

Interagency Fire
Program Management
Task Team Final Report
to the Fire
Management Board

March 17, 2021

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND.....	1
Executive Summary.....	1
Background.....	1
Overview.....	3
ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	5
1. Complexity Analysis	5
2. Selective Placement Factors	6
3. IFPM Positions.....	7
4. Maintenance Plan	9
5. Competencies	10
6. IFPM Career Pathways	11
7. Required Training.....	12
8. Currency.....	12
9. IFPM Website.....	12
10. Other Issues	13
CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS	13
APPENDIX A.....	15
APPENDIX B.....	16
APPENDIX C.....	17
APPENDIX D.....	17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In February 2019, the Fire Management Board (FMB) assembled an interagency task team representing the federal fire management agencies (United States Forest Service (USFS), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), United States Fish, Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Park Service (NPS), and Bureau of Land Management (BLM)) to provide a comprehensive assessment of the *Interagency Fire Program Management (IFPM) Standards* to determine if the intent and needs of the federal fire management organizations are being met. The task team reviewed the original intent behind the current Standards, developed a list of concerns or issues brought forth from each agency, and then worked on developing recommendations to resolve those issues.

This final report provides a summary of recommendations that respond to the concerns and issues summarized in the *Task One Interagency Fire Management Program Report to the Fire Management Board, July 18, 2019* and recommends next steps. The task team agrees that the recommendations in this final report need to be reviewed and further evaluated to determine if the changes are supported by all agencies. Next steps recommend that FMB should task the standing Interagency Fire Program Management Group (Group) under the FMB to review the IFPM complexity framework, update the competencies, modernize the website referencing the IFPM Standard, and consider minimum qualifications. Note that some of the recommendations in this final report may not have support from all members of the task team, and additional review and interagency coordination is imperative. The Group would determine which recommendations should be accepted to meet the needs of the federal fire management organizations into the future, and would issue an updated Standard, wrapping the current maintenance plan into the Standard.

BACKGROUND

The IFPM Standard was an outcome from a seminal event, the 1994 South Canyon Fire in Colorado, that led to multiple assessments and investigations of wildfire safety and program management. The South Canyon Fire Investigation Report (August 17, 1994), and the recommendations from the Interagency Management Review Team (IMRT) each pointed to a need to develop minimum qualifications for fire management positions. On October 17, 1994, the IMRT plan for corrective action was published and it included these recommendations, among others (IMRT Topic 3.6):

- “Establish minimum qualifications for fire managers and agency administrators who are required to make fire management decisions.”
- “Agency Administrators should ensure that personnel holding, or selected for, fire management or agency administrator positions are qualified for the level of

wildland fire complexity involved in the position or are able to obtain these qualifications within an acceptable time period.”

On December 18, 1995, the U.S. Department of Interior and the U.S. Department of Agriculture published the final report of the Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy and Program Review (Federal Fire Policy). Signed by both Department Secretaries, it directed the federal agencies to:

“establish fire management qualifications based on program complexity, and staff existing and future agency administrator and fire management vacancies with individuals who meet these qualifications and who are committed to accomplishing the total fire management program.”

On May 23, 1996, the U.S. Department of Interior and the U.S. Department of Agriculture published the Implementation Action Plan Report outlining action items which must be accomplished by the signatory agencies to fully implement the Federal Fire Policy. Several action items are specific to the development of qualifications for agency administrators and personnel assigned fire management duties including:

Action Item 27, “establish fire management qualifications based on program complexity, and staff existing and future agency administrator and fire management vacancies with individuals who meet these qualifications and who are committed to accomplishing the total fire management program.”

Action Item 62, “Develop and utilize consistent fire management qualification standards and specific selection criteria for fire program managers.”

Action Item 63, “Establish job performance standards for Agency Administrators and fire managers that clearly reflect the complexity and scope of fire management responsibilities.”

