



*CANADIAN INTERAGENCY FOREST FIRE CENTRE INC.
CENTRE INTERSERVICES DES FEUX DE FORÊT DU CANADA INC.*

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Developing a pan-Canadian understanding
of the wildfire response landscape in the
WUI

July 23, 2026

1. Definitions

CIFFC means the Canadian Interagency Forest Fire Centre Inc.

Agencies refers to the federal, provincial, and territorial ministries or departments mandated with wildland fire response within their respective jurisdictions.

RFP means Request for Proposal.

Participant means anyone submitting a response to this RFP.

Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) The area where homes and other human developments meet or are intermixed with wildland fire fuels.

2. Request for Proposal

CIFFC is extending an invitation to interested parties to provide proposals to undertake a national review of the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) as it relates to wildfire response, including a review of governance, responsibilities, and operational models across Canada.

The purpose of this project is to develop a pan-Canadian understanding of the wildfire operations landscape in the WUI and explore options to address jurisdictional challenges across federal, provincial, territorial, municipal and other partner organizations. The project will examine compatibility among existing authorities and governance structures, as well as whether a common framework or more consistent national approach to WUI wildfire operations may be feasible.

This project directly aligns with the 2026/27 CIFFC Strategic Action Plan priority on the WUI, which calls for a domestic and international environmental scan and the evaluation of a common WUI lexicon, communication protocol and local/municipal, provincial/territorial and/or national governance model.

A multi-disciplinary whole-of-society task team comprised of representatives from provincial and territorial wildland fire agencies, municipal fire services, and Indigenous fire organizations will provide perspective, guidance and subject matter expertise to the successful Participant throughout the duration of the project.

RFP Submission

CIFFC is seeking a Participant with demonstrated experience conducting complex jurisdictional reviews involving intergovernmental governance, authorities, liability frameworks, and multi-stakeholder operating environments. The successful Participant will possess the analytical capacity and institutional neutrality to synthesize multiple mandates and responsibilities.

Participants must clearly highlight the merits of their submissions and particularly note that the following, though not necessarily exhaustive, are critical to CIFFC in its assessment of the submissions.

Desired qualifications:

- Experience conducting policy, governance, legislative, or jurisdictional reviews involving multiple levels of government.
- Knowledge of wildland fire management, local structural fire operations, emergency management, public safety, municipal governance, or related sectors.
- Experience engaging and interviewing government, Indigenous, municipal, and non-government stakeholders.
- Experience developing governance, accountability, or interoperability frameworks.
- Strong research, analytical, and report-writing capabilities
- Experience producing strategic advice and options analysis for senior decision-makers
- Bilingual capability will be an asset

RFP submissions must include:

- i. A statement indicating the Participant's understanding of the project objectives and proposed methodology to complete the deliverables described in Section 4.
- ii. A summary of key activities, milestones, timelines and products to be delivered.
- iii. A complete resume indicating the Participant's experience as it relates to the requirements outlined above, including qualifications and proposed project team.
- iv. References from three (3) clients for similar projects.
- v. An indication of the earliest date that the Participant could begin the project.
- vi. A fixed cost quote for the total cost of the project outlined in Section 5.

Note: CIFFC shall not be responsible for any costs incurred by any Participant in preparing, submitting, and presenting proposals. All responses and accompanying documentation received under the RFP shall become the property of CIFFC and shall not be returned to the Participant. This RFP may not result in any contract awards and contains no contractual offer of any kind. Any RFP and quote received will be treated as an offer by the Participant and not as an acceptance of an offer made by CIFFC. Responses received unsigned or after the RFP closing date and time will

not be considered. If responses are ambiguous, unclear, or unreadable, they may not be considered.

Submissions should not exceed 10 pages (minimum 11-point font) and must be received by **4:00pm CT, August 27, 2026**. Submissions must be signed by a representative with the designated authority to bind the Participant to the terms, conditions, articles, and obligations of the proposal.

Submissions shall be delivered by email to **justin.noble@ciffc.ca**.

All submissions and any amendments thereto received after the closing date and time will not be accepted.

Participants may be required to make a virtual presentation to CFFC representatives to further explain their proposal. Presentations are limited to no more than 45 minutes, with a 15 minute question period.

Participants are requested to submit any questions regarding this RFP, in writing, no later than **August 20, 2026** to the following individual. Enquiries and responses will be recorded and may be distributed to all Participants.

