

# APPLICANT INFORMATION

## RESEARCH AND WORKPLACE INNOVATION PROGRAM

**2014**

*Funding occupational health research and innovative workplace solutions*

### CLOSING DATES

#### NOTICE OF INTENT

(For Scientific Research applications only)

**MARCH 24, 2014**

#### SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH APPLICATIONS

**MAY 12, 2014**

#### WORKPLACE INNOVATION APPLICATIONS

**JUNE 24, 2014**

#### EDUCATION AND TRAINING APPLICATIONS

**JUNE 24, 2014**



<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 RWIP Call for Applications.....	1
1.2 <b>NEW</b> Closing Date for Applications .....	2
1.3 <b>NEW</b> Policy Revisions .....	2
<b>2. INFORMATION ON FUNDING SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH PROJECTS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Notice of Intent.....	3
2.2 Scientific Research Application .....	4
2.3 Eligibility for Funding under the Scientific Research Stream .....	4
2.4 <b>NEW</b> Knowledge Transfer and Information Sharing.....	4
2.5 Peer Review of Scientific Research Proposals .....	4
2.6 Identification of Peer Reviewers .....	5
2.7 Project Signatories.....	5
2.8 Ethics Review.....	5
<b>3. INFORMATION ON FUNDING WORKPLACE INNOVATION PROJECTS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 Workplace Innovation Application.....	6
3.2 Scope of Workplace Innovation Projects.....	6
3.3 <b>NEW</b> Workplace Innovation Projects and The Workplace Safety and Health Act .....	7
3.4 Eligibility for Funding under the Workplace Innovation Stream.....	7
3.5 <b>NEW</b> Knowledge Transfer and Information Sharing Plan .....	7
3.6 Commitment and Support for Workplace Innovation Projects .....	7
3.7 Evaluation of Workplace Innovation Projects for Safety and Health .....	8
<b>4. NEW INFORMATION ON FUNDING TRAINING and EDUCATION PROJECTS.</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1 Scope of Training and Education Projects .....	9
4.2 Support of Industry Associations or Safety Associations.....	10
4.3 Training and Education Application .....	10
4.4 Eligibility for Funding under the Training and Education Stream .....	11
4.5 Knowledge Transfer and Information Sharing Plan .....	11



<b>5.</b>	<b>OTHER PROGRAM INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1	Identifying and Mitigating Risk.....	12
5.2	<b>NEW</b> Project Funding for Capital Expenditure.....	12
5.3	Restrictions on Program Funding.....	12
5.4	Meritorious Projects .....	12
5.5	Use of WCB Data.....	12
<b>6.</b>	<b>CONTRACT INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>14</b>
6.1	Conditions Regarding the Use of Funding.....	14
6.2	Grant Termination .....	14
6.3	Intellectual Property .....	15
6.4	Liability .....	15
<b>7.</b>	<b>INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING APPLICATIONS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
7.1	Separate Applications for Each Funding Stream .....	15
7.2	Length of Application.....	16
7.3	Supporting Information .....	16
7.4	Letters of Support.....	16
7.5	Application Format .....	16
7.6	Explanation of Budget and Justification of Budget Items .....	16
7.7	Electronic Submissions of Applications .....	17
7.8	Resubmissions .....	17
7.9	WCB Travel, Accommodation and Meal Rates .....	17
<b>8.</b>	<b>DESTINATION OF APPLICATIONS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>ATTACHMENT A: WCB PANEL-EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH APPLICATIONS .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>ATTACHMENT B: PEER REVIEWERS-EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH APPLICATIONS.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>11.</b>	<b>ATTACHMENT C: WCB PANEL-EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR WORKPLACE INNOVATION APPLICATIONS.....</b>	<b>25</b>



- 12. **NEW** ATTACHMENT D: WCB PANEL-EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TRAINING AND EDUCATION APPLICATIONS .....29
- 13. ATTACHMENT E: WCB TRAVEL, ACCOMMODATION AND MEAL RATES....33



## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Workers Compensation Board of Manitoba (WCB) is committed to insuring and supporting safe and healthy workplaces, putting workers at the centre of all we do and providing them with valued services for injury prevention, compensation, and return to health and work while maintaining system integrity.

The WCB has established the Research and Workplace Innovation Program (RWIP) to promote and fund scientific research, workplace innovation projects, and knowledge transfer related to prevention of occupational injuries, diseases and meaningful return to work of injured or ill workers.

**NEW** Beginning this year, the WCB is adding a new funding stream to support training and education projects in occupational health and safety. RWIP projects will now be funded under three (3) streams:

1. Workplace innovation projects that lead to improvements in workplace health and safety, and foster successful rehabilitation and productive and safe return to meaningful work,
2. High quality scientific research and applied research projects with practical benefits that are related to significant issues in workers compensation, and
3. Training and education projects relevant to workplace health and safety, injury prevention, safe return-to-work and treatment of occupational illness.

The WCB makes available \$1 million each year for RWIP projects. In general, each project may be a maximum of two years in duration and may receive maximum funding of \$100,000 for each year.

### ***1.1 RWIP Call for Applications***

The call for funding under the RWIP is being issued on February 24, 2014, in the Winnipeg Free Press, the WCB Employer Update and posted on the WCB website:

<http://www.wcb.mb.ca/research-and-workplace-innovation-program-0>

## 1.2 **NEW** *Closing Date for Applications*

There are two different closing dates for applications:

- ❖ Scientific research applications must be received by the WCB no later than **May 12, 2014 at 4:00 p.m.**
- ❖ Workplace Innovation and Education and Training applications must be received by the WCB no later than **June 24, 2014 at 4:00 p.m.**

Applications received after the competition closing will not be accepted.

## 1.3 **NEW** *Policy Revisions*

WCB Policy 52.10, *Research and Workplace Innovation Program* establishes the framework for the administration and management of the RWIP. The Policy outlines the mandate, terms of reference, funding eligibility, selection criteria and governance of the RWIP.

Effective January 1, 2014, the RWIP policy has been revised to include a third stream of funding to support Training and Education projects and a number of administrative changes. The link to the policy is below:

<http://www.wcb.mb.ca/research-and-workplace-innovation-program>

## 2. INFORMATION ON FUNDING SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH PROJECTS

The primary goal of this funding stream is to support high quality scientific and applied research projects with practical benefits that lead to a reduction in the incidence, morbidity and mortality from work-related injury and disease. The RWIP will consider funding scientific research proposals that:

- ❖ Develop a stronger understanding and further current knowledge of workplace injuries, illness, and disease;
- ❖ Identify, prevent, treat or support recovery from workplace injuries, illness and disease;
- ❖ Explore risk factors associated with specific industries, occupations, technology, work processes or other factors that may give rise to workplace injuries, illness and disease; or
- ❖ Expand Manitoba's research capacity in occupational health and safety and issues related to workers compensation.

### 2.1 *Notice of Intent*

Applicants intending to submit a scientific research proposal must provide a Notice of Intent (NOI) on or before **March 24, 2014**.

The NOI should be brief, providing a short description of the research undertaking, key research disciplines, information on the principal applicant and the organization with which the principal applicant is affiliated. The format for the Notice of Intent is provided on the WCB website. Please [click here](#) or copy and paste this link into your browser:

<http://www.wcb.mb.ca/sites/default/files/files/NOI%20scientificresearch.docx>

The WCB will accept a NOI submitted electronically e.g. via email or fax.

The WCB will not consider scientific research proposals unless a NOI has been submitted.

The WCB will acknowledge receipt of all NOIs.



## ***2.2 Scientific Research Application***

Applicants interested in requesting funding under the scientific research stream are required to submit an application using the format provided on the WCB website. The WCB requires a NOI from the applicant prior to submitting the complete application. Please see link:

<http://www.wcb.mb.ca/sites/default/files/files/Sci-Res%20application.docx>

## ***2.3 Eligibility for Funding under the Scientific Research Stream***

Qualified researchers, scholars and health professionals affiliated with Canadian post-secondary institutions including hospitals and research institutes, Canadian non-governmental organizations with an explicit research or knowledge translation mandate, or labour unions or organizations, industry or employer associations and their affiliates, representing Manitoba workers or employers may apply for funding under the scientific research stream.

