



PARENT PARTNERSHIP PROJECT INC. (PPP)

ONE CALL TO FIND THEM ALL

VULNERABLE MISSING PERSON RESPONSE

Model First Responder Training & Local Implementation Manual

PURPOSE

A model manual for translating a national Vulnerable Persons Alert framework into local readiness: trained call-takers, dispatchers, police, search managers, SAR partners, emergency-management personnel and other responders working from a common functional-risk approach.

MODEL POLICY / TRAINING FRAMEWORK — FOR GOVERNMENT & STAKEHOLDER DEVELOPMENT

Prepared by Parent Partnership Project Inc. (PPP)
Calgary, Alberta
October 2026

ONE FRAMEWORK. ONE SYSTEM. ONE MISSION.

ONE CALL TO FIND THEM ALL

Contents

HOW TO USE THIS MANUAL

Purpose, Scope & Governance.....	3
What This Framework Does — And Does Not Do.....	4
1. Governance model.....	5
2. Who should develop and deliver the training?.....	5
3. Training audiences.....	6

REFERENCE

Key Terms.....	7
-----------------------	----------

PROPOSED MODEL TRAINING STANDARD

Competency Framework.....	9
A. Functional-risk recognition.....	9
B. Time-critical response.....	10
C. Communication & interaction.....	10
D. Sensory & behavioural considerations.....	11
E. Search-behaviour intelligence.....	11
F. Hazard prioritization.....	11
G. VPA activation & public warning.....	12
H. Safe recovery & post-incident response.....	14

OPERATIONAL APPLICATION

VMP/VPA Operational Response Model.....	15
--	-----------

ROLE CARDS

Role-Specific Training Requirements.....	19
---	-----------

TRAINING DELIVERY

Course Structure, Assessment & Exercises.....	21
Recommended learning pathway.....	21
Assessment.....	22
Instructor / facilitator qualifications.....	22
Quality assurance.....	22

FIELD AID

Vulnerable Missing Person — First-Call / Preliminary Screening Checklist.....	23
Gate 1 / Gate 2 Assessment.....	25
Public Alert Message Standard.....	26
Recommended message elements.....	26
Information governance & privacy.....	26
Model message template.....	27
Managing public and volunteer response.....	27
Geographic targeting considerations.....	27

EXERCISES

Scenario Package.....	28
Scenario 1 — Water priority.....	28
Scenario 2 — Cognitive impairment and transit.....	28
Scenario 3 — Recovery is not the end.....	29
Scenario 4 — Vulnerable does not automatically mean alert.....	29
Scenario 5 — Cold-weather exposure and dementia.....	29
Scenario 6 — Conflicting intelligence / command challenge.....	30

EVALUATION

After-Action Review & Performance Measures.....	31
After-action review prompts.....	31
Suggested program measures.....	31
System-level program evaluation.....	32

EVIDENCE & IMPLEMENTATION BASIS

Existing Infrastructure to Build From.....	33
Source Directory.....	37
Relationship to the Evidence Base.....	38
Relationship to the National VPA Operational Standard.....	38
Development partners to consult before adoption.....	39
Proposed implementation sequence.....	39

QUICK REFERENCE

Local Implementation Standard.....	40
---	-----------

HOW TO USE THIS MANUAL

Purpose, Scope & Governance

This manual is a model implementation document, not an existing Canadian standard. It is designed to show how the training component of a Vulnerable Persons Alert (VPA) could be governed, delivered and applied without requiring every local jurisdiction or police service to invent its own curriculum. Throughout this manual, "Vulnerable Missing Person" (VMP) refers to the underlying case type and police/search response, while "Vulnerable Persons Alert" (VPA) refers specifically to the public-alert tool that may be used in a subset of VMP cases. The model separates national standard-setting, provincial/territorial integration and local operational delivery.

Where this manual addresses VMP/VPA eligibility or activation criteria, the National VPA Operational Standard governs. This manual translates those requirements into responder competencies, operational practice and local implementation.

VMP RESPONSE ≠ AUTOMATIC VPA ACTIVATION

Information indicating functional vulnerability should be incorporated into risk assessment and response planning from the first report. This triggers Gate 1 (VMP Operational Qualification) and the enhanced search response. A public VPA is an additional response tool used only where Gate 2 (Public Alert / Broadcast Immediate Qualification) is separately met. Every VPA is a vulnerable-missing-person response, but not every vulnerable-missing-person response requires a public alert.

CORE PRINCIPLE

The local level should train to a common standard and apply it in practice. The local level should not have to invent the standard from scratch.

PROPOSED GOVERNANCE — TO BE DETERMINED THROUGH F/P/T IMPLEMENTATION

This manual does not prescribe which federal, provincial or intergovernmental body will own or approve the national model curriculum. That governance decision must be established through implementation discussions with the appropriate federal, provincial/territorial, policing, emergency-management and public-alerting authorities.

HOW TO USE THIS MANUAL

What This Framework Does — And Does Not Do

This framework DOES:

- establish a common functional-risk vocabulary;
- define a proposed interoperability threshold (Gate 1) for an enhanced VMP response;
- train responders to distinguish the enhanced search response from public alerting;
- provide a common Gate 2 public-utility and geographic-utility test for public alerting;
- support consistent information flow across dispatch, police, SAR and alerting authorities.

This framework DOES NOT:

- replace existing missing-person legislation or police investigative authority;
- replace existing police risk-assessment systems where they can be mapped to the proposed standard;
- replace GSAR doctrine, incident command or Search Manager authority;
- make diagnosis an eligibility criterion or require its disclosure;
- require a public alert for every vulnerable missing person;
- require agencies to accept spontaneous volunteers;
- determine the final F/P/T governance body for the national model.

HOW TO USE THIS MANUAL

Purpose, Scope & Governance (continued)

1. Governance model

Level	Primary responsibility	Training role
National / F-P-T Framework Level	Coordinate development of national model competencies, interoperability principles and VPA training objectives through the appropriate F/P/T governance process, with participation from federal, provincial/territorial, policing, SAR, emergency-management, public-alerting and other relevant operational authorities.	Coordinate model curriculum development with policing, SAR, emergency management, disability/dementia/autism expertise, lived experience and research partners. Include Indigenous, rural, remote and northern operational partners directly in curriculum development, not only as later-stage consultation.
Provincial / Territorial	Adopt or adapt the national model within jurisdiction and establish applicable training requirements.	Identify required roles, establish approved delivery pathways, and connect training to academies, in-service systems, exercises and quality assurance.
Municipal / Local	Train personnel to the applicable standard and operationalize it through local protocols, supervision and exercises.	Ensure role-appropriate completion, local protocol orientation, scenario practice, exercises, supervision and after-action learning.

2. Who should develop and deliver the training?

Recommended model:

1. A national competency framework is developed collaboratively rather than by a single municipality or a single diagnosis-specific organization.
2. A national police/public-safety learning platform can host standardized core learning. The Canadian Police Knowledge Network (CPKN) is an existing example of this type of infrastructure.
3. Provincial/territorial authorities integrate the core competencies into their own policing, SAR and emergency-management requirements.
4. Police services, 9-1-1 centres, SAR organizations and local emergency partners deliver local protocol orientation and practical exercises.
5. Subject-matter experts and people with lived experience participate in curriculum design, review and periodic updating.

Existing Canadian precedent supports this architecture: CPKN hosts the RCMP-provided Missing Persons Investigations course and a University of Waterloo resource on managing risks of disappearance in people living with dementia. Alberta also uses standardized emergency-management and SAR training structures, including approved instructors, Search Manager training and exercises.

LOCAL ADAPTATION WITHIN A COMMON CORE

National competencies should establish minimum outcomes, not identical tactics. Jurisdictions must be able to adapt search, communications, staffing and exercise delivery to urban, rural, remote, northern, Indigenous and contract-policing environments while preserving the common functional-risk and alerting principles.

3. Training audiences

- 9-1-1 call-takers and dispatchers
- Frontline police officers
- Police supervisors / watch commanders
- Missing-person investigators and coordinators
- Personnel assigned a family/caregiver liaison role during a search
- SAR Search Managers, team leaders and searchers
- Emergency-management personnel involved in public warning or incident coordination
- Fire/EMS or other local partners where their operational role requires it
- Public-alerting / emergency-communications personnel responsible for message preparation or dissemination

ROLE-SPECIFIC, NOT ONE-SIZE-FITS-ALL

Every responder does not need the same course. All roles need a common conceptual foundation; dispatchers, investigators, alerting authorities and Search Managers then need additional role-specific competencies.

REFERENCE

Key Terms

Functional descriptions used throughout this manual. Jurisdictions may use different formal titles for the same function.

Functional risk — A person's functional inability or materially reduced ability to recognize danger, communicate location or needs, navigate to safety, seek help, or respond predictably to searchers, regardless of diagnosis.

Time-sensitive risk — A reasonable belief, based on case-specific circumstances, that the disappearance creates a materially elevated, time-sensitive risk of death or serious bodily harm. Time-sensitive risk forms part of Gate 1 qualification; VPA activation additionally requires Gate 2 qualification.

Activation decision-maker — The authorized person or position within the Activating Agency who approves initiation of an Activation Request under local/provincial protocol. An agency decides through its activation decision-maker; the Activating Agency is the organization, not the individual.

Search Manager / SAR Manager — The person responsible for planning and directing the search based on resources, expertise, hazards and incoming information, whether a police, SAR or jointly-appointed role. Jurisdictions may use either title, consistent with CSA Z1620:24's national "SAR manager" terminology.

SAR — Search and rescue personnel and organizations that support the authority having jurisdiction in ground, water or technical search operations.

Geotargeting — Defining the geographic area that receives a public alert, based on last known location, elapsed time, mobility and search intelligence.

After-action review (AAR) — A structured debrief following every VPA activation, every declined activation escalated for secondary review, and other high-risk incidents, used to capture lessons learned and identify training, policy or interoperability changes.

