

**Policy Brief:
Government Institutions in the U.S.-Mexico Border ¹**

Salvador Espinosa, Ph.D.

San Diego State University
School of Public Affairs
5500 Campanile Dr. (PFSA 178)
San Diego, CA 92120

DRAFT

Working paper prepared for
The U.S.-Mexico Border: A Discussion of Subnational Policies
Tempe, AZ. June 17-18, 2009

In Preparation for the
XXVII Border Governors Conference
In Monterrey, NL, Mexico

¹ Disclaimer: The contents of this document shall be considered as preliminary and subject to revision. Comments and suggestions will be appreciated if emailed to salvador.espinosa@sdsu.edu. The usual caveats apply.

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	- 3 -
2	THE STATUS OF THE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER INSTITUTIONS.....	- 5 -
2.1	DIAGNOSTIC OF THE CHALLENGES CONFRONTING WORKTABLE PARTICIPANTS ..	- 5 -
2.2	ASSESSING THE RULES: BILATERAL TREATIES.....	- 9 -
2.3	AN INVENTORY OF GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS.....	- 10 -
3	LOOKING INTO THE FUTURE: ELEMENTS OF A MASTER PLAN.....	- 10 -
3.1	THE ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGE: WHO SHOULD DO WHAT?.....	- 11 -
3.2	ARE THE BORDER STATES WILLING TO WORK TOGETHER?	- 11 -
3.3	HOW ARE LONG-LASTING BILATERAL INSTITUTIONS BUILT?	- 12 -
4.	SOURCES AND REFERENCES.....	- 12 -
5.	APPENDIX. FIGURES AND TABLES	14
	Table 1. Mission and challenges for each worktable.....	14
	Table 2. Inventory of Bilateral agreements	18
	Table 3 (a) BORDER SECURITY.....	20
	Table 3 (b) LOGISTICS AND INTERNATIONAL CROSSINGS	21
	Table 3 (c) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	22
	Table 3 (d) EDUCATION.....	23
	Table 3 (e) EMERGENCY AND CIVIL PROTECTION.....	25
	Table 3 (f) ENVIRONMENT	26
	Table 3 (g) WATER.....	27
	Pending: AGRICULTURE, ENERGY, HEALTH, SCIENCE, TOURISM, WILDLIFE.....	28

The integration and consolidation of a U.S.-Mexico trans-border region has taken place as a spontaneous phenomenon, and developed in spite of the lack of a strategic plan that could take maximum advantage of its strengths and guide its socioeconomic and environmental policies. The results of consolidated collaboration in our region would be the development of a joint plan that will guide us on our path towards a state of competitiveness, sustainability and well-being that allows us to leverage the region's development (www.bordergovernors.org)

1 Introduction

The development asymmetries that exist between Mexico and the United States are well known. The two countries also differ in terms of government organization, political culture and border policy. These differences have not prevented border states from working collaboratively and searching for solutions to problems that affect their jurisdictions. A strategic plan would be an excellent tool to set priorities and to identify issues that may hinder the development of sound policies for the region. Policymakers in charge of the design and implementation of the plan, nevertheless, must be aware of the limitations that the institutional setting in Mexico and the United States entail. This paper identifies some of the challenges that policymakers will need to face in the elaboration of the strategic plan and the actions that must be taken to create a competitive, secure and sustainable trans-border region.

This paper argues that to be able to attain these goals, it is necessary to evaluate if the institutional infrastructure that exist in both countries is adequate, and if it will enable policymakers to fulfill the objectives of a strategic plan for the border region. If the institutional foundations to build a competitive, secure and sustainable region are not present, the implementation of any plan could face serious difficulties.

The driving questions for this paper are as follows:

- *Are the governmental institutions in both countries sufficient to promote an agenda for the border region that advances security, competitiveness, and sustainable development?*
- *If this is not the case, what type of reforms should be considered in the preparation of a strategic plan?*

The Conference of Border Governors has 13 worktables that work collaboratively to accomplish the objectives of this organization². Similarly, there are numerous scholars and policy practitioners with a great deal of experience on border affairs. These individuals bring extensive knowledge of the ways in which the existing institutional framework impacts their specific policy area. The following research draws on a series of interviews held with participants from each of these worktables. These conversations facilitated the identification of areas where the existing institutions appear to be operating adequately, as well as those where there are important reforms to be made. This paper takes the opinions of government officials and staff members as a starting point for a reflection on the status of the binational institutions and the issues that policy makers charged with developing the strategic will need to address.

