

AKYEAME STATECRAFT INC

The Institutional Architecture of Canadian Emergency Management: Why Coordination Keeps Failing

Formal, Effective, and Legitimate Authority in a Distributed Crisis System

Shamuddeen Bagura, Elikem Tsamenyi & Benjamin Ofosu-Atuahene

Working Paper 2 | Political Architecture Assessment Series | September 2026

Core Claim

Canada does not suffer from emergency-management institutional absence. It suffers from authority misalignment. Formal authority, effective authority, and legitimate authority are distributed across federal, provincial, territorial, municipal, Indigenous, and community actors. Coordination becomes fragile when the system assumes these forms of authority will align during crisis without building a durable architecture that aligns them before crisis pressure arrives.

Political Architecture is the terrain. Political Architecture Assessment is the survey. The Political Architecture Brief is the map that tells reform designers what the terrain can carry.

Abstract

Canada does not lack emergency-management institutions. It has federal legislation, national frameworks, federal-provincial-territorial strategies, a Government Operations Centre, disaster finance arrangements, provincial and territorial emergency systems, municipal first responders, and Indigenous emergency-management programs. Yet major emergencies continue to expose recurring coordination problems. This paper argues that the deeper issue is not institutional absence, but authority misalignment. Canadian emergency management distributes authority across federal, provincial, territorial, municipal, Indigenous, and community-level actors. This distribution is appropriate for a federal system, but it creates a structural challenge: the actor with formal authority may not hold effective authority to act quickly; the actor with effective capacity may not possess legitimate authority in affected communities; and actors with local legitimacy may not be fully integrated into formal emergency-management architecture.

Using Akyeame Statecraft’s Political Architecture Assessment framework, the paper distinguishes between formal authority, effective authority, and legitimate authority as three different forms of power that must be aligned before crises occur. The Canadian case shows that coordination does not fail simply because plans are missing, but because crisis systems often assume that these forms of authority will converge under pressure. The paper argues that emergency-management reform should not only improve plans, funding programs, or coordination tables. It should build an institutional architecture capable of aligning legal responsibility, operational capacity, and public legitimacy before the next crisis tests the system.

Keywords: emergency management; federalism; authority; legitimacy; institutional architecture; Political Architecture Assessment; Canada; Indigenous governance; disaster governance.

1. Introduction: Authority Alignment in a Distributed Crisis System

Canada’s emergency-management system is institutionally dense. It contains federal legislation, national frameworks, federal-provincial-territorial strategies, public safety institutions, provincial and territorial emergency organizations, municipal responders, Indigenous emergency-management arrangements, humanitarian partners, and disaster recovery programs. On paper, the system is not empty. It is highly populated.

Yet major emergencies continue to reveal a recurring coordination puzzle. When emergencies move quickly, cross jurisdictional boundaries, overwhelm local capacity, or require action before formal request pathways fully activate, coordination becomes most difficult at precisely the moment when coordination matters most.

The pattern is documented across more than two decades of post-crisis review. The post-incident assessment of the 2016 Wood Buffalo wildfire, the Abbott-Chapman review of British Columbia’s 2017 flood and wildfire seasons, Ontario’s audit of its COVID-19 pandemic emergency-management response, a federal expert review of pandemic science and response coordination, and the after-action review of the 2023 Northwest Territories wildfire season all identify recurring weaknesses in coordination, role clarity, planning, or information-sharing (KPMG LLP, 2017; Abbott & Chapman, 2018; Office of the Auditor General of Ontario, 2020; Health Canada, 2024; Government of the

Northwest Territories, 2025). Different hazards, different governments, similar findings. Repetition on that scale is evidence that at least part of the problem originates in the architecture within which emergency management operates rather than in any single response.

This puzzle is often described as a problem of implementation, capacity, communication, or intergovernmental coordination. Those explanations are important, but incomplete. They identify symptoms without fully explaining the institutional condition that produces them. The deeper problem is that Canadian emergency management operates through a distributed authority system in which different actors hold different kinds of authority.

This paper argues that Canada’s emergency-management challenge is best understood as a problem of authority misalignment. Formal authority, effective authority, and legitimate authority are distributed across different actors. Coordination is not a neutral technical activity. It depends on authority. Someone must be able to decide, request, mobilize, fund, communicate, evacuate, prioritize, and explain. Someone must also be trusted enough for affected communities to comply with instructions and accept difficult decisions.