Gate 1 — VMP Operational Qualification — As defined in the National VPA Operational Standard: the threshold for treating a report as a qualifying vulnerable-missing-person case and beginning the enhanced police and search response. Satisfied where the person's whereabouts are unknown, the missing-person circumstances are sufficiently confirmed, functional vulnerability is present, and there is a materially elevated, time-sensitive risk of death or serious bodily harm. Gate 1 is not, by itself, a decision to issue a public alert. This manual does not restate the Operational Standard's activation criteria independently; where wording differs, the Operational Standard governs.

Gate 2 — Public Alert / Broadcast Immediate Qualification — As defined in the National VPA Operational Standard: the separate threshold for designating a Gate-1-qualifying case for public alerting — information exists capable of producing useful public observations or actions (public utility), and an identifiable, operationally defensible dissemination area exists in which recipients could reasonably contribute to locating the person (geographic utility). Time sensitivity, actionability and net safety benefit inform this determination; they are not independent elements of it. Not every Gate-1-qualifying case satisfies Gate 2; a missing vulnerable person does not automatically generate a public alert.

Activating Agency — Under this proposed model, the police service of jurisdiction responsible for determining whether an incident satisfies Gate 1 and Gate 2 and, where satisfied, initiating the Activation Request. (Canada's public-alerting architecture allows other government-designated issuing authorities; this manual's proposal chooses police as the Activating Agency for VPA cases.) The Activating Agency decides; the Alerting Authority issues.

Alerting Authority — The CAP-CP-recognized originator with technical authority to submit a validated alert message for aggregation and distribution. In some jurisdictions this function is performed by a provincial/territorial Emergency Management Organization (EMO) on behalf of police.

Alert Distributor — A broadcaster or wireless service provider that delivers a distributed CAP-CP alert to the public, per CRTC requirements.

CAP-CP — The Common Alerting Protocol – Canadian Profile, the technical message standard used to originate and distribute alerts through Canada's existing public alerting system (NPAS / Alert Ready).

missingVPer — The existing CAP-CP Event References code used for missing-vulnerable-person alerting, listed in Public Safety Canada's published CAP-CP Event References. A VPA does not require a new CAP-CP event code; it governs when this existing code receives Broadcast Immediate treatment.

Broadcast Immediate (BI) — A distribution treatment within the SOREM Public Alerting Layer used to identify qualifying alerts intended for immediate distribution by applicable last-mile distributors. The applicable event and urgency/severity/certainty criteria must be met; issuance remains subject to the authorized alerting decision and applicable protocol. missingVPer is not currently on the SOREM Broadcast Immediate Events List.

SOREM — Senior Officials Responsible for Emergency Management, the federal/provincial/territorial body whose approval is required for major revisions under the CEMCS Change Management Process, and which maintains the Broadcast Immediate Events List.

NAAD System — The National Alert Aggregation and Dissemination System, operated by Pelmorex Corp. under CRTC conditions of licence, which aggregates validated CAP-CP messages and makes them available to Alert Distributors.

KEY PRINCIPLE — WHO DECIDES, WHO ISSUES

The Activating Agency decides. The Alerting Authority issues.

Under this proposed model, the police service of jurisdiction assesses Gate 1 and Gate 2 and, where satisfied, initiates the Activation Request. The Alerting Authority (the CAP-CP-recognized originator, which may be the police service itself or, in some jurisdictions, a provincial/territorial EMO acting on its behalf) is the body with technical authority to submit and issue the validated alert. Responders should know which role their agency performs and which role belongs to a separate authority.

THREE SEPARATE CONCEPTS — DO NOT CONFLATE

Event code: missingVPer — the existing CAP-CP Event References code identifying a missing-vulnerable-person case. It already exists; no new code is proposed.

Distribution treatment: Broadcast Immediate (BI) — the mandatory-distribution designation an alert receives only where it meets the criteria on the SOREM Broadcast Immediate Events List. missingVPer is not currently on that list.

Operational framework: VPA (Vulnerable Persons Alert) — the proposed national eligibility and process standard governing when and how missingVPer receives BI treatment. A VPA is an operational/public-alert designation using existing CAP-CP infrastructure; it does not create a new CAP-CP event code.

PROPOSED MODEL TRAINING STANDARD

Competency Framework

The competencies below are proposed model requirements for consideration by the adopting authority. They do not supersede existing police, SAR, emergency-management, labour, occupational-safety or training requirements.

Completion should demonstrate practical competence, not merely exposure to awareness material. The proposed curriculum is diagnosis-neutral at its core and teaches condition-specific implications where they change risk, communication, search strategy or recovery. Diagnosis-neutral does not mean diagnosis-blind: diagnosis does not determine eligibility or response by itself, and condition-specific evidence remains relevant when it materially informs communication, behaviour, hazards, search strategy or safe recovery.

TERMS USED IN THIS MANUAL

Must / shall — a proposed minimum requirement of the model standard.

Should — recommended practice; departure should be documented and justified operationally.

May — a permissible or locally adaptable practice, left to the issuing authority's judgment.

RESPONDER AND SEARCHER SAFETY

Urgency does not eliminate dynamic risk assessment. Search, approach and recovery tactics must account for terrain, water, traffic, rail, confined spaces, weather, animals, environmental hazards and other risks to responders, SAR personnel, volunteers and the public.

A. Functional-risk recognition

- Recognize when a missing person may be unable to identify danger, communicate location or needs, navigate back to safety, seek help, or respond predictably to rescuers.
- Distinguish diagnosis from operational risk: a diagnosis may inform response, but the Gate 1 assessment is based on the person's actual vulnerability and time-sensitive risk.
- Recognize environmental and situational factors that can rapidly increase risk.
- Recognize that functional ability may be situational or variable; apparent capability in one setting does not necessarily establish the ability to remain safe in the circumstances of the disappearance.
- Recognize that some families and caregivers maintain a pre-completed advance safety plan or profile document (for example, a wandering/elopement safety plan, dementia registry profile, or equivalent). Where one exists, request and use it immediately as an immediate source of individualized information, alongside current evidence, witnesses and other information, while confirming any material information that may have changed.

ADVANCE SAFETY PLANS & PROFILES

Several jurisdictions use a pre-completed, family-maintained information document that is handed to responders at the point a person is reported missing, rather than reconstructed verbally under stress. The United Kingdom's Herbert Protocol is a widely adopted example for people living with dementia. Comparable Canadian tools exist for other populations, including family-completed wandering/elopement safety plans for autistic and neurodivergent individuals. This manual does not require any specific tool or vendor; it recommends that responders and dispatchers be trained to ask whether such a document exists and to use it as an immediate source of individualized information when it does. Jurisdictions and community partners may wish to promote a consistent local or provincial version.

B. Time-critical response

- Treat delay as an operational risk where vulnerability and environment create time-sensitive risk.
- Reject the misconception that a person must be missing for a fixed period before police action.
- Escalate promptly when functional risk and circumstances support a high-risk classification.
- This approach is consistent with established Canadian missing-person policing principles: British Columbia's provincial policing standards for missing-person investigations direct officers to conduct a risk assessment without delay, on the basis that a strong initial response can later be scaled back, whereas early investigative opportunities lost to delay cannot be recovered.

NO MINIMUM WAITING PERIOD

There is no minimum elapsed-time requirement before risk assessment or appropriate police action begins.

DEMENTIA-SPECIFIC RESPONSE NOTE

A known or suspected dementia-related disappearance warrants rapid missing-person/SAR assessment because disorientation, impaired judgment, exposure and inability to self-correct can escalate risk quickly. This does not mean automatic VPA activation; the applicable time-sensitive risk threshold must still be assessed separately.

C. Communication & interaction

- Recognize nonspeaking communication, AAC use, echolalia, delayed processing, dementia-related communication differences and intellectual/cognitive disability.
- Use simple, calm, concrete communication and allow processing time.
- Obtain individualized communication guidance from caregivers when available.
- Recognize that communication disability does not imply lack of comprehension; address the person directly and use their established communication method wherever possible.
- Do not assume that failure to answer, make eye contact, approach, or follow verbal directions means the person has not heard or perceived the responder.
- Recognize that apparent resistance, unusual statements, continued walking or failure to follow directions may reflect dementia-related disorientation rather than intentional non-compliance.

D. Sensory & behavioural considerations

- Understand that sirens, lights, crowds, dogs, shouting, touch or uniformed approach may affect behaviour.
- Recognize that a person may hide, fail to answer their name, flee from rescuers, or elope again after being located.
- Adapt approach tactics when safe and operationally appropriate.
- Where safe to do so, avoid unnecessarily converging multiple responders on the person when doing so may increase flight, hiding or distress.

E. Search-behaviour intelligence

- Ask about previous wandering, routines, special interests, likely destinations, fears, attractions, hiding behaviour, mobility and communication.
- Translate individualized behavioural information into search priorities rather than relying on a generic missing-person profile.
- Continuously update the search plan as new information is received.
- Treat family/caregiver knowledge as operational intelligence. Where a person who knows the missing individual well identifies a likely destination, attraction, hiding behaviour, route or hazard, document and assess that information promptly and incorporate it into search planning where operationally reasonable. Do not disregard individualized behavioural information solely because it differs from generalized missing-person assumptions. Family/caregiver information is an input to operational decision-making, not a substitute for police or Search Manager authority.

INDIVIDUALIZED INTELLIGENCE SHOULD BE ASSESSED, NOT DISPLACED

Generalized statistical profiles should not automatically displace credible case-specific evidence. Conflicting case-specific information should itself be assessed for reliability, recency and operational significance rather than assumed to be correct simply because it is case-specific.