## ***2.4 NEW Knowledge Transfer and Information Sharing***

The WCB is interested in the transfer of knowledge and information sharing with those who can use the information in the prevention of workplace injuries, or in reducing occupational illness, injury, and disability in Manitoba. The application must provide a description of the dissemination strategies that will be used to communicate and share the study's results with key user groups, potential audiences, practitioners in the occupational health and safety community and the academic community.

The Evaluation Criteria to be used by the WCB's selection panel is shown in ATTACHMENT A.

## ***2.5 Peer Review of Scientific Research Proposals***

Scientific research proposals will be subject to a minimum of two reviews by peers identified by the applicant or the WCB who have expertise in the relevant disciplines of the study and where there is no conflict of interest. The peer review will take into consideration the following dimensions: scientific merit, research design and methodology, management of proposed research and risk assessment, budget and expertise of the principal investigator and study team.

The Evaluation Criteria to be used by peer reviewers is shown in ATTACHMENT B.

### ***2.6 Identification of Peer Reviewers***

Although the RWIP reserves the right to determine which experts are the most suitable to review an application, applicants **must identify peer reviewers** who would be appropriate to review their application.

The peer reviewers **must be impartial** reviewers who have the necessary expertise to critically evaluate the application. An impartial reviewer would be a person with whom the applicant has no on-going or anticipated research collaboration in the near future.

**NEW** The applicant **must obtain the agreement** of the identified peer reviewers prior to listing them in the NOI.

An applicant may also explain why he or she would prefer that certain experts should not be contacted as potential reviewers for the peer review of the application. He or she should provide specific details as to the reason or reasons for exclusion.

### ***2.7 Project Signatories***

Grants for scientific research projects are made only with the consent and knowledge of the administrative head of the institution at which they are to be held, and applications must be countersigned accordingly.

### ***2.8 Ethics Review***

All scientific research projects must abide by applicable ethical standards and undergo review by an institutional ethics board, where appropriate.

### 3. INFORMATION ON FUNDING WORKPLACE INNOVATION PROJECTS

The primary goal of this funding stream is to support novel, creative, innovative projects that lead to positive change in the safety and health environment in Manitoba workplaces. The RWIP will consider funding workplace innovation projects that:

- ❖ Provide direct benefits to the occupational health and safety of a specific workplace or workplaces, including injury prevention and return to work;
- ❖ Develop, implement and evaluate innovative, practical, shop-floor solutions to improving workplace health and safety and fostering successful rehabilitation and meaningful return-to-work of injured or ill workers;
- ❖ Apply new information and technology to address occupational health and safety issues;
- ❖ Use existing knowledge in new ways to solve problems in occupational health and safety; or
- ❖ Transfer new knowledge to the workplace through the development or provision of education and training materials or programs in workers compensation issues or occupational health and safety.

#### ***3.1 Workplace Innovation Application***

Applicants interested in requesting funding under this stream are required to submit an application using the format provided on the WCB website for this program. Please [click here](#) or copy and paste this link into your browser:

<http://www.wcb.mb.ca/sites/default/files/files/WorkplaceInnovationApp.docx>

#### ***3.2 Scope of Workplace Innovation Projects***

Innovation is generally understood as the successful introduction of something new and useful. Innovation encompasses new ideas, processes, products and services and uses it to change and improve the environment in which the innovation is introduced. Innovation implies action that adds value and results in change. In the context of this Program, an innovative

project is expected to change and improve a specific workplace's safety and health environment leading to and resulting in reduced incidence and frequency of injuries and occupational illnesses and diseases. The intent is for the applicant to undertake the project within his or her own workplace. Applicants requesting funding under this stream are responsible for describing how their project meets this definition.

### **3.3** **NEW** *Workplace Innovation Projects and The Workplace Safety and Health Act*

The RWIP may also fund innovation projects that involve activities to improve occupational health and safety of a workplace in compliance with *The Workplace Safety and Health Act*. Project funding may be provided to meet in part, the cost of employer's legislative requirements under *The Workplace Safety and Health Act*.

### **3.4** *Eligibility for Funding under the Workplace Innovation Stream*

Manitoba employers or unions, labour organizations, industry associations, safety groups, researchers or consultants working with employers or workers may apply for funding under the workplace innovation stream. In addition, projects must be conducted within a specific workplace.

### **3.5** **NEW** *Knowledge Transfer and Information Sharing Plan*

The WCB is interested in the transfer of knowledge and information sharing with those who can use the information in the prevention of workplace injuries, or in reducing occupational illness, injury, and disability in Manitoba. The application must provide a description of the dissemination strategies that will be used to communicate and share the project's outcomes with other workplaces, key user groups, potential audiences and or practitioners in the occupational health and safety community.

The Evaluation Criteria to be used by the WCB's Selection Panel is shown in ATTACHMENT C.

### **3.6** *Commitment and Support for Workplace Innovation Projects*

The success of workplace innovation projects depends on the commitment and support of key stakeholders. Therefore, applications must demonstrate the commitment and support of business owners, management, employee unions and health and safety committees.

Projects where there is financial or in-kind investment by the applicants and or workplace parties are encouraged.

### ***3.7 Evaluation of Workplace Innovation Projects for Safety and Health***

The funding of workplace innovation projects is expected to result in improvements to a specific workplace's health and safety performance. The WCB may require an evaluation or review of the innovation project after a reasonable period of time from its completion. The evaluation would determine if the funds have been successfully used to generate improvements in the safety and health environment of the workplace and to obtain information on best practices for application in other Manitoba workplaces.

#### 4. **NEW** INFORMATION ON FUNDING TRAINING and EDUCATION PROJECTS

Beginning this year, the WCB is adding a new funding stream to support Training and Education projects in occupational health and safety that are consistent with *Manitoba's Five-Year Plan for Workplace Injury and Illness Prevention*. Please [click here for the Five Year Plan](http://www.gov.mb.ca/labour/safety/pdf/workplace_injury_illness_prevention_web.pdf) or copy and paste the link below into your browser:

[http://www.gov.mb.ca/labour/safety/pdf/workplace\\_injury\\_illness\\_prevention\\_web.pdf](http://www.gov.mb.ca/labour/safety/pdf/workplace_injury_illness_prevention_web.pdf).

The primary goal of this funding stream is to support and fund projects that:

- ❖ Develop or expand capacity for training that will benefit Manitoba workplaces, industry sectors or occupational groups;
- ❖ Address gaps in the delivery of training and education;
- ❖ Promote culture and language sensitive training to immigrant workers and workers at risk;
- ❖ Improve training in workplace risk assessment and hazard identification related to health and safety, injury prevention and safe return to work; or
- ❖ Apply new information, technology, work processes or other factors to address injury prevention, safe return to work and occupational illness.

##### ***4.1 Scope of Training and Education Projects***

The provision of high-quality occupational health and safety training and education is linked to improved occupational health and safety and injury prevention in the workplace. Education and Training projects for occupational health and safety may include instruction programs or activities that impart knowledge and skills related to occupational health and safety. Training projects may teach people how to use equipment, follow safe operating procedures or correctly handle hazardous materials. Training is generally delivered in the context of an active workplace and has a practical connotation. Education programs are generally delivered by public education institutions or certification bodies and are designed to create the foundation of knowledge, principles and practices for

occupational health and safety and the prevention of workplace injury and illness.

#### ***4.2 Support of Industry Associations or Safety Associations***

Before submitting an application under the RWIP's Training and Education funding stream, the applicant is encouraged to consult and obtain the support of key stakeholders such as industry associations or safety associations. The WCB also encourages the applicant to obtain financial or in-kind investment from stakeholders who support the project.