To accomplish these action items, the former Federal Fire and Aviation Leadership Council (FFALC) formed an Interagency Fire Program Management Qualifications Task Group. The objective of the Task Group was to complete staff work, acceptable to all federal agencies with wildland fire management responsibilities and to the Office of Personnel Management, sufficient for the establishment of minimum qualifications standards for key fire management positions. Following that review, the FFALC approved the *Interagency Fire Program Management Qualification Standards and Guide (IFPM Standard)* in January 2000. The initial *IFPM Standard* defined 14 key fire management positions as well as minimum qualification standards for those 14 key positions.

In June 2004, the Forest Service (USDA-FS) and Department of Interior (DOI) issued memorandums establishing October 1, 2004 as the date to officially begin implementing the *IFPM Standard* with a 5-year implementation time frame.

In 2008, a programmatic review of the IFPM Standard was conducted. As a result of this review, the Prevention and Mitigation Specialist was removed from the original 14 key fire management positions, and senior leadership positions at the geographic and national level

were allowed to delegate the IFPM requirements to a senior officer. In addition, the position qualification and training requirements were adjusted for six positions (National Fire Program Manager, Geographic Area Fire Program Manager, Unit Fire Program Manager, Wildland Fire Operations Specialist, Prescribed Fire and Fuels Specialist, and Senior Firefighter).

In 2015, the National Coordination System Committee made a recommendation to FMB to remove the IFPM requirements from Initial Attack Dispatcher requirements. The FMB supported and made this change. In 2016, the FMB agreed to add aviation qualifications as a method to qualify for Unit Fire Program Manager, Wildland Fire Operations Supervisor, and Prescribed Fire and Fuels Specialist positions.

In February of 2019, the FMB assembled an interagency task team representing the federal fire management agencies to provide a comprehensive assessment of the *Interagency Fire Program Management (IFPM) Standards* to determine if the intent and needs of the federal fire management organizations are being met. The objective of the group as defined by FMB was: "Ensure the IFPM Standard reflects current and projected needs of the federal wildland fire organization and workforce. Recommend updates to the IFPM Standard, processes, and associated documents. Recommendations should reduce complexity, decrease emphasis on human resource specific processes, and allow some level of interagency consistency while addressing differences among Departments and agencies. In completing this review, the team should strive to maintain core principles as outlined in the 1995 Federal Fire Policy, establish fire management qualifications based on program complexity, and staff existing and future agency administrator and fire management vacancies with individuals who meet these qualifications and who are committed to accomplishing the total fire management program."

The task team met on a regular basis reviewing all aspects of IFPM. The task team met with individuals who were involved in the original IFPM efforts, reviewed historic documents, reviewed associated position descriptions, and thoroughly went through all the parts of the current IFPM Standard. In this final report, the task team developed a list of issues and related recommendations. Recommendations came from individual members of the team, from Departments (either DOI task team members or USFS task team rep) of the team or were agreed to by the entire team.

OVERVIEW OF IFPM FROM THE TASK TEAM

The task team was asked four questions from the FMB to help with the overall assessment of the IFPM Standard. Those questions were:

- Did IFPM professionalize the workforce?
- Is IFPM still meeting the intent of what it was originally developed for?
- If IFPM had to start from scratch, would the federal agencies develop it the same way?
- How can IFPM be set up for success for the next 20 years?

Based on discussions within the task team, IFPM has helped ensure that for the thirteen positions in IFPM, people selected into those positions have qualifications which should give them the background to make fire management decisions commensurate to their position. This final report recommends some changes to the IFPM positions covered in the standard, and various changes to the qualifications for the IFPM positions.

The IFPM Standard had a much broader goal of helping build fire program managers and in turn professionalizing the workforce. When the Standard was originally developed, position taskbooks were created and extensive list of competencies at “working”, “journey”, and “expert” levels were developed; these taskbooks were never broadly adopted. The federal agencies have utilized the IFPM Standard in various ways over the years since it was implemented. The DOI agencies have largely used IFPM for determining selective factors associated with the 13 positions currently in the Standard. The USFS has used the IFPM Standard more extensively and have developed their own agency addendum to IFPM called the Forest Service Fire Program Management Standard (FS-FPM).