- When family/caregiver information is material — capable of changing the search area, priority, tactics, hazard assessment, communication/recovery strategy, or the Gate 2 assessment — document its disposition: information received; time received; person receiving it; transmission to investigation/search command; and assessment, action or reason for non-action.
- For dementia-related missing incidents, responders should understand that disorientation may result in continued travel, difficulty changing direction at decision points, following paths of least resistance, or becoming stopped, trapped or concealed by environmental barriers. Search planning should consider likely routes, barriers, drainage features, vegetation, structures and other places where the person could become stuck or remain unnoticed.
- Recognize, preserve and promptly report physical or digital clues that may update the last known position, direction of travel, subject condition or search priority.
- Search Managers should use current evidence-informed lost-person-behaviour data and jurisdictionally accepted statistical search-planning tools where applicable; statistical profiles should inform, not override, case-specific evidence.

F. Hazard prioritization

- Identify immediate hazards such as water, traffic, rail, construction, confined spaces, exposure and terrain.
- Where known behaviour or case-specific information indicates attraction to water or another hazard, elevate that hazard early in the search plan.

- Use diagnosis-specific evidence only where it changes operational priorities; avoid assuming all people with the same diagnosis behave alike.
- Searchers should not assume that a person living with dementia will avoid terrain or hazards that would ordinarily deter another person.

AUTISM ELOPEMENT — HIGH-THREAT SEARCH PRIORITY

Where autism-related wandering/elopement is known or reasonably suspected, current specialist guidance supports immediately checking nearby water hazards as a top search priority, alongside other immediate threats such as high-traffic roads and rail corridors. This condition-specific evidence should inform search priority without implying that every autistic person has the same wandering behaviour.

G. VPA activation & public warning

This manual trains responders to recognize and document factors relevant to risk. Activation follows a two-gate model, applied through the designated authorization process: Gate 1 (VMP Operational Qualification) triggers the enhanced search response; Gate 2 (Public Alert / Broadcast Immediate Qualification), assessed separately, governs whether that case is additionally designated for public alerting. A case can satisfy Gate 1 without ever satisfying Gate 2 — being a Vulnerable Missing Person does not automatically mean a public alert issues. The final activation criteria are defined in the governing national/provincial Operational Standard, policy or legislation.

STANDARD TERMS FOR THIS SECTION

Qualification — the criteria (Gate 1 and/or Gate 2) are satisfied on the available information.

Activation decision — the Activating Agency authorizes a VPA and initiates the Activation Request.

Issuance — the Alerting Authority technically issues and disseminates the alert.

This manual uses these three terms consistently rather than interchangeably; “alert eligibility,” “alert consideration” and “designation” describe the same qualification step unless the text specifically distinguishes a later procedural step.

GATE 1 DOES NOT REPLACE EXISTING MISSING-PERSON RISK CLASSIFICATION

Gate 1 is the VPA framework's interoperability threshold. It is not intended to replace a police service's existing missing-person risk-assessment system, incident-command structure or investigative classification. Jurisdictions may map Gate 1 to existing high-risk or urgent-response categories where those systems produce an equivalent operational response. Where an existing police risk classification and the Gate 1 assessment produce different results, the higher operational response should not be delayed while the discrepancy is resolved; the basis for each determination should be documented and reviewed under jurisdictional policy.

GATE 1 DECISION OWNERSHIP

Gate 1 decision authority should be assigned by jurisdiction. Local protocol must identify which roles may provisionally recognize Gate 1 for immediate escalation and which role records/confirm the formal Gate 1 determination. Immediate protective action must not wait for administrative confirmation where the available information supports urgent response.

ESCALATE ON CREDIBLE UNCERTAINTY

When information is incomplete but credible facts indicate a potentially time-sensitive risk, responders should escalate for timely assessment rather than delay action solely to resolve every uncertainty. Escalation for assessment does not itself establish Gate 1 or Gate 2.

“SUFFICIENTLY CONFIRMED” IS NOT A WAITING BARRIER

Confirmation should be proportionate to urgency; it is intended to establish a reasonable operational basis that the person's whereabouts are genuinely unknown — distinguishing, for example, a misunderstanding about expected return time, an adult intentionally away, a duplicate or cross-jurisdiction report, a person already located, or a custody/family dispute — not to create a verification delay before urgent protective action.

VULNERABILITY ≠ TIME-SENSITIVE RISK

Functional vulnerability describes the person's reduced ability to remain or return to safety. Time-sensitive risk asks whether the circumstances of this disappearance make delay materially dangerous. Assess the person and the circumstances together: environment, elapsed time, mobility, medical dependence, exposure, hazards, behavioural history and available evidence.

ALERT-FATIGUE SAFEGUARD

Gate 2 is intentionally narrower than Gate 1. Its purpose is to reserve disruptive public alerting for cases in which public participation can reasonably contribute to recovery within an operationally defensible area. Vulnerability alone does not justify a Broadcast Immediate alert.

PUBLIC ALERT SAFETY CHECK

Before activation, consider whether public dissemination could materially increase risk to the missing person or others — for example by prompting unsafe pursuit, revealing sensitive information or location, increasing exploitation risk, or interfering with an investigative strategy. Gate 2 requires useful public participation and an overall operational safety benefit, not public utility alone.

ADULT AUTONOMY AND PUBLIC ALERTING

Vulnerability does not eliminate an adult's privacy, autonomy or legal rights. Public alerting must be based on the applicable Gate 1/Gate 2 criteria and lawful authority, not solely on a caregiver's request, diagnosis, disability or disagreement with an adult's choices. Where facts indicate the person may be intentionally absent and capable of making that decision, those circumstances must be considered in the risk assessment consistent with applicable law and police policy.

- Gate 2 assessment, message preparation and authorization occur in parallel with — not before — the Gate 1 search response. Do not delay dispatch, investigation or search escalation to complete the Gate 2 assessment.
- Know the local escalation chain and the designated authority for alert activation.
- Apply the national/provincial functional-risk and time-sensitive-risk criteria consistently to establish Gate 1; assess public utility and geographic utility separately to determine Gate 2.
- Do not treat Gate 1 qualification as sufficient for Gate 2: confirm that useful public action is possible and that a defensible geographic target exists before recommending public alert designation.
- Operational alert procedures must reflect the actual technical capabilities and governance rules of the applicable public-alerting system.

- Gather the minimum information required for an actionable public alert without delaying urgent dissemination for nonessential details.
- Use geographic targeting appropriate to last known location, elapsed time, mobility and search intelligence.
- Draft actionable public messaging: what happened, where, who is at risk, what the public should look for, what to do, and what not to do.

H. Safe recovery & post-incident response

- Plan the approach to the located person, including communication, sensory and medical needs.
- Prevent immediate re-elopement where possible.
- Support safe reunification or appropriate transfer of care, consistent with the person's capacity, wishes, applicable law and immediate safety requirements.
- Capture lessons learned and prevention information after the incident.

OPERATIONAL APPLICATION

VMP/VPA Operational Response Model

Training should connect directly to the local operating sequence. The model below is designed to keep information moving from the first call into risk assessment, alerting, search planning and safe recovery.

PARALLEL-ACTION PRINCIPLE

The stages describe the information and decision pathway; they are not intended to require strictly sequential action. Urgent search measures begin at CALL, on reasonable suspicion, before Gate 1 is settled. From ESCALATE onward, two paths run in parallel: the enhanced search response (4A), which proceeds as soon as Gate 1 is satisfied, and the Gate 2 public-alert assessment (4B), which runs alongside it. Assessment, escalation, alert preparation, investigation and search activity should proceed concurrently where circumstances require. Public-alert approval should not delay urgent search or investigative action.

RESPONSE MODEL AT A GLANCE

CALL (urgent measures begin) → ASSESS → ESCALATE (Gate 1 satisfied)

then two parallel branches: 4A. SEARCH (proceeds regardless of Gate 2) || 4B. ASSESS / ACTIVATE ALERT (Gate 2, if met)

both branches converge → 5. RECOVER

The stage numbers 4A and 4B are deliberately parallel, not sequential: alert assessment or preparation must not delay initiation or continuation of the Gate 1 search response.

1. CALL — URGENT MEASURES BEGIN

Capture vulnerability and immediate hazards from the first contact.

- Where is the person missing from? When were they last seen?
- Is there an immediate life threat: water, traffic, rail, weather/exposure, or urgent medical dependence?
- What is their functional ability to recognize danger, communicate and return to safety?
- Are there known attractions, hazards, routines, previous destinations or prior elopements?
- What communication method works best?
- Does the family/caregiver have a pre-completed advance safety plan or profile document? If so, request it immediately and use it as an immediate source of individualized information, alongside current evidence, witnesses and other information, while confirming any material information that may have changed.
- Urgent measures begin at this step, on reasonable suspicion: dispatch the immediate response and start urgent hazard checks. They continue throughout ASSESS and ESCALATE and do not wait for the Gate 1 determination.

2. ASSESS

Classify risk using functional vulnerability plus circumstances.

- Do not rely on diagnosis alone.
- Do not delay solely because the elapsed time is short.
- Document the factors supporting the risk level and reassess as information changes.
- If Gate 1 is not met, continue the appropriate missing-person response and reassess as circumstances change. If Gate 1 is met but Gate 2 is not, the enhanced search response still proceeds — no public alert issues, but the case remains a qualifying VMP response. In a high-risk case, document the reasons for non-qualification at either gate and the information available at the time.

3. ESCALATE (Gate 1)

Move high-risk cases to the right supervisor, investigator or search authority without delay.

- Urgent search measures already under way on reasonable suspicion continue and never wait for the Gate 1 determination. Escalate to the enhanced search response immediately once Gate 1 is satisfied, and notify the designated decision-maker to assess Gate 2 (public alert consideration) in parallel — the search escalation does not wait on the alert decision.
- Engage Search Manager / SAR resources according to local tasking protocols.
- Preserve a clear timeline of decisions and information received.
- Jurisdictions should maintain a 24/7 activation pathway with sufficient delegated authority to avoid administrative delay in qualifying cases.
- Coordinate cross-boundary alert expansion, lead-agency transfer and cancellation authority where the person may have moved to another jurisdiction.

