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Border Control in a Post-9/11 Security Environment

The September 11, 2001, attacks transformed American and international conceptions of border control. The U.S. government, for instance, had traditionally viewed border control as a mostly customs- and immigration-based challenge. But after 9/11, policymakers and officials increasingly viewed borders as potential points of entry for would-be terrorists. To better address this shortcoming, Congress created the Department of Homeland Security, to include the unified border enforcement agency, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP). The bulked-up law enforcement agency brought together personnel from the former U.S. Customs Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, among other departments, and placed a renewed emphasis on protecting the nation’s borders from terrorist infiltration.¹

Internationally, other countries also took steps to rethink approaches to border security in the post-9/11 environment. Some states echoed the U.S. approach and moved to emphasize border control as part of a larger, and emerging, “homeland security enterprise” that dealt with how internal, external, and transboundary threats affect domestic security. For example, the UK Border Agency, formed in April 2008, integrated three existing agencies—Britain’s Border and Immigration Agency, UKVisas, and the port-of-entry functions of Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs—in a single border control organization within the Home Office. This reorganization followed a 2007 Cabinet Office report that highlighted the need for a more unified approach to British border security.²

But even as governments broadly heighten their focus on border control, important differences remain in how individual states approach organizational- and policy-based reforms. EU member states, for instance, have embraced a regional approach to border security by adopting common standards and moving toward a single, external border. Other countries, meanwhile, have turned inward to examine how national capabilities address—or, in some cases, fail to address—a growing litany of border security threats.

Poland and India exemplify these divergent approaches. The former presents an important test case in the European Union’s efforts, through the Schengen Agreement, to eliminate internal EU borders and replace them with a single, external one. India, by contrast, has looked inward and undertaken an extensive overhaul of its border- and domestic-security apparatus following a devastating terrorist attack in November 2008. So what have been the Polish and Indian experiences with

border control? What have been their successes and shortcomings? And most important, what do their experiences tell us more generally about post-9/11 border security strategy and policy? Below, we briefly describe why Poland and India are such fitting cases for this very study.

A Multitude of Challenges

Both Poland and India have experienced dramatic political and economic transformations over the last several years. Through these changes, both states have confronted numerous challenges in securing their borders.

Poland’s rapid emergence from communism; its transformation to a market economy; and its accession to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1999 and the European Union in 2004 all have resulted in deep political, economic, and societal changes in this vibrant Central European nation. EU integration has had an especially important transformational effect on how the Polish government conceives of its internal and external border security policies. The European Union requires that its member states maintain external border controls consisting of an effective border surveillance mechanism at authorized border crossings. In addition, the standard requires that all individuals crossing external borders are checked in a systematic way. As a result, Polish efforts on border security have been dominated by questions of how to effectively develop national capabilities to meet changing EU requirements.

Amid these bureaucratic challenges, Poland continues to address the growing threat of illegal immigration, human trafficking, and significant trade in contraband, as well as the potential threat of illicit trafficking of nuclear and other radioactive materials from Russia and former Soviet states. Together, these bureaucratic and threat-based challenges make Poland an intriguing case in a larger study on border security within an evolving economic and security environment.

India also faces the challenge of addressing border security in a time of significant transformation. Over the last several years, India has emerged as one of the world’s fastest growing economies. This trend underscores the need for effective border security strategies; integration with the world economy demands open and fluid borders. At the same time, however, economic growth requires stable and secure environments. But in India’s neighborhood these two aims often conflict. New Delhi faces a significant threat of infiltration by extremist groups based in—and sometimes, supported by—Pakistan. These networks have historically been active in Kashmir, the focus of India’s most difficult dispute with Pakistan, but also have caused problems elsewhere. The Pakistan-based Lashkar-e-Taiba, for example, is believed responsible for the 2008 Mumbai bombings. And there are significant threats in India’s ethnically heterogeneous northeast, some with connections beyond India’s borders. In addition, India must worry about preventing illegal immigration, interdicting the drug trade, guarding against the spread of disease, and economic crime, including evasion of customs and black market sales for goods.

Scope and Methodology

Any study on “border security” must necessarily define and limit its scope. Border security includes safeguarding a state’s land, air, and water domains; deterring threats along these borders; and securing all points of entry, which are locations such as seaports, airports, and land border
crossings, where officials are stationed to oversee the legal entry and exit of persons and merchandise. For the purposes of this report, we will focus primarily on Polish and Indian efforts to secure land borders between points of entry. By focusing on these geographical “gray” areas, we hope to best capture the nature of the unconventional threats—such as terrorist infiltration—that have come to define concerns over border security in the twenty-first century.

In addition, limited resources necessitate that we focus on a small number of states. This constraint lends itself to the case study method, which allows us to examine particular countries in significant detail. What emerges is by no means an exhaustive statement on the challenges that emerging states face in implementing border security policy. Rather, we hope to provide a snapshot, of sorts, of the experiences of two particular states that must navigate an array of threat-based and bureaucratic challenges. Far from serving as the last word on the subject, the final product is meant to accelerate a debate on an understudied issue.

Later, we explore both Poland and India in detail. But before presenting both case studies, it is helpful to address border security more generally, including issues of strategy and policy formulation, acquisition, and execution. Doing this provides additional context for the country-specific analysis that appears later in the report.