One of the original recommendations for IFPM was that it should establish minimum qualifications for agency administrators who are required to make fire decisions. This has not been accomplished through IFPM but each federal fire agency has developed their own specific requirements for agency administrators.

After reviewing how IFPM has been used by the federal agencies since its inception, there is a difference in opinion as to whether it would be developed the same way. The DOI agencies agree the Standard should be simplified and focused on determining *minimum* qualifications and training to make risk-based fire behavior related decisions. Competencies should be those minimum core competencies associated with risk-based fire decisions. Higher-level qualifications can be selected through the hiring process and should not be tied to the IFPM Standard. The USFS has relied on the current IFPM standard to develop a more comprehensive FS-FPM addendum which expands IFPM (adding additional positions) and uses IFPM related to workforce development efforts; the USFS is reluctant to make significant changes to the current IFPM Standard.

The selective placement factors for the IFPM positions have created challenges in filling positions for some of the federal agencies. This final report recommends the selective placement factors for IFPM positions, in addition to adding two new positions, should be reviewed. The DOI agencies have determined that some changes to these qualifications are appropriate, and consistent with the original intent behind IFPM to ensure personnel in positions requiring risk-based fire behavior decisions have minimum qualifications to make those decisions. These suggestions are not merely to enhance the number of qualified applicants.

The task team is providing the issues brought forth from agencies, Departments, or the collective team and a variety of recommendations for considerations. Those issues and recommendations follow. Some of the recommendations below do not have unanimous support from the agencies represented.

ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a non-prioritized list of IFPM topics where the task team identified issues and provided recommendations. We recommend the FMB task the Interagency Fire Program Management Group with follow-up on these proposed recommendations. The Group would determine which of these recommendations should be adopted, review the IFPM complexity framework, update the competencies, modernize the website referencing the IFPM Standard, and consider minimum qualifications. The Group would determine which recommendations should be accepted to meet the needs of the federal fire management organizations into the future, and would issue an updated Standard, wrapping the current maintenance plan into the Standard.

1. COMPLEXITY ANALYSIS

A. Issue: The current IFPM Standard lacks a full explanation on applying complexity analysis to positions and the current complexity analysis focuses only on describing unit complexity.

Recommendation:

- Review the direction in the IFPM Standard for determining complexity. Provide updated direction for determining complexity into the updated IFPM Standard.
- The DOI members of the task team recommend that complexity be clarified to refer to the unit's program complexity, and program complexity would apply only to the Unit Fire Program Manager and Assistant Unit Fire Program Manager (new position recommendation). This recommendation would then address the confusion surrounding the current IFPM Standard related to position/program complexity as only the Unit Fire Program Manager and Assistant Unit Fire Program Manager position would need to follow the unit program complexity. See Appendix A and B.

B. Issue: The current complexity analysis is lengthy and contains outdated language that does not reflect conditions existing in the field today. The weighting may not reflect the importance of program elements today.

Recommendation:

- Update the complexity analysis and review the weighting associated with program elements. Some of the task team would like to assist the Group on redeveloping the complexity analysis.

C. Issue: There is a lack of understanding both in the human resources (HR) and fire management communities regarding how complexity applies to positions other than the unit fire program manager.

Recommendation:

- This issue would be resolved by following the recommendation in 1.A above to clarify that complexity refers to a unit's fire program, and complexity would only

apply to the Unit Fire Program Manager and Assistant Unit Fire Program Manager positions.

D. Issue: Current *IFPM Standard* does not fully describe who makes unit and position complexity analysis determinations, and criteria may need to be updated for re-determining a unit's complexity analysis and determining position complexity.

Recommendation:

- Add instructions on complexity analysis determinations and updating to the *IFPM Standard*.
- Update the *Maintenance Plan* or provide new direction in the *IFPM Standard* itself. For example, "unit completes the analysis, region/state reviews, and national office approves."

E. Issue: Center manager (CMGR) has no differentiation of selective factors for complexity levels.

Recommendation:

- Remove complexity analysis differences for CMGR.
- Do not include CMGR in complexity analysis ratings.