CROSS-JURISDICTION TRANSFER

Movement across jurisdictional boundaries does not reset Gate 1/Gate 2 assessment or interrupt the search/alert response. Lead-agency transfer, alert ownership, tip routing, information transfer and cancellation/update authority should be explicitly handed off and documented.

4A. SEARCH — parallel with 4B

Build the search plan around the individual, the environment and elapsed time.

- Translate caregiver/family intelligence into search priorities. Search planning integrates statistical lost-person behaviour, investigative evidence, terrain/hazard analysis and individualized subject intelligence; generalized statistical profiles should not automatically displace credible case-specific evidence, and conflicting case-specific information should be assessed for reliability, recency and operational significance.
- Maintain a defined family/caregiver information channel so new behavioural or destination intelligence reaches the investigation and search command.
- Prioritize case-specific hazards and likely destinations.
- Coordinate police, SAR, emergency partners and public information.
- Maintain command, accountability, communications and search documentation.
- Where appropriate and safe, individualized interests, familiar voices, preferred sounds or objects may also inform attraction/engagement strategies during the search or recovery.

SAR OPERATIONAL INTERFACE

VMP/VPA training supplements rather than replaces established GSAR standards and local search doctrine. Search operations should continue to use the jurisdiction's established incident-command, Search Manager, personnel-accountability, communications, staging, tasking, search-documentation and stand-down procedures. VMP-specific information should be integrated into those existing systems. The initial planning point, last known position/point last seen, emerging clues and changes in subject mobility should be continuously communicated to the Search Manager and used to reassess search priorities. Nothing in this framework directs a Search Manager to deploy resources to a particular search segment solely because it was identified by a caregiver or behavioural profile. Search tasking remains an operational command decision based on the totality of available intelligence, probability, urgency, terrain, hazards, resources and responder safety.

RESOURCE AVAILABILITY VARIES BY JURISDICTION

Resource availability changes how the response is delivered, not whether risk is recognized. Jurisdictions may scale staffing, command and communication methods to local capability — including where SAR is hours away, communications are limited, no dedicated tip line exists, no 24/7 alert specialist exists, or police coverage is contract/remote — while preserving Gate 1 recognition, timely escalation, individualized search planning and Gate 2 decision principles.

4B. ALERT (Gate 2) — parallel with 4A

Issue a geographically appropriate public warning when criteria are met.

- Use the designated activation decision-maker and approved alerting pathway.
- Include actionable identifying and safety information.
- Diagnosis is normally excluded from alert content. Include communication status, sensory/behavioural detail, or a specific safety-approach instruction only where operationally necessary for safe public interaction, consistent with the national minimum-necessary content standard.
- Update or cancel the alert promptly as circumstances change. Update and cancellation procedures must follow the applicable CAP-CP/alerting-authority protocol; an update or cancellation is not necessarily distributed using the same Broadcast Immediate treatment as the original alert.
- Confirm public-tip intake and triage capacity as part of activation planning, not as an afterthought — a Broadcast Immediate alert without adequate intake capacity can swamp 9-1-1 and non-emergency lines and must be resourced before or concurrent with alert dissemination.
- Local protocols should identify fallback public-communication channels when the designated alerting pathway is unavailable or technically delayed.

TIP-INTAKE READINESS STANDARD

Before issuance, the Activating Agency should identify: the primary tip channel; an overflow/fallback pathway; the responsible triage function; the method for routing urgent sightings to operational command; and the procedure for managing duplicate or non-actionable reports. Required capacity should be proportionate to the alert's geographic reach and anticipated public response.

5. RECOVER — both paths converge here

Treat location as a transition, not the end of the response.

LOCATION ≠ SAFE RECOVERY

Finding the person does not end the risk assessment. Traffic, water, terrain, exposure, medical condition, distress, flight risk and responder approach may continue to create immediate danger.

- Use an individualized, calm approach.
- Use a controlled responder approach: limit the number of responders converging at once, where safe.
- Reduce unnecessary lights, sirens and noise on final approach where safe to do so.
- Use caregiver or familiar-person assistance where appropriate and available.
- Provide AAC or other established communication access during approach and recovery.
- Avoid unnecessary physical contact. Where circumstances permit, explain intended contact and use the person's established communication method before touch; immediate safety or medical intervention may require otherwise.
- Assess exposure, injury, dehydration and other urgent medical needs; anticipate flight or re-elopement risk and prevent it where possible; and support safe reunification or appropriate transfer of care, consistent with the person's capacity, wishes, applicable law and immediate safety requirements.
- Ensure coordinated stand-down and closure notification to all activated search, alerting and liaison partners.
- Conduct a structured post-incident review for every VPA activation, and for every declined activation escalated for secondary review, as the National VPA Operational Standard requires; capture prevention lessons.
- Where appropriate, provide or connect the person/family/caregiver to existing prevention, safety-planning or wandering-risk resources.
- Preserve relevant physical or digital evidence where the circumstances of the disappearance or recovery require investigation.

ROLE CARDS

Role-Specific Training Requirements

These are model minimums. Jurisdictions can add operational detail without changing the common functional-risk foundation. Role titles are functional; jurisdictions may assign the responsibilities to equivalent positions under local command structures.

9-1-1 CALL-TAKER / DISPATCH

- Recognize vulnerability cues immediately.
- Ask whether a pre-completed advance safety plan or profile document exists for the missing person.
- Use a structured vulnerable-missing-person question set.
- Capture hazards, communication method, prior wandering and likely destinations.
- Escalate according to high-risk protocol without imposing a waiting period.
- Transmit behavioural and communication intelligence to responding units.

FRONTLINE POLICE

- Confirm immediate risk and obtain individualized behavioural/search information.
- Begin urgent local checks and hazard prioritization.
- Use communication and approach strategies appropriate to the person.
- Document and promptly transmit individualized behavioural, destination and hazard intelligence to investigation/search command.
- Escalate to supervisor, missing-person investigator and/or Search Manager as required.
- Preserve information for alert activation and search planning.

SUPERVISOR / ACTIVATION DECISION-MAKER

- Apply activation criteria consistently and document the decision, including written rationale when a high-risk case does not result in activation. State which gate was not met and why, distinguishing a case that did not qualify at Gate 1 from a Gate 1 case that did not satisfy Gate 2.
- Ensure alerting does not unnecessarily delay search activity.
- Confirm geographic scope and actionable message content.
- Coordinate investigative, SAR, emergency-management and communications functions.
- Order reassessment, update or cancellation as conditions change.
- Where a family or caregiver requests activation and it is declined, log the request and the reason for declining, and ensure the documented escalation mechanism is available: a named secondary reviewer, such as a shift supervisor or duty inspector, reachable within the jurisdiction's defined window to revisit the decision as new information arrives (National VPA Operational Standard, Section 6.4).

MISSING-PERSON INVESTIGATOR / COORDINATOR

- Develop the behavioural and investigative profile.
- Coordinate records, technology, video, canvass and investigative leads with search operations.
- Maintain liaison with family/caregivers.
- Ensure public messaging and search intelligence remain synchronized.

FAMILY / CAREGIVER LIAISON

- Ask whether a pre-completed advance safety plan or profile document exists and obtain a copy immediately.
- Establish family/caregiver liaison where appropriate to the circumstances, legal authority, safety and investigative context.
- Establish and maintain a designated point of contact where operationally appropriate.
- Capture new behavioural, communication, destination and hazard information.
- Document the disposition of material caregiver-provided intelligence — information capable of changing search area, priority, tactics, hazard assessment, communication/recovery strategy, or the Gate 2 assessment: information received, time received, who received it, transmission to investigation/search command, and assessment, action or reason for non-action.
- Ensure relevant information reaches investigators and the Search Manager promptly.
- Keep the family informed about appropriate operational developments without compromising the investigation.
- Where the family's or caregiver's request for activation is declined, tell them how to request escalation review by the named secondary reviewer, and pass any new information to that reviewer promptly.

SAR SEARCH MANAGER

- Translate the subject profile, hazards, elapsed time, mobility and terrain into a search plan.
- Integrate available technical search resources and digital/location intelligence according to legal authority, operational value and local capability.
- Assign resources based on probability, urgency, expertise and safety.
- Integrate police intelligence and caregiver information.
- Use statistical lost-person behaviour as a planning tool without allowing generalized profiles to displace credible subject-specific intelligence.
- Reassess strategy continuously as clues and information develop.
- Coordinate technical resources and relief/expansion as needed.

PUBLIC WARNING / EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

- Know VPA authority, approval and dissemination procedures.
- Apply geographic targeting and message templates.
- Ensure accessibility, clarity and actionability.
- Apply applicable accessibility standards and ensure message design accounts for the capabilities and limitations of the alerting medium.
- Coordinate updates/cancellations and public-information consistency.
- Preserve activation records for review.

PUBLIC TIP INTAKE / TRIAGE

- This is a function, not necessarily a dedicated position in every service; it must exist for any VPA activation.
- Route public reports to the appropriate intake channel.
- Prioritize credible sightings for investigative and search follow-up.
- Prevent duplicate or low-value tips from overwhelming dispatch.
- Assess time/location reliability, identify duplicate reports and seek corroboration where practicable. Potentially time-critical or high-value sightings should be relayed promptly with the source and reliability information available at the time; corroboration should not delay urgent operational follow-up.
- Relay actionable information to investigation/search command promptly.

TRAINING DELIVERY

Course Structure, Assessment & Exercises

Training should combine scalable e-learning with local operational practice. Existing Canadian systems show that centralized content and local implementation can coexist.