**Border Security in Theory and Practice**

Conceptually, border security falls within the larger category of what is commonly called “ homeland security.” In its most basic sense, border security involves managing the flow of people, goods, and other tangible items across national boundaries. The concept is applicable across disparate topographical environments (land, water; urban, rural) and a variety of threats (illegal human migration, illicit smuggling of goods, spread of disease).

In theory, states would design and implement border security initiatives in a comprehensive, strategic, and sequential fashion. In other words, states would begin by defining their strategic imperatives, such as the need to prevent smuggling or illegal human entry. Then, they would identify the necessary corollaries—like some system to interdict smuggled goods—to meet these strategic imperatives. Finally, states would deploy specific tools—namely, human or technological resources—to implement their border security policies.

Of course, this process does not always play out fully according to form. Over the last 10 years—spurred, in part, by the September 11 attacks—the homeland security industry has expanded dramatically. New systems and technologies have proliferated as the United States and other countries increasingly seek to monitor and control the flow of people and goods across national boundaries. This development has had two, countervailing effects. The first has been to give states access to a slew of new tools that can augment border security effectiveness. The second, however, has been to sometimes induce technology-driven policymaking—in other words, to let the acquisition of tools drive policy rather than the other way around. The result can be a collection of impressive assets that, taken together, lack strategic coherence. And even when policymakers do make a conscious effort to develop strategic, rather than acquisitions-driven, border security strategies, they often confront problems with systems integration and cost overruns. Below, we explore in greater detail the considerations that states face in formulating border security strategies.
Developing a Border Security Strategy

At their core, border security strategies are meant to deter the entry of illegal or threatening people and goods while facilitating and speeding the entry of legal or desired people and goods. This means achieving “operational control” over borders and the threats they present. The steps to gaining operational control proceed sequentially: detection, identification, classification, and finally, response to emerging threats.

A country’s border security strategy needs to be shaped in light of an understanding of the most important threats, in terms of the likely enemy, the likely tactics, and the damage those tactics are likely to cause. Terrorists trying to enter the country via ship require a very different approach than counterfeiters trying to avoid customs by driving trucks of illegal goods through border checkpoints. Although this study is specifically focused on land borders between points of entry, a country’s border security strategy review needs to begin by examining the most likely potential threats and their most likely points of attempted entry given the terrain on the border of the given country.

In examining the regional environment, the planner needs to look at the existing political situation, regulations, and levels of cooperation. The United States faces different challenges and regulations in working with the Mexican and Canadian governments to cooperate on border security. No border security process starts from scratch, and in developing a new strategy policymakers need to examine existing capabilities, identify strengths and vulnerabilities, and seek ways to maximize the strengths and reduce the number of vulnerabilities. In addition to looking at the existing border security process and infrastructure, the strategy should consider the strengths and weaknesses of various resources in the country and seek to make the best possible use of them. No two countries are likely to need the same border security solutions. A country that has an abundant workforce can rely more heavily on manpower, whereas a wealthier country with less available labor can opt for a more technologically intensive approach to border security.

After examining the operating environment, a border security strategy needs to identify specific capabilities that a country should develop. These will vary based on the above factors—threats, regional regulations, and strengths and weaknesses—but some of the key capabilities are discussed below. More extensive texts on capabilities-based planning are available elsewhere from the defense and homeland security community, but generally focusing on developing capabilities rather than countering specific threats leads to a much more flexible and adaptable border security team. The strategy then needs to identify the specific combination of personnel, training, technology, and infrastructure to develop and implement those capabilities on and around the border.

Securing Borders between Points of Entry

Border security can be broken down into three functions: detection, interdiction, and deterrence. Detection is simply identifying that someone is attempting to cross the border, followed by classifying the threat. Interdiction is responding to and apprehending them during the act of crossing or attempting to cross the border. Deterrence is placing barriers along the border that make entry difficult or funneling attempted transgressors toward areas with higher detection and interdiction capabilities.

All three functions need to be considered in relation to urban, rural, and remote areas. Urban areas provide the advantages of infrastructure to both threats and border patrol agents, often
leaving responders only minutes for interdiction, a distinct disadvantage in the time/distance challenge. Rural areas have much less infrastructure and (generally) fewer places to hide, leaving much more time to respond, but they are generally more scarcely patrolled. Remote areas have natural defenses such as mountains or deserts. A sound border security strategy should attempt to use barriers and other deterrence factors to funnel threats toward rural and remote attempts to cross the border, where sensors and scanners can better detect entry and agents can optimize the time/distance challenge by allowing increased time and space to respond appropriately.

Detection can be as simple as border security agents watching the border, either from patrols or fixed locations, or as complex as integrated electronic sensors and scanners of various kinds and manned or unmanned aerial patrols along the border. Technology can be extremely important in helping increase the efficiency of border patrol agents, but it can also be prone to failure or interference and does not always stand up to the harsh conditions along many borders. As always, the exact mixture of technology and labor depends on the needs and strengths of the given country.