Formal authority is legal or institutional authority. It answers the question: who is officially responsible? In emergency management, formal authority is found in legislation, frameworks, intergovernmental agreements, departmental mandates, provincial and territorial emergency powers, municipal responsibilities, and program rules.

Effective authority is operational authority. It answers the question: who can actually act? Effective authority includes the ability to mobilize responders, move people, share information, coordinate logistics, activate emergency operations, deploy resources, and deliver services.

Legitimate authority is recognized authority. It answers the question: who will affected people trust, follow, and regard as rightful during crisis? Legitimate authority may come from elected office, Indigenous governance, local knowledge, community recognition, professional credibility, or demonstrated protection during emergency.

Authority form	Core question	What it includes	Canadian emergency-management examples
Formal authority	Who is officially responsible?	Legislation, mandates, frameworks, emergency powers, intergovernmental agreements.	Provinces and territories often hold primary operational responsibility; the federal minister coordinates federal emergency-management activity and federal assistance.
Effective authority	Who can actually mobilize action?	Operational capacity, logistics, funding control, information systems, responders, request pathways.	Municipal responders, provincial agencies, federal surge capacity, the Government Operations Centre, humanitarian partners, and emergency service providers.
Legitimate authority	Who will affected people trust and follow?	Community recognition, Indigenous authority, local knowledge, credible communication, visible protection.	First Nations Chiefs and Councils, trusted local governments, emergency responders, community leaders, and Indigenous institutions.

Emergency coordination works when these three forms of authority are sufficiently aligned before a crisis. It weakens when the system assumes they will align during crisis.

In Canada, formal authority may sit with provinces or territories, while effective response capacity may depend on municipalities, local responders, federal support, humanitarian partners, or Indigenous governments. Legitimate authority may rest with local governments, First Nations Chiefs and Councils, community leaders, emergency responders, or trusted local institutions. The problem is not that authority is distributed. In a federal country, it must be. The problem is that distributed authority requires an architecture strong enough to align legal responsibility, operational capacity, and public trust under pressure.

This is the contribution of a Political Architecture Assessment approach. PAA does not begin by asking whether institutions exist. It asks whether the authority structure beneath those institutions can support the function expected of them. In the Canadian emergency-management context, the core question is therefore not simply: who is responsible? It is: who has formal authority, who has effective capacity, who holds legitimate trust, and are these actors aligned before crisis conditions arrive?

This paper does not argue that Canadian emergency management should become centralized. Its claim is narrower: in a federal system, distributed authority is unavoidable, but distributed authority must be architecturally aligned before crisis. The contribution is to show that coordination failure is often not the primary defect; it is the visible symptom of a deeper authority structure that has not been made coherent enough to operate under pressure.

The distinction changes the reform problem. If the problem is institutional absence, the solution is to create more institutions, strategies, plans, or coordination tables. If the problem is authority misalignment, new institutions may simply add another layer to an already layered system. The better reform question becomes: how can the system align formal responsibility, operational capacity, and legitimate trust before emergency pressure arrives?

2. Canada's Emergency-Management Architecture

Canada's emergency-management architecture reflects the country's federal structure. Responsibility is shared across federal, provincial, territorial, municipal, Indigenous, and community-level actors. This distribution is not accidental. It reflects constitutional authority, geography, local knowledge, public safety capacity, and the practical reality that most emergencies begin locally.

The Emergency Management Framework for Canada states that most emergencies are local in nature and are managed by municipalities and communities or at the provincial or territorial level. It also describes emergency-management responsibilities as shared by federal, provincial, and territorial governments and their partners, including Indigenous peoples, municipalities, communities, and individual citizens (Public Safety Canada, 2017).

That statement captures both the strength and the risk of the Canadian model. Shared responsibility allows action to begin close to the emergency. It recognizes that local actors often have the best immediate knowledge of local terrain, people, infrastructure, and vulnerability. It also respects federalism. But shared responsibility creates a coordination burden. It requires the system to connect different orders of government, different kinds of authority, and different decision clocks under high pressure.

2.1 Formal Authority: A Federal System Built on Shared Responsibility

The Emergency Management Act gives the federal minister a leadership and coordination role. The minister is responsible for coordinating emergency-management activities among federal government institutions and, in cooperation with provinces and other entities, coordinating emergency-management activity. The Act also includes responsibility for coordinating the Government of Canada's response to an emergency and coordinating federal assistance to a province when a provincial emergency is declared to be of concern to the federal government, when the province requests assistance, or when an agreement requires or permits assistance (Department of Justice Canada, 2007).