² The policy areas that comprise the Conference are: border security, economic development, logistics and border crossings, education, agriculture, emergency and civil protection, energy, environment, health, science and technology, tourism, water and wildlife.

It is common to observe that people associate the term *institution* with the notion of a public sector entity (e.g. the Mexican and the U.S. Congresses). For ease of interpretation, this document makes a distinction between *an organization* and *an institution*. We can think about the former as a group of individuals who work together to accomplish certain goals (e.g. the Conference of Border Governors). The activities of these groups of individuals are guided by *rules* that determine what is permitted and what is not (e.g. an agreement such as NAFTA or a piece of legislation such as the U.S. Patriot Act). For the purposes of this essay, I will define an institution as a series of rules to be used by the members of an organization to organize their activities.

There are multiple organizations operating in the border region. These organizations are governmental and non-governmental. The former comprises agencies, departments and secretariats at the federal, state and municipal/county level. The latter refers to organizations such as churches, NGOs, and Chambers of Commerce, among many others. All of them play a relevant role in border affairs. Though this paper recognizes the role of non-government organizations, the locus of attention will be on governmental and inter-governmental organizations and the rules that regulate their actions.

2 The status of the U.S.-Mexico border institutions

2.1 Diagnostic of the challenges confronting worktable participants

A central goal of this research is to determine if the existing government institutions can contribute to attaining the objectives of a master plan for the border. As a first step to address the issue, extensive semi-guided interviews with staff members and

government officials participating in each of the 13 worktables of the conference were conducted³. The purpose of these interviews was to learn about the challenges in terms of policy implementation as well as to discover the perceptions of the participants with regard to the adequacy of the institutional framework⁴. Though the interviews touched upon various issues, a key question was whether the existing institutions themselves were impeding their missions (see table 1 in the appendix). The interviews identified three challenges that could impact the implementation of a master plan:

1. Worktable participants often face coordination and communication problems that result from the way in which the government in each country is organized.

It is well known that while the Mexican system of government is heavily centralized, state and local governments in the United States have more power to make decisions. This difference is reflected in the ways in which state agencies in both countries are organized, and in the definition of organizational roles and responsibilities. Several interviewees from the U.S. mentioned that even though the conference worktables are helpful to maintain an open line of communication with their Mexican counterparts, the fact that many responsibilities fall within the scope of the federal government limits what Mexican officials can do in terms of policy

³ At least two government officials per worktable were interviewed (more, whenever possible). Though the sample size is certainly limited and should be expanded, the responses were sufficient to obtain a good understanding of each topical area and the challenges that each worktable is experiencing.

⁴ Note to this draft: I was not able to complete all interviews before the first draft was submitted. They will be included in the final version of the report.

design and implementation (e.g. water, environment and border security policies). As one interviewee pointed out, negotiations on important border issues cannot be made in the context of the worktable because there are no representatives from the Mexican federal government.

The activities of some of the tables are also affected by the level of decentralization that exists in the United States and the numerous entities that must be included in the negotiations. In addition to state and county representatives, negotiations in some tables must take into account a wide variety of actors with differing agendas and decision-making capacity (e.g. school districts, Native American tribes, special authorities, local water districts, etc.).

2. In some worktables, there are no incentives to cooperate because states on both sides of the border are competing for the same things.

In policy areas such as economic development and tourism, the outcomes that can be achieved in the context of the worktables are limited. States on both sides of the border are trying to attract investment, create jobs and promote tourism. Since they are direct competitors, there are no incentives to share information. All interviewees agreed that a first step to address this issue would be to discuss specific areas where states in Mexico and the United States could collaborate. But as the interviewees correctly pointed out, state governors must make these types of decisions. This is a very important issue that policymakers in charge of the plan need to take into account. Without the commitment of state governors, it will be difficult to carry out many of the reforms that are needed to advance policies for the border region.

3. Bilateral agreements between Mexico and the United States in some policy areas are non-existent, outdated, or too limited in scope.

There are constitutional constraints in Mexico and the United States that prevent states from entering into binding agreements with their counterparts. In various cases, states have resorted to memoranda of understanding (MOU) to delineate the terms by which they would cooperate. Some of the interviewees mentioned the difficulties that they must face when an agreement of this kind does not exist or when the existing ones are not sufficient to attain the goals of a worktable. One example is the Emergency and Civil Protection worktable, where the lack of a comprehensive MOU has impeded a prompt response when an emergency occurs⁵. Another example would be in the education worktable, where the existing agreements between U.S. and Mexican federal agencies are not enough to address pressing issues related to the education of migrant workers or to address issues on curriculum content adequately.