F. Issue: The current ratings of high, moderate, and low should be reviewed as most positions fall into either the high or low categories.

Recommendation:

- See Appendix A-B for a change to the naming convention of complexity and consider reducing the complexity levels to two categories, high and base.

2. SELECTIVE PLACEMENT FACTORS

A. Issue: The *IFPM Standard's* distinction between "primary" and "secondary" core requirements is not clear. The differences between primary and secondary are not clarified in the *IFPM Standard*.

Recommendation:

- Remove primary and secondary from the selective factors. Utilize "and" or "or" statements for the requirements with multiple selective factors. See Appendix A-D suggested changes to selective placement factors related to this recommendation.

B. Issue: The aviation pathways do not need to stand alone.

Recommendation:

- Review selective factors for each position. See Appendix A-D for a recommended selective placement factors.

C. Issue: The selective placement factors (SPFs) may not fit the needs of the positions.

Recommendation:

- See Appendix A-D for review and consideration. The Group should consider the rationale developed by the task team (basing selective placement factors on risk-based fire decisions) and consider the *minimum* selective placement factors a candidate would need to make a certificate of eligible candidates for a position. The updated IFPM Standard should discuss how hiring managers and human resource specialists can apply more rigorous qualifications as a basis for selecting one candidate over another.

3. IFPM POSITIONS

A. Issue: Some positions in the *IFPM Standard* may no longer be relevant and should be deleted or updated; additional positions may be needed.

Recommendation:

- See Appendix A-D for a complete list of changes to position names and additions and subtractions of positions to the current standard.

B. Issue: The Assistant Fire Management Officer (AFMO) position is standard across DOI Bureaus and the Forest Service. The AFMO position is involved in making important decisions and is not included in the list of *IFPM Standards positions*. The gap between the UFPM and the Wildland Fire Operations Supervisor (FOS) and Prescribed Fire and Fuels Specialist (PFFS) causes confusion for both HR and fire management.

Recommendation:

- Add the Assistant Unit Fire Program Manager (AUFPM) to the IFPM standard. See Appendix B for recommendations on selective factors.

C. Issue: The overlap between the Supervisory Engine Operator (SEOP) and Engine Module Supervisor (EMLS) positions is confusing to HR and fire management.

Recommendation:

- Remove the SEOP and EMLS and replace with a Wildfire Crew Supervisor. See Appendix C for the specific recommendation.

D. Issue: The National Fire Program Manager (NFPM) position holds little relevancy given that many of the critical duties tied to this position are delegated lower in the national fire management organizations. Additionally, this position is far removed from critical fire ground decision making.

Recommendation:

- Change the selective placement factors to ICT3 or IMT2 C&G or RXB2 or AOBD and continue to allow for delegation to those involved in making critical national resource allocations and prioritizations such as NMAC representatives. See Appendix A.

E. Issue: The “Prescribed Fire and Fuels Specialist (PFFS)” may not be the right position name as the title has caused all fuels related positions to fall under the IFMP *Standards*.

Recommendation:

- Add the Prescribed Fire and Fuels Program Manager (PFPM) to the current list of IFPM positions, and. maintain the Prescribed Fire and Fuels Specialist position in IFPM. Adding the PFPM position would resolve differences in complexity ratings and selective factors between program managers and specialists and technicians. See Appendix A-B.

F. Issue: The complexity differences and the 90-day wildland fire management experience requirement may not be necessary for the Center Manager (CMGR) position.

Recommendation:

- Remove the tie to unit complexity from the CMGR position.
- Review and consider changing the *IFPM Standard* if the 90-day selective factor is not necessary for the CMGR or Assistant CMGR positions. The Department of Interior (DOI) standard position descriptions (SPDs) do not have this requirement.

G. Issue: The qualification requirements for the CMGR position are below what the Task Team believes would be expected for this organizational position.

Recommendation:

- Review and determine the most appropriate selective placement factors to ensure CMGRs hired possess the background necessary to understand the duties of the position. The duties with the center manager position has changed over the last twenty years where center managers have a list of duties officers they report to for risk-based fire management decision making.