To obtain more information on industry associations, safety associations or other key stakeholders related to a project application in the Training and Education funding stream, please contact:

Bruce M. Cielen

Manager, Research and Workplace Innovation Program

1010-363 Broadway

Winnipeg, MB R3C 3N9

Email [bcielen@wcb.mb.ca](mailto:bcielen@wcb.mb.ca) or call (204) 954-4650 or toll-free 1-800-362-3340 or Fax: (204) 954-4995

To obtain more information on the Training and Education priorities identified in *Manitoba's Five-Year Plan for Workplace Injury and Illness Prevention*, please contact:

Dwight Doell

Director, SAFE Work Services

(204) 954-4571

[Ddoell@wcb.mb.ca](mailto:Ddoell@wcb.mb.ca)

#### ***4.3 Training and Education Application***

Applicants interested in requesting funding under this stream are required to submit an application using the application format provided on the WCB website for this program. Please [click here for the application](#) or copy and paste the link below into your browser:

<http://www.wcb.mb.ca/sites/default/files/files/Training-Edu%20application.docx>

#### ***4.4 Eligibility for Funding under the Training and Education Stream***

Applicants must be engaged in occupational health and safety in Manitoba and demonstrate knowledge, expertise and proficiency in the development and delivery of education and training programs. Eligible applicants include qualified educators, trainers, health and safety professionals, healthcare professionals, labour organizations, unions, employers, employer associations, safety groups, industry associations and research organizations.

#### ***4.5 Knowledge Transfer and Information Sharing Plan***

The WCB is interested in the transfer of knowledge and information sharing with those who can use the information in the prevention of workplace injuries, or in reducing occupational illness, injury, and disability in Manitoba. The application must provide a description of the dissemination strategies that will be used to communicate and share the project's outcomes with other workplaces, key user groups, potential audiences and or practitioners in the occupational health and safety community.

The Evaluation Criteria to be used by the WCB's Selection Panel is shown in ATTACHMENT D.



## 5. OTHER PROGRAM INFORMATION

### Applicable to Projects in all Funding Streams

#### 5.1 *Identifying and Mitigating Risk*

To ensure that the projects result in successful outcomes, the WCB requires that all applications identify potential risks and include a plan for risk mitigation. These considerations should be clearly explained in the application.

#### 5.2 **NEW** *Project Funding for Capital Expenditure*

The WCB will consider funding the purchase or lease of equipment, technology or software licenses within an approved project's budget. The amount of funding will not exceed ten percent (10%) of the funding approved by the WCB for the project.

#### 5.3 *Restrictions on Program Funding*

The RWIP will not fund or support the following:

- ❖ All or a portion of an organization's operational expenses;
- ❖ Administrative surcharges or overhead percentage fees required by institutions to administer funds to researchers affiliated with the institution, although reasonable administrative expenses are eligible to be covered;
- ❖ Compensation for salaries, time-off or gratuities for employees in workplaces involved in an innovation project;
- ❖ Capital projects; or
- ❖ Profit-driven research and development projects.

#### 5.4 *Meritorious Projects*

The WCB has the discretion to fund meritorious projects which may not exactly fit within the three funding streams, but which still fit within the mandate of the Program.

#### 5.5 *Use of WCB Data*

This section only applies to applicants who will require WCB Manitoba data. Data from the WCB's database may be released for a project subject to the provisions in Policy 21.50.50, *Release of Statistical Data*.

Applicants requiring access to WCB data are advised to contact the Manager, Research and Workplace Innovation Program, prior to submitting the application and specify data elements needed, and their purpose. The WCB cannot guarantee the availability of all data required. The link to Policy 21.50.50, *Release of Statistical Data* is shown below.

[Release of Statistical Data | Workers Compensation Board of Manitoba](#)

## 6. CONTRACT INFORMATION

Successful applicants are required to enter into a formal funding agreement with the WCB. The funding agreement sets out the terms and conditions of funding including:

- a. The objectives and term of the project
- b. The amount of the funding award and the project's itemized budget

### ***6.1 Conditions Regarding the Use of Funding***

Grant recipients are required to hold project funding in trust and are required to return all project funding not required or expended upon completion of the project.

The funds awarded to each grant recipient are for use exclusively against expenditure items specified in the funding agreement. Some flexibility may be permitted for reallocation from one budget category to another within the approved budget. The movement of expenditure items within an approved budget requires prior authorization by the WCB.

Project payments are distributed over the term of the project, typically every four to five months, and are issued upon the WCB's satisfactory receipt of project deliverables that include progress and financial reports provided in a format satisfactory to the WCB.

Grant recipients are required to notify the WCB immediately of any unforeseen delays affecting the timing of the project.

### ***6.2 Grant Termination***

The WCB may terminate a grant where:

- ❖ The grant recipient has failed to meet the obligations set out in the funding agreement;
- ❖ There is evidence of misuse of funding; or
- ❖ The grant recipient is no longer able to complete the project to the WCB's satisfaction.

### ***6.3 Intellectual Property***

The grant recipient retains intellectual property rights to the outcome of the project. However, the WCB retains the right to use all material gathered or produced as a consequence of project funding in any manner it considers useful without further payment beyond the grant support.

### ***6.4 Liability***

The WCB has no liability or duty in connection with the project other than its commitment to provide the funds pursuant to the conditions outlined in the funding agreement.

## **7. INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING APPLICATIONS**

Applicants are expected to use the application formats developed for scientific research, workplace innovation or training and education based on the subject matter and focus of their submission. Applicants may download a Word version of the application from the WCB website or should contact [Janine Swanson](#) for an electronic version.

In cases where the application does not easily fall into any of the three funding streams but falls within the mandate of the RWIP, the applicant should use whichever format is the best fit and provide the information that would enable the WCB to properly review the application.

The WCB will not request clarification from any applicant regarding a submission. Each applicant will need to represent their funding request clearly and within the parameters established for each funding stream.

### ***7.1 Separate Applications for Each Funding Stream***

An applicant is permitted to apply for funding in one or more of the three funding streams under the RWIP (scientific research, workplace innovation or training and education) at the same time. If an applicant chooses to submit applications in more than one funding stream, then the application should reflect the core purpose of the selected funding stream.

There is no advantage to requesting funding for the same project under more than one funding stream. The RWIP will not fund projects that request funding from more than one funding stream for the same project.

## ***7.2 Length of Application***

There are no limits on the length of the application. Instead, ALL the sections of the application should be addressed and the information requested be provided.

## ***7.3 Supporting Information***

Where the applicant is providing supporting material (newspaper articles, etc.) it should be referenced in the body of the application and attached as appendices.

## ***7.4 Letters of Support***

Where the applicant is providing Letters of Support these should be attached at the end of the application.

## ***7.5 Application Format***

Each page of the application should be numbered and include the title of the project. Use a 12-point font throughout the application. The application should not be bound or stapled.

## ***7.6 Explanation of Budget and Justification of Budget Items***

The WCB will provide support for the direct costs of the project including project assistance, support for technical, professional and secretarial services, equipment (purchase or rental), project-related travel and supplies. Project costs may include reasonable administrative costs, but should not include costs of salary replacement for staff involved in the project.

Applicants must also demonstrate that the WCB grant and/or any financing from other sources will provide adequate financial support to achieve the objectives of the proposal. The budget quantifies the timetable and work plan to undertake the project. Budget items are to be related to the objectives and requirements of the proposed project and demonstrate the link between the project's activities/work-plan. The applicant must provide a description and a brief justification for each budget item essential for the conduct of the project. The following budget items are identified for inclusion in the project's budget:

- ❖ Salaries, benefits and consultancy fees
- ❖ Materials and supplies

- ❖ Equipment
- ❖ Knowledge transfer
- ❖ Travel
- ❖ Accommodation and Meals
- ❖ Specific project costs met by the employer and
- ❖ Other costs.

### ***7.7 Electronic Submissions of Applications***

When the application is submitted electronically, it must be followed by a signed hard copy by end of the business day:

**May 12, 2014** for scientific research applications,

**June 24, 2014** for workplace innovation projects and education and training projects.

The electronic copy of the completed application form **must be identical** (with the exception of signatures) to the submitted hard copies of the form. Non-identical copies may disqualify the applicant from the competition.

### ***7.8 Resubmissions***

An applicant, who in a previous RWIP grant competition had not been awarded funding, and, is re-submitting an application under the current competition, must provide a response to the comments and critiques of the WCB. In the case of scientific research applications, the WCB's comments would have included the evaluation from peer reviewers. The applicant should indicate how the re-submitted application is revised based on the feedback provided by the WCB in its letter informing the applicant about the status of his or her previous application.

### ***7.9 WCB Travel, Accommodation and Meal Rates***

Use this information when estimating travel, accommodation and meal costs in the budget section of your application.

The information is shown in ATTACHMENT E.

