Since launch on January 1, 2015, Express Entry has represented a major shift in the way Canada selects, receives and processes certain permanent residence applications within the economic immigration stream.

System actively and purposefully issues invitations to apply only to the candidates who are best positioned for economic success in Canada – not the first in line.

Not all candidates who successfully enter the Express Entry pool are invited to apply.

As a result, Express Entry eliminates the possibility of backlogs and enables:
  – Much faster processing (6 months* or less instead of 12-14 months);
  – Strong immigrant economic outcomes; and,
  – Improved labour market responsiveness through a greater role for employers and provinces and territories.

*In 80% of cases from receipt of complete application.
• Although Express Entry offers faster processing and an online platform, its defining feature is its ability to dynamically rank candidates and invite only the top scoring individuals.

• The Comprehensive Ranking System was developed in close collaboration with Statistics Canada and provides up to 600 points based on factors most closely associated immigrant employment earnings, including education, age, official language ability, and work experience (see Annex A).

• The ranking system also places significant emphasis on responsiveness to employer and provincial/territorial needs, providing 600 points to any candidate with a valid offer of arranged employment or provincial/territorial nomination.
  
  – The heavy weighting of these points means that a job offer or nomination is a definitive factor in determining which candidates receive invitations to apply, providing a high degree of selection power to employer and provinces/territories.
In May, 2016, about 57,500 foreign nationals were active candidates in the pool.

As of May 2016, a total of 44,062 invitations have been issued to foreign nationals:
- Mix of Provincial Nominees (15%), Canadian Experience Class (37%), Federal Skilled Workers (43%), and Federal Skilled Trades (7%).
- 59% of candidates have claimed a job offer or a provincial or territorial nomination.
- Approximately 2% of invitations have gone to candidates who submitted a language test in French for their first official language.

As of May 2016, almost 22,900 Express Entry candidates or their accompanying family members landed as permanent residents since the launch of Express Entry.

Early outcomes – invitations

Rounds of Invitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rounds of Invitations</th>
<th># of Invitations Issued</th>
<th>CRS Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># ITAs</td>
<td>min CRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The vast majority of active candidates (who have not yet been selected) have core human capital scores of between 300 and 450 points.

The core human capital scores of candidates with offers of arranged employment or provincial nominations are, on average, lower than invited candidates without a job offer or nomination.

About two-thirds (66%) of candidates with offers of arranged employment claimed core scores of 300 or less, meaning a majority of job offer candidates had core human capital scores that would place them in the bottom 7% of the distribution.

Candidates invited to apply without a job offer or nomination (those in RED in the chart) had higher human capital scores and represent an average of over 35% of all invitations issued.

Note 1: Core human capital score is defined as Comprehensive Ranking System score less points awarded for an offer of arranged employment or provincial/territorial nomination.
Note 2: Some candidates with offers of arranged employment underreport their human capital as some factors are not required for all immigration programs (e.g., Education Credential Assessment not required for Canadian Experience Class or Federal Skilled Trades Program).
Candidates were invited across a range of occupations and skill levels in 2015, with a particular concentration in the restaurant (NOC 63) and high-tech (NOC 21) sectors.

- ‘Fast food supervisors’, and ‘cooks’ collectively accounted for about one in six invitations in 2015.
- ‘Information systems analysts’, ‘software engineers’, and ‘computer programmers and interactive media developers’ collectively accounted for about one in ten invitations in 2015.

Both typically low-wage (food service supervisors, cooks, retail sales supervisors) and high-wage occupations (software engineers, university professors and lecturers, financial and investment analysts) are represented.