H. Issue: The qualification requirements for the Assistant CMGR/Initial Attack Lead Dispatcher are shown to be the same as the CMGR and do not include the Initial Attack Lead Dispatcher qualification.

Recommendation:

- Review and determine the most appropriate qualifications required to ensure Initial Attack Lead Dispatchers and Assistant CMGRs hired possess the background necessary to understand the duties of the position.

I. Issue: The title for “Helicopter Manager” is confusing due to Incident Command System (ICS) qualification name vs. organizational title.

Recommendation:

- Change the title of the IFPM Helicopter Manager title to Fire Helicopter Crew Supervisor (HECS). See Appendix A.

J. Issue: The Geographic Area Fire Program Manager (GFPM) position requirement of Task Force Leader (TFLD) limits the applicant pool for this position and does not reflect the depth and breadth of experience required of this organizational position.

Recommendation:

- Review and update requirements. See Appendix A for a recommendation.
- Consider the only requirements at the regional/state level to apply only to those positions representing respective agencies on geographical area multi-agency coordinating groups making resource allocations and prioritization decisions or to those positions making operational decisions and resource allocations.

K. Issue: The qualifications of the Wildland Fire Operations Supervisor are the same as the Unit Fire Program Manager.

Recommendation:

- Consider changing the qualifications of the WFOS since this position originally represented the AFMO but since the inception of IFPM the WFOS is now typically a subordinate to the AFMO. See Appendix A for a recommendation on the WFOS position.

4. MAINTENANCE PLAN

A. Issue: The DOI and United States Forest Service (USFS) have separate plans for maintenance and implementation.

Recommendation:

- Review plans and look for opportunities to develop interagency guidance.

B. Issue: The *Maintenance Plan* contains elements which belong in the *IFPM Standard*.

Recommendation:

- Recommend incorporating direction in the maintenance plan into the updated *IFPM Standard*.

C. Issue: The existing, current Interagency Fire Program Management Group is not defined in the *IFPM Standard* (and/or *Maintenance Plan*).

Recommendation:

- Define the purpose and role of the Group in the IFPM Standard and/or associated documents.
- Review and update the Group charter to be consistent with the updated IFPM Standard and oversight (e.g., FMB) over the Standard.

D. Issue: Bureaus are not utilizing and updating the “Standard Position Description Crosswalk.”

Recommendation:

- Develop guidance for bureaus to issue an agency crosswalk in the *IFPM Standard* (guidance for keeping it current or eliminate it), and for periodic agency review and reissuance of the crosswalk.
- Crosswalk can address grade level.

5. COMPETENCIES

A. Issue: Competencies, currently part of the *IFPM Standard*, are not being applied or utilized. Position task books (PTBs) were developed but are not being used.

Recommendation:

- Recommend a thorough review of competencies and determine whether three levels of competencies are still needed (working, journey, and expert). The DOI agencies are not using the competencies as written and recommend removing the levels and focusing competencies on the basic, or core competencies, thereby considerably shortening the list. Competencies are found in position descriptions and competencies in IFPM could be reduced to those specific around making risk-based fire behavior type decisions.
- Remove references to IFPM position task books when the IFPM Standard is updated, and website refreshed.

B. Issue: The competency planning tools, checklists (also referred to as the record or PTB), and worksheets are not being used.

Recommendation:

- Consolidate and simplify the “Training & Development Tools.”
- Checklists should not remain as part of the IFPM Standard and should be moved to the archives.
- Consider adding aspects of the planning tools to Chapter 2, “Position Standards and Guide.”

C. Issue: Common competencies may not reflect current fire program needs. The “working” (W), “journey” (J), and “expert” (E) descriptors in “Common Competency Descriptors” are not being used.

Recommendation:

- Work important competencies into Chapter 2, “Position Standards and Guide,” as opposed to a stand-alone common competencies chapter.
- Remove or revise the W, J, E descriptors.
- Delete Chapter 3, “Common Competencies.”
- Review, update, and incorporate competencies into Chapter 2, “Position Standards and Guide.”