At the same time, the Act preserves provincial authority. It states that a federal institution may not respond to a provincial emergency unless the province requests assistance or an agreement with the province requires or permits the assistance (Department of Justice Canada, 2007). This provision is not a defect. It is a jurisdictional safeguard. But it is also an architectural condition. Federal capacity may exist before it can be activated. Provincial authority may be primary before provincial capacity is sufficient. Municipal responders may face the emergency first before intergovernmental machinery is fully mobilized.

Formal authority is therefore deliberately distributed. The test is whether the architecture aligns that formal distribution with operational capacity and community legitimacy fast enough when emergencies compress time.

2.2 Effective Authority: Coordination Capacity Without Command Unity

Canada does have national coordination machinery. Public Safety Canada describes the Government Operations Centre as supporting preparedness and leading the coordination of the integrated federal response to all-hazard events of national interest. The GOC's role is to convene, collaborate, coordinate, and communicate; it also maintains communication with provinces and territories through Public Safety regional offices (Public Safety Canada, 2025a).

Canada has not ignored coordination. The issue is more precise: a coordination centre is not the same as a coordination architecture. A centre can convene actors, share information, coordinate federal departments, and support requests for federal assistance. It cannot, by itself, erase jurisdictional boundaries, local capacity gaps, funding delays, information asymmetries, or legitimacy deficits.

Effective authority in emergency management is therefore distributed across a wider operational field. It may sit with municipal fire services, police services, emergency medical teams, provincial emergency agencies, territorial governments, Indigenous emergency authorities, federal departments, the Canadian Armed Forces when called upon, non-governmental partners, telecommunications providers, utilities, evacuation logistics actors, and community organizations. Coordination must bring those actors into alignment before the crisis makes delay costly.

One indication that effective authority does not simply follow formal allocation is the recurring domestic deployment of the Canadian Armed Forces. Under Operation LENTUS, and under Operation LASER during the pandemic, the CAF has provided surge capacity in major emergencies, including the 2021 British Columbia floods, the 2023 Northwest Territories evacuation, and the COVID-19 response. National Defence describes the CAF as supporting civilian authorities during domestic emergencies

Quiet Authority. Enduring Institutions.

and notes that Operation LENTUS deployments are activated through requests for federal assistance (Department of National Defence, n.d.). The immediate explanation is logistical: the CAF can mobilize personnel, lift, planning, coordination, and other surge assets at a scale many civilian agencies cannot quickly match. The PAA interpretation is architectural. Once activated, the CAF provides concentrated federal operational capacity that can bridge gaps across fragmented civilian systems. Its recurring use should therefore be read not as evidence that military command replaces civilian emergency governance, but as a signal that civilian coordination and surge capacity remain uneven across the wider architecture.

2.3 Disaster Finance: Formal Reimbursement and the Prevention Gap

Disaster finance adds another layer of authority. Public Safety Canada's Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements provide financial assistance to provincial and territorial governments for response and recovery costs from large-scale disasters caused by natural hazards (Public Safety Canada, 2025b). Assistance is paid to provinces and territories, not directly to individuals or communities, which reinforces the centrality of provincial and territorial governments in recovery finance (Public Safety Canada, 2025b).

DFAA modernization is important because eligible disasters beginning April 1, 2025 are governed by updated guidelines that include mitigation, risk reduction, and recovery-support objectives. The modernized program includes a disaster risk reduction incentive and supports strategic mitigation in affected areas (Public Safety Canada, 2025c). This is a meaningful shift upstream.

Disaster finance therefore exposes a timing problem. It answers some questions after the event: what costs are eligible, what governments can be reimbursed, and how recovery can be supported. The harder architectural questions arise earlier: who controls risk reduction before the event, who can require mitigation before disaster, who funds preparedness when no crisis is visible, and who can act when the cost of inaction is not yet politically urgent?

2.4 Indigenous Emergency Governance: Recognized Legitimacy, Uneven Integration

Emergency management for First Nations communities makes the legitimacy dimension especially visible. Indigenous Services Canada states that during an emergency event on a reserve, First Nations Chiefs and Councils lead response and recovery efforts, and that ISC reimburses eligible response and recovery costs through the Emergency Management Assistance Program (Indigenous Services Canada, 2026a). EMAP supports eligible First Nations communities in accessing emergency assistance services and applies across mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery (Indigenous Services Canada, 2026b).