## 8. DESTINATION OF APPLICATIONS

Mail or deliver your application to:

**Bruce M. Cielen**  
**Manager, Research and Workplace Innovation Program**  
**1010-363 Broadway**  
**Winnipeg, MB R3C 3N9**

If you have any questions or difficulties completing the application you may contact [bcielen@wcb.mb.ca](mailto:bcielen@wcb.mb.ca) or call (204) 954-4650 or toll-free 1-800-362-3340 or Fax: (204) 954-4995

## 9. ATTACHMENT A: WCB PANEL-EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH APPLICATIONS

DIMENSION 1 - IMPORTANCE AND RELEVANCE TO THE WCB		
Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>The issues addressed are significant enough to warrant WCB investment.</p> <p>The problem and issues identified to be researched are frequently encountered and the impact is severe on workplaces and workers affected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Significant number of claims;</li> <li>○ Impacts on significant proportion of covered workers.</li> </ul> <p>The project will improve workplace safety and health.</p> <p>Project results and products will be relevant in the immediate term, or as part of the larger body of knowledge, over the longer term.</p> <p>The proposal includes initiatives for knowledge transfer to workplace safety and health.</p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project addresses issues that are very relevant and extremely important to the WCB.</li> <li>• This project has very strong potential to positively impact workplace health and safety.</li> <li>• It will have an impact on a significant number of workers and workplaces.</li> <li>• There is both a very strong commitment and a plan to transfer knowledge of study results to both academic and workplace parties.</li> </ul>
	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project addresses issues that are relevant and important to the WCB.</li> <li>• The project has potential to positively impact workplace health and safety.</li> <li>• It will have an impact on WCB covered workers and workplaces.</li> <li>• The researchers are committed to knowledge transfer of project results and include acceptable methods to transfer knowledge to academic and workplace parties</li> </ul>
	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project somewhat addresses issues that are relevant or important to the WCB.</li> <li>• There may be a positive impact on workplace health and safety.</li> <li>• It will have a limited impact on a small number of WCB covered workers and workplaces.</li> <li>• The researchers are vague about for knowledge transfer of project results.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project addresses issues that are neither relevant nor important to the WCB.</li> <li>• This project is not likely to positively impact workplace health and safety and may, in fact have an adverse effect.</li> <li>• It will have a no impact on WCB workers and workplaces.</li> <li>• The researchers do not have a plan for knowledge transfer of project results.</li> </ul>
DIMENSION 2 - QUALITY OF THE PROPOSAL		
Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>The research proposal is well thought-out, original and clearly presented.</p> <p>The project addresses un-explored issues or problems in the workplace.</p> <p>Research objectives are clearly described and demonstrate the practical significance of the proposed research.</p> <p>There is a clear explanation of key issues that will be addressed.</p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The research proposal is <b>very clearly</b> original and <b>most definitely does not</b> duplicate other studies as demonstrated in the literature review.</li> <li>• The project is <b>exceptionally well</b> thought out, <b>logical, very practical</b> in approach and <b>very clearly and logically</b> presented.</li> <li>• Research objectives are <b>clearly stated</b> and their relevance to workers compensation is <b>very thoroughly</b> addressed.</li> </ul>
	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The research proposal is <b>somewhat</b> original and <b>does not appear to</b> duplicate other studies as demonstrated in the literature review.</li> <li>• The project is <b>well</b> thought out, <b>logical, practical</b> and <b>clearly</b> presented.</li> <li>• Research objectives are clearly stated. Key issues relevant to workers compensation are <b>adequately</b> explored.</li> </ul>



<p>The objectives of the project may not be achieved through existing mechanisms and does not duplicate existing programs or services offered by other organizations.</p>	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research proposal <b>may duplicate</b> other studies as demonstrated in the literature review.</li> <li>The study is not well presented, and the overall approach needs to be revamped.</li> <li>Research objectives are <b>not well expressed</b>. Key issues relevant to workers compensation are explored in <b> cursory fashion</b>.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research proposal is <b>not</b> original and <b>clearly duplicates</b> other studies as demonstrated in the literature review.</li> <li>The project is <b>very poorly</b> presented. The overall approach needs to be <b>completely</b> redesigned.</li> <li>Research objectives are not at all <b>clear</b>. The <b>relevance</b> of the project to workers compensation is <b>not addressed</b>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>DIMENSION 3 - MANAGEMENT &amp; RISK ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED RESEARCH</b></p>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<p>There is a comprehensive and reliable work-plan to achieve research goals.</p> <p>The plan's proposed timeline is achievable as critical milestones are identified to ensure completion within the specified time.</p> <p>The estimated costs related to key research activities are specified.</p> <p>The risk assessment identifies and describes potential risks, adequately assesses each risk and provides measures to mitigate each risk. The proposed alternative approaches are practical and achievable and will not derail the project.</p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>extremely well</b> developed and conceived, goals clearly defined and critical milestones identified within a <b>very realistic</b> timeframe.</li> <li>It is <b>extremely likely</b> that the project will <b>successfully achieve</b> its goals and be completed on time.</li> <li>The proponents have <b>thoughtfully and critically</b> considered every possible risk to the project and propose <b>very realistic and practical solutions</b> to mitigate potential risks.</li> </ul>
	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>fairly well</b> developed and conceived, goals clearly defined and critical milestones identified within a <b>reasonable</b> framework and <b>realistic</b> timeframe.</li> <li>It is <b>likely</b> that the project will <b>achieve</b> its goals and be completed within the proposed timeframe.</li> <li>The proponents have identified some potential obstacles and propose <b>workable alternatives</b> to mitigate potential risks.</li> </ul>
	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>reasonably</b> developed but goals and key milestones are poorly defined. The timeframe may not be realistic.</li> <li>It is <b>uncertain whether</b> the project will completed within a reasonable time frame.</li> <li>The proponents do not demonstrate that they have given adequate consideration to potential obstacles and solutions to mitigate risks.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work plan is <b>vague and inadequate</b>. The proposal would need to be reconsidered and redeveloped.</li> <li>It is <b>unlikely</b> that the study will achieve its purposes or be completed within a reasonable time frame.</li> <li>The researchers <b>have not undertaken</b> a risk assessment.</li> </ul>

## 10. ATTACHMENT B: PEER REVIEWERS-EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH APPLICATIONS

DIMENSION 1 - SCIENTIFIC MERIT		
Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>The research proposal is well thought-out, original, clearly presented and embodies leading edge approaches and technology.</p> <p>Relevant literature is critically appraised, evaluated and includes a thorough explanation of strengths, weaknesses or limitations of the existing literature and data.</p> <p>Research objectives are clearly described and demonstrate the practical significance of the proposed research.</p> <p>There is a clear explanation of key issues that will be addressed.</p> <p>The study disciplines are relevant to the scope and intended outcomes of the research proposal.</p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research proposal is original, <b>exceptionally</b> well thought out and includes <b>very clear</b> explanations of key issues that will be addressed. The proposal embodies <b>leading edge</b> approaches and technology demonstrating the <b>extremely high</b> caliber and excellence of the researcher/s.</li> <li>The literature review is <b>remarkably exhaustive</b>.</li> <li>Study results would <b>strongly impact</b> areas of concern important to workers compensation and <b>substantially advance</b> knowledge and understanding in this area.</li> </ul>
	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal is <b>original, well thought out</b> and includes explanations of key issues that will be addressed. The proposal embodies <b>up-to-date</b> approaches and technology demonstrating the <b>high</b> caliber of the researcher/s.</li> <li>The literature review is <b>thorough</b>.</li> <li>Study results would have <b>impact</b> on areas of concern important to workers compensation and <b>contribute</b> to the body of knowledge and understanding in this area.</li> </ul>
	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal is <b>not thoroughly</b> conceived and <b>lacks clarity</b> in the explanations of key issues that will be addressed. The study approaches and technology are <b>appropriate</b>.</li> <li>The literature review is <b>incomplete</b>, and <b>does not</b> demonstrate knowledge of the area of study.</li> <li>Study results would have <b>limited impact</b> in areas of concern important to workers compensation or add to knowledge and understanding in this area.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal is <b>poorly conceived</b> and <b>seriously limited</b> in its explanation of key issues that the study will address.</li> <li>The literature review is <b>very poor</b>, demonstrating a lack of core knowledge in this area of study.</li> <li>It is <b>highly conceivable</b> that the results of the study would <b>not impact</b> on the areas of concern important to workers compensation.</li> </ul>
DIMENSION 2 - RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY		
Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>The methodology and study disciplines are clearly described and parallel the objectives of the study.</p> <p>The data acquisition methods are practical and free of bias.</p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research design and methodology is <b>extremely well grounded scientifically, very clearly</b> described and <b>aligns</b> with the objectives of the study.</li> <li>The methods specified for data collection and analysis are <b>highly appropriate</b> and free of bias.</li> <li>The sampling will yield <b>very reliable and valid</b> results.</li> <li>Very potential ethical issues related to the study are identified and resolved.</li> <li>There is a both a <b>very strong commitment and a plan</b> to transfer knowledge of study results to <b>both</b> academic and workplace parties.</li> </ul>