D. Issue: There is no incentive or mechanism to enforce competency development outside of incident-related competencies.

Recommendation:

- The Group should decide how to apply competencies as part of the IFPM Standard. In other words, decide whether IFPM simply covers a set of minimum qualifications (i.e., selective placement factors), or is it more comprehensive? If competencies remain an integral part of IFPM, consider ways to enhance application such as these ideas below:
 - Consider development of a series of “academies” which have an association with an academic institution and is focused on competencies associated with natural resource management, budget management, personnel management, leadership, communication, and interpersonal relationships.
 - Consider the Wildland Fire Apprenticeship Program (WFAP) as an example of a foundation and explore ideas of creating higher level training to develop competencies.
 - Standardize job analysis and interview questions; the job analysis and interview questions would be based on competencies.

E. Issue: The GS-0401 series, while outside of IFPM, has ties back to IFPM in terms of competency development and attainment. The series may not be the best fit for the unique mix of competencies required of fire management professionals which include land/natural resource management and emergency management.

Recommendation:

- All reference to series and grade should be removed from IFPM except for agency crosswalks.

6. IFPM CAREER PATHWAYS

A. Issue: There are limited pathways through broad fire program management positions to gain requirements for UFPM and GFPM.

Recommendation:

- See Appendix A-D for a recommendation on adjusting the selective factor requirements for these positions.

B. Issue: The Unit Fire Program Manager is the first position where management is over multiple program areas; currently only operations and command qualifications are selective factors.

Recommendation:

- See Appendix A-D for adjusted selective placement factors for this position. Additional qualifications outside of operations and command, should be considered in the hiring process and not necessarily with IFPM.

7. REQUIRED TRAINING

A. Issue: Required training does not appear to be consistent; only six of the twelve positions require training.

Recommendation:

- See Appendix A-D for recommendations on required training for applicants to make a certificate of eligible candidates. The DOI task team members are recommending only fire behavior trainings be included as a requirement for positions below the geographic and national fire program manager positions. For geographic and national positions, additional requirements would include M-581 with M-582 as a recommended course. Additionally, requiring M-581 for high complexity unit fire program managers is also a recommendation.

8. CURRENCY

A. Issue: Currency is inconsistent across IFPM positions. Discrepancy exists between the *IFPM Standard* and HR rules. HR rules indicate that currency is not needed to make a list for the selection official to hire from, candidates though must be able to obtain currency, if necessary for the position.

Recommendation:

- Address currency in the IFPM Standard, see guidance in NWCG memorandum 007-2011.

9. IFPM WEBSITE

A. Issue: The IFPM website contains many outdated documents.

Recommendation:

- The website needs to be thoroughly reviewed and updated. Once the Group has drafted a revised IFPM Standard (and identified any supporting policy/direction documents), FMB should determine the best method to accomplish the website updates and develop a user-friendly interface.

B. Issue: The IFPM website is difficult to navigate.

Recommendation:

- The website needs to be updated through reviewing the online documents, identifying which documents should be archived and updated, and a more user-friendly design is needed. Recommend FMB determine the best method to accomplish this.

10. OTHER ISSUES

A. Issue: Addressing Agency Administrator (AA) qualifications was a key driver for developing IFPM; however, the *IFPM Standard* does not address AAs. Agencies have provided specific direction, producing inconsistencies.

Recommendation:

- Individual agencies have developed requirements for agency administrators. Recommendation is to acknowledge that qualifications for agency administrators will be accomplished through agency direction. Alternately, the Group should consider how AAs can be included in IFPM and consider requiring the M-582 course for agency administrators and then additional requirements would be up to each agency.

B. Issue: The inclusion of “Common Grade” language in the *IFPM Standard* provides an expectation that the grade should be applied to any position having that complexity level.

Recommendation:

- Remove the language “Common Grade” and address grades in each agency crosswalk.

C. Issue: Hiring managers are not clear on the process to require qualifications beyond the minimum *IFPM Standards* qualifications (e.g., for a low-complexity UPFM, another qualification may be needed).