Though an MOU is usually not legally binding, its existence can help assign roles and responsibilities for the signing parties, and to determine how the document is compatible with federal regulations in each country. As explained during some of the interviews, even though an agreement of this sort is not a necessary condition for the implementation of a policy, it can facilitate the operations of the agencies involved in the process.

⁵ During the last emergency situation, the agencies on the U.S. side could not ship supplies across the border promptly and found it necessary to use a public-private partnership to be able to meet Mexican regulations.

One should point out that despite the fact that each of the worktables faces different problems and constraints, the majority of the interviewees across workgroups raised the preceding issues. Something that was particularly interesting was the response given when asked if the problems in their worktables were due to an inadequate institutional setting. A common answer was that while the existing rules that regulate their actions could certainly be improved, many of the situations they faced were due to inter-agency coordination problems, and the lack of an adequate definition of roles and responsibilities.

2.2 Assessing the Rules: Bilateral treaties

Border policy falls within the domain of the federal government in Mexico and the United States. And even though the signing of memoranda of understanding or joint declarations among states has certain advantages, they are not effective tools to attain stable inter-temporal agreements for regional development. This objective would be better accomplished though a bilateral treaty or agreement.

The next step in the research effort for this report included a review of the treaties in force that exist between the two countries. According to Mexico's Secretariat of Foreign Affairs, there are 68 bilateral agreements between Mexico and the United States⁶. As table 2 in the appendix shows, the locus of attention of the two governments has historically been in the assignment and use of communication rights (19 agreements), the setting of physical borders (11), treaties establishing

⁶ See <http://www.sre.gob.mx/tratados/Default.htm> (last retrieved on June, 2009). The list is also available in the U.S. Department of State's website (http://www.state.gov/www/global/legal_affairs/tifindex.html, last retrieved on June, 2009). The number of treaties varies between sources. The author estimates that the difference has to do with the way in which the documents are grouped or classified. The specific reason, nonetheless, will need to be verified.

different forms of legal cooperation (11) and issues pertaining to the environment (8). If the objectives of the treaties are compared to either the mission of the worktables or the broad objectives of a master plan (security, competitiveness and sustainability), the reader will observe that the institutional basis to attain far-reaching and stable border policy goals is limited.

2.3 An Inventory of Government organizations

As the interviews demonstrate, there is an organizational challenge that must be taken into account in order to have a feasible master plan for the border. The challenge is due to the presence of multiple actors whose roles and responsibilities are not always defined clearly. One of the goals of this report is to identify the main government actors that are involved in each of the policy areas (worktables) in which the conference is interested (see tables 3(a) through 3(g) in the appendix). However, policy makers involved in border policy design should not downplay the difficulties that will emerge during the implementation stage. Future efforts will need to consider the mission of each of these organizations, the scope of their mandates and the extent to which their actions can facilitate (or complicate) the attainment of the goals of a border master plan.

3 Looking into the future: Elements of a master plan

Finally, it is important to consider the results of the interviews and the challenges that the implementation of a border plan entails with a broader lens. There are three

questions about institutional design that policymakers will need to answer during the elaboration of the strategic plan:

3.1 The Organizational Challenge: Who should do what?

A common theme mentioned during the interviews was the multiplicity of actors involved in border affairs and the lack of clearly defined roles and responsibilities in many government organizations, which result in communication problems that could complicate the implementation of the strategic plan. Several government officials consider that while there is always room for improvement, the existing government organizations can be used to attain the mission of their worktables. The challenge, nonetheless, is to devise mechanisms to improve inter-agency coordination. This can be done if state leaders work with federal and local authorities but also if they promote changes to the organizational structure of their own agencies.

3.2 Are the Border States willing to work together?

For some staff members and government officials a very important issue that must be addressed is related to the lack of incentives to cooperate. A strategic plan for the border region will only be feasible if state leaders are willing to find common ground and decide what to do when they have conflicting goals. The entities in charge of the design and implementation of the strategic plan cannot assure success if Governors, state legislators and other key decision makers do not embrace the idea of a trans-border region. A successful strategic plan requires policy measures that will only be possible if state leaders are committed to the project.

3.3 How are long-lasting bilateral institutions built?

Given the role that the federal governments play in the setting of border policy, one cannot conceive the implementation of a successful plan without the involvement of the executive and legislative branches in both countries. The chance of success will increase if the Conference of Border Governors works with its federal governments in the creation of federal bilateral agreements that are compatible with the mission of the strategic plan. Despite the difficulties that may arise during the negotiation, an agreement between the two countries would equip state governments with more effective tools to advance an agenda that fosters security, competitiveness and sustainability.