<p>The measures specified for the analysis of the data are appropriate.</p> <p>The study sample is well-defined and the numbers of subjects in the study are sufficient to answer the research question unambiguously.</p> <p>The study is ethically sound.</p> <p>The proposal includes initiatives for knowledge transfer to workplace safety and health stakeholders.</p>	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research design and methodology is scientifically <b>acceptable and aligns</b> with the objectives of the study.</li> <li>The methods specified for data collection and analysis are <b>appropriate</b>.</li> <li>The sampling will yield <b>reliable and reasonably valid</b> results.</li> <li>Ethical issues related to the study are identified and resolved.</li> <li>The researchers are <b>committed</b> to knowledge transfer of study results and include <b>acceptable</b> methods to transfer knowledge to academic and workplace parties.</li> </ul>
	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research design and methodology <b>have limitations and should be revised and corrected</b> to align with the objectives of the study. The methods specified for data collection <b>are weak and limits accurate</b> or verifiable analysis.</li> <li>The sampling is <b>not sufficiently representative</b> of the study population and most likely affect the reliability and validity of the study results.</li> <li>The ethical issues related to the study are <b>not clearly</b> identified or resolved.</li> <li>The researchers are <b>vague</b> about the knowledge transfer of study results.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The research design and methodology are <b>not scientifically acceptable</b> and <b>do not</b> synchronize with the objectives of the study. The methods specified for data collection <b>are very weak</b> and <b>will not</b> permit accurate or verifiable analysis.</li> <li>The sampling is <b>not representative</b> of the study population and <b>will not yield</b> reliable results.</li> <li>The ethical issues related to the study are <b>not</b> identified or resolved.</li> <li>The researchers are <b>not committed</b> to knowledge transfer of study results.</li> </ul>

**DIMENSION 3 - MANAGEMENT OF PROPOSED RESEARCH & RISK ASSESSMENT**

Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>There is a comprehensive and realistic work-plan to achieve research goals.</p> <p>The plan's proposed timeline is achievable as critical milestones are identified to ensure completion within the specified time.</p> <p>The estimated costs related to key research activities are specified.</p> <p>The risk assessment identifies and describes potential risks, adequately assesses each risk and provides measures to mitigate each risk.</p> <p>The proposed alternative approaches are practical and achievable and will not derail the study.</p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>extremely well</b> developed, goals are clearly defined and critical milestones identified within a <b>very realistic</b> timeframe.</li> <li>It appears to be <b>extremely likely</b> that the study will <b>successfully achieve</b> its goals and be completed on time.</li> <li>The proponents have <b>thoughtfully and critically considered every possible risk</b> to the project and propose <b>very realistic and practical solutions</b> to mitigate potential risks.</li> </ul>
	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>fairly well</b> developed and conceived, goals are defined and milestones identified within a <b>reasonable</b> framework and <b>realistic</b> timeframe.</li> <li>It is <b>likely</b> that the study will achieve its goals and be completed within the proposed timeframe.</li> <li>The proponents have identified <b>some</b> potential obstacles and propose <b>workable alternatives</b> to mitigate potential risks.</li> </ul>
	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>reasonably</b> developed but goals and key milestones are poorly defined. The time frame may not be realistic.</li> <li>It is <b>uncertain whether</b> the project will be completed within a reasonable time frame.</li> <li>The proponents <b>do not demonstrate that they have given adequate consideration</b> to potential obstacles and solutions to mitigate risks.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>vague and inadequate</b>. The proposal would need to be reconsidered and redeveloped.</li> <li>It is <b>unlikely</b> that the study will achieve its purposes or be completed within a</li> </ul>

		<p>reasonable time frame.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The researchers <b>have not undertaken</b> a risk assessment.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

**DIMENSION 4 - BUDGET**

Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>The project's resource requirements are well thought out and thoroughly described with clear justification for each budget item.</p> <p><i>(Resources include human, physical, financial, and technological)</i></p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget justification is <b>thorough and very clear</b>. The overall budget is <b>within an acceptable range</b> for studies of this scope and type.</li> <li>Administrative costs are <b>very fair</b> and do not include blanket percentage administrative surcharges imposed by the institutions.</li> <li>Budget expenditures and the study's milestones are <b>very closely linked</b>.</li> <li>There is <b>no duplication</b> of resources or funding from other sources.</li> </ul>
<p>Administrative costs are reasonable and do not include blanket surcharges for institutional overheads.</p> <p>There is no duplication or overlap in funding.</p>	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget justification is <b>complete and clear</b>. The overall budget is <b>somewhat higher or lower</b> than would normally be seen for studies of this scope and type.</li> <li>Administrative costs are <b>reasonably fair</b> and do not include blanket percentage administrative surcharges imposed by the institutions.</li> <li>Budget expenditures and the study's milestones are <b>linked</b>.</li> <li>There is <b>no duplication</b> of resources or funding from other sources.</li> </ul>
<p>There is a clear link between budget line items and the study's work-plan.</p>	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget justification is weak and incomplete. The overall budget is <b>much higher or lower</b> than would normally be seen for studies of this scope and type.</li> <li>Administrative costs and institutional overheads are somewhat <b>higher than expected</b>.</li> <li>The link between budget expenditures and the study's milestones are <b>vague or undefined</b>.</li> <li><b>There may be some duplication</b> of resources or funding from other sources.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget justification is <b>extremely weak</b> or missing. The overall budget is <b>unacceptably high or significantly lower</b> than would normally be seen for studies of this scope and type.</li> <li>Administrative costs and institutional overheads are <b>much higher than expected</b></li> <li>The link between budget expenditures and the study's milestones is <b>quite unclear</b>.</li> <li><b>It is very likely</b> that duplication of resources or funding from other sources may occur.</li> </ul>

**DIMENSION 5 - EXPERTISE**

Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>There is a clear fit in the knowledge, expertise and experience of the research team with the disciplines required for undertaking the research proposal.</p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an <b>excellent</b> representation of relevant disciplines.</li> <li>The PI is a <b>nationally or internationally-recognized leader in his or her field</b> and has <b>exceptional knowledge</b> in all areas of the study.</li> <li>The researchers have access to <b>first class facilities</b> and resources.</li> <li>Given their documented experience and expertise, the reviewer is <b>highly confident</b> that the applicants can do the work proposed.</li> </ul>
<p>The Principal Investigator (PI) has made significant contributions to research in this area and is capable of coordinating and managing the proposed project.</p> <p>The team has sufficient access to</p>	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an <b>adequate</b> representation of relevant disciplines.</li> <li>The PI is known to have a <b>strong background</b> in the discipline related to the study and has undertaken <b>well-regarded</b> studies in this field.</li> <li>The researchers <b>have access to good</b> facilities and resources.</li> <li>Given their documented experience and expertise, the reviewer is <b>confident</b> that the applicants can do the work proposed.</li> </ul>

resources and the scientific environment in which the work will be done will support the successful completion of the study.	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an <b>inadequate</b> representation of relevant disciplines.</li> <li>• The researchers have <b>limited knowledge</b> in the study area and have had <b>limited previous involvement</b> in research activities related to the current proposal.</li> <li>• The researchers' access to appropriate facilities and resources is limited.</li> <li>• Given their documented experience and expertise, the reviewer is <b>not confident</b> about the capability and expertise of the applicants to do the work proposed.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relevant disciplines are <b>poorly represented</b>.</li> <li>• The researchers <b>do not have acceptable knowledge</b> in the study area with <b>little or no involvement</b> in research activities related to the current proposal.</li> <li>• There is <b>some</b> access to facilities and resources.</li> <li>• Given their documented experience and expertise, the reviewer is <b>reasonably certain</b> that the applicants <b>do not have</b> the capability and expertise to do the work proposed.</li> </ul>