Ray Ault
ray.ault@ciffc.ca
204-784-2030

3. RFP Schedule of Events

RFP Issue Date:	August 6, 2026
Deadline for Participant Enquiries:	August 20, 2026
RFP Submission Closing:	August 27, 2026
Presentation Notifications (if required):	No later than September 3, 2026
RFP Presentation (if required):	Week of September 7, 2026

If, after analysis of the Submissions, CFFC wishes to proceed with one of the proposals, the Participant will be required to enter into a contractual arrangement with CFFC (CFFC Consulting or General Services Contract). The tentative timelines for completion of the project are as follows.

Project Start Date:	September 14, 2026
Preliminary Report Due:	November 10, 2026
Final Report Due:	February 19, 2027

4. Project Scope and Deliverables

This project will deliver evidence-based options to assess compatibility and determine whether a national approach to WUI operations in Canada is possible. It will evaluate options for common frameworks and approaches, including common approaches to communication protocols, terminology, and governance models.

Deliverable(s) for this project include:

This project will explore options to bridge the jurisdictional challenges WUI fires present to PT wildland fire management agencies and local authorities. Key deliverables include:

- Domestic Jurisdictional Scan: A comprehensive review and analysis across all Canadian federal, provincial/territorial and municipal/local jurisdictions to document the current state for each jurisdiction, including:
 - Roles, responsibilities, and authorities related to WUI fire incidents
 - Governance and accountability structures;
 - Relationships between wildland fire agencies, municipal fire services, Indigenous organizations, and other partners; and
 - Current approaches to WUI preparedness, training, response and coordination.
- Governance and Operational Options Analysis: Develop and assess governance and operational model options, including an assessment of associated benefits, challenges, limitations, risks and implementation considerations. Option outputs will support the next steps toward a potential national WUI standard or model.
- .
- Evaluation of Common Frameworks: Assess the feasibility of establishing common approaches to: WUI terminology and lexicon, communication and coordination protocols, governance structures, and other mechanisms that support interoperability and readiness across jurisdictions at the PT, local and/or national level.
- Reports and presentations: All deliverables will be in the form of written reports detailing findings pertaining to each outcome.

CIFFC will entertain additional deliverables as recommended by the Participant that would contribute positively to the project. A list of important considerations provided by the project task team members is included in appendix A.

Please note this RFP does not extend to the implementation of any recommendations for change.

5. Proposal Quote

Please provide the Fixed Fee Quotation in the following format.

Item	Fixed Fee	Tax	Total (incl. tax)
Jurisdictional Scan: (Phase 1) Review of Canadian F/P/Ts. <i>Focus is on document review/desktop analysis.</i>			
Jurisdictional Scan: (Phase 2)			

Interviews and validation with F/P/T and Municipal representatives to confirm the "current state" of WUI operations and responsibility gaps.			
Options Development & Framework Evaluation Synthesizing findings to develop potential governance models/frameworks. Assessing the feasibility of a common lexicon and communication protocol.			
Final Reporting & Closeout Final presentation to RMC; Submission of all final artifacts.			

Note: If the proponent chooses to apply a conceptual framework different than outlined in Section 5, CIFFC is open to other approaches provided there is a clear explanation of the how the proponent will meet required deliverables.

Appendix A – Key Considerations for Participants

Critical questions put forward by task team members for consideration by Proponents.

Governance

1. How jurisdictions have or intend to bridge the doctrinal and operational divide between municipal structural services and provincial/territory wildland agencies for the WUI environment - and what governance or legislative mechanisms hold that bridge together? What are the opportunities to leverage nationally?
2. What governance and operation models are most effective in bridging jurisdictional boundaries as it relates to WUI.
3. Are there examples of other programs outside of WUI, where standardization, legislation, interoperability, etc. have been adopted? Thinking outside the box, is there any other program that has bridged across multiple jurisdictions?
4. To what extent do current WUI operational and governance models across F/P/Ts formally recognize and incorporate the legislated authority of Fire Marshals and Fire Commissioners including, where applicable, their oversight of structural firefighters during provincial/territorial states of emergency and where do gaps or inconsistencies exist between legislated responsibility, capability, operational liability and indemnification, and actual operational practice?
5. Are there best practices in how to balance broad standardization vs locally focused/customized approaches tailored to local community characteristics/typologies? How do we ensure compatibility with any universal approach across all levels of governance, all the way down to local levels (e.g. community wildland fire protection and mitigation plans).