It is crucial to recognize that without an adequate institutional infrastructure, the possibilities of success of any the border plan will be curtailed. Building that infrastructure requires all actors to participate. This report focused on the status of governmental organizations and bilateral rules. However, there is a wide array of non-government organizations that must also be taken into account.

4. Sources and references

Conference of Border Governors website, www.bordergovernors.org (last retrieved, June 2009)

Interviews with staff members and government officials participating in the 13 worktables of the Conference of Border Governors.

Ostrom, E., and Polski, M. (1998), *An Institutional Framework for Policy Analysis and Design*, working paper. Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis. Indiana University. Bloomington, IN.

Spiller, P., Stein, E., and Tommasi, M. (2008). *Political Institutions, Policymaking, and Policy: An Introduction*, in Stein, E. and Tommasi, M. (Ed.), *Policymaking in Latin America: How Politics Shapes Policies*, pp.1-28. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank.

Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores (México), Tratados bilaterales con Estados Unidos, in <http://www.sre.gob.mx/tratados/Default.htm> (last retrieved, June 2009).

U.S. Department of State, Bilateral Treaties with Mexico as of year 2000, in http://www.state.gov/www/global/legal_affairs/tifindex.html (last retrieved, June, 2009).

5. Appendix. Figures and tables

Table 1. Mission and challenges for each worktable⁷

Worktable	Mission	Challenges	
		U.S. Perspective	Mexican Perspective
Border security	The Border Security Worktable supports collaboration among the ten Border States on key security issues such as information sharing, technology and personnel with the common goal of preparedness, security and the smooth and continued flow of goods, services and people	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenge: States are very limited in what they can do because most of the responsibilities associated with public safety are centralized. Information does not flow adequately from higher to lower levels of government. Federal regulations in both countries prevent states in Mexico and the US to share information; states share certain information though informal mechanisms and on a case-by-case basis. • Need: formal information-sharing mechanism between U.S. and Mexican states
Economic Development	The Economic Development Worktable is committed to fostering regional integration and supporting activities to develop and strengthen the trade and investment opportunities for communities along the U.S.-Mexico Border.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem is not with institutions but with the incentives to cooperate. States are competing for the same things (jobs, investment). First, it is necessary to find common ground (e.g. what can states do together without hurting each other). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem is not the institutional arrangement but the lack of incentives to cooperate. States should look for common ground with U.S. counterparts (where can states complement each other?) • The fact that decisions in the CBG should be made by consensus delays implementation of policy. • Political willingness
Logistics and Border Crossings	The Logistics and International Crossings Worktable supports enhanced communications, coordination and consensus building among the ten Border States encouraging investment in modern and	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing institutional infrastructure is adequate but there are cooperation and coordination problems among government agencies (power struggles).

⁷ N/A=It was not possible to schedule an interview prior to the submission of this draft.

	efficient infrastructure at ports of entry and to increase security and strengthen commercial exchange.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deficient mechanisms of inter-governmental coordination between states and the federal government
Education	The Education Worktable is committed to supporting collaboration among states to resolve problems related to the education of youth along the U.S.-Mexico border region through education programs that promote bilingual education, cultural exchange and bilateral educational experiences.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenges: U.S. states concerned about size and preparedness of immigrant student population; some states are English-only states (language barrier); curricular differences between countries (cross-walk is not easy); mobility of student population is of primary concern Need: Binational agreements exist but in some cases are limited in scope (need to be expanded); nothing wrong with institutions. What needs to be done is update existing agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worktable currently focusing on migrant workers. Existing bilateral agreements pertaining to revalidation of studies should be revised.
Agriculture	The Agriculture and Livestock Worktable is dedicated to collaborative education, research and communication to resolve trade issues and increase the flow of agriculture products among the ten Border States.	N/A	N/A
Emergency and Civil Protection	The Emergency and Civic Protection Worktable works to strengthen bilateral, cross-border emergency response efforts to respond to terrorist acts, natural disasters and other hazards that threaten the security of the citizens of the Border Region.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lack of an MOU between the two countries makes difficult to attain some of the goals of the worktable. Complex regulations in Mexico makes emergency response efforts cumbersome and slow. 	
Energy	The Energy Worktable has is responsible for addressing broad energy policy issues in the border area.	N/A	N/A
Environment	The Environment Worktable facilitates joint environmental policy development to protect the environment and natural resources of the border by implementing programs aimed at conserving the wealth of those resources.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inter-institutional coordination problems partly due to an inadequate definition of roles and responsibilities (<i>who is in charge of what?</i>). In some sates, responsibilities are very diluted: Organizational problem (e.g.