## 11. ATTACHMENT C: WCB PANEL-EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR WORKPLACE INNOVATION APPLICATIONS

DIMENSION 1 - INNOVATION AND KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER		
Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p><b>The project is clearly innovative. Innovation can be defined as:</b>                      “The act of introducing something new: (The American Heritage Dictionary)                      “A new idea, method or device” (Webster Online)                      “Change that indicates a new dimension of performance” (Peter Drucker)</p> <p><b>The proponent has clearly demonstrated that the project uses new or existing knowledge, ideas, processes, products and services to change and improve the health and safety environment of a specific workplace.</b></p> <p><b>The project’s outcomes will be practical and concrete.</b></p> <p><b>The project includes provision for knowledge transfer or information sharing of results.</b></p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>Very High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal <b>very convincingly</b> demonstrates that the project is innovative. The project <b>does not in any way</b> duplicate other programs or services.</li> <li>The project will <b>strongly impact</b> and improve the health and safety environment of an identified workplace. The workplace must be a partner in the project.</li> <li>The project provides <b>very creative</b> solutions for specific health and safety problems in an identified workplace.</li> <li>A plan to share the outcomes of the project with other workplaces is an <b>integral</b> part of the project.</li> </ul>
	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal demonstrates <b>reasonably well</b> that the project is innovative. The project <b>does not appear</b> to duplicate other programs or services.</li> <li>The project will <b>impact</b> and improve the health and safety environment of an identified workplace. The workplace must be a partner in the project.</li> <li>The project provides somewhat creative solutions for specific health and safety problems in an identified workplace.</li> <li>A plan to share the outcomes of the project with other workplaces is an integral part of the project.</li> </ul>
	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project appears to be <b>somewhat</b> innovative. It is not clear whether the project duplicates other programs or services.</li> <li>The project <b>may have an impact</b> and may improve the health and safety environment of an identified workplace. The workplace must be a partner in the project.</li> <li>The project’s solution to specific health and safety problems <b>may be</b> creative, but it requires further development.</li> <li>There is <b>little or no mention</b> of sharing outcomes of the project with others.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is <b>not</b> innovative. It seems to duplicate other programs or services.</li> <li>The project is <b>not likely</b> to have an impact on the health and safety environment of a workplace. The project is not being conducted with the full involvement of a workplace.</li> <li>The project’s solution to specific health and safety problems is <b>not</b> creative or novel development.</li> <li>There is <b>no mention</b> of sharing outcomes of the project with others.</li> </ul>
DIMENSION 2 - IMPORTANCE AND RELEVANCE TO THE WCB AND THE WORKPLACE		
Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p><b>The issues addressed are significant enough to warrant WCB investment.</b></p> <p><b>The project will improve workplace health and safety.</b></p> <p><b>The project's activities comply with <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i></b></p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>Very High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project addresses issues that are <b>very relevant</b> and <b>extremely important</b> to the WCB.</li> <li>This project has <b>very strong</b> potential to <b>positively impact</b> workplace health and safety and the project's activities <b>very clearly supports</b> <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i></li> <li>There is <b>very strong support</b>, both over the short and long term, for the project from potential end-users in the workplace.</li> <li>There is a <b>commitment to sustain</b> the program following the cessation of WCB funding.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Project results and products will be relevant in the short and a longer term period.</b></p> <p><b>There may be a plan to continue and sustain the project in the workplace after WCB funding.</b></p>	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project addresses issues that are <b>relevant</b> and <b>important</b> to the WCB.</li> <li>This project has potential to <b>positively impact</b> workplace health and safety and the project's activities <b>supports</b> <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i>.</li> <li>There is <b>support</b>, both over the short and long term, for the project from potential end-users in the workplace.</li> <li>There is a <b>reasonable plan to sustain</b> the program following the cessation of WCB funding.</li> </ul>
	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project <b>somewhat</b> addresses issues that are <b>relevant</b> or <b>important</b> to the WCB.</li> <li>There may be a positive impact on workplace health and safety and the project's activities are <b>somewhat in support</b> of <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i>.</li> <li>There is <b>little</b> demonstrated <b>support</b> for the project from potential end-users in the workplace.</li> <li>There is <b>some indication</b> that the program would be sustained following the cessation of WCB funding.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project addresses issues that are neither <b>relevant</b> nor <b>important</b> to the WCB.</li> <li>This project is not likely to positively <b>impact</b> workplace health and safety and may, in fact have an adverse effect. The project's activities are <b>do not support</b> <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i>.</li> <li>There is <b>no</b> indication of <b>support</b> for the project from workplace parties and potential end-users in the workplace.</li> <li>There is <b>no indication</b> that the program would be sustained following the cessation of WCB funding.</li> </ul>

**DIMENSION 3 - PROJECT MANAGEMENT & RISK ASSESSMENT**

Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p><b>There is a comprehensive, reasonable and achievable work-plan to achieve project goals.</b></p> <p><b>Critical milestones are identified to ensure completion within the specified time.</b></p> <p><b>The risk assessment identifies and describes potential risks, adequately assesses each risk and provides measures to mitigate each risk. The proposed alternative approaches are practical and achievable and will not derail the project.</b></p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>Very High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>extremely well</b> developed, goals are clearly defined and critical milestones identified within a <b>very</b> practical framework and <b>realistic</b> timeframe.</li> <li>It is <b>extremely likely</b> that the project will <b>successfully achieve</b> its goals and be completed within the proposed timeframe.</li> <li>The proponents demonstrate that they have <b>thoughtfully and critically considered every possible risk</b> to the project and propose <b>very realistic and practical</b> solutions to mitigate potential risks.</li> </ul>
	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>fairly well</b> developed, goals are clearly defined and critical milestones identified within a <b>reasonable</b> framework and <b>realistic</b> timeframe.</li> <li>It is <b>likely</b> that the project will successfully achieve its goals and be completed within the proposed timeframe.</li> <li>The proponents have identified <b>some</b> potential obstacles and propose <b>workable</b> alternatives to mitigate potential risks.</li> </ul>
	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>reasonably</b> developed, but the goals and key milestones are <b>poorly defined. The timeframe may not be realistic.</b></li> <li>It is <b>uncertain whether</b> the project will be completed within a reasonable time frame.</li> <li>The proponents <b>do not demonstrate that they have given adequate consideration</b> to potential obstacles and solutions to mitigate risks.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>vague and inadequate.</b> The proposal would need to be <b>reconsidered and re-developed</b> into an acceptable framework.</li> <li>It is <b>unlikely</b> that the study will achieve its purposes or be completed within a reasonable timeframe.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proponents <b>have not</b> undertaken a risk assessment.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

**DIMENSION 4 - PROJECT BUDGET**

Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>The project's resource requirements are well thought out and thoroughly described with clear justification for each budget item. <i>(Resources include human, physical, financial, and technological)</i></p> <p>Financial and in-kind support from the employer and other workplace parties is encouraged, but is not required.</p> <p>Project costs are reasonable and do not include salaries or benefits for employees participating in the project. However, salaries for a new position created expressly for the purposes of the project or fees for consultants who are engaged to manage the project are acceptable budget items.</p> <p>There is no duplication or overlap in funding.</p> <p>There is a clear link between budget line items and the project's work-plan.</p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>Very High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget justification is <b>thorough and very clear</b>.</li> <li>There is <b>significant</b> financial and in-kind support from workplace parties.</li> <li>The project costs are <b>very reasonable</b> and do not include the cost of salaries or benefits for employees participating in the project.</li> <li>Budget expenditures and the project milestones are clearly linked and there is no <b>duplication</b> of resources or funding form other sources.</li> </ul>
	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget justification is <b>complete and clear</b>.</li> <li>There is <b>either</b> financial or in-kind support from workplace parties.</li> <li>The projects costs are <b>acceptable</b> and do not include the cost of salaries or benefits for employees participating in the project.</li> <li>The between budget expenditures and the project's milestones could be better explained. There is no <b>duplication</b> of resources or funding form other sources.</li> </ul>
	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget justification is <b>weak</b> and incomplete.</li> <li>There is <b>minimal</b> financial or in-kind support from workplace parties.</li> <li>The projects costs are <b>unreasonably high or low</b>. Salaries of employees participating in the project may be included and so the budget would need to be reworked.</li> <li>The link between budget expenditures and the project's milestones is quite unclear. <b>There may be some duplication</b> of resources or funding form other sources and would require clarification.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget justification is <b>extremely weak</b> or missing.</li> <li>There is <b>no financial or in-kind</b> support from workplace parties.</li> <li>The projects costs are <b>either unreasonably high or low</b>. Salaries of employees participating in the project may be included and so the budget would need to be reworked.</li> <li>The link between budget expenditures and the project's milestones is quite unclear. <b>There may be some duplication</b> of resources or funding form other sources and would require clarification.</li> </ul>