### Top 10 Invited Occupations - 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Median hourly wage</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>Halifax</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOC6311 - Food service supervisors</td>
<td>$13.56</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$12.75</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC6322 - Cooks</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC2171 - Information systems analysts and consultants</td>
<td>$38.46</td>
<td>$35.90</td>
<td>$32.97</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC2173 - Software engineers</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$43.27</td>
<td>$33.33</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC2174 - Computer programmers and interactive media developers</td>
<td>$37.98</td>
<td>$35.10</td>
<td>$30.90</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC4011 - University professors and lecturers</td>
<td>$45.67</td>
<td>$43.00</td>
<td>$39.52</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC6211 - Retail sales supervisors</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$15.50</td>
<td>$15.33</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC5241 - Graphic Designers and Illustrators</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>$25.48</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC1111 - Financial Auditors and Accountants</td>
<td>$35.15</td>
<td>$34.13</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC1112 – Financial and Investment Analysts</td>
<td>$40.21</td>
<td>$32.97</td>
<td>$23.69</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top 10 TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10,685</strong></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moving forward

Express Entry is meeting its application management objectives...

- IRCC is outperforming the processing standard (80% of applications processed within 6 months);
- IRCC is issuing invitations to top-ranked candidates on a generally consistent schedule; and,
- Express Entry candidates are able to easily submit and update Express Entry profiles, ensuring that the system remains dynamic.

...but early outcomes and feedback from stakeholders have revealed areas for improvement:

- As of May 2016, immigrants with valid job offers (44%) or nominations (15%) have accounted for the majority of invitations, meaning only (41%) were invited mainly on the basis of their human capital.
  - Because of the high volume of candidates with scores of 600 or more, and modest invitation rounds, the invitation cut-off score has never decreased below 450 points, making it difficult for candidates with high levels of human capital to receive invitations
- Many candidates with offers of arranged employment claim very low levels of human capital;
- A significant number of candidates are invited on the basis of offers of arranged employment in low-wage occupations;
- Candidates and employers have expressed frustration with the requirement to provide a Labour Market Impact Assessment to validate an offer of arranged employment, and the requirement that offers of arranged employment be “indeterminate” in duration; and,
- Stakeholders have raised concerns that candidates with Canadian study experience are not specifically advantaged within the Comprehensive Ranking System.
The Department is considering potential changes that would impact the treatment of:

• Arranged employment (both the level of points and requirements);
• Canadian study experience;
• Candidates with siblings in Canada;
• French-speaking candidates who intend to settle outside Québec; and,
• Candidates with experience in some semi-skilled (i.e. National Occupational Classification skill type C) occupations

These potential changes, individually and collectively, would impact which candidates receive invitations – and which do not, affecting:

• The invitation cut-off score;
• The average human capital of invited candidates;
• The occupational profile of invited candidates;
• The linguistic profile of invited candidates; and,
• The administrative burden on candidates and employers.
While there is significant diversity within the pool in relation to human capital factors, most candidates are clustered within a narrow band of core CRS scores:
  • 60% of candidates in the pool are spread within a 100 point range (351-450)
  • 90% of candidates in the pool are spread within a 150 point range (301-450)

This clustering means that the awarding of even a small number of additional points has a significant impact on which candidates receive invitations – and which don’t.

For instance, a hypothetical candidate with 400 core human capital points would “leapfrog” almost 15,000 other candidates if given 50 additional points; and over 18,000 candidates if given 100 additional points.
The Department is considering:

• A significant reduction in points awarded to candidates with offers of arranged employment, which would no longer guarantee an invitation while still significantly increasing the chance of being invited;
• Exempting certain candidates from the requirement to validate their offers of arranged employment with Labour Market Impact Assessments; and,
• Changing the job duration requirement from “indeterminate” to “one year”.

A reduction in arranged employment points would likely:

• Put significant downward pressure on the invitation cut-off score;
• Increase the number of candidates invited with higher levels of human capital (including former students), and decrease the number of candidates invited with lower levels of human capital; and,
• Change the occupational distribution of invited candidates, with fewer candidates invited with offers of arranged employment in low wage occupations.

