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>10,706.2</b>	<b>8,269.6</b>	<b>772,456.1</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>18,029,620</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>42,827</b>	<b>27,050</b>

Sources: Canada Revenue Agency, 2011 T4s with employment income.

<sup>1</sup> As premium payments are administered through the tax system, the most recent data available are for the 2011 taxation year.

<sup>2</sup> In general, 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 employee's contributions.

<sup>3</sup> Gender and age figures do not add up to the national total because some data are missing for these categories.



**Annex 2.19 Benefits-to-Contributions Ratios, 2011<sup>1</sup>**

	Total EI Premiums		Total Regular Benefits		Total Income Benefits		Regular Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio	Total Income Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio	Adjusted Regular Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted Total Income Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio <sup>2</sup>
	(\$ Million)		% of National Total		(\$ Million)					
<b>Province/Territory<sup>3</sup></b>										
Newfoundland and Labrador	290.5	1.5	679.3	6.2	890.3	5.6	2.3	3.1	4.1	3.6
Prince Edward Island	78.7	0.4	159.8	1.5	226.9	1.4	2.0	2.9	3.5	3.4
Nova Scotia	516.0	2.7	581.7	5.3	804.3	5.0	1.1	1.6	2.0	1.8
New Brunswick	420.9	2.2	634.2	5.8	853.3	5.3	1.5	2.0	2.6	2.4
Quebec <sup>4</sup>	3,481.4	18.3	3,158.9	28.9	3,610.2	22.5	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.2
Ontario	7,589.3	40.0	3,251.5	29.7	5,331.8	33.2	0.4	0.7	0.7	0.8
Manitoba	702.8	3.7	246.7	2.3	461.5	2.9	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.8
Saskatchewan	632.0	3.3	209.7	1.9	383.9	2.4	0.3	0.6	0.6	0.7
Alberta	2,724.0	14.4	732.5	6.7	1,422.1	8.9	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.6
British Columbia	2,441.9	12.9	1,224.9	11.2	1,973.0	12.3	0.5	0.8	0.9	1.0
Northwest Territories	41.8	0.2	19.3	0.2	32.4	0.2	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.9
Yukon	30.8	0.2	20.4	0.2	28.5	0.2	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.1
<b>Gender</b>										
Male	10,532.5	55.5	7,050.8	64.5	8,375.3	52.2	0.7	0.8	1.2	0.9
Female	8,443.3	44.5	3,880.1	35.5	7,661.3	47.8	0.5	0.9	0.8	1.1
<b>Age<sup>5</sup></b>										
15 to 24 years (youth)	1,612.9	8.5	962.2	8.8	1,485.9	9.3	0.6	0.9	1.0	1.1
25 to 44 years	8,953.3	47.2	4,730.4	43.3	8,435.2	52.6	0.5	0.9	0.9	1.1
45 to 54 years	5,150.2	27.1	2,893.4	26.5	3,399.2	21.2	0.6	0.7	1.0	0.8
55 years and older (older workers)	3,254.9	17.2	2,345.0	21.5	2,716.2	16.9	0.7	0.8	1.3	1.0

Continued on next page...

**Annex 2.19 Benefits-to-Contributions Ratios, 2011<sup>1</sup>** (CONTINUED)

Industry	Total EI Premiums		Total Regular Benefits		Total Income Benefits		Regular Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio	Total Income Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio	Adjusted Regular Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted Total Income Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio <sup>2</sup>
	(\$ Million)	% of National Total	(\$ Million)	% of National Total	(\$ Million)	% of National Total				
<b>Goods Sector</b>	<b>4,274.5</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>4,410.1</b>	<b>40.3</b>	<b>5,451.9</b>	<b>34.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.5</b>
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting	226.7	1.2	546.7	5.0	642.4	4.0	2.4	2.8	4.2	3.4
Mining, and oil and gas extraction	404.8	2.1	192.7	1.8	241.9	1.5	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.7
Utilities	184.5	1.0	40.2	0.4	64.1	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4
Construction	1,330.1	7.0	2,133.4	19.5	2,463.3	15.4	1.6	1.9	2.8	2.2
Manufacturing	2,128.4	11.2	1,497.2	13.7	2,040.3	12.7	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.1
<b>Service Sector</b>	<b>14,056.9</b>	<b>74.1</b>	<b>6,195.4</b>	<b>56.7</b>	<b>10,148.6</b>	<b>63.3</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.9</b>
Wholesale trade	971.2	5.1	480.0	4.4	753.7	4.7	0.5	0.8	0.9	0.9
Retail trade	1,516.0	8.0	719.7	6.6	1,132.9	7.1	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.9
Transportation and warehousing	849.1	4.5	432.5	4.0	584.0	3.6	0.5	0.7	0.9	0.8
Information and cultural industries	436.8	2.3	141.0	1.3	227.0	1.4	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.6
Finance and insurance	890.3	4.7	183.4	1.7	424.1	2.6	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.6
Real estate, and rental and leasing	288.2	1.5	162.4	1.5	228.9	1.4	0.6	0.8	1.0	0.9
Professional, scientific and technical services	1,040.5	5.5	492.7	4.5	749.2	4.7	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.9
Management of companies and enterprises	142.3	0.7	65.1	0.6	99.6	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.8
Administrative and support, waste management and remediation services	935.3	4.9	762.6	7.0	1,011.5	6.3	0.8	1.1	1.4	1.3
Educational services	1,490.5	7.9	617.1	5.6	1,046.8	6.5	0.4	0.7	0.7	0.8
Health care and social assistance	1,666.4	8.8	410.9	3.8	1,153.8	7.2	0.2	0.7	0.4	0.8

Continued on next page...

### Annex 2.19 Benefits-to-Contributions Ratios, 2011<sup>1</sup> (CONTINUED)

	Total EI Premiums		Total Regular Benefits		Total Income Benefits		Regular Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio	Total Income Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio	Adjusted Regular Contributions Ratio <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted Total Income Benefits-to-Contributions Ratio <sup>2</sup>
	(\$ Million)	% of National Total	(\$ Million)	% of National Total	(\$ Million)	% of National Total				
Arts, entertainment and recreation	204.5	1.1	233.5	2.1	283.2	1.8	1.1	1.4	2.0	1.6
Accommodation and food services	687.4	3.6	512.3	4.7	744.1	4.6	0.7	1.1	1.3	1.3
Other services	648.0	3.4	380.0	3.5	581.5	3.6	0.6	0.9	1.0	1.1
Public administration	2,290.6	12.1	602.1	5.5	1,128.2	7.0	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.6
<b>Unclassified</b>	<b>644.4</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>325.5</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>436.1</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.8</b>
<b>CANADA</b>	<b>18,975.8</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>10,931.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>16,036.6</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>

Sources: Canada Revenue Agency, 2011 T4s with employment income; EI administrative data.

1. As premium payments are administered through the tax system, the most recent data available are for the 2011 taxation year.

2. For ease of analysis, the benefits-to-contributions ratios have been adjusted so that the national figure equals one.

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

4. The calculation of Quebec's regular benefits-to-contributions ratio and adjusted regular benefits-to-contributions ratio takes into consideration the fact that employers and employees in the province do not pay EI premiums for maternity and parental benefits, due to the presence of the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP). To account for this, the EI contribution from Quebec, which is the denominator of the two ratios, has been modified upward to estimate how much employers and employees in Quebec would pay in EI premiums if they had to contribute to EI maternity and parental benefits.

5. Age figures do not add up to the national total because some data are missing for these categories.



## ANNEX 3

# EBSMs DATA TABLES



<b>Annex 3.1</b>	Overview of Labour Market Development Agreements . . . . .	<b>238</b>
<b>Annex 3.2</b>	Employment Insurance (EI), Part II – General Definitions . . . . .	<b>239</b>
<b>Annex 3.3</b>	EBSM Program Descriptions. . . . .	<b>240</b>
<b>Annex 3.4</b>	EBSM Overview . . . . .	<b>241</b>
<b>Annex 3.5</b>	EBSM Clients – Clients Served, by Client Type. . . . .	<b>242</b>
<b>Annex 3.6</b>	New EBSM Interventions . . . . .	<b>243</b>
<b>Annex 3.7</b>	EBSM Designated Members – Women . . . . .	<b>244</b>
<b>Annex 3.8</b>	EBSM Designated Members – Persons with Disabilities . . . . .	<b>245</b>
<b>Annex 3.9</b>	EBSM Designated Members – Aboriginal People . . . . .	<b>246</b>
<b>Annex 3.10</b>	EBSM Designated Members – Visible Minorities. . . . .	<b>247</b>
<b>Annex 3.11</b>	EBSM and Pan-Canadian Activities – EI, Part I Final Expenditures. . . . .	<b>248</b>
<b>Annex 3.12</b>	EBSM Final Expenditures. . . . .	<b>249</b>
<b>Annex 3.13</b>	EI, Part II Pan-Canadian – Final Expenditures. . . . .	<b>250</b>
<b>Annex 3.14</b>	Returns to Employment and Unpaid Benefits Indicators . . . . .	<b>251</b>
<b>Annex 3.15</b>	Returns to Employment, by EBSM Intervention . . . . .	<b>252</b>

### Annex 3.1 Overview of Labour Market Development Agreements

Province/Territory	Signature Date	Implementation Date	Allocation (\$000s) <sup>1</sup>		
			2013/14 LMDA	2012/13 LMDA	2011/12 LMDA
Newfoundland and Labrador	September 4, 2008	November 2, 2009	129,219	130,405	131,944
Prince Edward Island	September 5, 2008	October 5, 2009	26,084	26,467	27,138
Nova Scotia	June 13, 2008	July 1, 2009	79,013	79,606	80,269
New Brunswick	December 13, 1996	April 1, 1997	89,763	90,142	91,078
Quebec	April 21, 1997	April 1, 1998	581,242	584,048	589,155
Ontario	November 23, 2005	January 1, 2007	565,471	559,964	552,689
Manitoba	April 17, 1997	November 27, 1997	43,507	44,086	44,818
Saskatchewan	February 6, 1998	January 1, 1999	36,426	37,092	37,766
Alberta	December 6, 1996	November 1, 1997	109,143	108,678	106,925
British Columbia	February 20, 2008	February 2, 2009	280,647	280,013	278,689
Northwest Territories	February 27, 1998	October 1, 1998	3,143	3,156	3,193
Yukon	July 8, 2009	February 1, 2010	3,482	3,489	3,537
Nunavut	May 11, 2000	April 1, 2000	2,859	2,854	2,799
<b>Canada</b>			<b>1,950,000</b>	<b>1,950,000</b>	<b>1,950,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> 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 *Employment Insurance 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 P/Ts, specific projects and activities in the national interest under Part II of the *Employment Insurance Act*. Canada retains responsibility for the delivery of insurance benefits under Part I of the *Employment Insurance Act* and for the aspects of labour market development reflective of national interests.

For more information on LMDAs, please refer to [http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/employment/partnerships/labour\\_market\\_development/index.shtm](http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/employment/partnerships/labour_market_development/index.shtm).

### 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 *Employment Insurance Act*. The apprentice requires a referral under the authority of section 25 of the *Employment Insurance 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 Aboriginal organizations to design and deliver employment programs and services for Aboriginal people at the community level. The 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 sunsetting of AHRDS and the modernization of ESDC's Aboriginal labour market 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 P/Ts and the private sector, and 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.gc.ca/hrdc-drhc.gc.ca>.

---

### **Annex 3.3 EBSM Program Descriptions**

---

#### **Employment Benefits**

Targeted Wage Subsidies help insured participants 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 Creation Partnerships projects provide insured participants with opportunities to gain work experience that will lead to ongoing employment. Activities of the project help develop the community and the local economy.

Skills Development helps insured participants 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. 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).

---

#### **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, help with job search skills, job-finding clubs, job placement services, the provision of labour market information, and case management and follow-up.

Labour Market Partnerships provide funding to help employers, employee and employer associations, and communities improve their capacity to deal with human resource requirements and 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 prepare for or keep employment and 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

Clients Served <sup>1</sup>		2012/13		Designated Group Participation in EBSMs	
<b>Gender</b>					
Men	59.7%	Clients	662,260	Women	45.4%
Women	40.3%	Interventions	1,064,279	Aboriginal people <sup>3</sup>	6.7%
		Ratio	1.61	Persons with disabilities <sup>3</sup>	8.9%
				Visible minorities <sup>3</sup>	4.0%
<b>Age<sup>2</sup></b>		<b>Participation in Interventions as a Percentage of Total</b>			
15 to 19 years	5.1%	<b>Employment Benefits</b>			
20 to 24 years	14.3%	Targeted Wage Subsidies	1.2%	Employment	17,579,100
25 to 29 years	13.4%	Self-employment	0.8%	Unemployment rate	7.2%
30 to 34 years	12.8%	Job Creation Partnerships	0.3%		
35 to 39 years	11.5%	Skills development—regular	5.5%		
40 to 44 years	11.0%	Skills development—apprentices	5.8%		
45 to 49 years	11.0%	Targeted earnings supplements	0.5%		
50 to 54 years	9.8%				
55 years and older	11.0%				
Unknown	0.0%				
<b>EI Clients Served</b>					
Active claimants	76.1%	<b>Support Measures: Employment Assistance Services</b>			
Former claimants	23.9%	Employment services	51.8%		
		Group services	3.2%		
		Individual counselling	29.7%		
		<b>Pan-Canadian</b>	<b>1.3%</b>		

Sources: Client and participant datasets.