Interdiction of people detected crossing the border sounds simple, but in reality it is a complex law enforcement activity. Border security agents must have the appropriate transportation to actually interdict multiple people, possibly armed, who are intent on not getting caught. Agents must be equipped with the legal precedent and jurisdiction to catch people. They must have facilities to hold captured illegal entrants. They must also have a close working relationship with other internal law enforcement entities in the event that detected entrants do get past. And they need to be aware that border security is extremely difficult, with a potentially high rate of unresolved crossings no matter how big their force and how hard they work.

Deterrence is a matter of scale and is primarily to aid the other two categories. Not even the smallest countries can wall off enough of their border to have complete security, but they can place walls, barbed wire, trenches, or other deterrence technology in enough places that it funnels people toward areas with more border security agents and sensors.

Finally, effectively deterring entry between the ports of entry depends on a rational immigration processing system (to encourage migrants to use proper channels in crossing borders), effective interior enforcement of immigration laws away from the border (to thereby deter illicit crossings), and strong identity management systems that allow border guards to segment apprehended crossers quickly into high-threat (e.g., wanted criminal) or low-threat (e.g., economic migrant) categories.
Introduction

Poland’s recent experience with border security has been inextricably linked to the country’s 2004 accession to the European Union. In joining that body and its subsequent full admittance into the Schengen area in December 2007, Warsaw has and will continue to implement the new organizational and regulatory mandates tied to border control.

Most of these mandates and directives center on the “Schengen area,” a borderless zone that comprises 22 EU countries¹ plus Switzerland, Norway, and Iceland. First established by the Convention Implementing the Schengen Agreement in 1990—which supplemented the earlier Schengen Agreement of 1985—the Schengen Agreement eliminates signatories’ internal borders and replaces them with a “single external border,” allowing for freedom of movement within the Schengen area. The regime also requires member states to conform to a number of other standards, including adoption of common frameworks “applying to people crossing the external borders of the EU member states” and relating to “rules on visas for short stays.”²

As Poland has worked to enact these measures, Polish government officials have simultaneously continued to address existing border security challenges, including the illicit trafficking of humans, arms, drugs, and contraband, as well as illegal immigration. Poland’s expansive eastern land border—one of the European Union’s largest—has made these tasks all the more challenging. Therefore, this case study will examine how Poland has addressed these security threats while concurrently transitioning their internal framework to meet Schengen requirements.

Threats and Challenges to Poland’s Border Security: Geographic and Statistical Perspectives

Of the states that make up the European Union’s eastern flank, Poland’s border with non-Schengen countries, at approximately 1,185 kilometers, is one of the longest. Ukraine, Belarus, and the Russian exclave Kaliningrad share 535 kilometers, 418 kilometers, and 232 kilometers with Poland, respectively. In addition, Poland borders the Baltic Sea for 440 kilometers.

¹. Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden.

These external land borders are the sites of frequent illegal and illicit activity. In 2008, Polish officials detected 3,298 illegal border crossings according to a report released by FRONTEX in March 2009. This number is exceptionally high when compared to neighboring EU countries on the eastern flank: Slovakia, Hungary, and Romania each reported fewer than 1,000 illegal crossings over the same period.

Several factors may explain why Poland far outpaces its EU neighbors in terms of illegal border crossings. Many illegal immigrants use Poland as a transit country to reach other, more economically developed EU states. In addition, the country’s steady economic growth—Poland was the only European country whose economy grew in 2009—makes it an increasingly attractive permanent destination for illegal immigrants as well. For its part, the Polish government—perhaps in an attempt to portray the high number of arrests in a positive light—has suggested that the 2008 figures owe to better training and preparation on the part of the country’s Border Guard and Customs Service.

Poland also serves as a transit country for the trafficking of drugs, arms, alcohol, cigarettes, and humans. While Poland's Border Guard statistics reveal a decline in uncovered goods from smuggling between 2004 and 2008, the value of many illegal goods detected by the Border Guard in 2008 rose sharply from 2007 levels. The value of illegal drugs seized almost doubled to over 4.1 million zloty ($1.4 million) from nearly 2.45 million zloty in 2007 ($832,748). Similar trends apply to the smuggling of arms and ammunition, commercial goods, cigarettes, and alcohol. Over the span of six months in 2008, Polish authorities detected 87 liters of alcohol and 29 million cigarettes illegally imported, which translated to a potential revenue loss of 12.5 million zloty ($4.2 million). An excise tax imposed on legal trade of these goods would generate a significant source of internal revenue for Poland.

Ukraine appears to be the source of much of the increase in illicit activity uncovered at Poland’s eastern border. In 2008, for instance, Poland’s Border Guard reported a 48 percent increase in the number of uncovered cigarette smuggling plots. The economic downturn may
explain at least part of this trend. After seven years of 7 percent average annual GDP growth, Ukraine's economy grew at only 2 percent in 2008.8 And recent reports suggest that the Ukrainian economy contracted by as much as 15 percent in 2009.9 These conditions, along with a 38 percent decline in Ukraine's currency in 2009,10 may have spurred recent increases in smuggling, especially in the poor and largely rural areas along the Polish-Ukrainian border. Indeed, smuggling is an important source of income for many Polish and Ukrainian citizens living in these areas.