Recommended learning pathway

Component	Audience	Format	Model frequency
Core VMP/VPA fundamentals	All identified roles	Online / academy	On onboarding; refresher every 2 years
Role-specific module	By operational role	Online + facilitated	On assignment; after major protocol change
Local protocol orientation	Local responders	Briefing / in-service	At implementation; annual refresh
Tabletop exercise	Supervisors, dispatch, investigators, SAR, alerting	Facilitated scenario	At least annually
Operational / live exercise	Multi-agency partners	Field or functional exercise	Periodically, risk/resource based
After-action learning	Personnel involved in VPA activations and escalated declined activations	Structured debrief	After every VPA activation and escalated declined activation

MODEL RECOMMENDATION — NOT A CURRENT NATIONAL REQUIREMENT

The frequencies above are proposed for the VPA framework. They should be validated by policing, SAR, emergency-management, training and labour stakeholders before adoption. The specific interval for refreshers and exercises should ultimately be established by the jurisdiction based on risk, resourcing and existing training cycles, using the frequencies above as an illustrative starting point rather than a fixed requirement. Retraining should also be triggered after a significant operational failure identified through after-action review, not only after a major protocol change.

SCALABLE IMPLEMENTATION

Training requirements should be proportionate to operational role and service capacity. Core competencies may be delivered through centralized e-learning, while practical requirements can be integrated into existing missing-person, supervisory, SAR and emergency-management training wherever possible. The model is intended to reduce duplication, not create a separate stand-alone training system in every jurisdiction.

Assessment

- Knowledge check on functional-risk criteria, communication, hazards and activation.
- Scenario-based decision exercise requiring the learner to identify risk, escalation and immediate search priorities.
- Role-specific assessment for alerting authorities, Search Managers and supervisors.
- Exercise evaluation against defined objectives rather than attendance alone.
- Completion should require demonstration of the competencies assigned to the learner's role. Attendance or completion of an online module alone does not establish operational competence.

Scenario pass criteria

Learners should be able to demonstrate, at minimum:

- recognize Gate 1 factors;
- identify immediate hazards;
- escalate appropriately;
- distinguish Gate 1 from Gate 2;
- identify immediate search priorities;
- communicate individualized subject intelligence; and
- select an appropriate recovery approach.

Remediation

Learners who do not demonstrate required competencies receive targeted remediation and reassessment according to the adopting jurisdiction's training policy. The adopting jurisdiction determines whether assessment is formative, qualification-based or tied to operational authorization, consistent with collective agreements, employment policy, certification systems and existing training governance; this manual does not itself prescribe an employment or labour consequence.

Instructor / facilitator qualifications

- Core online material: content approved through the designated national VPA governance process and maintained by the designated curriculum owner.
- Local operational modules: qualified service instructors or approved subject-matter facilitators.
- SAR components: appropriately qualified SAR/Search Manager instructors.
- Exercises: facilitators familiar with incident command, missing-person operations and local VPA protocols.
- Lived-experience and disability subject-matter participation should be built into curriculum development and review, not used as a substitute for operational instruction.

Quality assurance

- Version-controlled national core curriculum.
- Documented completion and refresher records.
- Periodic review of activation decisions and after-action findings.
- Cross-agency exercises to identify handoff failures between dispatch, police, SAR and public warning.
- Scheduled curriculum review when evidence, technology, legislation or alerting standards change.

FIELD AID

Vulnerable Missing Person — First-Call / Preliminary Screening Checklist

Use as a model prompt, aligned with the Preliminary Screening Checklist (Appendix A) in the National VPA Operational Standard. It is not intended to replace jurisdiction-specific dispatch or investigative forms, and it supports Gate 1 triage only — it does not itself authorize activation and must not delay dispatch of an immediate response.

TIER 1 — IMMEDIATE (establish now)

Prompt	Capture
LOCATION / TIME	Exact location; time last seen; direction of travel; witnesses; video; transportation access.
IMMEDIATE HAZARDS	Water; roads; rail; weather/exposure; construction; confined spaces; heights; medication/medical dependence; exploitation risk.
FUNCTIONAL ABILITY	Can the person recognize danger? communicate needs/location? navigate home? seek help? respond to their name or instructions?
MOBILITY & IDENTIFIERS	Name; age; clothing; physical description; mobility; device/vehicle.

TIER 2 — SUBJECT INTELLIGENCE (gather rapidly)

Prompt	Capture
COMMUNICATION	Speaking/nonspeaking; AAC/device; preferred words/prompts; language; processing time; hearing/vision considerations; what person, voice, phrase, object or song is most likely to gain attention or calm the person.
BEHAVIOUR / ATTRACTIONS & FEARS	Previous wandering; hiding; bolting; routines; favourite/special-interest locations; fears; response to strangers/uniforms/dogs/lights/sirens; response to touch, pain or injury.
LIKELY DESTINATIONS	Previous recovery locations; schools; parks; transit; shops; relatives; water; favourite routes or destinations; parked or abandoned vehicles; small/enclosed/secluded spaces.

Prompt	Capture
PREVIOUS INCIDENTS	Has this happened before? Where was the person found? How did they travel? What search or approach strategy worked?
SAFETY PLAN / PROFILE	Does a pre-completed advance safety plan or profile document exist (wandering/elopement plan, dementia registry profile, or equivalent)? If so, request it immediately as an immediate source of individualized information.

TIER 3 — SEARCH / ALERT SUPPORT

Prompt	Capture
CURRENT PHOTO	Recent, accurate photo where available; if not available, note why and rely on physical description.
DIGITAL / LOCATION INFORMATION	Who knows the person best? Who can assist with communication? Are there tracking/location technologies or recent digital clues? If tracking technology is used, how is authorized location information accessed?
ACTIONABLE PUBLIC DESCRIPTION	What information would help a nearby member of the public identify or safely assist? What information is sensitive and not operationally necessary?
REPORTING / TIP CHANNEL	Confirm the reporting channel to be used for public sightings (jurisdiction-defined channel or 9-1-1, per the alert message).

FIELD AID

Gate 1 / Gate 2 Assessment

GATE 1 — DOES THE CASE QUALIFY FOR THE ENHANCED VMP RESPONSE?

These factors bear on Gate 1 (missing status, vulnerability and time-sensitive risk) and should trigger prompt escalation of the search response and assessment. Meeting Gate 1 is not, by itself, a decision to issue a public alert — Gate 2 (public utility and geographic utility) must be separately assessed before public alert designation.

- Case-specific information indicates imminent exposure to water, traffic, rail, extreme weather or another serious hazard.
- The person cannot reliably recognize danger or return to safety.
- The person has communication/cognitive limitations that materially reduce their ability to seek help or respond to searchers.
- Medication, medical condition or environmental exposure makes delay dangerous.
- Behavioural history or circumstances indicate a rapid, high-risk travel pattern.
- Any other factor creates a reasonable belief that there is a materially elevated, time-sensitive risk of death or serious bodily harm.

These are assessment indicators, not independent mandatory elements or a numerical checklist. Gate 1 is determined by applying the Operational Standard to the totality of the available information.

GATE 2 — DOES THE CASE QUALIFY FOR PUBLIC ALERTING?

Once Gate 1 is satisfied, assess these factors separately before recommending public alert designation. A Gate-1-qualifying case does not automatically satisfy Gate 2.

Required Gate 2 elements

- Public utility: is there information capable of producing useful public observations or actions (a description, direction of travel, distinctive clothing or behaviour)?
- Geographic utility: is there an identifiable, operationally defensible area in which recipients could reasonably contribute to locating the person?

Interpretive guidance

- Absence of a confirmed direction of travel does not, by itself, establish that public dissemination cannot assist.
- No single information type, including a photograph, is independently required where the available information as a whole is sufficient to support useful public action.
- Where Gate 2 is not met, continue the Gate 1 search response and reassess Gate 2 as new information arrives; document the reason public alert designation was not recommended.

FIELD AID

Public Alert Message Standard

A VPA should tell nearby people what they can do. The public should not have to decode a colour, diagnosis or internal police category before understanding the risk.

Recommended message elements

Every VPA must state the four mandatory minimum elements set by the National VPA Operational Standard (Section 6.5): that a vulnerable person is missing, the issuing authority, the last known area, and what the public should do. These are marked Required below. The other elements are recommended where known, relevant, technically supported and lawfully disclosable; none of them is a precondition for issuing an alert.

1. **Required.** Lead with the action: state plainly that a vulnerable person is missing and at time-sensitive risk, before any internal alert category or terminology.
2. **Required.** Issuing authority: name the police service or other authority issuing the alert.
3. Who: concise identifying description and current image where the system supports it.
4. **Required.** Where and when: last known location and relevant direction/travel information.
5. Why the public should act: vulnerability/hazard information necessary to understand urgency, without unnecessary diagnostic disclosure.
6. **Required.** What to do: look from lawful and safe locations; check their own property or other locations specifically identified by authorities where appropriate; report sightings through the reporting channel identified in the alert (use 9-1-1 only where immediate emergency response is required or where designated by the issuing authority), and follow responder instructions.
7. What not to do: case-specific safety instruction where direct approach could create risk.
8. Update/cancellation: clear notification when the person is located or the search area changes, issued under the applicable alerting protocol. An update or cancellation is not necessarily sent as another interruptive Broadcast Immediate alert.

PRIVACY RULE

A VPA message must not broadcast diagnosis, detailed medical history, family circumstances, or other disability information not necessary for safe identification or approach. Communication differences, behavioural or sensory information, and specific safety-approach instructions may be included only where operationally necessary. Public messaging should otherwise use only the minimum personal or health information reasonably necessary to support identification, safe public action and recovery.

Information governance & privacy

Beyond the public alert message, the framework must also govern how information moves between responders, SAR partners and family/caregiver liaisons during a search. This manual does not set out Canadian privacy law; the framework must operate within applicable federal/provincial privacy and policing law and the following principles:

- Collect only information operationally relevant to the search.
- Share information according to applicable law, authority and role.
- Distinguish public-alert information from operational responder information.
- Retain and dispose of information according to existing police/emergency records rules.
- Local protocols should identify authorized information recipients and approved information-sharing pathways for police, SAR, emergency-management and other participating partners.