<sup>1</sup> Clients with an unknown gender were added to the male category.

<sup>2</sup> SD—Apprentices and Group Services are excluded from the distribution because client date of birth is not collected.

<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>1</sup>

Province/Territory	2012/13							Total Clients Served
	EI Active Claimants			EI Clients			Non-Insured Clients Served	
	Target <sup>2</sup>	Active Claimants Served	Former Claimants Served	Total EI Clients Served	Total EI Clients Served	Total Clients Served		
Newfoundland and Labrador	9,700	9,124	1,992	11,116	2,046	13,162	13,162	
Prince Edward Island	2,848	3,032	708	3,740	1,316	5,056	5,056	
Nova Scotia	10,250	10,080	3,399	13,479	4,410	17,889	17,889	
New Brunswick	10,350	9,365	2,334	11,699	3,844	15,543	15,543	
Quebec	136,500	119,771	25,081	144,852	54,519	199,371	199,371	
Ontario	119,500	66,748	20,707	87,455	66,703	154,158	154,158	
Manitoba	14,500	11,744	3,844	15,588	13,369	28,957	28,957	
Saskatchewan	11,500	10,161	2,788	12,949	748	13,697	13,697	
Alberta	26,700	39,823	18,234	58,057	62,404	120,461	120,461	
British Columbia	50,000	31,953	13,303	45,256	31,522	76,778	76,778	
Northwest Territories	370	314	144	458	460	918	918	
Yukon	275	338	93	431	274	705	705	
Nunavut	160	100	113	213	219	432	432	
National headquarters	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
<b>Total EBSMs</b>	<b>392,653</b>	<b>312,553</b>	<b>92,740</b>	<b>405,293</b>	<b>241,834</b>	<b>647,127</b>	<b>647,127</b>	
Aboriginal pan-canadian	15,028	7,351	7,782	15,133	—	15,133	15,133	
<b>Canada</b>	<b>407,681</b>	<b>319,904</b>	<b>100,522</b>	<b>420,426</b>	<b>241,834</b>	<b>662,260</b>	<b>662,260</b>	

Source: Client dataset.

<sup>1</sup> This table includes clients served between April 1, 2012, and March 31, 2013, with one count per client served.

<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>1</sup>

	2012/13													Canada	
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont. <sup>2</sup>	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T.	Yuk.	Nun.		NHQ
<b>Employment Benefits</b>															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	481	393	668	1,042	6,423	2,089	90	–	48	1,216	72	6	57	–	12,585
Self-employment	171	147	454	258	1,918	2,269	196	87	237	2,498	19	7	–	–	8,261
Job Creation Partnerships	1,044	125	196	–	–	484	203	–	684	170	–	–	–	–	2,906
Skills development—regular	3,006	1,154	3,128	4,263	27,199	10,068	2,491	1,295	1,960	3,880	116	63	73	–	58,696
Skills development—apprentices	1,981	301	1,642	2,338	–	16,580	3,775	6,652	18,454	9,211	122	190	46	–	61,292
Targeted earnings supplements	–	–	–	–	5,781	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	5,781
<b>Total employment benefits</b>	<b>6,683</b>	<b>2,120</b>	<b>6,088</b>	<b>7,901</b>	<b>41,321</b>	<b>31,490</b>	<b>6,755</b>	<b>8,034</b>	<b>21,383</b>	<b>16,975</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>149,521</b>
<b>Support Measures: EAS</b>															
Employment services	–	3,978	22,400	9,163	118,494	–	28,218	5,491	235,175	127,017	–	610	299	–	550,845
Group services	–	–	1,346	–	32,339	–	–	557	–	–	–	–	–	–	34,242
Individual counselling	12,369	1,548	5,852	14,694	45,590	142,224	17,698	4,447	–	70,659	892	3	–	–	315,976
<b>Total support measures: EAS</b>	<b>12,369</b>	<b>5,526</b>	<b>29,598</b>	<b>23,857</b>	<b>196,423</b>	<b>142,224</b>	<b>45,916</b>	<b>10,495</b>	<b>235,175</b>	<b>197,676</b>	<b>892</b>	<b>613</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>901,063</b>
<i>Total support measures: EAS – without group services</i>	<i>12,369</i>	<i>5,526</i>	<i>28,252</i>	<i>23,857</i>	<i>164,084</i>	<i>142,224</i>	<i>45,916</i>	<i>9,938</i>	<i>235,175</i>	<i>197,676</i>	<i>892</i>	<i>613</i>	<i>299</i>	<i>–</i>	<i>866,821</i>
<b>Total benefits and support measures: EAS</b>	<b>19,052</b>	<b>7,646</b>	<b>35,686</b>	<b>31,758</b>	<b>237,744</b>	<b>173,714</b>	<b>52,671</b>	<b>18,529</b>	<b>256,558</b>	<b>214,651</b>	<b>1,221</b>	<b>879</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>1,050,584</b>
Aboriginal pan-canadian	309	187	341	387	3,058	4,947	3,930	1,738	2,493	7,480	253	340	142	82	25,687
<b>Grand total—benefits and support measures: EAS</b>	<b>19,361</b>	<b>7,833</b>	<b>36,027</b>	<b>32,145</b>	<b>240,802</b>	<b>178,661</b>	<b>56,601</b>	<b>20,267</b>	<b>259,051</b>	<b>222,131</b>	<b>1,474</b>	<b>1,219</b>	<b>617</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>1,076,271</b>
<b>Total—without group services</b>	<b>19,361</b>	<b>7,833</b>	<b>34,681</b>	<b>32,145</b>	<b>208,463</b>	<b>178,661</b>	<b>56,601</b>	<b>19,710</b>	<b>259,051</b>	<b>222,131</b>	<b>1,474</b>	<b>1,219</b>	<b>617</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>1,042,029</b>

Source: Participant dataset.

<sup>1</sup> Interventions in this table refer to all new starts between April 1, 2012, and March 31, 2013.

<sup>2</sup> Ontario counts one individual counselling intervention per client.

### Annex 3.7 EBSM Designated Members — Women<sup>1</sup>

	New Starts, by Intervention (%)—2012/13														
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T.	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
<b>Employment Benefits</b>															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	60.7	47.3	50.3	37.9	44.9	45.8	35.6	—	64.6	43.6	12.5	50.0	22.8	—	45.0
Self-employment	59.6	44.2	48.0	41.5	43.6	50.5	33.7	55.2	49.8	52.6	68.4	42.9	—	—	48.9
Job Creation Partnerships	52.0	38.4	57.7	—	—	63.6	32.5	—	51.0	28.2	—	—	—	—	50.8
Skills development—regular	51.0	55.8	53.1	49.4	45.3	51.1	50.2	50.3	61.8	50.2	16.4	47.6	52.1	—	48.7
Skills development—apprentices	5.8	4.7	3.5	2.8	—	2.9	2.2	3.8	5.8	4.6	3.3	6.8	2.2	—	4.2
Targeted earnings supplements	—	—	—	—	44.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	44.1
<b>Total employment benefits</b>	<b>38.7</b>	<b>45.1</b>	<b>39.2</b>	<b>33.9</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>25.5</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>11.8</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>30.0</b>
<b>Support Measures: EAS</b>															
Employment services	—	53.1	50.8	46.3	46.5	—	50.6	38.7	50.5	46.3	—	49.3	40.8	—	48.5
Individual counselling	51.8	53.4	50.6	42.6	42.6	49.6	48.8	43.6	—	46.3	27.6	33.3	—	—	47.5
<b>Total support measures: EAS</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>53.2</b>	<b>50.8</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>45.4</b>	<b>49.6</b>	<b>49.9</b>	<b>40.9</b>	<b>50.5</b>	<b>46.3</b>	<b>27.6</b>	<b>49.3</b>	<b>40.8</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>48.1</b>
<b>Total benefits and support measures: EAS</b>	<b>47.2</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>48.7</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>45.3</b>	<b>45.3</b>	<b>46.3</b>	<b>27.9</b>	<b>47.4</b>	<b>44.6</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>39.9</b>	<b>36.6</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>45.5</b>
Aboriginal pan-canadian	27.5	33.2	42.8	36.7	45.9	40.6	45.7	40.9	38.3	39.5	39.5	37.9	35.9	70.7	41.3
<b>Grand total, benefits and support measures: EAS</b>	<b>46.9</b>	<b>50.5</b>	<b>48.7</b>	<b>41.4</b>	<b>45.3</b>	<b>45.1</b>	<b>46.3</b>	<b>29.0</b>	<b>47.3</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>39.4</b>	<b>36.5</b>	<b>70.7</b>	<b>45.4</b>

Source: Participant dataset.

1. All percentages are based on new start interventions only (the number of interventions started in 2012/13).

### Annex 3.8 EBSM Designated Members — Persons with Disabilities<sup>1</sup>

	New Starts, by Intervention (%)—2012/13														
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T.	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
<b>Employment Benefits</b>															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	0.6	2.3	27.2	1.7	36.5	3.1	8.9	—	4.2	13.4	—	16.7	—	—	22.2
Self-employment	—	2.7	9.3	0.8	1.6	—	8.2	8.0	1.7	15.3	—	—	—	—	5.9
Job Creation Partnerships	1.5	4.0	11.7	—	—	—	1.5	—	2.6	15.9	—	—	—	—	3.2
Skills development—regular	1.3	2.3	16.5	3.4	3.1	—	3.2	9.3	1.3	20.4	—	15.9	—	—	4.4
Skills development—apprentices	—	—	0.4	0.2	—	—	—	1.0	—	0.3	—	—	—	—	0.2
Targeted earnings supplements	—	—	—	—	3.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3.7
<b>Total employment benefits</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>12.6</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>4.2</b>
<b>Support Measures: EAS</b>															
Employment services	—	14.5	23.5	12.5	9.0	—	10.5	17.2	2.9	23.5	—	17.5	—	—	10.6
Individual counselling	0.3	6.7	32.3	9.1	3.5	3.1	6.2	10.9	—	23.1	0.6	66.7	—	—	8.6
<b>Total support measures: EAS</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>25.3</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>23.4</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>9.9</b>
<b>Total benefits and support measures: EAS</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>23.1</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>22.2</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>9.0</b>
Aboriginal pan-canadian	2.3	9.6	7.3	4.4	0.5	6.8	4.6	2.5	2.2	2.5	1.2	2.6	—	3.7	3.5
<b>Grand total, benefits and support measures: EAS</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>8.9</b>

Source: Participant dataset.

1. All percentages are based on new start interventions only (the number of interventions started in 2012/13). These reported counts are generally lower than actual numbers because data are collected through self-identification.

### Annex 3.9 EBSM Designated Members — Aboriginal People<sup>1</sup>

	New Starts, by Intervention (%)—2012/13														
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T.	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
<b>Employment Benefits</b>															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	2.5	—	1.3	—	0.1	2.4	10.0	—	10.4	3.9	45.8	33.3	86.0	—	<b>1.8</b>
Self-employment	1.8	3.4	4.2	—	0.1	1.5	8.7	6.9	0.8	3.6	10.5	14.3	—	—	<b>2.2</b>
Job Creation Partnerships	0.6	0.8	0.5	—	—	3.7	10.8	—	1.8	17.1	—	—	—	—	<b>3.1</b>
Skills development—regular	2.0	0.7	2.7	—	—	1.1	9.0	9.5	0.3	7.0	35.3	15.9	93.2	—	<b>1.7</b>
Skills development—apprentices	0.2	—	0.1	—	—	0.1	1.6	1.8	0.1	0.4	4.9	—	4.3	—	<b>0.4</b>
Targeted earnings supplements	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	<b>0.1</b>
<b>Total employment benefits</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.9</b>	—	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>24.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>67.6</b>	—	<b>1.2</b>
<b>Support Measures: EAS</b>															
Employment services	—	0.8	2.5	—	0.1	—	13.0	16.2	6.0	8.5	—	17.4	96.3	—	<b>5.5</b>
Individual counselling	0.5	1.4	9.0	—	—	2.0	7.6	13.8	—	8.6	61.7	33.3	—	—	<b>3.8</b>
<b>Total support measures: EAS</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>3.8</b>	—	<b>0.1</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>61.7</b>	<b>17.5</b>	<b>96.3</b>	—	<b>4.9</b>
<b>Total benefits and support measures: EAS</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>3.5</b>	—	<b>0.1</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>85.7</b>	—	<b>4.4</b>
Aboriginal 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	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Grand total, benefits and support measures: EAS</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>16.4</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>37.7</b>	<b>89.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>6.7</b>

Source: Participant dataset.

1. All percentages are based on new start interventions only (the number of interventions started in 2012/13). These reported counts are generally lower than actual numbers because data are collected through self-identification.