**DIMENSION 5 - EXPERTISE OF PROJECT TEAM**

Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>The project team has been clearly identified and has the skills to successfully undertake the project.</p> <p>The project leader and/or team members have experience managing projects of a similar size and scope.</p> <p>The proponent and project staff have the knowledge,</p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>Very High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project team has <b>exceptional knowledge</b> in all areas related to the proposed project.</li> <li>The project leader has <b>demonstrated a track record in successfully managing several projects</b> of this nature.</li> <li>Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team, the reviewer is <b>highly confident</b> that the applicant will complete the project successfully.</li> </ul>
	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project team has <b>knowledge</b> in all areas related to the proposed project.</li> <li>The project leader has <b>successfully managing a similar project</b>.</li> <li>Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team, the reviewer is <b>reasonably confident</b> that the applicant will complete the project successfully.</li> </ul>



<p>expertise and experience to undertake and bring this project to a successful conclusion.</p>	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project team would need to consider <b>hiring or purchasing the services of external advisors</b> with the knowledge and experience required to undertake the proposed project.</li> <li>• The project leader <b>may have managed or participated in projects in the past.</b></li> <li>• Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team, the reviewer is <b>not certain</b> that the applicant will complete the project successfully without external assistance.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project team <b>must hire or purchase the services of external advisors</b> in order to be considered for funding.</li> <li>• The project leader has <b>never managed or participated in similar projects in the past.</b></li> <li>• Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team. The reviewer is <b>not confident</b> that the applicant will complete the project successfully, even with external assistance.</li> </ul>

## 12. **NEW** ATTACHMENT D: WCB PANEL-EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TRAINING AND EDUCATION APPLICATIONS

DIMENSION 1 - DEVELOPS CAPACITY IN OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY		
Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>The project has the potential to develop and expand capacity in occupational health and safety (OHS), injury prevention, return to work (RTW), and treatment of occupational illnesses.</p> <p>The project will address gaps in the delivery of education and training specifying the: Target group/s Subject matter and core content</p> <p>The application is comprehensive and thorough providing a clear description of the: structure, design delivery resource requirements for the training and education program/activity</p> <p>The project's outcomes will be practical and concrete.</p> <p>The project includes provision for knowledge transfer and information sharing of results.</p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>Very High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal <b>demonstrates convincingly</b> that the project will make a <b>significant contribution</b> to increasing capacity in OHS, injury prevention, RTW and treatment of occupational illnesses.</li> <li>The project <b>does not in any way</b> duplicate the subject matter or core content of other education, training programs or services.</li> <li>This is a <b>very high</b> quality proposal, very comprehensive in its structure, design, delivery and resource requirements.</li> <li>There is a <b>very realistic</b> plan to share the outcomes of the project with other workplaces or target groups.</li> </ul>
	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal <b>demonstrates</b> that the project will make a <b>contribution</b> to increasing capacity in OHS, injury prevention, RTW and treatment of occupational illnesses.</li> <li>The project <b>does not</b> duplicate the subject matter or core content of other education, training programs or services.</li> <li>This is <b>good</b> quality proposal, comprehensive in its structure, design, delivery and resource requirements.</li> <li>There is a <b>reasonable</b> plan to share the outcomes of the project with other workplaces or target groups.</li> </ul>
	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal is <b>vague</b> about its contribution to increasing capacity in OHS, injury prevention, RTW and treatment of occupational illnesses.</li> <li>There is <b>some overlap</b> in the subject matter/core content with other education, training programs or services.</li> <li>The quality of the proposal is <b>of concern</b> in terms of its structure, design, delivery and resource requirements.</li> <li>There is <b>little or no mention</b> of sharing outcomes of the project with others.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal is <b>extremely vague</b> about its contribution to increasing capacity in OHS, injury prevention, RTW and treatment of occupational illnesses.</li> <li>There is <b>clearly an overlap</b> in the subject matter/core content with other education, training programs or services.</li> <li>There are <b>serious concerns</b> with the quality of the proposal in terms of its structure, design, delivery and resource requirements.</li> <li>There is <b>no mention</b> of sharing outcomes of the project with others.</li> </ul>
DIMENSION 2 - IMPORTANCE AND RELEVANCE TO THE WCB AND THE WORKPLACE		
Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>The project is relevant to the training priorities identified in <i>Manitoba's Five-year Plan for Workplace Injury and Illness Prevention</i></p> <p>The application demonstrates why the project is necessary and how it will improve</p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>Very High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project addresses issues that are <b>very relevant</b> and <b>extremely important</b> to the WCB.</li> <li>The proposed training and education <b>very clearly aligns</b> with the priorities identified in <i>Manitoba's Five-year Plan for Workplace Injury and Illness Prevention</i></li> <li>The project will <b>strongly impact</b> and improve knowledge, understanding and awareness of OHS, injury prevention, RTW and treatments for occupational illnesses among the target groups identified for the project.</li> <li>There is a <b>strong commitment to sustain</b> the education and training program delivery</li> </ul>

<p>workplace health and safety.</p> <p>The identified gaps in education and training are significant enough to warrant WCB investment.</p> <p>Project results and products will be relevant in the short and a longer term period.</p>		following the cessation of WCB funding.
	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project addresses issues that are <b>relevant</b> and <b>important</b> to the WCB.</li> <li>The proposed training and education <b>aligns</b> with the priorities identified in <i>Manitoba's Five-year Plan for Workplace Injury and Illness Prevention</i></li> <li>The project will <b>impact</b> and improve knowledge, understanding and awareness of OHS, injury prevention, RTW and treatments for occupational illnesses among the target groups identified for the project.</li> <li>There is a <b>commitment to sustain</b> the education and training program delivery following the cessation of WCB funding.</li> </ul>
	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project addresses issues that are <b>somewhat related</b> to the WCB.</li> <li>The proposed training and education <b>somewhat aligns</b> with the priorities identified in <i>Manitoba's Five-year Plan for Workplace Injury and Illness Prevention</i></li> <li>It is <b>unclear whether</b> the project will <b>impact</b> and improve knowledge, understanding and awareness of OHS, injury prevention, RTW and treatments for occupational illnesses among the target groups identified for the project.</li> <li>There is <b>some indication</b> that the program would be sustained following the cessation of WCB funding.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project addresses issues that are neither <b>relevant</b> nor <b>important</b> to the WCB.</li> <li>The proposed training and education <b>does not line up</b> with the priorities identified in <i>Manitoba's Five-year Plan for Workplace Injury and Illness Prevention</i></li> <li>It is <b>very unclear that</b> the project will <b>impact</b> and improve knowledge, understanding and awareness of OHS, injury prevention, RTW and treatments for occupational illnesses among the target groups identified for the project.</li> <li>There is <b>no indication</b> that the program would be sustained following the cessation of WCB funding.</li> </ul>