While Poland addresses these border-related threats, government officials also are working to fully implement Schengen requirements. As the following section demonstrates, despite a sometimes difficult transition, Poland has made significant progress toward Schengen integration although several important EU initiatives have yet to be fully implemented.

A Mighty European Fortress: EU Border Security and the Schengen Requirements

Since coming into force in 1995, the Schengen area has expanded to include 400 million citizens and 25 signatory states. Poland was admitted into the Schengen area on December 21, 2007, becoming the eastern-most external border of the European Union. It is important to note that the Schengen Border Code provides a safeguard clause that authorizes any country to temporarily reinstate controls at its frontiers within the European Union in the event of a serious threat to public policy or public security.11

Guided by its Schengen Action Plan 2001 and the Integrated Border Management Strategy, Poland implemented the Schengen requirements in two different stages. The first stage required Polish legal codification of EU standards in five main areas: border management, visas, immigration, asylum, and security.12 The second stage involved implementation of the Schengen Information System (SIS), the electronic database used by Schengen countries to maintain and distribute information on individuals and property of interest for border security and law enforcement purposes.13

In order to complete both stages, the European Union, coupled with financial support from non-EU governments such as Norway, has supported Poland's reforms through four major financial mechanisms. First, from 1999 to 2004, Poland received €130 million under the PHARE

---

10. Ibid.
12. The Schengen Action Plan is a strategic document, adopted on August 15, 2001, by the Committee for European Integration. This annually updated document specifies both priorities and instruments for the implementation of Schengen Aquis in Poland and sets the deadlines for the implementation of respective measures. Strategy for Integrated Border Management was another document regulating the adjustment process of Polish border to Schengen requirements.
13. The Schengen Information System (SIS) will be discussed in further detail in this report.
program (Programme of Community Aid to the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe, or EU financial assistance for pre-accession members); Warsaw used these funds to purchase state of the art border security equipment for monitoring and protection. Second, Poland received €313 million through the Schengen Financial Instrument to modernize its external border crossing infrastructure, purchase modern equipment for border services, and train border guard and border police, with nearly half of the funding allocated to the construction, training, and implementation of SIS. Third, the Norwegian Financial Mechanism granted Poland €277.8 million (between 2004 and 2009) to strengthen its external borders, build the infrastructure for SIS, and improve cooperation between Polish police and the Border Guard. Finally, the EU External Border Fund 2007–2013, created by the European Parliament and the European Council in May 2007, granted Poland €78 million to support both effective organization of external border checks and effective management of the movement of persons at external borders, as required by Schengen.

Together, these four financial assistance mechanisms have been vital in accelerating Poland’s integration within the Schengen framework. Below, we outline three major EU initiatives associated with this integration process: SIS; EUROSUR (an EU border surveillance system); and FRONTEX (an EU border management coordination agency based in Warsaw).

Schengen Information System (SIS)

One of Poland’s most important initiatives was the establishment and implementation of the Schengen Information System—a priority reflected in the overwhelming percentage of EU funds given to Poland dedicated to the purchase, implementation, and training necessary to utilize SIS. Its main function is to divide the data entered into different categories of “alerts” to member states from a central server managed by the European Commission. These alerts indicate whether a

15. UKIE, Five Years of Poland in the European Union, p. 269.
16. The Norwegian Financial Mechanism was established in 2004 as Norway’s own counterpart of the EEA Financial Mechanism. Thus, the Norwegian Financial Mechanism is a fund from which Poland benefited substantially. It was not the Norwegian government that invested in Polish borders; rather, it was Poland that applied for funding from a fund created by Norway.
17. UKIE, Five Years of Poland in the European Union, p. 270.
person crossing a Schengen border is wanted for extradition to another Schengen state or whether a person or vehicle is to be placed under surveillance or subjected to specific checks.\textsuperscript{18}

The first version of SIS, known as SIS I, was deployed in September 2007 and has been moderately successful in coordinating the information and activities of various national border guards. Poland estimates that the Polish Border Guard has made some 5,000 queries per hour on average utilizing SIS (with peaks of up to 11,000 an hour). When coupled with approximately 13,000 monthly entries and up to 110,000 checks per day by Polish police forces,\textsuperscript{19} SIS I appears to be a useful tool in projecting shared information to the frontline.

That said, SIS I is limited in some important ways. The system does not have the capacity, for instance, to process biometric data. The upgraded version of SIS I, known as SIS II, was designed to address this shortcoming; it was set to be rolled out in 2007 to coincide with the admission of Poland and eight other countries into the Schengen Area. But lawsuits, questionable project supervision by the European Commission, and the sheer complexity of coordinating a large number of member states in a single database all have significantly delayed the implementation of SIS II. Polish authorities, along with several other member states, have expressed eagerness to connect to SIS II,\textsuperscript{20} but the planned deployment now has been pushed back to 2011.\textsuperscript{21} Unfortunately, these urgently needed upgrades are not available as old systems must be consolidated and updated in order to be effective in combating border threats.