### Annex 3.10 EBSM Designated Members<sup>1</sup> — Visible Minorities<sup>2</sup>

	New Starts, by Intervention (%)—2012/13														
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T.	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
<b>Employment Benefits</b>															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	0.6	1.5	2.7	0.3	—	8.1	4.4	—	—	2.5	11.1	—	1.8	—	1.9
Self-employment	—	3.4	2.0	0.4	—	7.9	3.6	10.3	2.1	1.9	5.3	—	—	—	3.2
Job Creation Partnerships	0.3	3.2	0.5	—	—	7.4	16.3	—	2.8	1.2	—	—	—	—	3.4
Skills development—regular	0.2	4.2	3.1	0.4	—	10.1	19.4	8.0	5.7	1.5	7.8	3.2	—	—	3.3
Skills development—apprentices	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	0.7	0.6	—	0.1	0.8	—	—	—	0.2
Targeted earnings supplements	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Total employment benefits</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>1.8</b>
<b>Support Measures: EAS</b>															
Employment services	—	12.0	2.9	0.7	—	—	18.9	9.5	2.3	4.1	—	0.8	0.7	—	3.2
Individual counselling	0.1	3.7	4.1	0.4	—	9.9	21.0	9.3	—	4.0	13.8	—	—	—	6.8
<b>Total support measures: EAS</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>19.7</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>4.5</b>
<b>Total benefits and support measures: EAS</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>4.1</b>
Aboriginal pan-canadian	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Grand total, benefits and support measures: EAS</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>4.0</b>

Source: Participant dataset.

<sup>1</sup> Quebec, New Brunswick and NHQ did not report participation levels for members of visible minority groups. Therefore, these jurisdictions were excluded from the calculation of the national average.

<sup>2</sup> All percentages are based on new start interventions only (the number of interventions started in 2012/13). These reported counts are generally lower than actual numbers because data are collected through self-identification.

### Annex 3.1.1 EBSM and Pan-Canadian Activities — EI, Part I Final Expenditures<sup>1</sup>

	In \$000s, by Intervention—2012/13														
	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	646	800	1,404	2,505	7,985	5,713	1,429	449	1,414	1,470	126	9	—	—	23,950
Job Creation Partnerships <sup>2</sup>	1,211	151	204	17	128	657	378	—	—	67	—	—	—	—	2,813
Skills Development	17,981	7,846	13,001	31,585	60,161	76,513	22,415	20,867	75,881	36,606	1,133	930	294	—	365,213
<b>Total<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>19,838</b>	<b>8,797</b>	<b>14,609</b>	<b>34,107</b>	<b>68,274</b>	<b>82,883</b>	<b>24,222</b>	<b>21,316</b>	<b>77,295</b>	<b>38,143</b>	<b>1,259</b>	<b>939</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>391,976</b>

Source: Benefit and Overpayment System.

<sup>1</sup> In previous years, the data source for this annex was the Corporate Management System. However, the implementation of a new financial system started in 2012/13. Starting this year, data will come from the Benefit and Overpayment System.

<sup>2</sup> In Quebec, this amount refers only to pan-Canadian activities.

<sup>3</sup> Totals may not add due to rounding.



### Annex 3.1.2 EBSM Final Expenditures<sup>1</sup>

	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont. <sup>2</sup>	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T.	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
<b>In \$000s, by Intervention—2012/13</b>															
<b>Employment Benefits</b>															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	5,320	2,014	1,010	3,144	41,698	3,900	477	—	451	9,123	186	8	588	—	67,919
Self-employment	4,339	1,320	6,239	3,782	26,590	47,805	1,298	362	1,910	24,380	159	85	—	—	118,268
Job Creation Partnerships	7,444	1,446	1,094	—	—	4,040	1,646	—	6,394	2,408	—	—	—	—	24,473
Skills development	87,190	14,423	43,338	48,838	264,481	231,030	22,560	27,960	70,041	100,923	1,023	2,056	938	—	914,800
Targeted earnings supplements, including <i>supplément de retour au travail</i>	—	—	—	—	3,001	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3,001
<b>Total employment benefits</b>	<b>104,293</b>	<b>19,203</b>	<b>51,681</b>	<b>55,764</b>	<b>335,769</b>	<b>286,775</b>	<b>25,981</b>	<b>28,322</b>	<b>78,795</b>	<b>136,834</b>	<b>1,368</b>	<b>2,149</b>	<b>1,526</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>1,128,460</b>
<b>Support Measures: EAS</b>															
Employment assistance	16,849	4,935	25,980	10,193	139,711	258,435	10,300	6,817	28,102	71,230	932	1,219	—	—	574,703
<b>Total support measures: EAS</b>	<b>16,849</b>	<b>4,935</b>	<b>25,980</b>	<b>10,193</b>	<b>139,711</b>	<b>258,435</b>	<b>10,300</b>	<b>6,817</b>	<b>28,102</b>	<b>71,230</b>	<b>932</b>	<b>1,219</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>574,703</b>
<b>Sub-total: employment benefits and support measures: EAS</b>	<b>121,142</b>	<b>24,138</b>	<b>77,661</b>	<b>65,957</b>	<b>475,481</b>	<b>545,210</b>	<b>36,280</b>	<b>35,139</b>	<b>106,897</b>	<b>208,064</b>	<b>2,300</b>	<b>3,368</b>	<b>1,526</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>1,703,163</b>
<b>Other Support Measures</b>															
Labour market partnerships	6,374	2,329	1,945	7,622	108,303	14,454	7,005	1,703	1,781	4,540	345	108	143	—	156,651
Research and innovation	—	—	—	307	264	300	801	250	—	10,290	—	—	—	—	12,212
<b>Total other support measures</b>	<b>6,374</b>	<b>2,329</b>	<b>1,945</b>	<b>7,929</b>	<b>108,567</b>	<b>14,754</b>	<b>7,806</b>	<b>1,953</b>	<b>1,781</b>	<b>14,830</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>168,863</b>
<b>Total EBSMs—Part II</b>	<b>127,516</b>	<b>26,467</b>	<b>79,606</b>	<b>73,886</b>	<b>584,048</b>	<b>559,964</b>	<b>44,086</b>	<b>37,092</b>	<b>108,678</b>	<b>222,894</b>	<b>2,645</b>	<b>3,476</b>	<b>1,668</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>1,872,026</b>
Overcontributions <sup>3</sup>	2,889	—	—	16,256	—	—	—	—	—	57,119	511	13	1,186	—	77,974
Pan-canadian (see details in Annex 3.1.3)	2,044	494	1,846	1,529	9,662	21,803	14,476	11,498	13,268	14,328	2,395	1,196	2,737	56,148	153,422
Adjustment <sup>4</sup>	(364)	27	(154)	(1,679)	(186)	(10,058)	(17)	(14)	(100)	(11,882)	(392)	(1)	(1,528)	(1,240)	(27,588)
<b>Total including pan-canadian</b>	<b>132,084</b>	<b>26,987</b>	<b>81,298</b>	<b>89,992</b>	<b>593,524</b>	<b>571,709</b>	<b>58,545</b>	<b>48,576</b>	<b>121,846</b>	<b>282,458</b>	<b>5,159</b>	<b>4,684</b>	<b>4,063</b>	<b>54,908</b>	<b>2,075,834</b>
Administrative costs related to LMDAs <sup>5</sup>	8,727	2,611	10,112	8,922	58,920	56,932	6,078	6,021	9,594	20,535	1,450	330	787	—	189,468

Source: Corporate Management System and P/T audited statements.

- Totals may not add due to rounding.
- The expenditure amount for Ontario TWS (Job Placement with Incentives) was 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.
- Overcontributions will be recovered during 2013/14.
- This adjustment reflects overpayments established, refunds of previous years' expenditures and other accounting adjustments.
- Administrative costs include \$179 million (salary and non-salary) to administer LMDAs and \$10 million for rent.

### Annex 3.13 EI, Part II Pan-Canadian — Final Expenditures<sup>1</sup>

	In \$000s, by Intervention—2012/13														
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T.	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
<b>Pan-Canadian: Programming Funds</b>															
Aboriginal Skills and Employment Training Strategy	1,825	225	1,596	1,302	9,006	20,525	14,145	11,253	12,882	13,881	2,132	980	2,461	875	<b>93,089</b>
Labour Market Partnerships	218	269	250	227	656	1,278	330	245	386	446	263	216	276	43,654	<b>48,713</b>
Research and Innovation	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11,619	<b>11,619</b>
<b>Total programming funds</b>	<b>2,044</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>1,846</b>	<b>1,529</b>	<b>9,662</b>	<b>21,803</b>	<b>14,476</b>	<b>11,498</b>	<b>13,268</b>	<b>14,328</b>	<b>2,395</b>	<b>1,196</b>	<b>2,737</b>	<b>56,148</b>	<b>153,422</b>
Supporting agreements with P/Ts	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Grand total pan-canadian</b>	<b>2,044</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>1,846</b>	<b>1,529</b>	<b>9,662</b>	<b>21,803</b>	<b>14,476</b>	<b>11,498</b>	<b>13,268</b>	<b>14,328</b>	<b>2,395</b>	<b>1,196</b>	<b>2,737</b>	<b>56,148</b>	<b>153,422</b>

Source: Corporate Management System.

<sup>1</sup> Totals may not add due to rounding.

### Annex 3.14 Returns to Employment and Unpaid Benefits Indicators

Province/Territory	2012/13											
	Clients Who Returned to Employment <sup>4</sup>					Unpaid Benefits (\$ Millions) <sup>1</sup>						
	Target <sup>2</sup>	Results				Result vs. Target (%)	Target <sup>2</sup>	Results				Result vs. Target (%)
	SD-Apprentices	Group Services	Other <sup>3</sup>	Total			SD-Apprentices	Group Services	Other <sup>3</sup>	Total <sup>4</sup>		
Newfoundland and Labrador	5,800	1,573	-	4,541	6,114	105%	24.5	18.6	-	11.8	30.4	124%
Prince Edward Island	1,901	248	-	1,691	1,939	102%	8.5	3.2	-	4.3	7.5	89%
Nova Scotia	6,500	1,175	99	3,985	5,259	81%	25.0	13.2	0.8	11.8	25.7	103%
New Brunswick	8,700	1,544	-	6,471	8,015	92%	34.2	15.2	-	12.4	27.6	81%
Quebec	50,900	-	6,178	43,579	49,757	98%	156.2	-	51.6	178.9	230.5	148%
Ontario	62,230	12,732	-	23,380	36,112	58%	325.0	127.6	-	100.1	227.7	70%
Manitoba	9,000	2,651	-	5,405	8,056	90%	45.0	26.1	-	17.4	43.5	97%
Saskatchewan	4,850	3,592	87	2,105	5,784	119%	35.0	42.6	0.7	12.3	55.6	159%
Alberta	-	12,596	-	11,090	23,686	-	-	138.1	-	81.5	219.6	-
British Columbia	30,000	7,071	-	9,706	16,777	56%	124.0	74.1	-	38.5	112.5	91%
Northwest Territories	223	23	-	162	185	83%	3.0	0.4	-	1.8	2.2	72%
Yukon	225	108	-	148	256	114%	2.6	1.6	-	0.6	2.1	82%
Nunavut	140	17	-	36	53	38%	0.9	0.2	-	0.2	0.4	45%
<b>Canada</b>	<b>180,469</b>	<b>43,330</b>	<b>6,364</b>	<b>112,299</b>	<b>161,993</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>783.9</b>	<b>460.8</b>	<b>53.1</b>	<b>471.6</b>	<b>985.4</b>	<b>126%</b>

Source: Results dataset.

<sup>1</sup> ASETS activity resulted in 6,932 returns to employment and \$14.4 million in unpaid benefits. These amounts are not included in the provincial totals.

<sup>2</sup> Targets are for EBSM regular clients only.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> Some unpaid benefit figures have been rounded.

