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How border regions can learn from each other
The border

- The Border is often associated with the unknown (blank space on the map)
- Besides the physical line the border is also a mental border (stories, discourse, histories, habits)
- The dominant narrative of the border is totally associated with Security and defence of the homeland
- The border narrative in local politics in the San Diego region is focused on immigration and security despite more than 50,000 northbound vehicles crossing every day
Securitization of the border

2012: record high budget for U.S.-Mexico border security

- $242 million to pay for high tech watch towers and movable screeners along the border
- $229 million to raise border agents' pay
- $184 million to identify and deport criminal aliens in state prisons and local jails
- $14 billion to support the ongoing infrastructure

In contrast the U.S. federal budget in 2011 for security on the U.S.-Canada border was $2.9 billion

It was reported that the U.S. spent $90 billion over 10 years in securing the US-Mexico border
Investment in Security
European Union: ‘Security’

• Investment in security is significantly less
• $2.6 billion spent on External border security (2007-2013)
• Frontex: European Union Border Agency for coordinating border management; assisting member states in technology and resources.
• A focus on migration receiving countries in southern Europe
• Expenditures in 2012:
  – Spain: $61 million
  – Italy: $67 million
  – Greece: $56 million
  – Germany: $18 million
Current Situation at the External Borders

LEGEND
- EU/Schengen/Associated countries
- Third countries

FLOW OF ILLEGAL MIGRATION
- Central Mediterranean route
  Italy: 2009 - 9,500, 2008 - 77,000
  Malta: 2009 - 1,500, 2008 - 2,800
- West Africa route
  Canary Islands: 2009 - 2,200, 2008 - 9,200
- Central Eastern European route
  Eastern Land Borders of the EU: 2009 - 1,333, 2008 - 2,653
- South Eastern European route
  Greece sea: 2009 - 10,420, 2008 - 31,700
  Greece land: 2009 - 49,000, 2008 - 38,000

- Flow of illegal immigrants within EU/Schengen/Associated countries
- Intra EU/Schengen/Associated countries route
- Main routes to EU/Schengen/Associated countries
Cross Border Cooperation In Europe

INTERNAL BORDERS:

• The Schengen Convention (1990) defines areas of cooperation for the interior space of the European Union:
  – policies on border checks, asylum and immigration, cooperation in civil matters, cooperation in criminal matters and police cooperation
  – Schengen Borders Code requires participating states to remove all obstacles to free traffic flow at internal borders. Thus, road, rail and air passengers no longer have their identity checked by border guards when crossing borders

EXTERNAL BORDERS:

• Frontex: coordination of border management

• The European Union pursues a friendly neighborhood policy through the European Neighborhood Policy created in 2004:
  • Encourage cross border cooperation beyond the external borders: Help to bring countries closer to European standards
  • The goal is to prevent new dividing lines between the EU and its neighbors, increase stability, ‘ring of friends’, EU has interest in a stable neighborhood
Cross Border Cooperation In Europe

• Budget: $15 billion for the 2007–2013 period

• Individual action plans (bilateral agreements)

• Carrot and Stick policies (Securitization and Cooperation)

• No EU membership but ‘Special Partnership’ (wellbeing for all)

• Goal bring countries closer to European standards and values
  – By reducing trade barriers and promoting human rights, market democracy and education, assistance in the field of justice, anti-terrorism and police.
European Neighborhood Policy
Cross border commuting in Europe
Cooperation in the U.S.

- Apart from Security, U.S. federal interest in the border region has been sporadic over the years.
- U.S.-Mexico relations hybrid between European Neighborhood Policy (ENP) and EU-Russia relations of ‘Special Partnership’
- ENP/NAFTA: “proximity, interpenetration, and asymmetry”
- NAFTA was an initial boost in border relations
- Priority changed after 9/11 to national security
Two-Way Trade in Goods

(value of exports in billions of dollars)

- U.S. Exports to Mexico
- Mexican Exports to U.S.

Source: Foreign Trade Division, U.S. Census Bureau.
Focus on Border Regions

• Regional governments in border regions are generally weak both in Europe and U.S.; Often far away from financial centers and capitals

• The European Union’s Cohesion and Regional Policy 2007-2013 (assistance for poor areas):
  – has an operating budget of 500 million dollars with a clear focus on distributing aid to poorer areas of the EU.
  – By comparison, the total budget of the entire ENP for the same period will be about 15 billion dollars

• Great challenge for binational programs remains the implementation and coordination

• After 9/11 federal resources for the effort were decreasing

• Barcelona Convention early example of Regional cooperation
Barcelona Convention for the protection of the Mediterranean

The 22 Contracting Parties to the Convention will individually or jointly take all appropriate measures to protect and improve the Mediterranean marine environment in order to contribute to sustainable development.