			<p>in some states, the environment is in charge of government officials with less weight in the hierarchical structure).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to have a comprehensive environmental policy for the border because of the way roles and responsibilities among states are distributed. • Mexico: federal agencies and enterprises sometimes do not share information. • There are cases where important issues discussed in the worktables do not “go up”. Upper-level officials in some states are not fully aware of technical discussions.
Health	The Health Worktable, in partnership with the federal governments and the private sector, works to protect and improve the health of border communities, supporting the efforts of the United States-Mexico Border Health Commission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inter-state coordination (e.g. CA-BC) exist; some states have better coordination mechanism than others • Challenges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requirements for border crossing (i.e. customs) - Multiple entities participate, making fluent communication challenging • Need: standardized communication protocols among cities; roles and responsibilities must be clearly defined 	
Science and Technology	The Science and Technology Worktable support collaboration to capitalize on the region's concentrations of technological and research and development capability to promote the ten Border States as an emerging region of technology and innovation.	N/A	N/A
Tourism	The Tourism Worktable supports preserves and promotes the natural and cultural diversity and the scenic beauty of the Border Region through education and marketing of	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States compete among themselves. • U.S immigration requirements make cross-border tourism difficult • Coordination is better in some regions

	historic, cultural and ecotourism resources and to inform and assist travelers.		(e.g. AZ-Mexico) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The U.S. does not have a government agency at the federal level.
Water	The Water Worktable supports cooperation among the ten Border States to manage the water resources of the Border Region in cooperation with other agencies, to protect, restore and enhance the natural and human environments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiplicity of organizations makes coordination among organizations difficult. Many resolutions are not backed up with funds for implementation. Mexican side: centralism makes the federal government the most important actor while in the US, states have primary responsibility for management. Challenge: state-to-state negotiations are not possible; the US side talks to the federal government; informal mechanisms are used to address issues. Conflicting interests among states make consensus difficult. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria to manage resource differs significantly between the two countries Current problems: Centralized decision-making in Mexico; information sharing problems among levels of government (e.g. stream flows); states left out of negotiations
Wildlife	The Wildlife Worktable supports the ten Border States in adopting a binational approach to wildlife management issues, including conservation projects, permits for wildlife activities, and pilot projects related to hunting.		N/A