Changes to Labour Market Impact Assessment and job duration requirements would likely:

• Facilitate more offers of arranged employment for candidates who are exempt from needing to obtain an LMIA for temporary purposes, including those on work permits pursuant to international agreements, or who bring significant benefit to Canada (e.g. Intra-company transferees, distinguished researchers, etc.); and,
• Facilitate offers of arranged employment to candidates in contract-based positions, benefiting some occupations in high-tech and tenure-track professors.
Rebalancing the Comprehensive Ranking System to facilitate more invitations to high-human capital candidates:

• How would a significant reduction in arranged offer points affect your sector?
• Would this approach to be a net positive for the broader labour market?
• Which types of candidates would be most affected (positively or negatively) by this change?
• How do you think employer and candidate behaviour would adapt in response to these changes?

Measures for employers to facilitate offers of arranged employment, including relaxing Labour Market Impact Assessment requirements and redefining job duration:

• Would the introduction of some exemptions to the LMIA process help to ease the pressure for some of your employees?
• Is a labour market test (to ensure Canadians and permanent residents have the first opportunity to fill job openings) appropriate in the context of permanent immigration?
• Would changing the job duration requirement from “indeterminate” to “one year” better reflect labour market conditions?

Taken together, would these changes be of net benefit to the labour market?
The Department is considering:

- Providing ‘bonus’ points to candidates with Canadian educational credentials, in addition to the base points that candidates receive for their level of education.
- Providing a higher level of points to candidates with higher level Canadian credentials.

Providing ‘bonus’ points for candidates with Canadian educational credentials would likely:

- Increase the number of candidates with Canadian educational credentials who receive invitations;
- Increase the overall proportion of invited candidates with Canadian educational credentials;
- Provide a competitive edge for Canadian post-secondary institutions in their recruitment of international students;
- Sidestep difficulties related to the recognition of foreign credentials; and,
- Displace, to some degree, high-skilled candidates without Canadian study experience.

Providing a higher level of points to candidates with higher level Canadian credentials would likely:

- Facilitate relatively more invitations for candidates with Canadian university level (undergraduate and graduate) credentials
Student questions

Providing bonus points for candidates with Canadian educational credentials:

• How would an increase in the number of candidates with Canadian educational credentials affect your sector?
• How are candidates with Canadian credentials different, in general, from candidates without Canadian credentials?
• What role should the immigration system play in supporting post-secondary institutions?

Providing a higher level of points to candidates with higher level Canadian credentials:

• Should the Comprehensive Ranking System differentiate between different types of Canadian credentials? Why or why not?

Taken together, would these changes be of net benefit to the labour market? To employers? To post-secondary institutions?
The Government has committed to:

• Providing ‘bonus’ points for candidates with siblings in Canada.

This would likely:

• Increase the number of candidates with siblings in Canada that receive invitations;
• Increase the overall proportion of invited candidates with siblings in Canada;
• Increase the retention rate of candidates invited through Express Entry; and,
• Displace, to some degree, high-skilled candidates without siblings in Canada.
Providing bonus points for candidates with siblings in Canada:

- Do you think having a sibling in Canada can better facilitate social and economic integration?
- Would an increase in the number of candidates with siblings in Canada affect your sector? If so, how?
- Do you see the retention of skilled immigrants as an issue in your sector?
- What other steps could the Department take to increase the retention of skilled immigrants?

Would this change be of net benefit to the labour market? To Canada more generally?
Official languages

The Government has committed to increasing the inflow of French-speaking immigrants in the economic stream to 4 percent by 2018, and is considering:

- Providing ‘bonus’ points to French-speaking candidates who intend to settle outside Québec; and,
- Providing a higher level of points to French-speaking candidates with better English proficiency.

Providing ‘bonus’ points to French-speaking candidates would likely:

- Increase the number of French-speaking candidates that receive invitations;
- Increase the overall proportion of permanent residents that speak French;
- Support official language minority communities outside Québec;
- Encourage more French-speaking foreign nationals to create an Express Entry profile;
- Incentivize bilingual candidates to be assessed in both official languages; and,
- Displace, to some degree, high-skilled candidates that do not speak French.