### Annex 3.15 Returns to Employment, by EBSM Intervention<sup>1</sup>

2012/13															
	N.L.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	N.W.T.	Yuk.	Nun.	NHQ	Canada
<b>Employment Benefits</b>															
Targeted Wage Subsidies	207	167	121	585	1,264	766	61	–	8	16	13	1	8	–	<b>3,217</b>
Self-employment	110	118	228	167	1,113	229	76	27	81	547	9	2	–	–	<b>2,707</b>
Job Creation Partnerships	348	88	66	–	–	99	83	–	159	25	–	–	–	–	<b>868</b>
Skills development—regular	1,644	614	986	3,138	8,277	1,315	805	404	164	1,006	69	28	10	–	<b>18,460</b>
Skills development—apprentices <sup>2</sup>	1,573	248	1,175	1,759	–	12,974	2,764	3,866	12,596	7,122	27	109	17	–	<b>44,230</b>
Targeted earnings supplements	–	–	–	–	4,160	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	<b>4,160</b>
<b>Total benefits</b>	<b>3,882</b>	<b>1,235</b>	<b>2,576</b>	<b>5,649</b>	<b>14,814</b>	<b>15,383</b>	<b>3,789</b>	<b>4,297</b>	<b>13,008</b>	<b>8,716</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>35</b>	–	<b>73,642</b>
<b>Support Measures: EAS</b>															
Employment services	–	495	1,921	879	23,367	5	2,489	504	10,678	5,342	–	116	18	–	<b>45,814</b>
Group services	–	–	99	–	6,178	–	–	87	–	–	–	–	–	–	<b>6,364</b>
Individual counselling	2,232	209	663	1,487	5,398	20,723	1,778	896	–	2,719	67	–	–	–	<b>36,172</b>
<b>Total support measures: EAS</b>	<b>2,232</b>	<b>704</b>	<b>2,683</b>	<b>2,366</b>	<b>34,943</b>	<b>20,728</b>	<b>4,267</b>	<b>1,487</b>	<b>10,678</b>	<b>8,061</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>18</b>	–	<b>88,350</b>
<b>Total employment benefits and support measures: EAS</b>	<b>6,114</b>	<b>1,939</b>	<b>5,259</b>	<b>8,015</b>	<b>49,757</b>	<b>36,111</b>	<b>8,056</b>	<b>5,784</b>	<b>23,686</b>	<b>16,777</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>53</b>	–	<b>161,992</b>
Target	5,800	1,901	6,500	8,700	50,900	62,230	9,000	4,850	–	30,000	223	225	140	–	–
<b>Result vs. target (%)</b>	<b>105.4%</b>	<b>102.0%</b>	<b>80.9%</b>	<b>92.1%</b>	<b>97.8%</b>	<b>58.0%</b>	<b>89.5%</b>	<b>119.3%</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>55.9%</b>	<b>83.0%</b>	<b>113.8%</b>	<b>37.9%</b>	–	–

Sources: Results dataset and Common System for Grants and Contributions (CSGC).

<sup>1</sup> Results associated solely with the ASETS are not available.

<sup>2</sup> 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 4

# KEY PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION DATA AND RESULTS



<b>Annex 4.1</b>	Service Delivery .....	<b>254</b>
<b>Annex 4.2</b>	Call Centres .....	<b>255</b>
<b>Annex 4.3</b>	Mobile Outreach Services .....	<b>256</b>
<b>Annex 4.4</b>	Electronic Records of Employment (E-ROEs) .....	<b>257</b>
<b>Annex 4.5</b>	EI Claims Processing .....	<b>258</b>
<b>Annex 4.6</b>	Electronic Services .....	<b>259</b>
<b>Annex 4.7</b>	Integrity Operations .....	<b>260</b>

## Annex 4.1 Service Delivery<sup>1</sup>

Region	In-Person EI Requests <sup>2</sup>		Service Canada Web Site Visits <sup>3</sup>		Web Site Visits that Included the EI Index Page <sup>4</sup>		My Service Canada Account Logins <sup>5, 6</sup>		Points of Service for EI Program Delivery <sup>7</sup>			
	% Change	(Million)	% Change	(Million)	% Change	(Million)	% Change	(Million)	% Change	(Number)		
	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12 2010/11 2009/10 2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12 2010/11 2009/10 2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12 2010/11 2009/10 2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12 2010/11 2009/10 2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12 2010/11 2009/10 2008/09	2011/12 2010/11 2009/10 2008/09	
Atlantic	-20.0	0.8 1.0 0.9 0.9	-7.4	8.0 8.6 N/A N/A	-11.1	0.8 0.9 N/A N/A	N/A	N/A N/A N/A N/A	0.0	88 88 91 91	88 88 91 91	
Quebec	-18.8	1.3 1.6 1.4 1.3	2.7	19.4 18.9 N/A N/A	-4.2	2.3 2.4 N/A N/A	N/A	N/A N/A N/A N/A	-8.5	107 117 115 115	107 117 115 116	
Ontario	-15.0	1.4 1.6 1.7 1.9	0.9	29.0 28.7 N/A N/A	7.1	3.0 2.8 N/A N/A	N/A	N/A N/A N/A N/A	-0.5	197 198 202 201	197 198 202 201	
Western	-13.3	1.3 1.5 1.6 1.7	-0.8	20.7 20.9 N/A N/A	-4.5	2.1 2.2 N/A N/A	N/A	N/A N/A N/A N/A	-2.7	216 222 225 223	216 222 225 208	
<b>NATIONAL</b>	<b>-14.0</b>	<b>4.9 5.7 5.7 5.9</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>77.1 76.5 67.0 55.1</b>	<b>-1.2</b>	<b>8.2 8.3 N/A N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A N/A N/A N/A</b>	<b>-19.1</b>	<b>18.9 23.4 15.9 14.7</b>	<b>608 625 633 630</b>	<b>609 630 633 609</b>

Source: EI administrative data.

- Discrepancies between totals and the sum of regional values may be due to rounding.
- 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.
- Regional breakdowns for Service Canada web site visits were not available prior to 2011/12, 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).
- 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.
- An estimated 88% of the activity on MSCA continued to be related to EI functions. 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.
- For analysis of data, please refer to section II, 1.1.1 EI: Electronic Services of Chapter 4, Program Administration.
- The values represent existing points of service as of March 31<sup>st</sup> for each fiscal year.

## Annex 4.2 Call Centres

	Enquiries Resolved via Telephone Information Service <sup>1</sup>		Calls Answered (EI Specialized Call Centres) <sup>2</sup>		First Contact Resolution – EI Specialized Call Centres <sup>3, 4</sup>		1 800 O-Canada EI-Related Calls		First Call Resolution <sup>5</sup> – 1 800 O-Canada EI-Related Calls																			
	% Change	(Million)	(In Thousands)	% Change	(%)	% Change	(In Thousands)	% Change	(%)	% Change	(%)																	
												2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2009/10	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2009/10	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2009/10											
	2012/13	2011/12	2012/13	2011/12	2012/13	2011/12	2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2012/13	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2009/10	2011/12-2012/13	2010/11-2009/10														
<b>Region</b>																												
Atlantic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.3	57	29	23	17	38.5	13.6	9.9	12.1	10.0	7.8							
Quebec	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-17.3	152	183	105	80	57	53.3	13.7	8.9	13.6	12.8	15.7						
Ontario	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.1	176	171	130	113	119	24.0	13.9	11.3	10.3	7.5	4.0						
Western	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-0.9	163	165	103	79	61	33.0	14.0	10.6	12.6	10.0	7.7						
<b>NATIONAL</b>	-11.4	22.6	25.5	18.8	18.8	22.1	-19.7	4,248	5,290	6,803	7,644	6,408	84.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	-4.8	548	576	386	256	254	90.7	19.4	10.2	12.0	9.8	7.8

Source: EI administrative data.

1,2,3 Regional breakdowns for Enquiries Resolved via the Telephone Information Service 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. Variations in data from site to site are related to a number of factors such as the type of calls handled at sites, hours of service, planned activities as well as unanticipated outages or technical issues. Within this context, site specific performance data does not represent the true level of performance from site to site, nor is it representative of the service provided to clients from a specific area or region.

4 The first contact resolution metric was not fully implemented until 2012/13. It was introduced through 2011/12. As a result, the metric for that year is not fully comparable to those for subsequent years.

5 EI Related Calls resolved 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 to a caller to satisfy an EI related enquiry and a referral to the program was not required. While one enquiry may have been resolved at first contact, a caller may still have additional enquiries related to EI or other Government of Canada programs and services. A recent increase in first call resolution may be related to the new EI measures and an increase in related announcements.

### Annex 4.3 Mobile Outreach Services

Region	All EI Information Sessions – Citizens <sup>1</sup>				Workers Facing Mass Layoffs Reached <sup>2</sup>				Employers Reached <sup>3</sup>								
	% Change	(Number)			% Change	(Number)			% Change	(Number)							
	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09		
Atlantic	-4.6	209	219	254	82	N/A	1,382	689	1,054	1,617	N/A	-48.3	154	298	351	1,067	N/A
Quebec	-20.8	461	582	849	151	N/A	6,331	7,509	11,710	3,723	N/A	-57.7	771	1,822	35,158	6,974	N/A
Ontario	-1.8	1,003	1,021	963	664	N/A	6,621	5,267	3,773	16,684	N/A	-55.1	962	2,144	4,291	9,903	N/A
Western	3.9	318	306	413	131	N/A	2,598	2,160	2,309	3,268	N/A	41.1	594	421	595	2,521	N/A
<b>NATIONAL</b>	<b>-6.4</b>	<b>1,991</b>	<b>2,128</b>	<b>2,479</b>	<b>1,028</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>16,932</b>	<b>15,625</b>	<b>18,846</b>	<b>25,292</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-47.0</b>	<b>2,481</b>	<b>4,685</b>	<b>40,395</b>	<b>20,465</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Source: EI administrative data.

1,2,3 Regional breakdowns are not available for 2008/09 as Service Canada was not yet engaging in Mobile Outreach Services.



## Annex 4.4 Electronic Records of Employment (E-ROEs)<sup>1</sup>

Region	New ROE Web Registrations					ROEs Submitted Electronically by Employers <sup>2</sup>					% Distribution of Paper ROEs vs. Electronic ROEs by Regions <sup>3</sup>																										
	(Number)					(Number)					%					% Change for E-ROE <sup>5</sup>					%																
	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09							
Atlantic	-5.6	2,924	3,095	3,121	3,387	1,886	378,528	399,101	321,480	271,037	227,769	5.4	59.1	40.9	55.5	44.5	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	42.4	57.6	34.6	65.4	9.0	5.0	59.1	40.9	55.5	44.5	50.0	50.0	50.0	42.4	57.6	34.6	65.4
Quebec	7.0	10,404	9,727	10,990	9,707	9,046	1,532,848	1,427,301	1,252,792	1,101,695	961,772	7.4	64.8	35.2	61.2	38.8	55.6	44.4	46.8	51.2	40.9	59.1	40.9	59.1	8.0	7.0	64.8	35.2	61.2	38.8	55.6	44.4	46.8	51.2	40.9	59.1	
Ontario	-37.9	11,749	18,918	19,082	15,584	7,968	2,232,140	2,161,339	1,860,450	1,612,055	1,339,935	3.3	70.5	29.5	66.4	33.6	60.6	39.4	50.4	49.6	38.1	61.9	38.1	61.9	14.0	3.0	70.5	29.5	66.4	33.6	60.6	39.4	50.4	49.6	38.1	61.9	
Western	4.3	13,853	13,278	8,563	10,369	8,412	1,973,827	1,812,232	1,575,802	1,388,157	1,308,633	8.9	75.3	24.7	71.3	28.7	65.2	34.8	55.9	44.1	47.7	52.3	47.7	52.3	11.0	9.0	75.3	24.7	71.3	28.7	65.2	34.8	55.9	44.1	47.7	52.3	
Total <sup>4</sup>	-13.7	38,000	45,097	41,809	39,125	27,386	6,247,235	5,904,097	5,150,249	4,474,093	3,951,815	5.8	69.7	30.3	65.8	34.2	60.0	40.0	51.0	49.0	41.4	58.6	41.4	58.6	11.0	6.0	69.7	30.3	65.8	34.2	60.0	40.0	51.0	49.0	41.4	58.6	

Source: ROE Single Database, Corporate Client Information Service (CCIS or Easy/Access) – Employer Summary Table (Note: 2<sup>nd</sup> copy paper ROEs loaded in CCIS).

1 For actual volumes of electronic versus paper ROEs submitted, broken down by Region, please refer to section II, 2.1 *Electronic Record of Employment* of Chapter 4, Program Administration.

2 Electronic Record of Employment (E-ROEs) consist of Web E-ROEs and Secure Automated Transfer (SAT) E-ROEs.

3 E-ROE and Paper Distribution by Region based on postal code and on telephone area code.

4 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.

5 The % change represents the percentage change of volumes of paper and E-ROEs.

## Annex 4.5 EI Claims Processing

	EI Claims Processed				Payment Accuracy Rate <sup>1,2</sup>				Processing Accuracy Rates <sup>3</sup>				Speed of Payment				Claimants Receiving Benefits Through Direct Deposit														
	% Change		(Number)		% Change		(%)		% Change		(%)		% Change		(%)		% Change		(%)												
	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09							
<b>Région</b>																															
Atlantic	-4.6	367,938	385,658	385,114	390,928	384,085	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.3	94.7	90.8	94.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.1	77.5	73.7	85.2	88.0	76.8	2.6	90.3	88.0	81.8	79.2	74.1
Quebec	-1.2	823,635	839,999	847,166	917,813	880,628	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.1	91.5	90.5	93.2	91.4	91.7	91.7	15.6	82.4	71.3	84.1	86.1	81.7	1.6	92.7	91.2	86.5	84.1	84.3
Ontario	-4.1	876,935	914,101	911,555	1,097,182	1,062,560	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-0.1	80.5	80.6	84.4	84.0	82.0	82.0	-0.7	70.6	71.1	83.9	84.8	77.7	2.6	90.8	88.5	82.6	80.4	80.1
Western	-3.2	694,316	717,352	758,560	888,774	731,988	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-0.7	84.3	84.9	86.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	-1.6	68.4	69.5	83.1	79.7	77.3	1.8	89.6	88.0	82.1	79.1	78.7
<b>NATIONAL</b>	<b>-3.1</b>	<b>2,765,824</b>	<b>2,857,110</b>	<b>2,902,395</b>	<b>3,294,897</b>	<b>3,055,261</b>	<b>-1.2</b>	<b>94.1</b>	<b>95.2</b>	<b>94.0</b>	<b>96.1</b>	<b>95.7</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>86.9</b>	<b>85.9</b>	<b>88.8</b>	<b>87.9</b>	<b>87.1</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>74.5</b>	<b>71.1</b>	<b>83.9</b>	<b>84.2</b>	<b>78.6</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>90.9</b>	<b>88.9</b>	<b>83.2</b>	<b>80.7</b>	<b>79.7</b>	

Source: EI administrative data.