This recognition matters. It confirms that First Nations governments are not simply stakeholder groups within emergency management. In their communities, they may hold formal authority, effective local knowledge, and legitimate authority. But the broader architecture has not always integrated those authority claims effectively. The Office of the Auditor General of Canada found in 2022 that Indigenous Services Canada's actions were more reactive than preventative, that the department spent 3.5 times more on response and recovery than on prevention and preparedness, and that many issues had not improved since a 2013 audit (Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 2022).

The institutional issue is therefore not program delivery alone. It is whether emergency-management architecture recognizes where authority already sits. If First Nations governments lead response and recovery on reserve and hold local legitimacy, the broader system must build that authority into planning, prevention, funding, service standards, evacuation, recovery, and accountability before crisis.

2.5 Whole-of-Government, Whole-of-Society, and the Authority Problem

Canadian emergency-management reform has increasingly used the language of whole-of-society resilience. This reflects a real problem: emergencies cannot be managed by government alone. They involve federal, provincial, territorial, municipal, and Indigenous authorities, but also private infrastructure operators, utilities, humanitarian organizations, communities, households, and citizens.

This is broader than a whole-of-government approach. Whole-of-government focuses on coordination within and across public institutions. It asks how departments, agencies, ministries, and levels of government work together. Whole-of-society expands the field by recognizing that emergency management also depends on actors outside formal government.

The shift is necessary, but it does not solve the authority problem. Naming more actors does not automatically clarify who can decide, who can fund, who can act, who can coordinate, who can block, or who affected communities will trust during crisis.

Whole-of-society language is therefore strong as an inclusion principle, but weaker as an authority architecture. It tells the system that many actors matter, but it does not always explain how their authority, capacity, resources, and legitimacy will be aligned before an emergency occurs.

Private infrastructure operators may control assets essential to response. Municipal governments may have local knowledge but limited fiscal capacity. Indigenous governments may hold legitimate authority in their communities but remain unevenly integrated into planning and finance. Humanitarian organizations may have practical reach but limited decision authority. Federal institutions may have coordination capacity but still depend on provincial or territorial request pathways.

The problem is not that whole-of-society is wrong. It is necessary. The problem is that it can expand responsibility without building the institutional architecture needed to make shared responsibility work.

Political Architecture Assessment helps make this distinction clear. It does not reject whole-of-government or whole-of-society approaches. It asks whether these approaches have a functioning authority structure beneath them. The key question is not whether all relevant actors have been named. The key question is whether the system has aligned formal authority, effective authority, and legitimate authority before crisis pressure arrives.

3. Where Authority Separates: Three Misalignments

The Canadian emergency-management landscape is not best understood as a blank institutional field. It is a layered field in which authority, capacity, finance, and legitimacy have accumulated across

different actors and different moments of reform. The central PAA question is where the layers do not align.

3.1 Formal Authority Without Direct Operational Reach

The first misalignment appears when an actor has formal responsibility or coordination mandate but does not directly control the operational system required to act. The federal government has national coordination capacity and surge resources, but provincial and territorial governments often hold primary operational authority within their jurisdictions. Federal institutions may also require provincial requests or agreements before responding to provincial emergencies.

This produces a federalism-compatible but crisis-sensitive design. It protects jurisdictional authority, but it also means that action can depend on requests, agreements, shared interpretation, and relationships. In ordinary time, that may be manageable. In fast-moving crises, it can produce delays or ambiguity. The central problem is not that formal authority is divided. It is that divided authority requires stronger pre-crisis alignment than a centralized command system would require.

This is why coordination cannot be treated as improvisation. If actors wait until the crisis to clarify roles, formal authority has already become a bottleneck. If federal support, provincial requests, municipal needs, and local legitimacy are not linked before the crisis, the emergency reveals a design weakness that existed earlier.

3.2 Effective Authority Without Full Decision or Fiscal Control

The second misalignment appears when actors can act in practice but do not control the decisions, funding, or escalation pathways needed to sustain action. Municipalities and local responders are often closest to the emergency. They may see the threat first, communicate with residents first, and absorb the earliest operational pressure. But they may not control provincial emergency declarations, federal requests, recovery finance, or the intergovernmental tables where larger support is coordinated.

Similarly, local service providers, humanitarian partners, and community organizations may have practical reach but not formal decision authority. They can distribute information, support evacuation, identify vulnerable residents, or deliver services. But their effectiveness depends on whether formal systems recognize their role before the emergency. When practical capacity sits outside formal decision architecture, the system may underuse the actors who are best placed to act quickly.