**EUROSUR**

Second to Poland’s disappointment over the delayed implementation of SIS II is the European Union’s failure to launch the European Border Surveillance System (EUROSUR), an effort to enhance border surveillance with the main purposes of preventing unauthorized border crossings, countering cross-border criminality, and supporting measures to be taken against persons who have crossed illegally.\textsuperscript{22} Poland and other Schengen states with external borders have been awaiting the implementation of EUROSUR, described as a “decisive step in the further gradual establishment of a common European integrated border management system.”\textsuperscript{23} The system would identify intelligence gaps throughout the Schengen area by improving the performance of surveillance tools and sensors—through the use of satellites or unmanned aerial vehicles and by developing a common application of these tools by gathering, analyzing, and disseminating information in a structured manner.\textsuperscript{24}

---

23. Ibid.
Unfortunately, EUROSUR is still very much an idea that has yet to come to fruition. The system would provide a common technical framework to support member states to act efficiently at the local, national, and pan-European level in cooperation with third countries, to detect, identify, track, and intercept persons attempting to enter the European Union illegally. Moreover, EUROSUR would enhance EU member states’ ability to have full situational awareness at their borders and increase the response capability of law enforcement authorities.25 Perhaps EUROSUR’s most interesting concept is a call for several National Coordination Centers (NCCs) that are to be established in eight yet-to-be-identified EU member states along the EU eastern land border. These centers would function as the central component of national border surveillance systems and would ensure near real-time local, regional, and national decisionmaking among various national authorities involved in border control activities, as well as provide situational awareness of conditions and activities along the external borders.26

This would continue to support the nearly insatiable need for constant coordination among national authorities and could be an ideal training platform for both Schengen and non-Schengen countries. If EUROSUR does not evolve, perhaps the NCC concept could be developed by yet another EU border security program that has begun to gain traction: the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union (known as FRONTEX).

FRONTEX
FRONTEX, established in 2005 and headquartered in Warsaw, is an EU agency dedicated to coordinating national border guards to secure EU borders with non-EU states. As an independent body tasked with integrating the national border security systems of EU member states to combat the myriad of threats on the European Union’s external border, FRONTEX seeks to develop a pan-European model of integrated border security. It operates along four tiers: the exchange of information and cooperation between member states, immigration, and repatriation; surveillance, border checks, and risk analysis represented by border and customs control; cooperation with border guards, customs, and police authorities in non-Schengen neighboring countries; and cooperation with third countries to include common activities.

The extent of direct interaction between FRONTEX and the Polish Border Guard, as well the former’s operational impact within Poland itself, is ambiguous. However, FRONTEX’s growing budget has provided hope that the agency might eventually have a significant impact on security along the EU external border, particularly in Poland. FRONTEX’s budget has increased steadily from an initial allocation of €6.2 million in 2005 to over an estimated €80 million in 200927 which represents an increase of nearly 70 percent in one year (from 2007 to 2008 funding), while staff has increased by more than 40 percent.28

26. Ibid.
The European Union views FRONTEX as increasingly central to its external border security efforts, with particular operational emphasis on training activities (which account for the second-largest portion of FRONTEX’s 2008 operational budget at 13 percent) and land border operations (representing 8 percent of the budget). The new EU home affairs commissioner, Cecilia Malmström, has stated that she favors strengthening the EU border management system and the capabilities of FRONTEX. The commissioner envisions FRONTEX being capable of coleading border patrol operations with EU member states, providing technical assistance to third countries and deploying liaison officers in third countries” all while improving the quality of border security equipment and sharing member state assets.

A number of joint operations were carried out under FRONTEX’s authority along Poland’s eastern land border, including Ariadne, Five Borders (Operations Atlas I, Atlas II, and Atlas III), Focal Points 2008, and Gordius in 2008, which through synchronizing air and land external borders control and joint surveillance efforts, not only strengthened border security but also increased capabilities of participating border guard authorities and cooperation with their counterparts in other member states.

The Polish Border Guard: Implementing Land Border Security on the EU Frontline

The Integrated Border Management Programme 2007–2013 serves as Poland’s primary strategic and budgetary framework for the continued reform and modernization of its Border Guard. This critical document attempts to develop a balanced approach when making border security investments based on risk and needs assessment. The main objective of the strategy is to ensure the efficient movement of legal persons and goods through the national border while providing robust border protection against security, economic, or public health related threats. The continued trans-

formation of the Border Guard into a robust and capable modern border-immigration service undergirds the success of the Integrated Border Security Management Programme as a whole.

Having reached the halfway point in its integration program, Poland has made significant progress, but must focus on the following four key priorities in modernizing its border management infrastructure:

- Facilitate openness and border access
- Enhance border security
- Enhance Border Guard effectiveness
- Increase cooperation and exchange of information

In line with this first priority, Poland must continue to facilitate openness and border access. Polish authorities have successfully removed controls on its internal EU borders, but the government must continue to eliminate unnecessary internal border crossings and modernize old crossings on its external border. Efforts to institutionalize cooperation and joint planning with its external border neighbors have become increasingly urgent. Since the Polish-Ukrainian border has seen a high incidence of border traffic, smuggling, and illegal immigration, Poland has accurately identified all of this border's crossing points as the highest priority for further investment. Although this investment is welcome, it must be coupled with substantial progress in cross-border cooperation with non-EU members at both the political and institutional (e.g., Border Guard) level. Under the European Neighborhood Policy, the European Union financially supports cross-border cooperation activities on its external borders, such as the Cross-border Cooperation Programme Poland-Belarus-Ukraine 2007–2013. This program is aimed at broadening the cooperation in the border zone areas of these three countries to realize the full social and economic potential of the region. Together, the national border guards of these three nations perform joint activities that increase the transparency and efficiency of border controls and customs procedures, as well conduct joint activities to prevent and eradicate illegal migration, trafficking, and organized crime.