6. What agreements, governance structures, and accountability mechanisms are currently used between provincial/territorial wildfire agencies, municipal and volunteer fire departments, Indigenous organizations, and emergency management authorities for WUI incidents, and how do these arrangements address resource sharing, command, training responsibilities, and operational effectiveness?
7. Are there jurisdictions in the world we should look to that are some years further ahead in terms of experience of wildfires crossing the WUI and becoming conflagrations? (California, Australia, Spain come to mind.) Further, what can we learn specifically from these jurisdictions about what works and what is not working from a governance, coordination, response (and prevention) perspective?

Funding

1. What funding and cost-sharing models sustain WUI programs appropriately and are there opportunities for federal funding to augment these models for interoperability's sake
2. What are the pros and cons of the legislative tools or mechanisms used by the PTs to define the terms of mutual aid between municipal fire departments and the provincial agency for response in WUI?
3. What are the pros and cons of the funding models used by PTs to ensure a fair and equitable sharing of the costs associated with firefighting in WUI among the various levels of government (local, regional, and provincial)?

Operations

1. Clear picture of how WUI fires are being managed and resourced within the provinces and territories including the relationship between the agencies and local governments.
2. Critical Gaps that limit interoperability.
3. What systems, structures, and operating arrangements best enable integrated planning, resource sharing, unified command, and operational interoperability between wildland agencies and structural fire services before and during WUI incidents?
4. How can municipal fire services effectively prepare to support wildland urban interface operations, in regard to training, equipment acquisition and mobilization?
5. Are there training or equipment gaps for wildfire firefighters and/or structural fire fighters when response to major incidents is required? Are other Non Govt Agencies needing to be considered in this space or available to enhance capacity?
6. How is the evacuation planning, communication, and process incorporated into the overall IMC/IMT and is it effective?
7. How are local FDs incorporated into the Incident Command structure in a WUI fire scenario and is that effective. Can we show any examples of this in practice? What would still be needed for further effectiveness?

8. Information sharing during WUI fire response. How to share across all levels of governance? What communication structures need to be in place? What data is available? What additional data is needed? How can it be shared/used in ways that best supports decision making?
9. What minimum training, qualifications, equipment, and operational standards are required for fire departments to safely and effectively participate in WUI incidents, and what level of advanced capability is realistically achievable across Canada's municipal, volunteer, rural, remote, and Indigenous fire services?
10. What if any role could mass water delivery play at the interface (if water is available)?

Resource Sharing

1. Is a Standardized national WUI Framework achievable, where are the touch points.
1. Inventory of WUI human and equipment resources by province / territory and a provincial definition of WUI resource terms to allow for a comparison and inventory.
2. Given that Fire Marshals and Fire Commissioners are legislatively responsible for setting structural firefighter training standards and policy for structural fire departments, what options exist to achieve greater national consistency in how these standards are established, applied, and integrated into WUI response and what would be required to align wildland and structural training frameworks across jurisdictions?
3. In jurisdictions where the Fire Marshal or Fire Commissioner (FM/FC) holds legislated authority over structural firefighters during a declared provincial/territorial state of emergency, what governance or protocol options would ensure that PT wildland fire agencies and the FM/FC engage collaboratively from the outset fully reflecting that legislated authority and what accountability mechanisms would support consistent application across the F/P/Ts where this authority exists? Equally, to what extent and role FM/FC and their respective organizations can play in interprovincial or interjurisdictional deployment of structural firefighters in support of WUI, SPU or other joint operations?
4. Which elements of WUI governance, doctrine, terminology, qualifications, resource typing, and operational coordination should be nationally standardized in Canada, and which are best retained as provincial or territorial responsibilities?
5. What organizational models best balance internal WUI capability within wildland agencies with surge capacity provided through municipal, contractor, Indigenous, and other partner organizations, and what are the strengths and limitations of each approach?
6. Can we effectively achieve a standardized template for mobilization of municipal resources within a WUI scope that would ensure responding firefighters are an asset and utilized accordingly?

7. How do differences in forest ecosystems, fuel types, and WUI community configurations (interface, intermix, and rural/remote communities) influence wildfire risk, preparedness requirements, response strategies, and public education needs across Canada, and what elements can realistically be standardized within a national WUI framework?