DFAA illustrates a related fiscal point. Recovery finance flows through provincial and territorial governments. This may be administratively coherent, but it means that communities, municipalities, and Indigenous governments may experience the consequences of disasters while depending on higher-order fiscal pathways for recovery support. When effective authority and fiscal authority separate, emergency recovery can become a negotiation over eligibility, timing, and responsibility.

3.3 Legitimate Authority Without Full Architectural Integration

The third misalignment appears when actors who hold community trust are not fully integrated into formal emergency-management architecture. Legitimacy is not a communications problem added

after decisions are made. It is part of emergency capacity. People evacuate, shelter, comply, share information, and accept risk messages based not only on formal jurisdiction but on trust.

In many communities, legitimate authority may belong to local governments, First Nations Chiefs and Councils, community health workers, Indigenous emergency coordinators, elders, emergency responders, or trusted civil society actors. If those actors are not part of planning, prevention, risk communication, evacuation protocols, and recovery decision-making, the system may have legal authority without social traction.

This is especially significant for Indigenous emergency management. If First Nations governments lead response and recovery on reserve, then their authority is not derivative of federal or provincial consultation. It is constitutive of the emergency architecture. A system that recognizes Indigenous leadership in principle but underinvests in prevention, updated plans, service agreements, or implementation capacity produces a legitimacy gap that cannot be repaired by late-stage outreach.

The misalignment is especially visible in what might be called the chronic emergency: recurring hazards that trigger repeated acute response without resolving the underlying exposure. Indigenous Services Canada notes that Kashechewan First Nation has faced flood risk every year since 2012, often requiring precautionary evacuation. Peguis First Nation has likewise faced serious recurring flooding; Manitoba's Clean Environment Commission concluded that its flooding is more likely related to watershed conditions and may also be affected by upstream drainage than to Lake Winnipeg Regulation itself (Indigenous Services Canada, n.d.; Manitoba Clean Environment Commission, 2015). These cases should not be collapsed into a single causal story. They illustrate a common architectural problem: evacuation and immediate response can be mobilized through existing emergency pathways, while durable mitigation may depend on longer-term infrastructure, land, watershed, fiscal, and intergovernmental decisions that sit outside the acute-response cycle. The mobilize-respond-demobilize system can therefore function as designed while the conditions generating recurrent emergency remain. PAA treats that pattern as a chronic governance challenge, not simply as a failure of frontline response.

3.4 Institutional Sediment: Layered Coordination Without Resolved Authority Alignment

The fourth layer is historical. Canadian emergency management has accumulated reforms over time: federal legislation, federal-provincial-territorial frameworks, national response systems, recovery finance arrangements, whole-of-society resilience strategies, Indigenous emergency programs, and repeated modernization efforts. Each layer may be reasonable on its own. The PAA question is whether the layers integrate or simply accumulate.

Institutional sediment matters because new reforms often inherit old authority arrangements. A new strategy may call for better coordination while leaving request pathways, fiscal incentives, local capacity gaps, and legitimacy deficits largely intact. A new funding instrument may support mitigation while still depending on layered intergovernmental administration. A new coordination table may improve communication while still relying on the same actors to align under pressure.

This is why repeating the same reform language across multiple documents is itself diagnostic. If the system repeatedly calls for whole-of-society governance, stronger prevention, improved coordination, better risk understanding, and more resilient recovery, then the problem may not be lack of

awareness. It may be that the architecture has not yet converted awareness into durable authority alignment.

The post-crisis record makes the same point from a different direction. Reviews from SARS in 2003 through Wood Buffalo, Abbott-Chapman, and the COVID-19 assessments recommend improved intergovernmental coordination, clearer roles and responsibilities, and better communication in nearly identical terms (National Advisory Committee on SARS and Public Health, 2003). Two decades of partially implementing those recommendations has not changed the findings. That recurrence locates the problem at a level the recommendations do not reach: they are applied to the symptoms of an authority structure rather than to the structure itself.

4. The 2023 Wildfire Season as a Stress Test

4.1 The 2023 Wildfire Season

The 2023 wildfire season is useful not as a blame case, but as a stress test. Public Safety Canada described 2023 as the worst wildfire season in Canadian history and reported that the Government Operations Centre activated emergency teams from May to October 2023, coordinated federal assistance, and supported evacuations, including from Yellowknife. Public Safety Canada also reported that the GOC coordinated 24 Requests for Federal Assistance in 2023-24, 18 of which were in response to the historic wildfire season (Public Safety Canada, 2024b).