The second and third priorities of the Integrated Border Management Programme 2007–2013 emphasize enhancing border security and border guard effectiveness, both of which depend entirely on the development of border guard operational capabilities. The Border Guard is the Polish state security agency responsible for protecting the state border, fighting border crime, prosecuting perpetrators, implementing international agreements, organizing border control and air transit security, ensuring public order within the border crossing area, preventing terrorism, and preventing the transportation of contraband goods. In addition, it supervises the Polish maritime areas and monitors vessels for their compliance with the regulations in effect in that area. According to Poland’s National Security Strategy, adopted on November 5, 2007, the Border Guard must provide “effective security of national border and border control in accordance with national security

---

33. Ibid.
Guided by the Principles of Multiannual Strategy for Functioning of the Border Guard for 2009–2015 as the Polish government’s main strategic border security document, Poland will establish the border guard as the primary Polish immigration service and will increase its effectiveness in conducting border traffic control and protecting its borders by 2015. In order to accomplish this, Poland will consolidate the current Border Guard infrastructure by eliminating 23 checkpoints on the internal Schengen borders (they intend to transform nine checkpoints into local Border Guard groups and dismantle the rest). By shifting personnel, resources, and capabilities from the internal Schengen border to the external border checkpoints, the Border Guard seeks to provide better and more competent internal migration services and patrols. The desired end state is to transform the border guard’s operational capabilities into a modern border-immigration service. In its first year under these new guiding principles, Poland has established mobile patrols that are authorized to perform identity checks and examine visa documents throughout Poland, without being limited to the regions directly adjacent to the Polish external border. These mobile patrols are now visible in city streets, at railways stations, and on trains, sending a forceful message of Poland’s commitment to increased vigilance against illegal immigrants.

In addition to reallocating personnel, from 2007 to 2009 the Border Guard invested more than 897 million zloty (US$323 million) to modernize its infrastructure and equipment, with additional plans to invest another 61 million zloty (US$21.4 million) between 2010 and 2011. While substantial, these investments are not sufficient to meet the border guard’s overall needs, which include uniforms, vehicles, data-sharing and communications technology, and other specialized equipment. The extensive list of requirements necessary for the modernization of border guard
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37. This document has a strategic importance in terms of finalizing the transformation process of Border Guard into a modern border immigration service of police character, responsible for state border controls and protection of EU/Schengen external border, conducting its tasks in the scope of preventing and combating illegal immigration, cross-border crime and crime with involvement of third-country nationals. The process initiated in 2000 was supposed to prepare the service in a view of Poland joining the European Union and fully implementing the Schengen Agreement.
infrastructure is daunting: Poland will need to construct air bases and helipads for Border Guard planes on EU external borders, build and modernize training centers and the headquarters of Border Guard divisions, and modernize radio-communication systems.

The third priority of the Integrated Border Security Management Programme is to enhance Border Guard effectiveness across the board. Although broad in description, this priority ensures that all border guard activities meet international standards. Poland has made impressive progress in reforming its structure to meet the Schengen zone requirements. However, Poland must step up its border guard training programs while simultaneously ensuring that its national strategy is flexible enough to reflect ongoing requirement changes emanating from Brussels.

Currently, Polish Border Guard officials are being trained under the EU Common Core Curriculum for EU Border Guards with the support of FRONTEX. Joint patrols have been established with representatives of border protection services of fellow Schengen members, with most of these patrols taking place on the Polish-German, Polish-Czech, and Polish-Slovak borders, which have helped to streamline common practices and training. However, both the current training and joint patrols must be augmented and institutionalized.

Poland’s fourth priority in the Integrated Border Management Programme is to strengthen its national capacity to develop appropriate risk assessment models by improved cooperation and exchange of information. If Warsaw hopes to achieve this goal, it must develop a centralized communications system by purchasing mobile terminals and biometric readers as part of the implementation of the Visa Information System (VIS), as well as prepare for the implementation of entry-exit systems (EES) and participation in the Register Traveler Program (RTP).

Polish officials also proposed establishing the country’s own Immigration Liaison Officers (ILO) network, which envisages a network of immigration liaison officers posted to the consular section of Polish embassies in non-EU member states. The goal is to exchange information, attend specialized joint training courses, and develop common information gathering approaches. The ILO would institutionalize long-term cross-border cooperation and exchange of information with non-EU member states and all neighbor states. In order to successfully create an ILO network, Poland would need to develop a cadre of qualified personnel, establish a training curriculum, and identify external sources of funding.

Whether or not Poland has the will, ability, and finances to institutionalize an ILO network remains to be seen. What is clear, however, is that cooperation and exchange of information is an urgent need and is not limited to cross-border issues but requires improving cooperation and the exchange of information between and among different border forces and services. If the Border Guard can improve its own internal collaboration with the Polish National Police, Internal Security Agency, and Customs Service, its overall effectiveness and regional impact will increase substantially.