1 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%.

2 For analysis of the Payment Accuracy Rate by source, please refer to section III, 1.1 EI Payment Accuracy Review of Chapter 4, Program Administration.

3 Prior to fiscal year 2010/11, results were presented by province, not by region.

#### Annex 4.6 Electronic Services

Region	% Change		Applications Submitted Online (%)					Partially or Fully Automated Claims (%)					
	2011/12-2012/13		2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	% Change		2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09
	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2011/12-2012/13	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09
Atlantic	0.3	98.8	98.5	98.3	98.4	98.3	98.3	10.9	74.1	66.8	65.8	54.1	40.5
Quebec	0.2	97.9	97.7	97.2	96.7	97.0	97.0	8.4	65.6	60.5	59.1	47.2	35.6
Ontario	0.5	98.4	97.9	96.2	96.4	96.6	96.6	11.0	65.5	59.0	56.7	44.0	32.5
Western	0.5	98.6	98.1	97.7	97.1	97.7	97.7	10.4	61.6	55.8	53.9	39.2	28.6
<b>NATIONAL</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>98.4</b>	<b>98.0</b>	<b>97.2</b>	<b>96.9</b>	<b>97.2</b>	<b>97.2</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>65.7</b>	<b>59.7</b>	<b>57.9</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>33.5</b>

Source: EI administrative data.

## Annex 4.7 Integrity Operations

Region	Investigations Completed				Value of Overpayments Imposed				Value of Penalties Imposed				Total Savings									
	% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	(Number)			% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	(\$ Million)			% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	(\$ Million)			% Change 2011/12- 2012/13	(\$ Million)								
		2011/12	2011/12	2010/11		2009/10	2008/09	2011/12		2011/12	2010/11	2009/10		2008/09	2011/12	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09			
NIS <sup>1</sup>	-13.7	33,304	38,584	36,200	36,325	33,736	11.2	17.1	14.6	14.7	8.2	3.7	5.3	3.4	3.6	2.3	-7.5	28.6	30.9	24.4	24.9	12.6
Atlantic	-10.7	43,920	49,162	79,732	87,312	101,721	23.6	26.2	28.4	23.6	22.9	7.8	8.4	8.2	6.6	6.5	6.9	52.9	49.5	58.6	64.4	60.8
Quebec	-11.2	80,833	90,988	142,698	174,213	187,102	54.7	49.8	53.6	59.7	58.0	14.4	15.7	14.8	16.0	1.8	23.8	121.6	98.3	114.6	124.4	125.6
Ontario	-7.8	95,589	103,658	143,293	150,205	139,278	59.0	58.6	68.8	54.7	47.4	16.9	16.1	17.1	12.0	11.8	11.6	120.4	107.8	125.7	113.0	95.5
Western	-0.9	83,895	84,661	103,700	104,619	120,994	39.8	40.7	55.5	49.5	52.5	10.4	10.7	13.2	9.6	12.3	16.0	115.0	99.1	130.2	112.5	116.5
<b>NATIONAL</b>	<b>-8.0</b>	<b>337,541</b>	<b>367,053</b>	<b>505,623</b>	<b>552,674</b>	<b>582,831</b>	<b>188.3</b>	<b>192.3</b>	<b>221.0</b>	<b>202.2</b>	<b>189.0</b>	<b>53.2</b>	<b>56.2</b>	<b>56.6</b>	<b>47.8</b>	<b>34.7</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>438.5</b>	<b>385.6</b>	<b>453.5</b>	<b>439.2</b>	<b>410.9</b>

Source: EI administrative data.

<sup>1</sup> National Investigative Services (NIS).

# ANNEX 5 EI FINANCES



**Annex 5.1** Employment Insurance Operating Account ..... **262**

## Annex 5.1 Employment Insurance Operating Account

	2012/13	2011/12
	(\$ Million)	
<b>Revenues and Funding</b>		
<b>Premiums<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>20,795.7</b>	<b>18,938.3</b>
<b>Interest<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>27.6</b>	<b>20.9</b>
<b>Penalties</b>	<b>59.1</b>	<b>49.7</b>
<b>Total Economic Action Plan (EAP) Measures Funding</b>	<b>-10.6</b>	<b>117.7</b>
Extra Five Weeks	-0.9	116.0
Additional training funds	-9.9	-22.5
Work-Sharing	0.0	0.0
Career Transition Assistance Initiative	0.2	24.2
<b>Total revenues and funding</b>	<b>20,871.8</b>	<b>19,126.6</b>
<b>Expenditures<sup>3</sup></b>		
<b>Part I: Income Benefits</b>	<b>15,240.9</b>	<b>15,797.1</b>
Regular benefits	10,503.6	11,220.8
Fishing benefits	262.9	266.1
Work-Sharing benefits	25.6	33.5
Special benefits	4,448.9	4,276.7
<b>Part II: Employment Benefits and Support Measures</b>	<b>2,075.8</b>	<b>2,081.7</b>
Employment benefits <sup>4</sup>	-0.4	-0.7
Support measures	150.8	154.8
Labour Market Development Agreements	1,925.4	1,927.6
<b>Benefit Repayments<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>217.7</b>	<b>-231.1</b>
<b>Administration Costs</b>	<b>1,791.1</b>	<b>1,906.8</b>
<b>Bad Debt</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>122.9</b>
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<b>18,887.2</b>	<b>19,677.3</b>
<b>Annual balance</b>	<b>1,984.7</b>	<b>-550.8</b>
<b>Accumulated balance at the beginning of the year</b>	<b>-7,948.2</b>	<b>-7,397.4</b>
<b>Accumulated balance at the end of the year</b>	<b>-5,963.5</b>	<b>-7,948.2</b>

Source: Government of Canada, *Public Accounts of Canada 2013, Volume I: Summary Report and Consolidated Financial Statements* (Ottawa: Receiver General for Canada, October 2013).

<sup>1</sup> The EI premiums reported in the summary financial statements of the Government of Canada and the federal budget exclude the premium contributions made by the Government of Canada as an employer.

<sup>2</sup> This interest includes all interest accrued on the balance with the Receiver General for Canada and on overdue accounts receivable.

<sup>3</sup> Expenditures reported in Chapter 2 of this report are based on administrative data and may differ from the ones reported in the financial statements included in the Public Accounts of Canada due to methodological differences.

<sup>4</sup> Since 2010/11, Employment Benefits under EI Part II have been delivered exclusively by the provinces and territories through Labour Market Development Agreements. As such, there are no new expenditures for these benefits. The negative expenditures of \$0.4 million in 2012/13 and \$0.7 million in 2011/12 represent Employment Benefits refunds and overpayments for expenditures in the previous year.

<sup>5</sup> These repayments are received or receivable from higher income claimants.

## ANNEX 6

# KEY STUDIES REFERENCED IN CHAPTER 2



### 1. Employment Insurance Coverage Survey

**Author(s)**

Statistics Canada

**Objective(s)**

The Employment Insurance Coverage Survey (EICS) provides information on unemployed individuals, whether or not they are eligible for or apply for Employment Insurance (EI) benefits.

**Key finding(s) referenced in the report**

- In 2012, 81.9% of unemployed individuals who had been paying premiums and had a recent job separation that met EI program criteria were eligible to receive EI benefits.
- Among the 1,310,000 unemployed individuals in 2012, 808,000 were covered by the EI program, as they had paid EI premiums in the previous 12 months before becoming unemployed. They represented 61.7% of all unemployed people.

**Availability**

Findings for the 2012 EICS are available on Statistics Canada's web site at <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/131115/dq131115b-eng.htm>.

### 2. Financial Impacts of Receiving Employment Insurance

**Author(s)**

Constantine Kapsalis, Data Probe Economic Consulting Inc.

**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) referenced in the report**

- 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**

This report is available upon request.

### 3. The Redistributive Impact of Employment Insurance 2007–2009

#### Author(s)

Ross Finnie, Queen's University School of Policy Studies; and Ian Irvine, Concordia University for HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate

#### 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) referenced in the report

- 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 redistributive 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

This report is available upon request.

### 4. Inflation and Fixed Dollar Thresholds: The EI Family Supplement

#### Author(s)

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate

#### Objective(s)

This paper considers how eligibility for the family supplement provided to EI claimants with family net income below \$20,921 may have evolved had the threshold been indexed to a measure of price inflation.

#### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- Between 2001 and 2010, the number of households in Canada that would be eligible to receive the family supplement has fallen by nearly 20%. Similarly, the real value of the supplement has declined by approximately 14% over the same time period.
- If the same index that is used to adjust the maximum insured earnings had been used to index family supplement eligibility, then the threshold for the full family supplement would have been \$23,174 in 2010.

#### Availability

This report is available upon request.



## 5. EI Premium Refund: Trend Analysis 1997 to 2011

### Author(s)

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate

### Objective(s)

This paper considers how the EI premium refund for individuals who have less than \$2,000 of insured earnings in a tax year would have evolved had the threshold been indexed to the minimum wage in Canada.

### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- Over time, the number of people who receive the premium refund has fallen from 5.6% of Canadians who filed taxes in 1997 to 3.8% in 2011. The mean value of the refund has also fallen, from \$29 in 1997 to \$16.70 in 2011. This decrease is primarily due to the steady reduction in the EI premium rate since 1997.
- In 2011, the estimated number of people who would have received the premium refund under an indexed threshold is approximately 1.1 million people, compared to 622 thousand who actually did receive it. The total dollar amount of the refund would have increased to a high of \$27 to \$29 million in 2009, about 2.5 times the amount that was actually paid.

### Availability

This report is available upon request.

## 6. EI Hiring Credit for Small Businesses: Analysis Based on the 2011 T4 File

### Author(s)

Constantine Kapsalis, Data Probe Economic Consulting Inc. for ESDC, Evaluation Directorate

### Objective(s)

This paper provides a description of the firms that benefited from the Hiring Credit for Small Business (HCSB) in 2011.

### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- Approximately 538,750 businesses, representing 61% of all businesses in 2011, received the HCSB. Over 56% of businesses that benefited from the credit had less than 5 employees.
- The average credit was \$386 per recipient business, a reduction of EI premiums by 15.3%, for a total cost of \$208 million.

### Availability

This report is available upon request.

## 7. EI and Non-Standard Workers: Part-Time, Short-Term and Seasonal Workers

### Author(s)

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate

### 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) referenced in the report

- 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

This report is available upon request.

## 8. Employment Insurance (EI) and Key Socio-Economic Groups

### Author(s)

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate

### Objective(s)

This paper looks at three indicators of EI access (EI coverage, EI eligibility and EI application) for four key socio-economic groups (women, youth, immigrants and single parents) for the years 2009 and 2010. The objective is to assess the gaps in EI access for the key socio-economic groups and identify the sources of these gaps.

### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- The EI coverage rate was found to be statistically and significantly lower for women compared to men (63.5% vs. 70.2%), youth (15–24 years) compared to older individuals (59.4% vs. 70.5%), immigrants compared to non-immigrants (56.2% vs. 71.2%), and single parents compared to individuals in other family situations (56.8% vs. 68.7%).
  - The larger share of claimants in the socio-economic groups who had not worked in the last year or who had never worked mainly explained these coverage gaps.
- The EI eligibility rate was found to be statistically and significantly lower for women compared to men (65.8% vs. 72.3%), youth compared to older individuals (29.2% vs. 82.2%) and single parents compared to individuals in other family types (48.3% vs. 71.7%).
  - The higher proportion of women who quit their job without a cause acceptable to the EI program is one of the reasons why their EI eligibility rate is lower. The larger share of youth and single parents who quit their job to go to school, and who did not have enough insured hours mainly explained their lower EI eligibility rate.
- The EI application rate was statistically and significantly lower for youth compared to older claimants (84.5% vs. 93.4%).

### Availability

This report is available upon request.

## 9. Potential EI Eligibility of Canadian Paid Workers Using the Labour Force Survey

### Author(s)

Constantine Kapsalis, Data Probe Economic Consulting Inc.