The official record shows activation, coordination, and support. That is precisely why the case is analytically useful. It shows that national-scale emergencies can stress a distributed system even when institutions are active and acting in good faith. Wildfires do not respect jurisdictional boundaries. Smoke, evacuation, infrastructure risk, health impacts, and resource demands can cross municipalities, provinces, territories, Indigenous jurisdictions, and federal responsibilities.

In such conditions, the system must align formal authority, effective authority, and legitimate authority quickly. Formal authority determines who can request assistance, declare emergencies, activate statutes, and commit public resources. Effective authority determines who can deploy firefighters, move residents, communicate risk, arrange transportation, protect infrastructure, and provide shelter. Legitimate authority determines whether communities trust instructions, accept evacuation orders, and regard response decisions as credible.

The wildfire season therefore illustrates the paper's central claim. Canada's emergency-management challenge is not only more frequent or more severe hazards. It is the challenge of making a distributed authority system operate as one coherent crisis architecture. The more severe and cross-jurisdictional the hazard, the more decisive pre-crisis authority alignment becomes.

4.2 Existing Reforms Are Necessary but Incomplete

Recent Canadian reforms and strategy documents already recognize many of the relevant problems. Public Safety Canada's Emergency Management Strategy for Canada: Toward a Resilient 2030 emphasizes whole-of-society resilience and aligns Canadian emergency-management priorities with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (Public Safety Canada, 2019). Public Safety Canada's 2024 Areas for Action advances the federal-provincial-territorial strategy through priorities including

whole-of-society collaboration and governance, better understanding of disaster risks, stronger prevention and mitigation, enhanced response capacity and coordination, and recovery that builds back better (Public Safety Canada, 2024a).

These priorities are necessary. They acknowledge that emergency management requires more than response. They recognize the need for prevention, mitigation, governance, collaboration, and recovery. From a PAA perspective, however, the existence of the right priorities does not guarantee that the architecture can carry them.

The question is whether reforms change the alignment of authority. Do they clarify who can act before a request pathway slows response? Do they move fiscal incentives upstream enough to make prevention politically and administratively easier than reimbursement? Do they integrate Indigenous governments as emergency-management authorities rather than merely partners? Do they give municipalities and local responders more reliable channels into escalation and resource decisions? Do they survive changes in federal, provincial, territorial, municipal, and Indigenous leadership?

A reform agenda can be correct and still remain incomplete if it does not answer these authority questions. Strategies can name coordination; architecture must make coordination durable.

4.3 Comparative Federal Lessons

Comparative experience shows that this is a design problem that federations address in different ways rather than a constitutional fate. Germany's Basic Law anticipates intergovernmental disaster assistance: Article 35 allows a Land facing a grave accident or natural disaster to request police forces from other Länder and personnel or facilities from federal administrative authorities, the Armed Forces, or federal police (Federal Ministry of Justice, n.d.). Australia made two distinct institutional changes after the 2019-20 crisis period: National Cabinet replaced the COAG model in 2020 as the central intergovernmental forum, and the Commonwealth established the National Emergency Management Agency in 2022 by combining Emergency Management Australia with the National Recovery and Resilience Agency (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2020; National Emergency Management Agency, 2022). In the United States, the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 clarified and expanded FEMA's organizational authorities and responsibilities after Hurricane Katrina (United States Congress, 2006). These are not directly transferable templates for Canada. They show that federations can modify coordination forums, civilian surge capacity, or statutory emergency authorities when recurrent stress exposes institutional gaps. The Canadian reform question is therefore architectural as well as programmatic.

5. What Political Architecture Assessment Adds

Political Architecture Assessment adds a specific contribution to emergency-management analysis. It does not replace operational planning, climate adaptation, public safety expertise, emergency-response doctrine, or disaster finance reform. It asks a prior institutional question: can the authority structure support the function the system expects from it?

In the Canadian emergency-management case, PAA shifts analysis from a general call for coordination to a more precise authority-alignment test. The test asks whether formal authority,

effective authority, and legitimate authority are mapped, aligned, and stress-tested before crisis conditions arrive.

5.1 Authority Mapping

The first PAA task is authority mapping. This means identifying who can decide, who can request assistance, who can block, who can fund, who can deploy, who can communicate, who can evacuate, who can coordinate, and who can make decisions stick. Authority mapping must distinguish between legal responsibility and practical capacity.

A Canadian emergency-management authority map would not simply list federal, provincial, territorial, municipal, and Indigenous institutions. It would ask where decision rights sit in relation to operational capacity. It would identify points where federal resources depend on provincial requests, where municipal responders depend on provincial support, where Indigenous authorities hold local legitimacy but lack adequate prevention resources, and where private or non-governmental actors control critical infrastructure or service delivery.

