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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 physical line, 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 safety 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.

Contrast: U.S-Canada border security - $2.9 billion of federal budget in 2011

It was reported that $90 billion was spend on public money in 10 years in securing the US-Mexican border.
Investment in Security
Security European Union

- Investment in security is significantly less
- $2.6 billion in External border security (2007-2013)
- Frontex: European Union Border Agency for coordinating Border management, assisting member states in technology and resources
- Focus on Migration receiving countries in southern Europe
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 = 37,000
  - Malta: 2009 = 1,300, 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 = 1,331, 2008 = 2,653
- South Eastern European route
  - Greece: 2009 = 30,400, 2008 = 31,700
  - Greece land: 2009 = 4,900, 2008 = 5,600
- Flow of illegal immigrants within EU/Schengen/Associated countries route
- Main routes to EU/Schengen/Associated countries

AIRPORTS:
- SOUTH AMERICAS, CHINA, INDIA
- AFRICAN NATIONS
- WESTERN BALTIK
- SMALL INCREASE
- EASTERN BALTIK
- EASTERN LAND BORDERS OF THE EU
  - 2009 = 1,331
  - 2008 = 2,653
  - DECREASE: 50%

EASTERN LAND BORDERS OF THE EU
- DECREASE: 50%

MAJOR DECREASE AT ALL MARITIME BORDERS
- 2009 = 48,700
- 2008 = 64,900
- DECREASE: 25%
Cross Border Cooperation In Europe

• **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
  - The goal is to prevent new dividing lines between the EU and its neighbors, ‘ring of friends’, EU has interest in stable neighborhood

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

  - Individual action plans (bi-lateral 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

  - 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 US

• Apart from Security, US federal interest in the border region has been sporadic over the years
• U.S/Mexico relations hybrid between European Neighborhood Policy 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)

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 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 Union. By comparison, the total budget of the entire Neighbourhood Policy 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 16 February 1976 and amended on 10 June 1995. Over time, its mandate has been widened to include planning and the integrated management of the coastal region.

Example for the former Border 2012?
Border regions have great opportunity for Economic integration

- SD/TJ: The largest and most dynamic of the Mexican-U.S. 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 raise in trade with Mexico
- Border delays cost the U.S Mexican economies $7.2 billion
- Currently the focus of San Diego development is focused north and not so much south towards the border
<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 Vehicles and Buses)</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>33,310,098</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>

1998-2010: -37.2% 
2003-2010: -30.31% 
2005-2010: -26.14%
<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>$27,288,846,651</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>$8,906,941,227</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
<td>$18,381,905,424</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$27,999,705,722</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>$9,734,731,928</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>$18,264,973,794</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$24,899,320,239</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
<td>$8,357,671,276</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
<td>$16,541,648,963</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$26,194,141,520</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>$9,148,359,012</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>$17,045,782,508</td>
<td>3.0%</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 SD and TJ 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 model of Port of San Diego and SD airport: opportunity for Port of Entry?

7. Bring collaboration to the next level: Cooperation
Conclusion

• Cross border activities often take place against the backdrop of considerable structural, financial, political constraints

• What model of cooperation is desired in the San Diego/Tijuana region?

• 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?