### Objective(s)

Using the Labour Force Survey, the study estimates the proportion of Canadian paid workers who, in the event of a layoff, would have sufficient insurable hours of work to be eligible for EI benefits. The term paid worker refers to employees who are not self-employed and who are required to pay EI premiums. The main findings of the study are as follows:

### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- Simulations indicate that 87.0% of individuals who were working as paid workers during the twelve-month period October 2012–September 2013 would have been eligible for EI regular benefits if they had lost their job.
- There are small differences in the EI eligibility ratio between the two genders and among the various regions.
- However, there is a significant gap between youth and adults aged 25 to 69 (61.6% versus 92.0% respectively). One reason that may account for this result is that many youth are still in school and often work few hours. Another likely reason is that many youth workers are new entrants to the labour force and, therefore, face a higher entrance requirement (910 hours).
- There is also a significant gap between full-time and part-time paid workers (58.3% versus 93.4%). The main reason is that fewer part-time workers are able to accumulate enough hours over a 52 week period.

### Availability

This report is available upon request.

## 10. 2013 Actuarial Report on the Employment Insurance Premium Rate

### Author(s)

Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board (CEIFB), Chief Actuary

### Objective(s)

This report presents the premium rates for the 2013 MIE, the annual break-even rate and the projections for the EI Operating Account.

### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- Employee premiums increased in 2013 to \$1.88 per \$100 of insurable earnings, from \$1.83 in 2012 and \$1.78 in 2011.
- Accordingly, employer premiums increased in 2013 to \$2.63 per \$100 of insurable earnings, increasing from \$2.56 in 2012.
- The MIE increased to \$47,400 in 2013 from \$45,900 in 2012 and \$44,200 in 2011.

### Availability

This report can be found on the Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board's web site at

[http://www.ceifb-oftaec.ca/en/PDF\\_Reports/Rate%20Setting/CA%20English%20Report%202013%20FINAL.pdf](http://www.ceifb-oftaec.ca/en/PDF_Reports/Rate%20Setting/CA%20English%20Report%202013%20FINAL.pdf).

## 11. Estimates of the Employment Insurance Replacement Rate

### Author(s)

Constantine Kapsalis, Data Probe Economic Consulting Inc.

### Objective(s)

This study examines the extent to which EI regular benefits replace the weekly earnings of beneficiaries. In particular, the study estimates the share of regular beneficiaries who receive the maximum 55% replacement rate, as well as the average replacement rate across all regular beneficiaries.

### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- According to the 2010 EICS, 62% of regular beneficiaries received the maximum replacement rate in 2010. According to the 2009 SLID, the same share of regular beneficiaries (62%) received the maximum replacement rate in 2009.
- Over a 10-year period, the share of beneficiaries receiving the maximum 55% replacement rate has declined. Based on time trend regression analysis, both surveys show that the share has been declining at an annual rate of 1.5 percentage points.
- One possible explanation for the declining trend in the above share is that wages in current dollars are increasing faster than the maximum insurable earnings (MIE). This was clearly the case in 2000–2006, during which the MIE was fixed at \$39,000. Another possible reason is that the wage gap between unemployed beneficiaries and the average worker has been closing.
- Differences in the replacement rate between different demographic groups tend to be small. Moreover, the minor differences that are observed are almost entirely due to the correlation of individual characteristics with the level of weekly wages.

### Availability

This report is available upon request.

## 12. Evaluation of the Impacts of the Increase in EI Allowable Earnings Pilot Project: Update Study

### Author(s)

Stephanie Lluís and Brian P. McCall for ESDC, Evaluation Directorate

### Objective(s)

This study measured the impacts of the pilot project in effect between December 11, 2005 and December 6, 2008 in 23 high unemployment EI economic regions for claims who worked while on claim. The pilot project increased the amount a claimant could earn during a week while on claim before receiving a dollar-for-dollar reduction in EI benefits.

### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- The pilot increased the likelihood of working on claim with full benefits by 96% for men and 69% for women, and increased average weeks working on claim with full benefits by 0.6 weeks for men and by 0.7 weeks for women.
- The pilot also reduced average total weeks on claim by 1.2 weeks for men and 1.5 weeks for women.

### Availability

This report is available upon request.

### 13. An Evaluation of the EI Pilot Project on Small Weeks, 1998–2001

#### Author(s)

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate

#### Objective(s)

This study investigates the effectiveness of the pilot project in encouraging program participants to accept “Small Weeks” of work during the rate calculation period (the 26 weeks preceding the last day of employment); determines the project’s impact on program participants’ earnings and weeks of work; and assesses the project’s impacts on male and female EI benefits claimants separately.

#### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- Many EI claimants in the 31 Small Weeks regions benefited from the project.
- The provision increased total duration of work in the 26 weeks prior to job separation and increased the total average income of male and female participants.

#### Availability

This report is available upon request.

### 14. Labour Supply and the Impacts of the Best 14 Weeks Pilot

#### Author(s)

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate

#### Objective(s)

This paper examines the impact of the Best 14 Weeks pilot project on claimants’ incentives to work.

#### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- Approximately 55% of claimants in pilot regions had a higher benefit rate under the pilot. The increase ranged from \$14.90 a week in 2006 to \$20.90 in 2011.
- The estimated impact on the number of weeks worked during the rate calculation period was between 0.6 and 0.8 fewer weeks worked as a result of the pilot. However, the impact on the number of weeks worked in the qualification period was insignificant in most years.

#### Availability

This report is available upon request.

## 15. An Evaluation Overview of Seasonal Employment: Update

### Author(s)

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate

### Objective(s)

This study provides an overview of seasonal employment in Canada and draws conclusions on the subject of seasonal work.

### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- 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

This report is available upon request.

## 16. Extended Duration of Employment Insurance Regular Benefits: Second Evaluation Update

### Author(s)

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate

### 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) referenced in the report

- 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

This report is available upon request.

## 17. EI Payments and the GIS System

### Author(s)

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate

### 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) referenced in the report

- 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

This report is available upon request.

## 18. A Profile of Seasonal Workers in 2011: A Complement to a Profile of Temporary Workers

### Author(s)

HRSDC, Economic Policy Directorate

### Objective(s)

This study provides a profile of seasonal workers. It explores their demographics and work characteristics, and their regional and industry distribution using data from the 2011 Labour Force Survey (LFS).

### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- Between 1997 and 2011, the number of seasonal workers grew steadily and more rapidly than total employment. On average, the number of seasonal workers grew by 43.3%, compared to 26.2% for all employed individuals.
- Seasonal workers are aging more rapidly than all Canadian workers.
- Seasonal workers are more likely to be employed in the construction and tourism sectors, with slight variations depending on the season.
- Seasonal workers are more frequently found in firms with less than 20 employees.
- Seasonal workers have lower earnings and income than all salaried workers.

### Availability

This report is available upon request.

## 19. Interprovincial Mobility and Earnings

### Author(s)

André Bernard, Ross Finnie and Benoît St-Jean,  
Statistics Canada

### 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) referenced in the report

- 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>.

## 20. The Impact of EI Regional Boundary Revisions on Mobility in New Brunswick: Evidence from the Longitudinal Administrative Databank

### Author(s)

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate

### 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) referenced in the report

- 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

This report is available upon request.



## 21. Regional Out-Migration and Commuting Patterns of Employment Insurance (EI) Claimants

### Author(s)

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate

### 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) referenced in the report

- 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

This report is available upon request.

## 22. The Commuting and Mobility Patterns of Employment Insurance (EI) Recipients and Non-Recipients

### Author(s)

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate

### 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) referenced in the report

- 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

This report is available upon request.

## 23. Policy-Induced Internal Migration: An Empirical Investigation of the Canadian Case

### Author(s)

Kathleen M. Day, University of Ottawa,  
and Stanley L. Winer, Carleton University

### Objective(s)

This study investigates the influence of public policy on interprovincial migration in Canada.

### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- The prime determinants of interprovincial migration were differences in earnings, employment prospects and moving costs.
- EI is not a barrier to mobility, as eliminating regional EI extended benefits and regional EI differences in qualifying requirements would increase the volume of migration by less than 1%.

### Availability

This paper can be found through CESifo at <http://www.ifo.de/portal/pls/portal/docs/1/1188434.PDF>.

## 24. Results of the 2011 Evaluation Survey of Self-Employed People

### Author(s)

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate

### Objective(s)

The main objective of the survey is to establish a profile of participants and non-participants and explore the issue of awareness of the Special Benefits available to Self-Employed (SBSE) Canadians. To this end, respondents were asked about their reasons for participation or not in the measure, and participants were asked about the registration, claim, and cancellation/termination processes.

### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- Compared to non-participants, SBSE participants are more likely: to be female; under 45 years of age; to report post-secondary education; to be self-employed with no help; to work in the government, education or health care industries; and to report fewer years of self-employment.
- Self-employed Canadians in general were not well aware of the SBSE. Only 25.4% of non-participants had heard of the SBSE measure prior to the survey interview.
- Respondents most often heard about the SBSE measure from the media or word-of-mouth. Almost one-quarter of participants first heard of the SBSE measure via a federal government website (ESDC or Service Canada).
- Less than half of non-participants (45.7%) indicated they would consider registering for the SBSE; 18.6% were unsure. Reasons related to age (being at or near retirement), insufficient earnings or no longer being self-employed were cited by 29.6% of those who did not intend on participating. No need for the insurance was reported by 22.1%. Another one-fifth reported insufficient information about the SBSE.

- Overall, participants were satisfied with the registration process (77.9%), and claimants were satisfied with the claims process (69.7%). There were two main reasons for cancellation or termination of agreements: uncertainty regarding program requirements and aspects of the measure such as benefit level and the payment of premiums (49.0%); and no need for the insurance, due to changes in circumstances (38.7%).

### **Availability**

This report is available upon request.

## **25. Use of EI Regular and Special Benefits by Maternity and Parental Claimants**

### **Author(s)**

ESDC, Evaluation Directorate

### **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) referenced in the report**

- The number of maternity/parental claims rose by 17.5% from 2002/03 to 2010/11. 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**

This report is available upon request.

## **26. 2013 Actuarial Report on the Reduction in EI Premiums for Employers with Wage-Loss Plans**

### **Author(s)**

Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board (CEIFB)

### **Objective(s)**

This report presents the details of the methodology and calculations that support the rates of premium reduction that will apply to employers with registered wage-loss replacement plans in 2013.

### **Key finding(s) referenced in the report**

- Employers who participated in the EI Premium Reduction Program received a total of \$918 million in EI premium reductions in 2012.

## 27. Compassionate Care Benefits

### Author(s)

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate

### Objective(s)

The report provides an overview of compassionate care benefits (CCB). It also provides a socio-economic profile of CCB applicants and claimants and specific claim characteristics. Data are updated from previous reports. Due to the small number of claims established by self-employed applicants in 2011/12, the report does not cover the use of compassionate care benefits by self-employed individuals.

### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- The acceptance rate averaged 63.7% 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 2011/12, CCB applicants caring for a spouse or partner were more likely to have their claims approved than those caring for a parent, sibling or other type of family relation (excluding children).
- 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

This report is available upon request.

## 28. Usage of the Work-Sharing Program: 1990/91 to 2011/12

### Author(s)

HRSDC, Evaluation Directorate

### Objective(s)

This report examines the usage of the Work-Sharing program from 1990/91 to 2011/12. Specifically, it examines the extent to which the Work-Sharing program is used, expenditures on Work-Sharing benefits, and the characteristics and experiences of Work-Sharing participants.

### Key finding(s) referenced in the report

- 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 in 2011/12 due to the Work-Sharing program was around 6,600 down from 35,000 in 2009/10.

### Availability

This report is available upon request.