5.2 Legitimacy Auditing

The second PAA task is legitimacy auditing. Emergency legitimacy is not only about public trust in government generally. It is about whether affected communities recognize the actors giving instructions and believe those actors are acting competently and rightfully. During evacuation, sheltering, recovery, and risk communication, legitimacy can be as operational as fuel, buses, radios, or fire crews.

A legitimacy audit would ask: who do affected communities trust before the emergency? Which institutions have credibility with remote, rural, urban, Indigenous, immigrant, elderly, low-income, or medically vulnerable populations? Which actors have lost trust because of previous disasters, service failures, exclusion, or slow recovery? Which authorities can communicate risk in ways that people will follow?

This is especially important for Indigenous emergency management. Where First Nations governments lead response and recovery, legitimacy auditing should begin from their governing authority rather than from a stakeholder model. It should ask what support, agreements, service standards, and financing are required for that authority to function under pressure.

5.3 Sediment Analysis

The third PAA task is sediment analysis. Emergency-management systems are rarely built from scratch. They accumulate statutes, frameworks, cost-sharing rules, intergovernmental habits, after-action recommendations, institutional memories, and informal routines. These layers shape how actors behave when crisis arrives.

A sediment analysis would examine which historical layers continue to shape present-day coordination. Which earlier reforms created useful capacity? Which left unresolved authority gaps? Which after-action recommendations have been repeated without structural resolution? Which informal practices depend too heavily on incumbent relationships and goodwill? Which mechanisms are likely to weaken after political leadership changes?

New plans can fail when they layer new language over old authority separations. A Political Architecture Brief would therefore separate visible institutional design from the underlying authority structure that makes design function or fail.

5.4 Design Parameters for Reform

If Canada's emergency-management problem is authority misalignment, then reform should be assessed against design parameters rather than general recommendations alone. The following parameters translate the authority argument into practical reform tests.

- **Build standing coordination before crises.** Coordination should not depend mainly on emergency improvisation. Standing coordination mechanisms should clarify decision roles, escalation triggers, information protocols, request pathways, and shared operating expectations before crises. The test is whether the mechanism can produce decisions, move information, activate resources, and hold legitimacy when conditions change quickly.
- **Clarify authority triggers without erasing federalism.** A federal system should respect jurisdiction. But respecting jurisdiction does not require tolerating avoidable uncertainty. Reform should clarify when federal support can be requested, who initiates requests, how cross-boundary emergencies are handled, and how urgent assistance moves when routine administrative channels are too slow.
- **Move finance upstream from reimbursement to prevention.** DFAA modernization moves in the right direction by placing greater emphasis on risk reduction and strategic mitigation. The fiscal test is whether the system rewards risk reduction early enough to reduce the need for larger recovery spending later.
- **Treat Indigenous governments as emergency-management authorities.** First Nations governments should not be treated only as consulted stakeholders. Where they lead response and recovery and hold local legitimacy, they must be integrated as governing authorities through reliable service agreements, prevention funding, updated emergency plans, data-sharing arrangements, evacuation protocols, and durable financing mechanisms.
- **Apply a transition test.** Emergency-management mechanisms should survive political change. Every major reform should be tested against whether it would still work after a change of government in Ottawa, two provinces, several municipalities, and multiple agency leaders at the same time.
- **Connect performance assessment to accountability.** Where authority is unresolved, accountability is unresolvable. After a failed emergency, each order of government can credibly point to another. The accountability test is whether performance findings carry consequences for funding, authority, or the terms of intergovernmental emergency-management agreements.
- **Require a Political Architecture Brief before major reform.** A Political Architecture Brief would not replace emergency planning. It would make emergency planning more realistic by mapping who has formal authority, who has effective authority, who holds legitimate authority, who controls funding and information, where request pathways create delay, and which historical layers continue to shape present coordination.

5.5 Contribution and Limits

This paper makes a focused contribution. It does not claim that all Canadian emergency-management problems can be reduced to authority misalignment. Capacity, hazard severity, infrastructure vulnerability, climate change, resource constraints, operational complexity, and political leadership all matter. Nor does it argue for centralized command as the solution. Canada's federal structure makes distributed authority necessary and, in many cases, desirable.

The claim is narrower and more useful: in a distributed emergency-management system, coordination depends on whether formal authority, effective authority, and legitimate authority are aligned before crisis pressure arrives. When those forms of authority are separated without durable alignment mechanisms, emergency coordination becomes structurally fragile.