Table 2. Inventory of Bilateral agreements

Topic		Total
Communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement on aerial transportation (1960) • Agreement on assignment and use of TV channels along the border (1962) • Agreement that modifies the terms of the 1960 aerial transports agreement (1970) • Agreement to assign and use TV frequencies (1982) • Agreement on AM and hectometric waves (1986) • Agreement that modifies the 1960 agreement on aerial transportation (1988) • Agreement to modify the 1982 agreement on assignment and use of TV frequencies (1988) • Agreement on procedures to coordinate “<i>estaciones terrenas</i>” (1991) • Agreement that modifies the 1960 agreement on aerial transports (1991) • Agreement to use Khz bands for radio transmissions (1992) • Agreement to assign Mhz frequencies along the border (1992) • Agreement on use of FM bands (1992) • Agreement to use GHZ band (1993) • Agreement pertaining to use of frequency bands along the border (1994) • Treaty on transmission and reception of satellite signals (1996) • Agreement to modify the 1960 agreement on aerial transports (1997) • Agreement to modify the 1992 agreement on the assignment and use of Mhz frequencies along the border (1998) • Agreement on the use of Mhz bands (2000) • Agreement to modify the 1960 agreement on aerial transports (2005) 	19
Borders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guadalupe-Hidalgo Treaty (1848) • La Mesilla Treaty (1853) • Convention to replace monuments used to signal the border between Paso del Norte and the Pacific Ocean (1882) • Convention to facilitate the implementation of 1848 (1889) • Convention to assure a fair distribution of the water of the Rio Grande (1906) • Treaty to derogate article 8 of the 1853 agreement (1937) • Treaty to distribute the water from the Colorado, Tijuana and Bravo (Grande) rivers (1944) • Convention to solve the problem of El Chamizal (1963) • Treaty to resolve pending border disputes (1970) • Treaty on maritime borders (1978) • Treaty to delimit the continental platform in the west region of the Gulf of Mexico (2000) 	11
Legal cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperation treaty on the recuperation and devolution of stolen archeological, historic and cultural objects (1970) • Treaty on implementation of sentences (1976) • Extradition treaty (1978) 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement on recuperation and devolution of stolen vehicles (1981) • Cooperation treaty on legal assistance (1987) • Cooperation agreement on drug smuggling and consumption (1989) • Protocol that modifies the 1989 agreement on exchange of tax information. (1989) • Agreement to exchange information on bank transactions to avoid illicit activities (1994) • Protocol that modifies the 1994 agreement on information on bank transactions to avoid illicit activities (1994) • Protocol to the 1978 extradition treaty (1997) • Agreement on customs cooperation (2007) 	11
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention to protect migratory birds and hunting mammals (1936) • Cooperation agreement on sea pollution caused by oil spills (1980) • Agreement to protect and enhance the environment in the border region (La Paz Agreement) (1983) • Agreement to modify the 1980 cooperation agreement (1980) • Cooperation agreement to protect the environment in the metropolitan zone of Mexico City (1989) • Agreement to create the Environmental Border Cooperation Commission and North American Development Bank (1993) • Protocol to modify the convention to protect migrating birds and hunting mammals (1997) • Protocol to modify the 1993 agreement to establish a Border Ecological Cooperation Commission and a North American Bank (2002) 	8
Education, Cultural and Scientific Cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement to exchange official documents (1937) • Agreement to exchange official publications (1938) • Scientific and Technical Cooperation Agreement (1972) • Cooperation agreement in case of a natural disaster (1980) 	4
Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention to prevent the introduction of infectious diseases from cattle (1928) • Agreement to establish a Border Health Commission (2000) 	
Education, Cultural and Scientific Cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement to exchange official documents (1937) • Agreement to exchange official publications (1938) • Scientific and Technical Cooperation Agreement (1972) • Cooperation agreement in case of a natural disaster (1980) 	4
Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention to prevent the introduction of infectious diseases from cattle (1928) • Agreement to establish a Border Health Commission (2000) 	2
Others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maritime Law. Convention to sent rescue ships (1935) • Maritime Law. Agreement on marine search and rescue (1989) • Consular convention (1942) • General arrangement for technical cooperation (1951) • Convention to solve disputes (1941) 	5

Source: Secretariat of Foreign Affairs. Mexico

Table 3 (a) BORDER SECURITY

	Nivel de gobierno (Government level)	Instituciones de Gobierno (Government Institutions)
MEXICO	Federal (federal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat of National Defense • National System of Public Safety (<i>Sistema Nacional de Seguridad Pública</i>) • Secretariat of Public Safety (<i>Secretaría de Seguridad Pública</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Federal Preventive Police (<i>Policía Federal Preventiva</i>) • Attorney General (<i>Procuraduría General de la Republica</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Federal Bureau of Investigations (<i>Agencia Federal de Investigaciones</i>) • National Institute for Migration (<i>Instituto Nacional de Migración</i>)
	Estatat (State)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Public Security Councils (e.g. <i>Consejo Regional de Seguridad Pública Sonora-Baja California</i>) • State Public Security Councils • Secretariat of Public Security (<i>Secretaría de Seguridad Pública Estatal</i>) • State Preventive Police (<i>Policía Estatal Preventiva</i>) • State General Attorney (<i>Procuradurías Generales de Justicia Estatales</i>) • State Bureaus of Investigation (<i>Policía Ministerial</i>) (e.g. <i>Policía Ministerial del Estado de Baja California, Agencia Estatal de Investigaciones de Nuevo León</i>)
	Municipal (County or City)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal Public Security Councils (<i>Consejos Municipales de Seguridad Pública</i>) • Municipal Police (e.g. <i>Secretaría de Seguridad Pública Municipal de Tijuana, Dirección de Seguridad Pública Municipal de Mexicali</i>)
UNITED STATES	Federal (federal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Homeland Security <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transportation Security Administration - U.S. Customs and Border Protection - Immigration and Customs Enforcement - Secret Service - Coast Guard - CBP Port Working Groups • Department of Justice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Drug Enforcement Administration - U.S. Attorneys office - Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives - Federal Bureau of Investigations

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - U.S. Marshals Service • U.S. General Services Administration
	Estatad (<i>State</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Border Governors Conference • Border Liaison Mechanism • Border Trade Alliance • State Police and Highway Patrol • State Office of the Attorney General (e.g. California State Office of the Attorney General) • California State Emergency Management Office
	Municipal (<i>County or City</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County sheriff (e.g. San Diego County Sheriff's Department) • City police force (e.g. San Diego Police Department, Chula Vista Police Department) • Also Indian Reservations might have law enforcement and justice agencies • South Council Economic Development Council •
BINATIONAL	Federal (<i>federal</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various ad hoc mechanisms for coordination including working groups on immigration and human trafficking, arms trafficking, drug trafficking,
	Estatad (<i>State</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Borders Governor Conference Worktable on Border Security • Various ad hoc mechanisms for coordination
	Municipal (<i>County or City</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular communication through liaison officers