The main aims of the Convention consist of:
• assessing and controlling pollution
• carrying out the sustainable management of natural marine and coastal resources
• integrating the environment into economic and social development
• protecting the marine environment and coastal regions through action aimed at preventing and reducing pollution and, as far as possible, eliminating it, whether it is due to activities on land or at sea
• protecting natural and cultural heritage
• strengthening solidarity between countries bordering the Mediterranean; and contributing to improving quality of life
• The Convention for the protection of the Mediterranean Sea against pollution was adopted in Barcelona on February 16, 1976 and amended on June 10, 1995. Over time, its mandate has been widened to include planning and the integrated management of the coastal region
• Example for the Border 2020?
Great Opportunity for Economic integration

• San Diego-Tijuana: The largest and most dynamic of the U.S.-Mexico border regions also compared to many European border regions
• Decrease in northbound crossings since 2001 despite growth in trade
• 8% of the workers of Tijuana actually are employed across the border in the San Diego region
• Economic interaction hindered by excessive border regulations despite the rise in trade with Mexico
• Border delays cost U.S.-Mexico economies $7.2 billion
• Currently the focus of San Diego’s development is focused north and not so much south
# San Ysidro Port of Entry – Northbound Individual Crossings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Individual Crossings</th>
<th>% Annual Change Total Individual Crossings</th>
<th>Total Passengers (Private Vehicles and Buses)</th>
<th>% Annual Change Total Passengers (Private)</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>% Annual Change Pedestrians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>39,644,307</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>32,734,925</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>6,909,382</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>42,005,306</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>34,447,132</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7,558,174</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>39,351,555</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td>31,809,105</td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
<td>7,542,450</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>45,336,547</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>33,900,601</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>11,435,946</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>45,274,997</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>37,371,514</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>7,903,483</td>
<td>-30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>48,727,602</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>40,425,492</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8,302,110</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>43,872,934</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td>34,415,334</td>
<td>-14.9%</td>
<td>9,457,600</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>41,417,164</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
<td>33,260,814</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
<td>8,156,350</td>
<td>-13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>40,740,621</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>32,929,007</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>7,811,614</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>37,022,194</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
<td>29,265,625</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
<td>7,756,569</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>33,310,096</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td>26,020,236</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
<td>7,289,862</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>30,576,138</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
<td>24,388,012</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td>6,188,126</td>
<td>-15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30,590,858</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>24,150,906</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>6,439,952</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>% Annual Change</th>
<th>% Annual Change</th>
<th>% Annual Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-2010</td>
<td>-37.2%</td>
<td>-40.26%</td>
<td>-22.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2010</td>
<td>-30.31%</td>
<td>-29.14%</td>
<td>34.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2010</td>
<td>-26.14%</td>
<td>-27.39%</td>
<td>-21.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Otay Mesa Port of Entry - Export and Import Trade by Truck

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Trade by Truck</th>
<th>% Annual Change Total Trade</th>
<th>Exports by Truck</th>
<th>% Annual Change Exports</th>
<th>Imports by Truck</th>
<th>% Annual Change Imports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$14,645,671,987</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,927,772,131</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,717,899,856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$15,583,562,817</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>$6,134,728,067</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>$9,448,834,750</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$18,759,879,210</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>$8,110,052,031</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>$10,649,827,179</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$19,384,772,659</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>$8,225,985,115</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>$11,158,787,544</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$20,367,624,663</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>$8,549,456,838</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>$11,818,167,825</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$19,660,723,948</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>$8,260,389,400</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
<td>$11,400,334,548</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$22,171,883,070</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>$8,917,456,915</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>$13,254,426,155</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$24,400,618,960</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>$9,269,520,520</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>$15,131,098,440</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$28,597,443,478</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>$9,937,653,489</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>$18,659,789,989</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$30,666,517,719</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>$9,939,099,890</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$20,757,418,829</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$31,723,564,193</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>$10,499,853,431</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>$21,223,710,762</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$28,212,893,515</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
<td>$9,040,450,491</td>
<td>-13.9%</td>
<td>$19,172,443,024</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$30,745,984,194</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>$10,062,454,134</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$20,683,530,060</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excessive border regulations = high costs
Congestion problem for the region
So what works in Europe?

- In Europe there is a political willingness to cooperate beyond the external borders, providing supra-national support for institutionalizing cross border cooperation.
- Active promotion of border regions and cooperation (this is the key to raise awareness and promote people to people contact).
- Make the border more efficient. Easier crossings, better infrastructure, less of a fortress (means better circumstances for integration).
- Active narrative to promote cross border cooperation in policies and media.
- Cooperation and Securitization go hand in hand.
Policy considerations

1. Exploit where possible the economics of San Diego and Tijuana urban networks: relationships between public agencies, universities, firms, etc. (SDSU had a fruitful network)

2. Role for chamber of commerce to create cooperation narrative

3. Rethink security in terms of increased mobility (Better planning/infrastructure/mobility at ports of Entry)

4. Link regional plans together/Coordinate plans (like we do today)

5. Reverse narrative of fear which draws resources to the border to a narrative of cooperation

6. Look at business models of Port of San Diego and San Diego International Airport: opportunity for Ports of Entry?

7. Bring collaboration to the next level: Cooperation
Conclusion

• Cross border activities take place against the backdrop of considerable structural, financial, political constraints
• What model of cooperation is desired in the San Diego/Tijuana region?
• Is a partnership compared to the European Neighborhood Policy possible?
• How to bring cooperation to the next level?
• What is the vision of the border?
• Our vision...
Create a unified narrative that doesn’t dismiss security but also embraces cooperation
Cooperation 2.0?