This claim also explains why repeated calls for coordination can persist despite institutional density. The problem is not that actors have failed to name coordination. It is that coordination language often does not alter the architecture through which authority is distributed and activated.

6. Conclusion: From Institutions That Exist to Institutions That Endure

Canada's emergency-management challenge is not institutional absence. The country has laws, frameworks, strategies, coordination bodies, federal-provincial-territorial mechanisms, disaster finance arrangements, provincial and territorial systems, municipal responders, Indigenous emergency-management programs, and humanitarian partners. The challenge is authority alignment. Stated differently, Canada does not have an emergency-management problem so much as a governance problem that keeps presenting as one.

Formal authority, effective authority, and legitimate authority are distributed across different actors. That distribution is appropriate for a federal system, but it creates a design problem. A crisis system cannot assume that legal responsibility, operational capacity, and public trust will automatically converge when emergencies move quickly, cross jurisdictions, or overwhelm local capacity.

Political Architecture Assessment makes that problem visible. It asks who can decide, who can act, who can fund, who can block, who must be trusted, and which historical arrangements still shape behaviour. It treats coordination not as a slogan but as an architectural condition.

The practical lesson is therefore clear: Canada does not need emergency-management reform that simply adds another plan, another table, or another reporting requirement. It needs institutional architecture that aligns authority before the next crisis tests it. That is the difference between emergency-management institutions that exist and emergency-management institutions that endure.

References

- Abbott, G., & Chapman, M. (2018). [Addressing the new normal: 21st century disaster management in British Columbia](#). Government of British Columbia.
- Akyeame Statecraft. (2026). Building institutions that survive: A political architecture approach to governance reform in Canada and West Africa [Working paper]. Akyeame Statecraft.
- Department of Justice Canada. (2007). [Emergency Management Act, S.C. 2007, c. 15](#). Government of Canada.
- Department of National Defence. (n.d.). [Operation LENTUS](#). Government of Canada.
- Quiet Authority. Enduring Institutions.

- Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. (2020). [Final report - Review of COAG councils and ministerial forums](#). Australian Government.
- Federal Ministry of Justice. (n.d.). [Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany](#). Federal Republic of Germany.
- Government of the Northwest Territories. (2025). [After-action review: Northwest Territories 2023 wildfire season](#). Municipal and Community Affairs.
- Health Canada. (2024). [Report of the Expert Panel for the Review of the Federal Approach to Pandemic Science Advice and Research Coordination: The time to act is now](#). Government of Canada.
- Indigenous Services Canada. (2026a). [Emergency management](#). Government of Canada.
- Indigenous Services Canada. (2026b). [Emergency Management Assistance Program](#). Government of Canada.
- Indigenous Services Canada. (n.d.). [Flooding in First Nations communities](#). Government of Canada.
- KPMG LLP. (2017). [May 2016 Wood Buffalo wildfire: Post-incident assessment report](#). Alberta Emergency Management Agency.
- Manitoba Clean Environment Commission. (2015). [Lake Winnipeg Regulation report](#). Government of Manitoba.
- National Advisory Committee on SARS and Public Health. (2003). [Learning from SARS: Renewal of public health in Canada](#). Health Canada.
- National Emergency Management Agency. (2022). [The National Emergency Management Agency established](#). Australian Government.
- Office of the Auditor General of Canada. (2022). [Report 8 - Emergency Management in First Nations Communities - Indigenous Services Canada](#). Government of Canada.
- Office of the Auditor General of Ontario. (2020). [Special report on Emergency Management in Ontario - Pandemic Response](#). Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Public Safety Canada. (2017). [An Emergency Management Framework for Canada - Third Edition](#). Government of Canada.
- Public Safety Canada. (2019). [Emergency Management Strategy for Canada: Toward a Resilient 2030](#). Government of Canada.
- Public Safety Canada. (2024a). [Advancing the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Emergency Management Strategy: Areas for Action](#). Government of Canada.
- Public Safety Canada. (2024b). [Public Safety Canada's 2023 to 2024 Departmental Results Report](#). Government of Canada.
- Public Safety Canada. (2025a). [About the Government Operations Centre](#). Government of Canada.
- Public Safety Canada. (2025b). [Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements](#). Government of Canada.
- Public Safety Canada. (2025c). [Guidelines for the Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements: For eligible disasters beginning April 1, 2025](#). Government of Canada.
- United States Congress. (2006). [Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006, Pub. L. 109-295, Title VI](#). U.S. Government Publishing Office.