Table 3 (b) LOGISTICS AND INTERNATIONAL CROSSINGS

	Nivel de gobierno (<i>Government level</i>)	Instituciones de Gobierno (<i>Government Institutions</i>)
MEXICO	Federal (<i>federal</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.A.A. de la Aduana Fronteriza de Colombia A.C • Secretaria de Comunicaciones y Transportes
	Estatad (<i>State</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CODEFRONT Corporación para el Desarrollo de la Zona Fronteriza del Estado de Nuevo León • CODEFRONT Corporación para el Desarrollo de la Zona Fronteriza del Estado de Nuevo León
	Municipal (<i>County or City</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presidencia Municipal de Nuevo Laredo
UNITED STATES	Federal (<i>federal</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US Department of Transportation Arizona
	Estatad (<i>State</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US Department of State

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US Customs and Border Protection
	Municipal (County or City)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City of Laredo
BINATIONAL		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretaria de Relaciones y Transportes

Table 3 (c) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

	Nivel de gobierno (Government level)	Instituciones de Gobierno (Government Institutions)
BINATIONAL	Federal (federal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Binational Organizing Committee • Border Environmental Cooperation Commission • U.S-Mexico Binational Commission
	Estatad (State)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arizona-Mexico Commission (Comisión Sonora Arizona) • Border Governors Conference • Border Legislative Conference of the Council of State Governments • Border Liaison Mechanism • California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank
	Municipal (County or City)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Economic Development Entities • Local and regional government associations (e.g. Imperial Valley Association of Governments, Sandag) • Port and airport authorities in U.S. localities (e.g. Port of San Diego)
UNITED STATES	Federal (federal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBP • U.S. Army Corps of Engineers • U.S Department of State • U.S. ExIm Bank • U.S. Trade and Development Agency • Overseas Private Investment Corporation
	Estatad (State)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arizona Department of Commerce (Involved)
	Municipal (County or City)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
MEXICO	Federal (federal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customs General Administration (part of the Secretariat of Finance and Public Credit) • Secretariat of Foreign Affairs • Secretariat of Economy

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BANCOMEXT (Foreign Commerce Bank) • BANOBRAS (National Development Bank) • Banobras • NAFIN • Secretariat of the Interior (Secretaría de Gobernación) • National Institute of Migration • NAFIN (National Financing Institution)
	Estatal (State)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariats of Economy in the States (specific name may change)
	Municipal (County or City)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desarrollo Economico Municipales asi como regionales

Table 3 (d) EDUCATION

	Nivel de gobierno (Government level)	Instituciones de Gobierno (Government Institutions)
BINATIONAL	Federal (federal)	
	Estatal (State)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference of Border Governors • AZ-Mexico/Sonora-Arizona Comission • Intra-state arrangements between public universities and community colleges
	Municipal (County or City)	
UNITED STATES	Federal (federal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US Department of Education, Office of Migrant Student Education; US Department of Education, Office of International Affairs (Western Hemisphere)
	Estatal (State)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departments of Education of the States of Arizona, California, New Mexico and Texas
	Municipal (County or City)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local school districts
MEXICO	Federal (federal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretaría de Educación Pública <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dirección General de Relaciones Internacionales - Dirección General de Acreditación, Incorporación y Revalidación - Dirección General de Profesiones • Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dirección General para Norteamérica - Consejo de Mexicanos en el Exterior
	Estatal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretarías de Educación de los Estados de Baja California, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Nuevo León y Tamaulipas.