41. UKIE, Five Years of Poland in the European Union, p. 270.
42. For more information on EES or RTP, see the European Commission document, “Preparing the next steps in border management in the European Union,” February 13, 2008.
An Assessment of Poland’s Border Management Strategy: Findings and Recommendations

The Integrated Border Management Programme does succeed in identifying four critical priorities, both internally and institutionally, to create a robust border security regime that secures Poland and the European Union as a whole. While this document clearly lays out Poland’s priorities, it does not outline, in any certain detail, a clear roadmap on how the government will accomplish its priorities. This uncertainty is reinforced by several inconsistencies and significant obstacles that prevent well-defined, long-term strategic planning, chief among them being the self-imposed limitations of Poland’s budgetary procedures. Since the Polish government can only issue requests that do not exceed the resources allocated for the given fiscal year, it is extremely difficult to manage multiyear, multiterraced projects. In recognition of this challenge and to help alleviate the problem, the Polish parliament established the 2007–2011 Modernization Programme for the Police, Border Guard, State Fire Service, and the Government Protection Bureau, which granted considerable financial resources for enhancing the operational capabilities of Polish security services. However, this is just an exception to the general budgetary rule. Until Poland reforms its budgetary procedures, authorities will continue to face difficulties implementing long-term and large-scale strategic planning despite the fact that the Polish authorities have also maximized savings by shifting forces and equipment away from its now internal EU borders to external border protection.

The silver lining in this budgetary cloud, however, is that a significant amount of Poland’s total border security budget comes from the European Union, mostly from the External Border Fund. It is important to note that the European Union will begin to develop its next five-year budget plan beginning in 2013. With its professed priority in the area of border security, we would anticipate that the Polish government would actively seek a substantive increase in funding for its activities along the European Union’s eastern flank.

The Polish Border Guard could also benefit greatly from an even deeper partnership with FRONTEX, particularly in the fields of joint training, equipment integration, and training curriculum for EU external border security as part of Rapid Border Intervention Teams (RABITs)44 and FRONTEX’s Joint Support Teams (FJSTs).45 Under FRONTEX auspices, Poland has coordinated efforts along the Polish-Ukrainian border, but more can be achieved. Poland has certainly gained important practical experience as it continues to jointly train and exchange information with and among other EU and non-EU member states and could benefit more from an integrative EU approach.

In order for Poland to achieve enhanced border guard effectiveness, it must develop and deploy a more effective and integrated interagency and intra-EU risk assessment model to aid implementation and review of its border management strategy. Although a Polish intergovernmental secretariat does exist whereby various agencies and departments coordinate their border security
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44. Rapid Border Intervention Teams (RABITs) provide short-term assistance through immediate deployment of border guards on a European level in case of urgent and exceptional migratory pressure. Members of RABIT are officers of national law enforcement bodies responsible for border management, including border guards, police officers, and immigration officers.

45. FRONTEX’s Joint Support Teams (FJSTs) foresee the creation of a pool of experts and expert teams from the member states, skilled in individual aspects of border control with specific geographically related knowledge. Trained by FRONTEX, they would be planned on the basis of risk analysis and deployed in joint operations.
activities, we recommend that this secretariat be strengthened and more closely integrated into Polish intelligence services.

With four very challenging objectives to realize and a less-than-optimal budget cycle, a comprehensive risk assessment tool would enable the Polish authorities to prioritize risks and ensure that those priorities receive either domestic or EU funds initially. Other lower assessed priorities could be delayed or addressed through cooperative mechanisms with neighboring states. We recommend that a preliminary assessment be conducted to determine if a risk modeling and assessment tool would be beneficial to the Polish authorities either now or at a more optimal point in the Polish Border Guard’s transformation.

Finally, from a review of existing Polish strategic documents and analytical literature, we recommend that there be continued focus on the area of joint border guard training, with emphasis on joint training with Poland’s non-EU neighbor Ukraine, and equipment integration. This final recommendation comes with urgency as Poland faces its most significant border security challenge with the upcoming EURO 2012 Football Championships, which Poland and Ukraine will cohost. Poland must ensure the smooth and secured movement of all soccer fans entering Poland who will travel between Warsaw, Gdansk, Poznan, and Wroclaw, as well as cross the Polish-Ukraine border to attend matches that will be held in Ukraine. No fewer than 1.4 million fans are expected at the stadiums, a number that does not account for the millions of additional fans and tourists that will be traveling to Poland and Ukraine to enjoy the festivities outside the actual matches. Poland plans to construct two new border crossings along its border with Ukraine, as well as modernize its current checkpoints, in order to be better equipped to process the intensified movement of fans and tourists during the tournament.

Figure 2.2. Border Crossing Points on the Poland-Ukraine Border


Provided that existing checkpoints are modernized, it is believed that there will be sufficient infrastructure to service EURO 2012, as the majority of fans will arrive by air. This, however, does not account for the increased traffic of fans crossing the Polish-Ukrainian border multiple times in order to attend the 31 matches that will be split between the two countries between June 8 and July 1, 2012.\(^{48}\) Poland will be forced to simplify its visa regulations and has considered using Ukraine’s approach of granting fans “F” (football) visas upon presenting tickets to EURO 2012 matches. This extraordinary undertaking will require well-established border management systems and highly trained border guards to deal with the influx of visa requests and tracking, skyrocketing tourism, and associated organized crime. The greatest challenge of long-term significance will be to ensure that all tourists who enter Poland depart at the conclusion of EURO 2012.