## ANNEX 7

# RECENT LEGISLATIVE AND TEMPORARY CHANGES TO EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE



<b>Annex 7.1</b>	Major Changes to the Employment Insurance (EI) Program Since 1996/97.....	<b>278</b>
<b>Annex 7.2</b>	Economic Action Plan (EAP) Temporary Employment Insurance (EI) Measures .....	<b>289</b>

## Annex 7.1 Major Changes to the Employment Insurance (EI) Program Since 1996/97

Regulatory Amendments (2012)	
Element	Rationale
<b>Limiting Access to Maternity/Parental Benefits to Persons Authorized to Remain in Canada (EI Regulations 55 and 55.01)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claimants who leave Canada and whose work permit and social insurance number (SIN) expire are no longer eligible to receive maternity/parental benefits.</li> <li>Claimants with a valid SIN can continue to receive these benefits both inside and outside Canada.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that maternity/parental benefits are paid only to claimants with ongoing ties to the Canadian labour market—notably, those authorized to live and work in Canada.</li> </ul>
<b>Working While on Claim (WWC) Pilot Project</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pilot Project No. 8 (WWC Pilot Project) was introduced in 2005 in 23 EI regions of relatively high unemployment (10% or higher). It was re-introduced nationally in 2008 as Pilot Project No. 12.</li> <li>These pilot projects increased the amount that claimants were allowed to earn while on claim to \$75 per week or 40% of weekly benefits, whichever was higher. Any income above that amount was deducted in full from benefits. These pilots applied to regular, parental, compassionate care and fishing benefits, but excluded maternity and sickness benefits.</li> <li>Pilot Project No. 12 was extended on October 12, 2010, until August 6, 2011.</li> <li>Budget 2011 announced a one-year renewal of the WWC Pilot Project, available nationally, until August 4, 2012.</li> <li>On August 5, 2012, as part of Economic Action Plan 2012, the Government introduced Pilot Project No. 18, under which claimants keep 50% of their 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 have the option of reverting to the terms of Pilot Project 12.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tested whether allowing claimants to earn more income while receiving EI benefits gave them incentives to accept all available work.</li> <li>Renewal provided additional data to assess the effectiveness of the pilot during a period of economic recovery and a full economic cycle.</li> <li>Pilot Project 18 tests whether the new approach will further encourage claimants to work additional days while on claim. It is also considered fairer, since it provides a uniform exemption for all those working while on claim, not just those working about one day a week.</li> </ul>
Budget Implementation Act, Part II: Bill C-45 (2012)	
Element	Rationale
<b>Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board (CEIFB) Act</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective March 7, 2013, the <i>Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board Act</i> has been suspended and the CEIFB has been dissolved until the CEIFB can fulfill its full legislative mandate of setting premium rates and investing surplus premium revenues, once the EI Operating Account returns to cumulative balance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that independent EI rate-setting is performed in the most cost-effective manner.</li> </ul>
<b>Premium Rate-Setting</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An interim rate-setting regime takes effect, under which EI premium rates are set by the Governor-in-Council on the joint recommendation of the Ministers of Employment and Social Development, and Finance. The 2014 rate will be the first rate set under the interim regime.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures premium rates are set according to the premium rate-setting mechanism set out in the <i>Employment Insurance Act</i>, and provides ongoing stability and predictability for premium payers.</li> </ul>

**Helping Families in Need Act: Bill C-44 (2012)**

Element	Rationale
<b>Parents of Critically Ill Children (PCIC)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective June 9, 2013, a new 35-week EI special benefit to provide income support to eligible parents who are unable to work while providing care or support to a critically ill or injured child.</li> <li>Bill C-44 also amended the <i>Canada Labour Code</i> to protect the jobs of employees under federal jurisdiction while they take unpaid leave to care for their critically ill or injured child.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognizes the needs of parents, who are likely to take time away from work when their child is critically ill.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<b>Flexible Access to Sickness and Maternity/Parental Benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective March 24, 2013, claimants receiving parental benefits no longer have to be "otherwise available" for work to receive sickness benefits.</li> <li>Allows claimants on parental benefits to claim sickness benefits and have their benefit period extended by up to 15 weeks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognizes that when a parent is sick, he/she may not be able to take care of and bond with his/her child.</li> <li>Enhances the flexibility and responsiveness of the EI program.</li> </ul>

**Budget Implementation Act: Bill C-38 (2012)**

Element	Rationale
<b>Connecting Canadians to Available Jobs (CCAJ)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhances the content and frequency of job and labour market information for job seekers.</li> <li>Strengthens and clarifies claimants' obligations by defining reasonable job search and suitable employment for claimants who are receiving EI regular or fishing benefits.</li> <li>Ensures Canadians are considered before temporary foreign workers are hired to fill job vacancies.</li> <li>Initiate discussions with provinces and territories to make skills training and job search supports available to EI claimants earlier in their claim.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures unemployed Canadians are better connected with available jobs in their local area.</li> <li>Clarifies claimants' responsibility to undertake a reasonable job search for suitable employment while receiving EI regular or fishing benefits.</li> </ul>
<b>Variable Best Weeks (VBW)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EI claimants (with the exception of fishing and self-employed claimants) have EI benefit amounts calculated based on the weeks of their highest insurable earnings during the 52-week qualifying period.</li> <li>The best 14 to 22 weeks are used to calculate benefits, depending on the unemployment rate in the EI economic region where the claimant resides.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Makes the EI program more responsive to changes in local labour markets.</li> <li>Ensures that those living in similar labour markets receive similar benefits.</li> </ul>
<b>Premium Rate-Setting</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 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 EI Operating Account has returned to cumulative balance.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Advanced the date by which the premium rate must be set to September 14<sup>th</sup>, rather than November 14<sup>th</sup>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures that the EI Operating Account is in cumulative balance at the end of the seven-year period.</li> <li>Enhances the predictability and stability of the EI premium rate.</li> <li>Provides employers and workers with more notice of the EI premium rate for the coming year.</li> </ul>

Element	Rationale
<b>Social Security Tribunal (SST)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Social Security Tribunal (SST) replaces 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.</li> <li>• The new SST is comprised of two levels of appeal, similar to the previous appeal process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The General Division has an Employment Insurance Section for EI appeals, and an Income Security Section for CPP and OAS appeals. A vice-chairperson will head each of the sections of this Division.</li> <li>– The Appeal Division decides appeals of decisions made by the General Division. The third vice-chairperson will head this Division.</li> <li>– Both divisions are dedicated to providing fair and impartial reviews of government decisions on EI, CPP and OAS.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The SST will move away from the current paper-based system through the use of electronic documents and will enable clients to participate in hearings through telephone and video conferencing, where appropriate.</li> <li>• Appeals will be considered and decided by single member panels. Most tribunal members are full-time and dedicated solely to hearing and deciding EI or CPP and OAS appeals.</li> <li>• Tribunal members will have access to new tools including written (or 'on the record') considerations for straightforward appeals and the authority to summarily dismiss an appeal when the member is satisfied that the appeal has no reasonable chance of success.</li> <li>• The SST began its operations on April 1, 2013. Any appeals that were filed to the EI Board of Referees before April 1, 2013 but not heard by October 31, 2013 will be transferred to the SST. Any appeals that were filed and not heard by the EI Umpire before April 1, 2013 were transferred to the SST. On April 1, 2013, a total of 1,070 files were transferred to the SST.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legislative amendments to eliminate administrative duplication in appeals and tribunal services by replacing the current administrative tribunal system for major federal social security programs with a single-window decision body.</li> <li>• This new approach to appeals introduced a number of measures to improve efficiencies, simplify and modernize the process and reduce costs.</li> </ul>

### Regulatory Amendments: Extended EI Benefits and Best 14 Weeks Pilot Projects (2010)

Element	Rationale
<b>Extended EI Benefits Pilot Project</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EI Pilot Project No. 6, Pilot Project Relating to Increased Weeks of Benefits, was introduced for a two-year period in 2004 in 24 EI regions of high unemployment (10% or higher).</li> <li>• The pilot was re-introduced as a new pilot project, Pilot Project No. 10, for a period of 18 months in 2006 in 21 EI economic regions and was further extended until May 31, 2009.</li> <li>• Pilot Project No. 10 ended in February 2009 and was replaced by the Extra Five Weeks Economic Action Plan measure, which lasted until September 11, 2010.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tested the costs and impact of extending the number of weeks of benefits in EI economic regions of relatively high unemployment.</li> <li>• Provided time-limited, broad-based support for all workers during the recent recession.</li> </ul>



Element	Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On October 12, 2010, the Government of Canada re-introduced the Extended EI Benefits Pilot Project (as Pilot Project No. 15) for two years, until September 15, 2012, or earlier if there was a sustained economic recovery. The pilot was based on the same parameters and included the same 21 EI economic regions as Pilot Project No. 10.</li> <li>Pilot Project No. 15 increased the maximum number of weeks for which benefits could be paid by 5, to a maximum of 45 weeks.</li> <li>This pilot project applied to claimants whose benefit period began on or after September 12, 2010, and ended on one of the following dates, whichever came first: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 15, 2012; or</li> <li>the second Saturday after the first day of the 12<sup>th</sup> consecutive period (beginning after October 9, 2010) when the regional unemployment rate was less than 8% in the region in which the benefit period was established.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Pilot Project No. 15 concluded earlier in 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 and, as a result, the Extended EI Benefits pilot project ended in this region on September 24, 2011.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tested 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.</li> <li>Allowed for further collection of data and testing to more fully capture the impact of Pilot Project No. 10 during a period of economic recovery.</li> </ul>

#### **Best 14 Weeks Pilot Project**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pilot Project No. 7 (Best 14 Weeks) was introduced in 2005 in 23 EI regions of relatively high unemployment (10% or higher). It was re-introduced in 2008 for two years as Pilot Project No.11 in 25 EI economic regions with an unemployment rate of 8% or higher.</li> <li>Under this pilot project, EI benefits were based on claimants' 14 weeks of highest earnings in the 52 weeks before the claim or since the beginning of the last claim.</li> <li>Pilot Project No. 11 was extended on October 12, 2010, until June 25, 2011.</li> <li>Budget 2011 announced a one-year renewal of the Best 14 Weeks pilot project, available in the same 25 EI economic regions, until June 23, 2012.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tested whether basing claimants' benefit rate on their 14 weeks of highest earnings in the 52 weeks before they claimed EI encouraged claimants to accept all available work.</li> <li>Provided additional data to assess the effectiveness of the pilot during a period of economic recovery and a full economic cycle.</li> </ul>
---	--

### *Fairness for Military Families Act: Bill C-13 (2010)*

Element	Rationale
<b>Improved Access to EI Parental Benefits for Military Families</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides additional flexibility to military families to access parental benefits for parent-child bonding, while recognizing the importance of military service.</li> </ul>

### Employment Insurance Operating Account: Bill C-9 (2010)

Element	Rationale
<b>Employment Insurance Operating Account</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Employment Insurance Operating Account has been established in the accounts of Canada to record all EI-related credits and charges since January 1, 2009, the date from which the CEIFB was to ensure that EI revenues and expenditures broke even and the EI Account was closed.</li> <li>This change repeals the provision under which advances from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the EI Account were made and the provision under which interest could be paid on the balance of the EI Account.</li> <li>The CEIFB's obligation to set EI premium rates under section 66 of the <i>Employment Insurance Act</i> has been clarified to ensure that EI revenues and expenditures recorded in the EI Operating Account balance over time, beginning January 1, 2009.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further strengthens the transparency and effectiveness of the financing of the EI program.</li> <li>In line with steps taken in 2008 to establish the CEIFB.</li> </ul>

### Fairness for the Self-Employed: Bill C-56 (2009)

Element	Rationale
<b>Special Benefits for Self-Employed Persons</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective January 31, 2010, EI maternity, parental, sickness and compassionate care benefits have been extended to self-employed persons. Self-employed persons can opt into the EI program. Benefits were paid starting January 1, 2011.</li> <li>These benefits for self-employed persons mirror special benefits available to salaried employees under the current EI program.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a voluntary scheme of EI benefits to self-employed Canadians for life transitions such as the birth of a child, adoption, illness or the grave illness of a family member.</li> </ul>

### Budget Implementation Act: Bill C-10 (2009)

Element	Rationale
<b>Premium Rates</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legislation was enacted to retroactively set the premium rates for 2002, 2003 and 2005.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This retroactive change was made necessary by the ruling of the Supreme Court of Canada in the <i>CSN-Arvida</i> 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.</li> </ul>

### Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board (CEIFB): Bill C-50 (2008)

Element	Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Act creating the CEIFB became effective on June 18, 2008.</li> <li>The CEIFB's mandate was to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>set EI premium rates using a modified premium rate-setting process; and</li> <li>manage a separate account where excess premiums were held and invested.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensured that EI revenues were sufficient to cover EI costs in the following year.</li> <li>Used current premium surpluses to reduce future premium rates.</li> <li>The <i>Canada Employment Insurance Financing Board Act</i> was suspended in 2013 and the CEIFB dissolved under the Budget legislation 2012 (no. 2).</li> </ul>

### Regulatory Amendments: New Entrants and Re-Entrants (NERE) Pilot Project (2008)

Element	Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NERE Pilot Project (Pilot Project No. 9) was introduced in 2005 in 23 EI regions of relatively high unemployment (10% or greater). It was renewed in 2008 as Pilot Project No. 13 in 25 EI regions with an unemployment rate of 8% or higher.</li> <li>The pilot project reduced the number of hours NEREs needed to be eligible for EI benefits from 910 to 840.</li> <li>Pilot Project No. 13 was allowed to sunset as scheduled on December 4, 2010.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tested whether providing NEREs with less stringent EI eligibility requirements and informing them of EI employment programs improved their employability and helped reduce their future reliance on EI benefits, partly by improving their access to EI Part II measures.</li> </ul>

### Legislative and Regulatory Amendments: Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP) (2006)

Element	Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective January 1, 2006, Quebec implemented the QPIP, under which Quebec residents receive maternity and parental benefits under a provincial plan, not from EI.</li> <li>The regulations provide for interaction between the QPIP and EI, as well as a premium reduction for Quebec residents, reflecting the savings to EI.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures consistency with <i>Employment Insurance Act</i> provisions that provinces may provide their own benefit plans, as long as they provide benefits equivalent to those offered under EI.</li> <li>Supported by the Supreme Court of Canada decision in the Quebec parental reference case in 2005, which confirmed the authority of the federal government to provide maternity/parental benefits under the EI head of power.</li> </ul>

### Regulatory Amendments: EI Compassionate Care Benefit (2006)

Element	Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective June 14, 2006, expanded the eligibility criteria for the compassionate care benefit from that of immediate family to include extended family members and others who are considered to be as family to provide greater access to the benefit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanded 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 gravely ill family member.</li> </ul>