	<i>(State)</i>	
	Municipal <i>(County or City)</i>	

Table 3 (e) EMERGENCY AND CIVIL PROTECTION

	Nivel de gobierno (<i>Government level</i>)	Instituciones de Gobierno (<i>Government Institutions</i>)
MEXICO	Federal (<i>federal</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEGOB Secretaría De Gobernación
	Estatad (<i>State</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baja California Direccion Estatal de Proteccion Civil • Chihuahua Coordinador de la Unidad Estatal de Proteccion Civil • Coahuila Subsecretario Proteccion Civil • Nuevo Leon Proteccion Civil del Estado • Sonora Estatal de Proteccion Civil • Tamaulipas Estatal de Proteccion Civil
	Municipal (<i>County or City</i>)	
UNITED STATES	Federal (<i>federal</i>)	US AID (United States Agency for International Development) US Department of Homeland Security Federal Emergency Management Agency Regional Headquarters NORAD/Northern Command (USNORTHCOM) US Environmental Protection Agency US Department of State
	Estatad (<i>State</i>)	Arizona Division of Emergency Management California Emergency Management Agency New Mexico Department of Homeland Security and Emergency Management Texas Governor's Office of Emergency Management
	Municipal (<i>County or City</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
BINATIONAL	Federal (<i>federal</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
	Estatad (<i>State</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
	Municipal (<i>County or City</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Table 3 (f) ENVIRONMENT

	Nivel de gobierno (<i>Government level</i>)	Instituciones de Gobierno (<i>Government Institutions</i>)
BINATIONAL	Federal (<i>federal</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Border 2012 • Border Environmental Cooperation Commission • BECC –COCEF • NADBank • Comisión Internacional de Limites de Agua CILA • Comisión de Salud Fronteriza, México-Estados Unidos • Consejo Ambiental de Estados Unidos – ECOS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CILA-IBWC • North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation
	Estatat (<i>State</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Junta Ambiental del Buen Vecino GNEB • SCREP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Border Governors Conference • Border Legislative Conference of the Council of State Governments
	Municipal (<i>County or City</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TRIBUS Campo Band of Kumeyaay Indians Tohono O’odham Nation Ewiiapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians Pala Band of Mission Indians
UNITED STATES	Federal (<i>federal</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Protection Agency • US Geological Services – USG <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US-EPA • US states environmental protection agencies • U.S. Army Corps of Engineers • U.S. Coast Guard • U.S. Department of the Interior-Bureau of Land Management • U.S. EPA • U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service • U.S. General Services Administration • U.S. Public Health Service, department of Health and Human Services

	Estatad (<i>State</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Border Governors Conference • CALIFORNIA - California Environmental Protection Agency • ARIZONA - Arizona Department of Environmental Quality • NUEVO MEXICO - New Mexico Environment Department • TEXAS - Texas Commission of Environmental Quality • Western Climate Initiative – WCI • California Climate Register – CCR
	Municipal (<i>County or City</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LAREDO TEXAS. Keep Beautiful- Laredo
MEXICO	Federal (<i>federal</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales - SEMARNAT • Instituto Nacional de Ecología - INE • Comisión Nacional del Agua - CONAGUA • Procuraduría de Protección al Ambiente – PROFEPA • Comisión Federal para la Protección de Riesgos Sanitarios - COFEPRIS
	Estatad (<i>State</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BAJA CALIFORNIA - Secretaria de Protección al Ambiente • SONORA - Comisión de Ecología y Desarrollo Sustentable del Estado de Sonora • CHIHUAHUA - Secretaría de Desarrollo Urbano y Ecología • COAHUILA - Secretaria de Medio Ambiente del Estado de Coahuila • NUEVO LEÓN - Agencia de Protección al Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales • TAMAULIPAS - Agencia Ambiental de Desarrollo Sustentable de Tamaulipas
	Municipal (<i>County or City</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Todos los municipios fronterizos tienen una Dirección de Ecología o de Medio Ambiente

Table 3 (g) WATER

	Nivel de gobierno (<i>Government level</i>)	Instituciones de Gobierno (<i>Government Institutions</i>)
BINATIONAL	Federal (<i>federal</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Border 2012 (US EPA-Semarnat) • Border Power Plant Working Group • CILA-IBWC
	Estatad (<i>State</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Border Governors Conference • Border Legislative Conference of the Council of State Governments
	Municipal (<i>County or City</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Government Associations (e.g. Imperial Valley Local Government Association, SANDAG) • Local Water Authorities
UNITED STATES	Federal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corps of Engineers (Water Infrastructure)

	<i>(federal)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau Reclamation • US Geological Survey • Dept of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) • Environmental Protection Agency (Water quality)
	Estatal <i>(State)</i>	•
	Municipal <i>(County or City)</i>	•
MEXICO	Federal <i>(federal)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Water Commission (CNA) • National Institute of Ecology • Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT) • Secretariat of Foreign Affairs
	Estatal <i>(State)</i>	• State Water Commissions (specific name may be different)
	Municipal <i>(County or City)</i>	•

Pending: AGRICULTURE, ENERGY, HEALTH, SCIENCE, TOURISM, WILDLIFE