



IDENTIFICATION

Name of the railway company proposing the initiative:

Coordinates of the person that came up with the initiative, if it originates or has been implemented by an employee, a customer, a supplier or by any other stakeholder:

Name of the initiative leader:

If another name should be used on the award, please specify:

CATEGORY

- 1. North American Class 1 freight
- 2. Non-Class 1 freight
- 3. Passenger (intercity, tourist, commuter)

DESCRIPTION

Describe briefly the initiative and indicate how it meets the criteria. (Use a separate sheet if needed)

You may include picture, diagrams, media articles or any other relevant documents or information.

CRITERIA

Indicate N/A if a criterion does not apply or N/I if further information is not available at the time of the nomination.

Numbers in brackets next to a criterion indicate the weighting assigned to this criterion in its category, which can be changed by the Review Committee. Please do not rate yourself. This box is to be used to explain how you meet the criteria. The rating will be done by the selection committee.

EXPLAIN HOW THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA ARE MET:

INNOVATIVE

This criterion evaluates the extent to which the initiative introduces a novel approach, technology, or solution that has not been previously implemented in its domain.

The initiative is introducing something new in:

- A breakthrough innovation in railway safety with no prior precedent (5)
- A first-of-its-kind innovation in the rail industry globally (4)
- A new concept for the rail industry in Canada (3)
- A novel approach within a specific company, region, or niche market (2)
- Adaptation or replication of an existing initiative (1)

PROGRESSIVE

This criterion evaluates how creatively the initiative rethinks or improves upon existing practices. It considers the extent to which the initiative introduces a fresh approach, even if inspired by existing concepts.

The initiative is:

- A groundbreaking, inventive design that significantly redefines best practices (3)
- A creative adaptation or improvement of an existing idea (2)
- A direct imitation or replication of an existing approach (1)

PROACTIVE VS. REACTIVE

This criterion evaluates whether the initiative was implemented proactively (to prevent issues before they arise) or reactively (to address an issue after it has occurred). While preventive measures are generally preferred, well-executed corrective actions can also provide value.

SCORING:

- Proactive: The initiative was implemented at the planning stage to prevent issues before they arose (2)
- Reactive: The initiative was implemented primarily in response to an unforeseen issue (1)

COST-EFFECTIVENESS & IMPACT

This criterion evaluates whether the initiative provides meaningful benefits relative to the resources invested. It considers financial, operational, environmental, and rail safety impacts while ensuring that costs are proportionate to the value created.

SCORING:

- High impact, low cost: The initiative delivers significant benefits (environmental, safety, operational, or financial) at a relatively low investment (5)
- High impact, moderate cost: The initiative provides significant benefits, but requires moderate investment (4)
- Moderate impact, low-to-moderate cost: The initiative provides modest benefits but is still cost-effective (3)
- Modest impact, high cost: The initiative delivers some benefits, but the investment is relatively high (2)
- Status quo: The initiative provides little to no benefit (1)
- Negative return: The initiative's costs outweigh its benefits (0)

3

SCALABILITY & TRANSFERABILITY

This criterion evaluates how easily the initiative can be adopted, implemented, or adapted by others in the industry. It considers factors such as cost, time, technology, administration, resources, and training.

SCORING:

- Fully transferable: The initiative can be adopted as-is with no modifications or constraints (4)
- Easily adaptable: The initiative requires minor adjustments but is readily implementable (3)
- Moderately adaptable: The initiative requires some modifications but remains practical for others to adopt (2)
- Difficult to transfer: The initiative requires significant modifications and faces major adoption barriers (1)
- Not transferable: The initiative is highly specific and cannot be adopted elsewhere (0)

STAKEHOLDER ENDORSEMENT

This criterion evaluates the level of support the initiative has received from key stakeholders, including employees, management, customers, partners, the public, industry organizations, and governments.

SCORING:

- Strong external & internal support: The initiative is widely endorsed across multiple stakeholder groups, including external partners or the public (2)
- Internal support only: The initiative is supported by employees and management but has little or no external recognition (1)
- No clear support: The initiative has not gained meaningful endorsement from any group (0)

OFFICIAL RECOGNITION

The initiative has received official recognition/acknowledgement (i.e. reported in the media, mentioned by CTA, TC, TSB).

THE INITIATIVE:

- Received external recognition / acknowledgement in the form of an award (2)
- Received external recognition / acknowledgement in the form of a publication (1)
- Have not received recognition / acknowledgement (0)

Date:		
Signature:		
Email:	Telephor	ne:
Please send your completed nomination form to:		
Brianna Bowman Railway Association of Canada <u>bbowman@railcan.ca</u>		
Thai	nk you.	

5