### Annual Premium Rate-Setting by the Canada Employment Insurance Commission: Bill C-43 (2005)

Element	Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective January 1, 2006, the legislation allows the Canada Employment Insurance Commission to set the premium rate under a new rate-setting mechanism.</li> <li>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 EI chief actuary and any public input.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allows for a new rate-setting process where the EI premium rate is determined independently by the Canada Employment Insurance Commission.</li> </ul>

### Compassionate Care Benefits: Bill C-28 (2003)

Element	Rationale
<b>Compassionate Care Benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since January 4, 2004, compassionate care benefits have been available to help eligible family members to provide or arrange care for a gravely ill family member who faces a significant risk of death. The duration of the benefits is up to six weeks within a 26-week window.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides support to workers during temporary absences from work due to the need to provide care or support to a gravely ill family member who faces a significant risk of death within a 26-week period.</li> </ul>

### Access to Special Benefits: Bill C-49 (2002)

Element	Rationale
<b>Period to Claim Parental Benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides flexibility for parents who choose to wait until their child comes home before collecting parental benefits.</li> </ul>
<b>Period to Claim Special Benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 can be extended, under certain circumstances.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensures full access to special benefits for biological mothers who claim sickness benefits prior to and following maternity or parental benefits.</li> <li>Responds to the ruling of the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal in the <i>McAllister-Windsor</i> case.</li> </ul>

### Small Weeks Provision (2001)

Element	Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This provision excluded weeks of earnings below \$225 from the benefit rate calculation, potentially increasing the weekly benefit rate, but only applied to weeks with insurable earnings beyond a minimum divisor.</li> <li>It was tested through multiple pilot projects from 1997 to 2001.</li> <li>In November 2005, the Best 14 Weeks Pilot Project replaced this provision in pilot regions.</li> <li>Replaced by the Variable Best Weeks provision that was introduced in 2012, except for fishers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encouraged acceptance of all available work.</li> </ul>

### A More Responsive EI Program: Bill C-2 (2001)

Element	Rationale
<b>Intensity Rule</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective October 1, 2000, eliminated the Intensity Rule, which had reduced the benefit rate by 1 percentage point for every 20 weeks of EI regular benefits used in the past. The maximum reduction was 5 percentage points.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eliminated an ineffective rule that had the unintended effect of being punitive.</li> </ul>

Element	Rationale
<b>Benefit Repayment (Clawback)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applied new rule, effective retroactively to the 2000 taxation year.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– First-time claimants of regular or fishing benefits are now exempt from the benefit repayment.</li> <li>– Claimants of special benefits (maternity, parental and sickness benefits) are no longer required to repay any of those benefits.</li> <li>– The benefit repayment threshold for regular and fishing benefits is now 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.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corrects a discrepancy, as analysis indicated that the benefit repayment provision was having a disproportionate impact on middle-income claimants.</li> <li>• Focuses on repeat claimants with high incomes.</li> <li>• Simplifies the provision.</li> </ul>
<b>Re-Entrant Parents</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective retroactive to October 1, 2000, the rules governing new entrants/re-entrants (NEREs) 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures that parents returning to the workforce following an extended absence to raise young children are not penalized.</li> </ul>
<b>Maximum Insurable Earnings (MIE)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MIE will remain at \$39,000 until average earnings exceed this level, at which time the MIE will be based on average earnings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corrects a discrepancy in which the MIE was higher than the average industrial wage.</li> </ul>
<b>Enhanced Parental Benefits: Bill C-32 (2000)</b>	
Element	Rationale
<b>Parental Benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective December 31, 2000, the duration of parental benefits has been increased from 10 to 35 weeks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 (adoptive parents).</li> </ul>
<b>Entrance Requirements: Special Benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improves access to special benefits.</li> </ul>
<b>Waiting Period</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective December 31, 2000, the second parent sharing parental leave is no longer required to serve the two-week waiting period.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotes gender equality and improves flexibility by reducing the income loss for the second parent.</li> </ul>
<b>Allowable Earnings While on Claim</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective December 31, 2000, claimants receiving parental benefits can also earn \$50 or 25% of their weekly parental benefit, whichever is higher, without a loss of their EI benefits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helps low-income claimants.</li> <li>• Improves flexibility by allowing parents to work while receiving parental benefits.</li> </ul>

## Major EI Reform: Bill C-12 (1996 and 1997)

Element	Rationale
<b>Hours-Based System</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective January 1997, EI eligibility is based on hours of insurable employment rather than weeks worked.</li> <li>For regular benefits, claimants need 420 to 700 hours instead of 12 to 20 insured weeks.</li> <li>For special benefits, claimants need 700 hours instead of 20 insured weeks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduces a fairer and more equitable measure of time worked by making all hours count.</li> <li>Removes inequities and anomalies of the weeks system by:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>recognizing the intense work patterns of some employees;</li> <li>correcting the anomaly that existed under UI, when a week of 15 hours or a week of 50 hours each counted as one week; and</li> <li>eliminating the 14-hour job trap as, under UI, 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.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>New Entrants and Re-Entrants</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective July 1996, new entrants and re-entrants to the labour force needed 26 rather than 20 weeks of work to qualify for EI. In January 1997, the 26 weeks were converted to 910 hours.</li> <li>This rule applies only to those who have had minimal or no labour market attachment over the past two years. Workers who have at least 490 hours of work in the year prior to unemployment need only 420 to 700 hours the next year to qualify for EI. Time on EI, workers' compensation, disability benefits and sick leave counts as time worked.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discourages a cycle of reliance by ensuring that workers, especially young people, develop a significant attachment to the labour force before collecting EI benefits.</li> <li>Reintroduces insurance principles to the system by ensuring that workers make a reasonable contribution to the system before collecting benefits.</li> <li>Strengthens the relationship between work effort and entitlement to benefits.</li> </ul>
<b>Reduction in Maximum Insurable Earnings (MIE)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjusted the MIE to a level where EI benefits would no longer be competitive with wages in some parts of the country and in some industries.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<b>Reduced Maximum Benefit Duration</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective July 1996, the maximum length of a claim was reduced from 50 to 45 weeks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflects the fact that most claimants find work within the first 40 weeks of receiving benefits.</li> <li>Affects workers in high unemployment regions who work for long spells prior to unemployment.</li> </ul>
<b>Benefit Calculation</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> <li>Provides an incentive to work in the "shoulder" season.</li> <li>Ensures a better relationship between the flow of benefits and normal earnings.</li> </ul>

Element	Rationale
<b>Family Supplement</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Claimants with children and annual net family incomes of up to \$25,921 receive a top-up of their basic insurance benefits.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improves assistance to those most in need, because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– the old 60% dependant rate under UI was very poorly targeted—about 45% of low-income families did not qualify; and</li> <li>– about 30% of those who did receive the 60% rate had family incomes over \$45,000.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Allowable Earnings While on Claim</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective January 1997, claimants can earn \$50 or 25% of their weekly benefit, whichever is higher, without a loss of their EI benefits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helps low-income claimants.</li> <li>• Encourages claimants to maintain work attachment and increase their earnings from work.</li> </ul>
<b>Benefit Repayment (Clawback)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits were repaid at the rate of \$0.30 for every \$1 of net income above the threshold.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Made benefits fairer and more accurately reflective of insurance principles.</li> <li>• Discouraged repeated use of EI by those with high levels of annual income.</li> <li>• The Benefit Repayment provision was revised in Bill C-2 (2001).</li> </ul>
<b>Intensity Rule</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The maximum reduction was 5 percentage points.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduced an element of experience rating to the program, since heavy users of the system bore more of the costs.</li> <li>• Discouraged use of EI as a regular income supplement rather than insurance for times of unpredictable job loss, while not excessively penalizing those who made long or frequent claims.</li> <li>• Created a better balance between contributions made and benefits received.</li> <li>• Repealed in Bill C-2 (2001).</li> </ul>
<b>First-Dollar Coverage</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective January 1997, all earnings from the first dollar are insurable up to the annual MIE. There are no weekly minimums or maximums for determining earnings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creates a more equitable and balanced system—all earnings are insurable.</li> <li>• Decreases paper burden for employers.</li> <li>• Helps guard against “gaming” the system to avoid paying premiums.</li> </ul>
<b>Premium Refunds</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since 1997, workers earning \$2,000 or less per year have had their premiums refunded.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helps workers who must pay premiums but do not have enough hours to qualify for benefits.</li> </ul>

Element	Rationale
<b>Increased Sanctions for Fraud</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective July 1996, penalties for fraud by employers and claimants were increased.</li> <li>• Since January 1997, claimants who committed fraud after June 1996 have faced higher entrance requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protects the integrity of the EI program.</li> </ul>
<b>Part II of the <i>Employment Insurance Act</i>: Employment Benefits and the National Employment Service</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part II of the <i>Employment Insurance Act</i> provides authority for three types of arrangements for employment program implementation and delivery with support from EI funds.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Canada EI Commission is authorized to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Establish federal employment programs, coupled with a duty to work with provincial governments regarding their design, delivery and evaluation;</li> <li>– Authority for the Commission to enter into agreements for the administration on its behalf of its employment benefits and support measures; and</li> <li>– Authority to enter into agreements with provinces and other entities to contribute toward the costs of their similar benefits and measures/ programs (Labour Market Development Agreements).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



## Annex 7.2 Economic Action Plan (EAP) Temporary Employment Insurance (EI) Measures

<b>Budget Implementation Act: Bill C-3 and C-13 (2011)</b>	
<b>Element</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
<b>Changes to the Work-Sharing Program</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allowed for an extension of up to 16 weeks, to a maximum of 42 weeks, to active and recently terminated agreements.</li> <li>This extension was retroactive to March 20, 2011, and ended on October 29, 2011.</li> <li>It introduced adjustments to make the program more flexible and efficient for employers: a simplified recovery plan, more flexible utilization rules and technical amendments to reduce administrative burden.</li> <li>These adjustments became effective on April 4, 2011.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gave businesses and workers additional support to avoid potential layoffs.</li> </ul>
<b>Temporary Hiring Credit for Small Businesses</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided small businesses with a temporary hiring credit of up to \$1,000 against an increase in the firm's 2011 EI premiums over those paid in 2010.</li> <li>Available to approximately 525,000 employers whose total EI premiums were at or below \$10,000 in 2010 and will reduce their 2011 payroll costs by about \$165 million.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encouraged additional hiring in small businesses, and helped them to take advantage of emerging opportunities and compete in the global economy.</li> </ul>
<b>Additional Changes to the Work-Sharing Program: Bill C-9 (2010)</b>	
<b>Element</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
<b>Changes to the Work-Sharing Program</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allowed active and recently terminated agreements to be extended for an additional 26 weeks, up to a maximum of 78 weeks.</li> <li>Maintained previous changes that improved the flexibility of qualifying criteria for new agreements and streamlined the process for employers.</li> <li>These enhancements were in place until April 2, 2011.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gave businesses and workers additional support to avoid potential layoffs.</li> </ul>
<b>Increased Benefits for Long-Tenured Workers: Bill C-50 (2009)</b>	
<b>Element</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
<b>Temporary Additional EI Benefits for Unemployed Long-Tenured Workers</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long-tenured workers are individuals who have worked and paid EI premiums for a significant period and have previously made limited use of EI regular benefits.</li> <li>Provided up to 20 weeks of additional benefits, depending on how long an eligible individual had been working and paying into EI.</li> <li>Applied to claimants who met the long-tenured worker definition and who made their claim between January 4, 2009, and September 11, 2010.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Benefited workers who faced unemployment with low prospects of finding work and who had previously made limited use of EI benefits.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>

**Additional Support for the Unemployed – Budget Implementation Act: Bill C-10 (2009)**

Element	Rationale
<b>Five-Week Extension of EI Regular Benefits</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective on March 31, 2009, eligible claimants were automatically eligible for five additional weeks of regular benefits.</li> <li>• It affected all claims active or starting between March 1, 2009, and September 11, 2010.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided all EI regular benefit claimants with additional financial support while they searched for new employment.</li> </ul>
<b>Career Transition Assistance Initiative</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two measures to support long-tenured workers.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The Extended Employment Insurance and Training Incentive (EETI) extended EI regular benefits to a maximum of 104 weeks for EETI participants, including up to 12 weeks of EI regular benefits for job search.</li> <li>– The Severance Investment for Training Initiative removed restrictions on EI regular benefits for all eligible claimants who invested part or all of their separation monies in eligible training.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved claimants' incentive to renew or upgrade their skills.</li> <li>• Encouraged claimants to invest in their own training.</li> <li>• Encouraged claimants to undertake long-term training to improve their re-employability.</li> </ul>
<b>Changes to the Work-Sharing Program</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased the maximum agreement duration by 14 weeks, to a maximum of 52 weeks, for applications received between February 1, 2009, and April 3, 2010.</li> <li>• It also improved access to work-sharing agreements by making the qualifying criteria more flexible and streamlining processes for employers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gave businesses and workers additional support to avoid potential layoffs.</li> </ul>
<b>Premium Rate Freeze</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This measure froze EI premium rates for employees at \$1.73 per \$100 for 2010, the same rate as in 2009 and 2008.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintained premium rate stability during the recession despite higher EI costs.</li> </ul>