Model message template

VULNERABLE PERSONS ALERT — MISSING PERSON AT TIME-SENSITIVE RISK

Police are searching for [NAME/AGE OR DESCRIPTION], last seen near [LOCATION] at [TIME]. [PERSON] may be unable to recognize danger / communicate / return to safety and is believed to be at time-sensitive risk. Description: [DESCRIPTION]. [ACTIONABLE CASE-SPECIFIC INFORMATION]. If seen, [SAFE ACTION]. Report sightings to [REPORTING CHANNEL: 9-1-1 / DESIGNATED NON-EMERGENCY LINE / TIP LINE] immediately. Do not [CASE-SPECIFIC CAUTION, IF REQUIRED].

The template establishes required content, not a fixed technical message format. Final messages must comply with applicable CAP-CP, Common Look and Feel, official-language, accessibility, text-to-speech and channel-specific requirements.

Managing public and volunteer response

A Broadcast Immediate alert can prompt people to do more than look. Local protocols should address spontaneous public participation, not only public observation:

- The public should not enter unsafe terrain, water, private property or restricted areas.
- Public sightings should be reported through the designated channel rather than pursued by the reporting person.
- Where spontaneous volunteers are accepted or deployed, they should be managed under local incident-command and SAR protocols rather than left to search independently and unmanaged. Local authorities may restrict or decline spontaneous volunteer participation where safety, evidence preservation, terrain, operational security or command capacity requires.

Geographic targeting considerations

- Last known location and reliability of that location.
- Elapsed time.
- Known or reasonably estimated mobility and transportation access.
- Likely destinations, routes and behavioural attractions.
- Terrain, waterways, road/rail corridors and other hazards.
- Credible investigative information suggesting movement outside the initial area.
- Need to expand, contract or shift the alert area as the search develops.

Geographic utility does not require certainty that the person remains within the dissemination area. The area should represent a reasonable operational opportunity for useful public observation based on the information available, with expansion, contraction or shift as evidence develops.

- Message design should direct public tips through the designated reporting channel and avoid unnecessarily broad instructions that generate low-value calls or interfere with emergency communications.

EXERCISES

Scenario Package

These scenarios are deliberately diagnosis-neutral at the decision point. Diagnosis-specific information is included only where it changes communication, hazard or search considerations.

COMMON ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR EVERY SCENARIO

Apply this framework to each scenario below, then work through its scenario-specific questions: Is Gate 1 satisfied? What immediate actions follow? What are the search priorities? Is Gate 2 satisfied? What communication or recovery considerations apply? What new information could change the response?

Scenario 1 — Water priority

A young nonspeaking person leaves a residence unnoticed. Caregiver reports a strong attraction to nearby ponds and that the person may not answer when called. Last seen 12 minutes ago.

Discussion objectives

- What makes this immediately high risk?
- What questions must dispatch obtain now?
- What is the first search/hazard priority?
- Who should be escalated?
- Is Gate 1 satisfied? Why?
- What search actions begin immediately?
- Is Gate 2 satisfied on the information currently available? Why or why not?
- What new information could change the Gate 2 assessment?
- What should the public message say—and what information is unnecessary?

Scenario 2 — Cognitive impairment and transit

An older adult with cognitive impairment is missing from a shopping area. They routinely use transit but cannot reliably state their address and have missed essential medication. Two hours have elapsed.

Discussion objectives

- How does mobility change geographic targeting?
- What investigative and search streams run in parallel?
- What functional-risk facts matter more than the diagnostic label?
- What information should transit/public partners receive?
- Is Gate 1 satisfied? Why?
- Is Gate 2 satisfied on the information currently available? Why or why not?

Scenario 3 — Recovery is not the end

A vulnerable missing person is located by a member of the public near a busy road. When police approach with emergency lights active, the person moves away quickly and appears distressed.

Discussion objectives

- This scenario begins after the person is located; note how the Gate 1/Gate 2 questions apply differently once the search response has succeeded.
- How should approach tactics change?
- What information from the caregiver should responders use?
- How is the scene made safe?
- What medical/reunification steps follow?
- What should be captured in the after-action review?

Scenario 4 — Vulnerable does not automatically mean alert

An adult with an intellectual disability is reported overdue from a familiar community activity. They normally travel independently, carry a working phone, routinely navigate the route without assistance, there are no unusual environmental hazards, and there is currently no information indicating immediate danger.

Discussion objectives

- What vulnerability information matters?
- What police response is appropriate?
- What additional information could elevate the risk?
- Does functional vulnerability alone establish Gate 1? Why or why not?
- Is Gate 2 satisfied on the information currently available? What new information could change that?
- When should the risk assessment be repeated?

Scenario 5 — Cold-weather exposure and dementia

An older adult living with dementia is reported missing from a rural residence in freezing overnight temperatures. The person is not dressed for the weather, cannot reliably state their location, and has a history of leaving on foot toward a previous home in another town. Ninety minutes have elapsed.

Discussion objectives

- What makes cold-weather exposure an immediate hazard here?
- How does a history of returning to a previous home change the search area?
- What rural/remote search and resourcing factors apply?
- Is Gate 1 satisfied? Why?
- What search actions begin immediately?
- Is Gate 2 satisfied on the information currently available? Why or why not?
- What new information could change the Gate 2 assessment?
- What does this scenario demonstrate about applying the same functional-risk framework across different conditions and environments?

Scenario 6 — Conflicting intelligence / command challenge

A vulnerable person has been missing 40 minutes. Family identifies two historically relevant destinations from past elopements: a drainage corridor and a former residence across town. Initial patrol assumptions favour nearby transit stops based on the person's usual routine, and there is some evidence supporting that direction. CCTV footage later becomes available showing ambiguous movement toward one search sector, consistent with more than one of the possibilities raised. Public alert preparation is underway while SAR arrives and numerous public tips begin coming in.

Discussion objectives

- What happens immediately?
- Who receives the caregiver information, and how is it documented?
- When should the search plan change?
- How should the ambiguous CCTV information be weighed against the transit evidence and the two caregiver-identified destinations, rather than treated as confirming any one of them?
- Who communicates that change, and to whom?
- Does alert preparation delay the search response?
- How are incoming public tips triaged?
- What does this scenario illustrate about weighing multiple credible sources rather than assuming any single source (family, patrol assumption, or CCTV) is simply correct?

EVALUATION

After-Action Review & Performance Measures

The framework should measure whether the system works as a coordinated response, not merely whether personnel completed an online course.

After-action review prompts

- Was functional risk recognized at the first reasonable opportunity?
- Was information from family/caregivers captured and transmitted accurately?
- Was credible individualized information acted upon, assessed, or documented with a reason for non-action?
- Was escalation timely?
- If an alert was issued, was the decision timely, documented and consistent with criteria?
- Was geographic targeting appropriate and adjusted as information changed?
- Did the public message contain actionable information without unnecessary disclosure?
- Did search planning reflect individualized behaviour and immediate hazards?
- Were police, SAR, dispatch and emergency/public-warning roles coordinated?
- Was the recovery approach safe and individualized?
- What training, policy, technology or interoperability change is required?
- Is the framework being applied consistently across age, disability type, neighbourhood, service area and other demographic factors where legally appropriate to measure?

Suggested program measures

Measure	Purpose
Training completion by required role	Readiness
Time from first report to documented risk assessment	Recognition / delay
Time from receipt of material caregiver/family intelligence to documented assessment or incorporation into the search plan	Use of family/caregiver intelligence
Time from qualifying decision to alert issuance	Activation performance
Percentage of alerts with documented rationale for geographic scope and subsequent expansion/contraction where circumstances changed	Precision / fatigue mitigation
Post-incident review completion for every VPA activation and every escalated declined activation	Learning
Exercise findings closed within assigned timelines	Quality improvement

Measure	Purpose
Recurring issues in communication, search handoffs or alert messaging	System weakness detection
Complaints or concerns alleging delay, failure to consider vulnerability, inappropriate disclosure, or inconsistent VPA decision-making	Public accountability / equity monitoring

Gate 1 performance, measured separately from VPA/alert performance

To avoid program evaluation becoming overly focused on whether an alert was issued, measure Gate 1 timeliness and coordination independently:

- Time from first report to initial urgent protective action;
- Time from report to Gate 1 assessment;
- Time from Gate 1 satisfaction to search escalation;
- Time from Gate 1 satisfaction to Search Manager/SAR notification, where applicable; and
- Time from Gate 1 satisfaction to Gate 2 determination.

Detailed measure definitions, clock rules and exclusions should be established in the implementation/QA specification before performance comparison across agencies.

DO NOT CREATE PERVERSE INCENTIVES

Recovery outcome alone should not be used as a responder performance metric. Outcomes depend on many factors outside responder control. Measure recognition, timeliness, coordination, adherence to criteria, message quality and learning.

System-level program evaluation

The measures above evaluate individual responder and agency performance. The framework should separately evaluate, at a program level, whether the alert tool itself is contributing to outcomes — this is a policy evaluation question, not an individual-responder metric. Suggested program-level measures include:

- Number of high-risk VMP incidents assessed for VPA eligibility, including the proportion resulting in activation.
- Number of VPA activations and their geographic scope.
- Public tips received, and the proportion that were actionable.
- Whether public information contributed to locating or recovering the person.
- False or duplicate tip burden on dispatch and investigators.
- Time from alert issuance to location, and time to cancellation.
- Public complaints, opt-out or alert-fatigue indicators, where measurable.
- Cases where retrospective review determines that activation criteria appear to have been met on the information reasonably available at the relevant time but no VPA was issued, and cases where a VPA was issued but later review determines the criteria do not appear to have been met on that same standard.