**DIMENSION 3 - PROJECT MANAGEMENT & RISK ASSESSMENT**

Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>There is a comprehensive, reasonable and achievable work-plan to achieve project goals.</p> <p>Critical milestones are identified to ensure completion within the specified time.</p> <p>The risk assessment identifies and describes potential risks, adequately assesses each risk and provides measures to mitigate each risk. The proposed alternative approaches are practical and achievable and will not derail the project.</p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>Very High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>extremely well</b> developed, goals are clearly defined and critical milestones identified within a <b>very</b> practical framework and <b>realistic</b> timeframe.</li> <li>It is <b>extremely likely</b> that the project will <b>successfully achieve</b> its goals and be completed within the proposed timeframe.</li> <li>The proponents demonstrate that they have <b>thoughtfully and critically considered every possible risk</b> to the project and propose <b>very realistic and practical</b> solutions to mitigate potential risks.</li> </ul>
	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>fairly well</b> developed, goals are clearly defined and critical milestones identified within a <b>reasonable</b> framework and <b>realistic</b> timeframe.</li> <li>It is <b>likely</b> that the project will successfully achieve its goals and be completed within the proposed timeframe.</li> <li>The proponents have identified <b>some</b> potential obstacles and propose <b>workable</b> alternatives to mitigate potential risks.</li> </ul>
	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a work-plan, but the goals and key milestones are <b>poorly defined</b>. <b>The timeframe may not be realistic</b>.</li> <li>It is <b>uncertain whether</b> the project will be completed within a reasonable time frame.</li> <li>The proponents <b>do not demonstrate that they have given adequate consideration</b> to potential obstacles and solutions to mitigate risks.</li> </ul>

	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work-plan is <b>vague and inadequate</b>. The proposal would need to be <b>reconsidered and re-developed</b> into an acceptable framework.</li> <li>It is <b>unlikely</b> that the study will achieve its purposes or be completed within a reasonable timeframe.</li> <li>The proponents <b>have not</b> undertaken a risk assessment.</li> </ul>
--	---------	---

**DIMENSION 4 - PROJECT BUDGET**

Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>The project's resource requirements are well thought out and thoroughly described with clear justification for each budget item. <i>(Resources include human, physical, financial, and technological)</i></p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>Very High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget justification is <b>thorough and very clear</b>.</li> <li>There is <b>significant</b> financial and in-kind support from workplace parties.</li> <li>The project costs are <b>very reasonable</b> and do not include the cost of salaries or benefits for employees participating in the project.</li> <li>Budget expenditures and the project milestones are clearly linked and there is no <b>duplication</b> of resources or funding form other sources.</li> </ul>
<p>There is some financial and in-kind support from the stakeholders, employer and other workplace parties.</p> <p>Project costs are reasonable and do not include salaries or benefits for employees participating in the project. However, salaries for a new position created expressly for the purposes of the project or fees for consultants who are engaged to manage the project are acceptable budget items.</p>	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget justification is <b>complete and clear</b>.</li> <li>There is <b>either</b> financial or in-kind support from workplace parties.</li> <li>The projects costs are <b>acceptable</b> and do not include the cost of salaries or benefits for employees participating in the project.</li> <li>The link between budget expenditures and the project's milestones could be better explained. There is no <b>duplication</b> of resources or funding form other sources.</li> </ul>
<p>There is no duplication or overlap in funding.</p> <p>There is a clear link between budget line items and the project's work-plan.</p>	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget justification is <b>weak</b> and incomplete.</li> <li>There is <b>minimal</b> financial or in-kind support from workplace parties.</li> <li>The projects costs are <b>unreasonably high or low</b>. Salaries of employees participating in the project may be included and so the budget would need to be reworked.</li> <li>The link between budget expenditures and the project's milestones is quite unclear. <b>There may be some duplication</b> of resources or funding form other sources and would require clarification.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The budget justification is <b>extremely weak</b> or missing.</li> <li>There is <b>no financial or in-kind</b> support from workplace parties.</li> <li>The projects costs are <b>either unreasonably high or low</b>. Salaries of employees participating in the project may be included and so the budget would need to be reworked.</li> <li>The link between budget expenditures and the project's milestones is quite unclear. <b>There may be some duplication</b> of resources or funding form other sources and would require clarification.</li> </ul>

**DIMENSION 5 - EXPERTISE OF PROJECT TEAM**

Criteria	Score	Descriptor
<p>The project team has been clearly identified and has the skills to successfully undertake the project.</p> <p>The project leader and/or team members have experience managing</p>	3.0-4.0	<p><b>Very High to Outstanding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project team has <b>exceptional knowledge</b> in all areas related to the proposed project.</li> <li>The project leader has <b>demonstrated a track record in successfully managing several projects</b> of this nature.</li> <li>Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team, the</li> </ul>

<p><b>projects of a similar size and scope.</b></p> <p><b>The project leader has the knowledge, expertise and experience to undertake and bring this project to a successful conclusion.</b></p> <p><b>The project leader and project team demonstrate they have the knowledge, experience and credentials in occupational health and safety, injury prevention, return to work, and treatment of occupational illnesses.</b></p>		<p>reviewer is <b>highly confident</b> that the applicant will complete the project successfully.</p>
	2.0-2.9	<p><b>Adequate to Good:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project team has <b>knowledge</b> in all areas related to the proposed project.</li> <li>• The project leader has <b>successfully managed a similar project.</b></li> <li>• Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team, the reviewer is <b>reasonably confident</b> that the applicant will complete the project successfully.</li> </ul>
	1.0-1.9	<p><b>Needs Revision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project team would need to consider <b>hiring or purchasing the services of external advisors</b> with the knowledge and experience required to undertake the proposed project.</li> <li>• The project leader <b>may have participated in similar projects in the past.</b></li> <li>• Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team, the reviewer is <b>not certain</b> that the applicant will complete the project successfully without external assistance.</li> </ul>
	0.0-0.9	<p><b>Seriously Flawed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project team <b>must hire or purchase the services of external advisors</b> in order to be considered for funding.</li> <li>• The project leader has <b>never managed or participated in similar projects in the past.</b></li> <li>• Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team. The reviewer is <b>not confident</b> that the applicant will complete the project successfully, even with external assistance.</li> </ul>

### 13. ATTACHMENT E: WCB TRAVEL, ACCOMMODATION AND MEAL RATES

**WCB TRAVEL:**

*Mileage Rates*

Project staff will be entitled to the mileage rate set by the WCB. The rate is updated every six months. The current rate is \$0.38 per kilometer.

*Air Travel*

Project staff should take advantage of discount fares, hotel rates and use Economy Class of air service.

**ACCOMMODATION:**

- A standard hotel room is to be used on business travel. Depending on the availability, you should choose a hotel close to the site where business will be conducted as this usually limits the need for a rental car.
- Original receipts must accompany claims for accommodation and other expenses.
- All bills for accommodation must be signed except if you stay with friends or relatives.
- Reimbursement made for gifts in the form of food, drink or related items, will not exceed 80% of the cost that otherwise would have been incurred.
- The WCB will not reimburse the cost of a spouse or second party who accompanies you.

**MEAL RATES:**

Manitoba Meal Rates	Effective for Jan. 1/2014
	\$
Breakfast	9.70
Lunch	13.20
Dinner	25.80
<b>Total</b>	<b>48.70</b>
<b>Note:</b> Breakfast will be paid if departure is before 0730 hours while dinner will be paid if return after 1730	

<b>Out of town, overnight in Manitoba</b>	
Departure before 0900 hours (breakfast, lunch & dinner)	48.70
Departure after 0900 hours but before 1400 hours (lunch & dinner)	39.00
Departure after 1400 hours (dinner only)	25.80
Return before 0900 hours (breakfast only)	9.70
Return after 0900 hours but before 1400 hours (breakfast & lunch)	22.90
Return after 1400 hours (breakfast, lunch & dinner)	48.70
<b>Outside Manitoba Meal Rates;</b>	
Breakfast	12.90
Lunch	17.40
Dinner	34.45
<b>Total</b>	<b>64.75</b>
<b>Note: For day trips, receipts not required</b>	
<b>Out of town overnight expenses</b>	
Departure before 0900 hours (breakfast, lunch & dinner)	64.75
Departure after 0900 hours but before 1400 hours (lunch & dinner)	51.85
Departure after 1400 hours (dinner only)	34.45
Return before 0900 hours (breakfast only)	12.90
Return after 0900 hours but before 1400 hours (breakfast & lunch)	30.30
Return after 1400 hours (breakfast, lunch & dinner)	64.75

“Out-of-town”, means travel outside the City of Winnipeg and its surrounding communities from which persons typically commute to Winnipeg. Please take note that meal rates are subject to review at six (6) month intervals and mileage rates updated quarterly.