Providing a higher level of points to French-speaking candidates with better English proficiency would likely:

- Give preference to French-speaking candidates that are more likely to participate in labour markets outside Québec.

Note: The Province of Québec is responsible for selecting all economic immigrant who intend to settle in Québec as per the Canada-Quebec Accord.
Official languages questions

Providing ‘bonus’ points to French-speaking candidates:

• Is awarding ‘bonus’ points to French-speaking immigrants settling outside Quebec the best approach to increase French-speaking economic immigration through Express Entry? Why or why not?

• Would an increase in the number of candidates who speak French in Canada affect your sector? If so, how?

• As a retention factor, should the Department consider giving more bonus points to French-speaking individuals with Canadian work or study experience?

Providing a higher level of points to French-speaking candidates with better English proficiency:

• Should the Comprehensive Ranking System differentiate between candidates who speak French and English and French speaking candidates who do not speak English? Why or why not?

Would this change be of net benefit to the labour market? To Canada more generally?
Currently, workers must have at least one year of experience in a skilled occupation to be eligible for immigration under the programs managed by Express Entry. The Department is considering:

- Creating a new program, or modifying an existing program, to provide a federal pathway to permanent residence for semi-skilled workers, in addition to existing provincial pathways; and,
- Modifying minimum entry criteria for Express Entry to include candidates qualifying for the program in question.

This would likely:

- Expand federal immigration into a program area that is currently occupied by the provinces and territories (most Provincial Nominee Programs include semi-skilled stream).
- Increase the occupational diversity of candidates eligible to enter the Express Entry pool;
- Increase the number and overall proportion of invited candidates with experience in some semi-skilled occupations; and,
- Displace, to some degree, high-skilled candidates.
Semi-skilled worker questions

Expanding minimum entry criteria to include semi-skilled workers:

- Are there untapped sources of labour in the domestic labour force seeking work in semi-skilled occupations that could be accessed by employers, including non-economic class immigrants?
- Are other non-immigration supports needed to facilitate this e.g. recruitment, training and/or retention supports?
- Are semi-skilled needs best addressed through permanent immigration? National programs or provincial programs?
- If so, given that it may not be possible to provide permanent residence to all semi-skilled temporary foreign workers in Canada, which human capital characteristics and circumstances should be prioritized when selecting semi-skilled candidates?
- Given that there are relatively fixed immigration levels in any given year, which existing priorities should be scaled back to accommodate an increase in the number of semi-skilled immigrants selected through economic programs?

Would an expansion of minimum entry criteria to include semi-skilled workers be of net benefit to the labour market?
Cumulative impact

The Department is considering a significant number of changes to Express Entry to improve outcomes and address stakeholder feedback.

- Would these changes effectively address the issues identified by your constituencies?
- Are there other major issues that the Department should be addressing?
- Would you expect the cumulative impact of these changes to be a net positive for your sector?
- Would the cumulative impact of these changes be a net positive for the labour market more broadly?
- From a system perspective, what do you think could be done to improve client service? For instance, should candidates have more time to submit their applications after being invited?
### Annex A – Relative impact of CRS factors over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor (at landing)</th>
<th>Short-term (YSL 1-2)</th>
<th>Medium-term (YSL 5-6)</th>
<th>Long-term (YSL 10-11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>![Small Bubble] ![Down Arrow]</td>
<td>![Medium Bubble] ![Down Arrow]</td>
<td>![Large Bubble] ![Down Arrow]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Work Experience</td>
<td>![Large Bubble] ![Up Arrow]</td>
<td>![Medium Bubble] ![Up Arrow]</td>
<td>![Small Bubble] ![Up Arrow]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Study Experience</td>
<td>![Small Bubble] ![Down Arrow] ![or] ![Dash]</td>
<td>![Medium Bubble] ![or] ![Dash]</td>
<td>![Large Bubble] ![or] ![Dash]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Size of bubble indicates relative impact - Arrow direction indicates positive or negative relationship - Dash indicates insignificant relationship