The framework requires a defined quality-assurance review process for activation and non-activation decisions. This manual does not prescribe whether that review sits with a local supervisor, a provincial authority or an independent panel, but the responsibility must be explicitly assigned rather than left implicit.

EVIDENCE & IMPLEMENTATION BASIS

Existing Infrastructure to Build From

This manual proposes a new VPA training standard, but it deliberately builds from existing training and operational structures rather than assuming a new institution is required. These sources are presented as operational and governance precedents supporting individual elements of the model; they do not constitute evidence that the proposed VPA training framework, as a complete package, has already been evaluated in Canada.

HOW TO READ THIS LIST — TWO KINDS OF SOURCE

Sources are grouped by their primary evidentiary function; several support more than one element of the model, and this grouping is illustrative rather than exclusive. Condition-specific / operational evidence (items 6, 13, 14) informs specific competencies directly — item 14 (CDC) is direct condition-specific operational guidance, item 6 (NCMEC) is specialist operational guidance read alongside it, and item 13 (Waterloo) is both operational evidence and Canadian implementation/research infrastructure. Policing-policy precedent (items 7, 8, 9, 10) supports the accountability and governance model; item 10 (BC policing standards) also directly supports the no-delay operational competency, not only governance. Delivery-infrastructure precedent (items 1, 2) supports how training is hosted and delivered. SAR competency/training architecture (items 3, 4, 5, 11, 12) supports the search and training-standard structure. Advance-information precedent (item 15) supports the advance safety plan/profile concept. Worked example (item 16) is PPP's own material, not external evidence — see the note at the end of this section.

SOURCE VERIFICATION — OCTOBER 2026

The external sources in this section were checked against publicly available source material in October 2026. Sources are used for the specific propositions identified below and should not be read as independent validation of the proposed VPA framework as a complete package. Technical standards, course offerings, government guidance and public-alerting specifications may change; current versions should be confirmed during formal implementation and before regulatory or technical submission.

1. Canadian Police Knowledge Network / RCMP — Missing Persons Investigations (2024)

CPKN's three-hour course is provided by the RCMP and covers timely action, investigative steps, tools/resources/best practices, and vulnerable populations. It is aimed at police, government and other first responders.

Source: Canadian Police Knowledge Network, "Missing Persons Investigations" (course, RCMP-provided). Available at: cpkn.ca/course/missing-persons-investigations-mpi/. Accessed October 2026.

2. Canadian Police Knowledge Network / University of Waterloo — Managing Risks of Disappearance in Persons Living with Dementia

CPKN lists this as a free learning resource developed through the University of Waterloo's Managing Risks of Disappearance in Persons Living with Dementia project. It includes learning materials addressing pre-missing, during-missing and post-missing incidents and demonstrates an existing Canadian model for specialized missing-person vulnerability learning distributed through a national police/public-safety learning platform.

Source: Canadian Police Knowledge Network / University of Waterloo, "Managing Risks of Disappearance in Persons Living with Dementia" (learning resource). Available at: cpkn.ca. Accessed October 2026.

3. Alberta — Search and Rescue

Alberta describes SAR teams as supporting police and municipal emergency services. At scene, a Search Manager plans the response based on resources, expertise and training while continuously gathering incident information.

Source: Government of Alberta, "Search and Rescue." Available at: alberta.ca/search-and-rescue. Accessed October 2026.

4. Alberta — Ground Search and Rescue training

Alberta GSAR training-grant materials have included Search Manager training and recertification, tabletop and provincial exercises, and train-the-trainer models; regional teams are encouraged to train with local police. This documents provincial GSAR training precedent rather than a claim about a currently unchanged program.

Source: Government of Alberta, Ground Search and Rescue Training Grant: Program Guidelines (2022/23 edition materials reviewed). Available at: alberta.ca/ground-search-and-rescue-training-grant. Accessed October 2026.

5. Alberta Emergency Management Agency — ICS training

AEMA uses standardized curriculum/instructor requirements and provides ICS training to eligible municipal emergency-management personnel, SAR volunteers and Alberta RCMP members, demonstrating another existing mechanism for standardized provincial delivery.

Source: Alberta Emergency Management Agency, Incident Command System courses. Available at: alberta.ca/incident-command-system-courses. Accessed October 2026.

6. National Center for Missing & Exploited Children — Autism & Wandering / Search Water First

NCMEC provides first-responder search protocols and training across a set of autism/wandering resources, including its "Autism & Wandering" guidance and associated "Search Water First" material, identifying operational considerations such as nonresponse to name, hiding and bolting behaviour, and attraction to hazards. This manual reads NCMEC together with the current CDC guidance at item 14 below — rather than relying on NCMEC alone — for the water/roads/rail search-priority and nonresponse competencies; specific behaviours are drawn from NCMEC's broader guidance rather than a single page.

Source: National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, "Autism & Wandering." Available at: ncmec.org/autism. Accessed October 2026.

7. Civilian Review and Complaints Commission for the RCMP — Policing in Northern British Columbia (2017)

The Commission's review of RCMP policing in Northern British Columbia identified record-keeping and policy gaps in missing-person investigations and made recommendations aimed at improving training, supervisory review and reporting practices. The Commission specifically found that the RCMP had no mandatory missing-person-investigation training for members at Depot Division, the Pacific Region Training Centre or in the Field Coaching Program (Finding 45), and recommended that the RCMP consider making training on the national missing-persons policy mandatory for members in contract policing, in the interest of a standardized, effective, comprehensive and coordinated response (Recommendation 31). This provides Canadian policy precedent

supporting consideration of standardized missing-person training and mandatory training where consistency is required.

Source: Civilian Review and Complaints Commission for the RCMP, Chairperson's Final Report After Commissioner's Notice on Chairperson-initiated Complaint and Public Interest Investigation regarding Policing in Northern British Columbia (February 2017). Available at: crrc-ccetp.gc.ca/en/node/1965. Accessed October 2026.

8. Toronto Police Service — Missing and Missed Report (2021)

The Independent Civilian Review into Missing Person Investigations, led by the Honourable Gloria J. Epstein, made 151 recommendations following a review of the Toronto Police Service's handling of missing-person cases involving marginalized communities. Its recommendations include developing a specialized risk-assessment tool, ensuring risk assessments are conducted by trained personnel within defined timelines, establishing a risk-assessment-based triage protocol, and building community partnership into how missing-person investigations are conducted.

Source: The Honourable Gloria J. Epstein, Missing and Missed: Report of the Independent Civilian Review into Missing Person Investigations (April 2021). Available at: tps.ca. Accessed October 2026.

9. RCMP — Response to the Mass Casualty Commission on Critical-Incident Training and After-Action Review

Following the Mass Casualty Commission's final report, the RCMP commissioned an independent external review of its Initial Critical Incident Response training for front-line supervisors. The review is particularly relevant to this model because it recommends adding missing-person response to foundational critical-incident training (Initial Critical Incident Response 100), greater use of tabletop practice and refresher learning, performance tracking through after-action debriefs, and additional advanced command training addressing missing vulnerable persons. The RCMP has also committed to formalizing after-action review and post-incident debrief within its critical-incident management training and processes. This is a close Canadian operational precedent for the model's approach to command training, scenario exercises, refreshers and structured after-action learning.

Source: RCMP, Independent Review Report: RCMP Initial Critical Incident Response 100 and 200 — Training Compliance and Assessment (2023); RCMP Mass Casualty Commission Position Notes, "After-Action Review." Available at: rcmp.ca/en/mass-casualty-commission/independent-review-report-rcmp-initial-critical-incident-response-100-and. Accessed October 2026.

10. British Columbia Provincial Policing Standards — Missing Persons: Guiding Principles

British Columbia's provincial policing standards require missing-person reports to be accepted and investigations commenced promptly regardless of how long the person has been missing. They direct officers to conduct a risk assessment without delay and note that it is easier to scale back an initial response than to recover early investigative opportunities lost through delay. This is the direct Canadian policing-standard basis for the model's Time-Critical Response competency.

Source: Government of British Columbia, BC Provincial Policing Standards, Section 5.1 — Missing Person Investigations: Guiding Principles. Available at: www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/justice/criminal-justice/policing-in-bc/policing-standards/5-1/5-1-guiding-principles. Accessed October 2026.

11. CSA Z1620:24 — Core Competency Standards for Ground Search and Rescue Operations

CSA Z1620:24 is the current National Standard of Canada for GSAR core competencies, covering the three core roles of searcher, team leader and SAR manager. It was developed for interoperability and portability of GSAR skills across Canada. This manual's VMP/VPA training model is designed to supplement, not replace, this established national standard.

Source: CSA Group, CSA Z1620:24, Core competency standards for ground search and rescue operations: Searcher, team leader, and SAR manager (2024). Available at: csagroup.org. Accessed October 2026.

12. CSA Z1625:24 — Training Curriculum Standards for Ground Search and Rescue Operations

CSA Z1625:24 aligns with CSA Z1620:24 and provides the national training curriculum requirements and design guidance for the same three GSAR core roles. It supports this manual's standardized, role-specific curriculum architecture.

Source: CSA Group, CSA Z1625:24, Training curriculum standards for ground search and rescue operations: Searcher, team leader, and SAR manager (2024). Available at: csagroup.org. Accessed October 2026.

13. University of Waterloo — Dementia-Friendly Resources for First Responders

Beyond the short CPKN course listing (Source 2), the University of Waterloo's Managing Risks of Disappearance in Persons Living with Dementia (MRDPD) project maintains a dedicated resource hub for first responders and SAR personnel, funded by Public Safety Canada's Search and Rescue New Initiatives Fund. The hub provides prevention- and safety-focused resources intended to assist in preventing a missing incident, provide guidance for search strategies specific to a person living with dementia, and support follow-up after an incident to prevent recurrence, alongside links to allied resources such as the Canadian Guideline for Safe Wandering and Alzheimer Society of Canada first-responder materials. This manual's dementia-specific search-behaviour guidance is consistent with, and informed by, this body of material and the broader lost-person-behaviour literature it draws on; specific tactical details (e.g., decision-point behaviour, paths of least resistance) reflect general lost-person-behaviour science rather than a single verbatim source.