Potential Resolutions/Alternatives:

- The *IFPM Standard* should address how selecting officials can “augment” the qualifications through the hiring process, not the initial screening process.

CONCLUSION and NEXT STEPS

The FMB task team has developed this final report with the intent that it meets the FMB’s expectations, and that more work on IFPM is needed. The task team suggests the FMB engage the Interagency Fire Program Management Group to review these recommendations and/or refine these recommendations and ensure interagency review and evaluation of any recommended changes to the IFPM Standard. The Group should provide FMB with at least quarterly updates on the status of recommendations and should share this report and appendices within their member’s respective agencies. Once FMB concurs with the Group’s

suggested changes to IFPM, a new IFPM Standard and related documents would need to be written. The task team found significant difference among the agencies related to updating and changing some parts of the current IFPM Standard and supporting documents, and the Group may choose to acknowledge agency or departmental differences in some parts of the IFPM Standard (similar to the Red Book). Once the revised IFPM Standard is developed, there is a critical need to update the website and supporting documents, and consider communication needs in delivering the new IFPM Standard.

Several of the task team members would like to work with the Group to help provide context and background related to these recommendations and are available to help the Group with these suggested next steps.

APPENDIX A. LEADERS OF ORGANIZATIONS (CREATE VISION)

IFPM POSITION CHANGE RECOMMENDATION

Position Mnemonic	Position Name	Program Complexity	Selective Factors (IQCS Quals)	Training	Risk-Based Fire Decision Making
NFPM	National Fire Program Manager		ICT3 or IMT2 C&G or RXB2 or AOBD	M-581, recommend M-582	NMAC: Resource Allocation/ Negotiation with GACCs
GFPM	Geographic Area Fire Program Manager		ICT3 or IMT2 C&G or RXB2 or AOBD	M-581, recommend M-582	GA MAC / Duty Officer
UFPM	Unit Fire Program Manager	High	ICT3 or RXB2 or AOBD	M-581 and S-390	Overall responsibility of Fire Program decisions
		Base	TFLD or RXB2 or ASGS	S-390	
PFPM	Prescribed Fire and Fuels Program Manager		RXB2	S-390	Burn Plan signature and Burn Boss

APPENDIX B. LEADERS OF LEADERS (PROVIDE DIRECTION)

IFPM POSITION CHANGE RECOMMENDATION

Position Mnemonic	Position Name	Program Complexity	Selective Factors (IQCS Quals)	Training	Risk-Based Fire Decision Making
AFPM	Assistant Unit Fire Program Manager	High	TFLD or RXB2 or ASGS	S-390	Specific Program Operations
		Base	ICT4 or HEBM	S-390	
WFOS	Wildland Fire Operations Supervisor		ICT4	S-290	Initial Attack IC of multiple resources
PFFS	Prescribed Fire and Fuels Specialist		Any SRB: ENGB or CRWB or FIRB or HEQB or FELB or HMGB	S-290	RX implementation (Firing/Holding)
HECS	Fire Helicopter Crew Supervisor		HEBM and ICT4	S-290	Defined in Redbook
IHCS	Interagency Hotshot Crew Superintendent		TFLD and ICT4 and FIRB (SIHCO)	S-290	Defined in SIHCO

APPENDIX C. LEADER OF PEOPLE (DEVELOP INTENT)

IFPM POSITION CHANGE RECOMMENDATION

Position Mnemonic	Position Name	Program Complexity	Selective Factors (IQCS Quals)	Training	Risk-Based Fire Decision Making
WFCS	Wildfire Crew Supervisor		ENGB or CRWB or HMGB and ICT5	S-290	Crew supervision & Initial Attack IC

APPENDIX D. NEW LEADER (CONVEY INTENT)

IFPM POSITION CHANGE RECOMMENDATION

Position Mnemonic	Position Name	Program Complexity	Selective Factors (IQCS Quals)	Training	Risk-Based Fire Decision Making
SFF	Senior Firefighter		FFT1	S-190	Experienced FFTR, trainer/leader