Source: University of Waterloo, Managing Risks of Disappearance in Persons Living with Dementia — Dementia-Friendly Resources for First Responders. Available at: uwaterloo.ca/managing-risks-of-disappearance-in-persons-living-with-dementia/dementia-friendly-resources-first-responders. Accessed October 2026.

14. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention — Autism Wandering Is an Emergency (2026)

The CDC's current guidance states that autism-related wandering/elopement can become life-threatening within minutes, identifies drowning as the leading cause of death after wandering, and directs that water be treated as the top search priority alongside roads and other immediate hazards. This supports the model's autism elopement high-threat search-priority guidance.

Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Autism Wandering Is an Emergency" (August 2026). Available at: cdc.gov/priorities/autism/autism-wandering-and-elopement-is-an-emergency.html. Accessed October 2026.

15. Police Scotland / UK Police Forces — The Herbert Protocol

The Herbert Protocol originated with Norfolk Constabulary in 2011 and has since been adopted by police forces across the United Kingdom. Police Scotland rolled it out nationally in September 2021 after earlier local use. It is a pre-completed, family-maintained advance information form for people living with dementia, handed to police at the point a person is reported missing so that responders have essential information immediately, rather than gathering it under stress at first contact. It is a working precedent for the advance safety plan/profile concept introduced in this manual's Functional-Risk Recognition competency.

Source: Police Scotland, "The Herbert Protocol - missing persons with Dementia." Available at: scotland.police.uk. Accessed October 2026.

16. Parent Partnership Project Inc. — Elopement Safety Plan & Response Workbook

Parent Partnership Project Inc.'s Elopement Safety Plan & Response Workbook (Volume 1 of the PPP Elopement Safety Series) is a Canadian family-completed advance planning workbook for autistic and neurodivergent individuals at risk of wandering/elopement. It includes a risk profile and trigger summary, a first responder/ID information sheet, a home and environment safety checklist, an emergency contacts and response plan, a community notification letter for neighbours and schools, and an incident tracking log. Its companion High-Risk Elopement Area Preparedness Guide includes a cut-and-keep profile card and a "When Police Arrive" handoff page. Together these serve the same core function as the Herbert Protocol (Source 15) for a different population, and are cited here as a worked Canadian example rather than a mandatory template. The workbook is maintained and distributed separately by Parent Partnership Project Inc. and is not reproduced in this manual.

Source: Parent Partnership Project Inc., Elopement Safety Plan & Response Workbook (PPP Elopement Safety Series, Volume 1); High-Risk Elopement Area Preparedness Guide. Available from Parent Partnership Project Inc.

Source Directory

Compact index of the sources cited above, for policy staff who need to trace a specific reference quickly. The Access column shows the host domain; the full address for each source is given in the numbered citation above.

#	Title	Organization	Year	Access
1	Missing Persons Investigations (course)	CPKN / RCMP	2024	cpkn.ca
2	Managing Risks of Disappearance in Persons Living with Dementia (learning resource)	CPKN / University of Waterloo	n.d.	uwaterloo.ca
3	Search and Rescue (program page)	Government of Alberta	n.d.	alberta.ca
4	Ground Search and Rescue Training Grant: Program Guidelines	Government of Alberta	2022/23	alberta.ca
5	Incident Command System courses	Alberta Emergency Management Agency	n.d.	alberta.ca
6	Autism & Wandering	National Center for Missing & Exploited Children	n.d.	ncmec.org

#	Title	Organization	Year	Access
7	Chairperson's Final Report — Policing in Northern British Columbia	Civilian Review and Complaints Commission for the RCMP	2017	crcc-ccetp.gc.ca
8	Missing and Missed: Report of the Independent Civilian Review into Missing Person Investigations	Independent Civilian Review (Hon. Gloria J. Epstein) / Toronto Police Service	2021	tps.ca
9	ICIR 100/200 Independent Review; MCC Position Notes ("After-Action Review")	RCMP	2023	rcmp.ca
10	Missing Persons: Guiding Principles (BC Provincial Policing Standards, Section 5.1)	Government of British Columbia	n.d.	www2.gov.bc.ca
11	Core Competency Standards for GSAR Operations	CSA Group	2024	csagroup.org
12	Training Curriculum Standards for GSAR Operations	CSA Group	2024	csagroup.org
13	Dementia-Friendly Resources for First Responders (MRDPD)	University of Waterloo	n.d.	uwaterloo.ca
14	Autism Wandering Is an Emergency	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	2026	cdc.gov
15	The Herbert Protocol	Police Scotland / UK police forces	2011 / 2021	scotland.police.uk
16	Elopement Safety Plan & Response Workbook (Vol. 1)	Parent Partnership Project Inc.	n.d.	Contact PPP

Relationship to the Evidence Base

The campaign's Evidence Base, *The Research Behind the Campaign: An Evidence Base for the Vulnerable Persons Alert Proposal*, identifies standardized responder training as a policy design requirement and uses Canadian qualitative research comparing Scotland and Canada to show why training consistency matters. This manual operationalizes that principle; it does not replace the Evidence Base.

Relationship to the National VPA Operational Standard

This manual is the applied-skills layer. The Proposed National Vulnerable Persons Alert (VPA) Operational Standard: Discussion Draft is the eligibility and process layer: it defines the Gate 1 / Gate 2 activation criteria, the Preliminary Screening Checklist (Appendix A), the Activation Request Form (Appendix B), and the minimum alert-content standard that this manual's field guidance is designed to apply. That single document now carries both the operational standard and the technical questions proposed for review under the CEMCS Change Management Process; it replaces three earlier PPP documents: *National Framework for Vulnerable Persons Alerts*; *Federal Responsibilities: A Body-by-Body Breakdown of Required Federal Action*; and *National VPA Operational Standard, External Review Draft 0.92*. Where this manual's field guidance and the Operational Standard's eligibility language diverge, the Operational Standard governs; updates to either document should be reconciled with the other.

Development partners to consult before adoption

- Federal/provincial/territorial public-safety and emergency-management authorities
- RCMP and representative municipal/provincial police services
- 9-1-1 / public-safety answering point representatives
- SAR organizations and Search Managers
- Police training academies and CPKN or equivalent national learning infrastructure
- Disability, autism, dementia, cognitive-impairment and communication experts
- People with lived experience and family/caregiver representatives
- Privacy, accessibility, Indigenous, rural/remote and northern-community experts
- Alert Ready / public-warning technical and governance stakeholders

Proposed implementation sequence

This model describes an end state. Getting there is expected to proceed in phases rather than all at once nationally.

Phase 1 — Governance and standard development. Federal, provincial/territorial and operational stakeholders establish competencies, alert criteria, governance and curriculum ownership. Privacy/legal review — including a Privacy Impact Assessment where required — should occur before operational deployment, addressing collection authority, inter-agency disclosure, public dissemination, retention, access, correction and safeguards for competent adults.

Phase 2 — Pilot. The pilot should be designed to include sufficient operational diversity to meaningfully test the model — for example, some combination of: urban municipal policing; RCMP/contract policing; a rural/remote environment; 9-1-1/PSAP; SAR; and a provincial alerting authority. A pilot limited to one environment type risks leaving cross-jurisdictional handoffs, rural/remote resourcing, and alerting-authority variation untested. Pilot evaluation should include implementation cost, personnel time and training-delivery burden.

Phase 3 — Evaluate. Test training completion, decision consistency, agency handoffs, alert preparation, public-tip load and exercise findings from the pilot.

Phase 4 — Refine, reconsider or scale. Based on pilot findings, revise the model, reconsider elements that did not work as intended, or progressively integrate it into provincial and local systems.

QUICK REFERENCE

Local Implementation Standard

Use this page as the short-form implementation summary for local governments and police services.

1 — RECEIVE REPORT + BEGIN URGENT MEASURES + ASSESS GATE 1

Urgent measures begin on reasonable suspicion and do not wait for Gate 1. Apply Gate 1 from the first report: unknown whereabouts + sufficiently confirmed missing circumstances + functional vulnerability + time-sensitive risk.

2 — ESCALATE THE VMP RESPONSE

Begin appropriate investigation, hazard checks and search activity without waiting for an alert decision.

3 — ASSESS PUBLIC ALERT UTILITY

Apply Gate 2 separately: can public observations/actions help, and is there an operationally defensible dissemination area?

4 — MAKE THE VPA ACTIVATION DECISION

Where Gate 1 and Gate 2 are satisfied, the authorized decision-maker initiates the Activation Request through the designated pathway. The Alerting Authority issues the alert.

5 — TARGET + UPDATE

Base geography on last known position, elapsed time, mobility, hazards, behavioural intelligence and emerging evidence.

6 — SEARCH + INVESTIGATE + ENGAGE THE PUBLIC IN PARALLEL

Keep information moving among police, SAR, investigation, family/caregiver liaison, public warning and tip intake.

7 — RECOVER + STAND DOWN SAFELY

Use an individualized recovery approach, cancel/update public messaging, stand down resources and capture lessons learned.

MAINTAIN FIRST-RESPONDER READINESS

Ensure dispatch, frontline police, supervisors, investigators, Search Managers and relevant emergency/public-warning personnel complete role-appropriate training and recurring exercises.

FEDERAL: COORDINATE THE MODEL STANDARD • PROVINCIAL/TERRITORIAL: ADAPT + IMPLEMENT • MUNICIPAL/LOCAL: TRAIN & APPLY

ONE FRAMEWORK. ONE SYSTEM. ONE MISSION.