Clearly, cross-border cooperation between Poland and Ukraine will be crucial in the run-up to and during EURO 2012, as it will challenge Poland’s border management infrastructure and personnel in new and untested ways. The EU authorities have expressed considerable concern regarding the potential for unwanted immigration into the European Union through Poland during the course of these games. Poland is currently considering the option of temporarily reintroducing border controls at its internal borders during EURO 2012, which it is permitted to do when there is a serious threat to public policy or internal security.\(^{49}\) Such practice is not unprecedented: Portugal, Finland, and Germany have all re-imposed border controls for major sporting events such as the 2006 FIFA World Cup.\(^{50}\)

Overall, Poland has managed an extraordinary amount of change in its conceptualization of border security in a short period of time. Since 1989, it has gone from a hostile, Cold War border security regime to becoming a frontline EU member state that has both “borderless” internal borders and one of the European Union’s most exposed external borders. Poland has not shied away from meeting stringent EU requirements, has adapted its national laws to be compatible with EU laws, and has been an effective steward of substantial EU funds and resources. It has clearly identified its border security priorities and attempted to address challenging budget shortfalls. Poland has developed impressive strategic documents, which at times are contradictory but nonetheless provide a sense of direction and purpose to the long-term transformation of the Polish Border Guard in cooperation with the European Union. However, the European Union has fallen short in implementing several of its important security initiatives, such as SIS II and EUROSUR, both of which would greatly enhance Poland’s border security efforts. It goes without saying that for all of its success over the past decade, however, the Polish government and its Border Guards will be severely challenged by EURO 2012. Fairly or unfairly, EURO 2012 will likely be seen as either vindication of its border security strategic plans and budget allocation decisions or an unwelcome political wake-up call for a new strategic direction and funding plan.

---

\(^{48}\) Ibid.


Introduction

As Home Minister P. Chidambaram recently remarked, India has quickly and unhappily become home to the confluence of every type of violence. Whether it is insurrection motivated by a rejected ideology (Maoist Naxalites in eastern and central India), violent struggle to create sovereign states (separatists in Kashmir and ethno-linguistic nationalists in the northeastern states), or terrorism driven by religious extremists (the attacks on Mumbai and on the Delhi Parliament), India is increasingly engaged in efforts to counter political violence. In 2009, India lost more than 2,300 lives to incidents related to lapses in internal security.¹ The U.S. Department of State considers India to be one of the most terror-afflicted nations on earth.²

More than any other single incident, the November 2008 attacks on two luxury hotels and a number of other well-known settings in Mumbai, India’s financial capital, brought home to Indians and the rest of the world the gravity of India’s internal and border security problems and galvanized India’s efforts to improve its system.³ The normally bustling Indian metropolis was under siege for three days. Journalists covered the civilian tragedy and internal security paralysis in an unprecedented media blitz. The attacks and the inadequate government response generated public outrage. In the aftermath of the attack, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh appointed a new minister of home affairs, the post responsible for internal security, selecting P. Chidambaram, already known as a tough and forceful administrator. Since then, Chidambaram has presided over an effort to move India toward a more integrated and structured approach to internal security.⁴ India is expected to spend $10 billion on domestic security before 2016.⁵

This case addresses a critical aspect of India’s security: the management of its land borders. We will examine this subject from two perspectives: first, the organizations at both the national and state level that are responsible for border management; and second, the different types of challenges they are dealing with on India’s different borders.

Due to the direct or indirect involvement of several of India’s neighbors in efforts to destabilize the country, India’s internal security challenges are inextricably linked with border security. The

². Ibid.
best known of these challenges come from India’s long-standing problems with Pakistan and the presence of extremist militant groups that have been involved in violence in India. Cross-border arms trade, human trafficking, and drug smuggling all help finance terrorist and insurgent groups, and illegal cross-border infiltration has been linked to terrorist attacks time and time again. India’s challenge is both to protect the border against military threats and illegal activity and to facilitate legal trade and transit. None of the countries that border India is currently a major trading partner, but this dimension will become more important as trade increases and as India liberalizes trade with its neighbors.

To address these challenges, India deploys a multiplicity of agencies with military, paramilitary, and civilian staffing. The technological components of the system are relatively recent, differ between segments of the border, and are not equally accessible to different categories of border personnel, making smooth coordination difficult.

An effective system for dealing with India’s land borders has to deal with the twin problems of coordination and diversity. Technology can help those responsible for India’s borders see what is happening there and communicate this to the rest of the system. Technology and infrastructure can enable a quicker response from backup forces, law enforcement, or others whose help may be needed when a dangerous threat slips through the system. But ultimately, the backbone of the system will be people, both decisive administrators at the top and motivated staff at the bottom. Exercises and other similar devices can help knit a large number of people, representing many organizations, into an effective team. In the end, the big challenge is implementation.

The People: How the Border Security Apparatus Is Organized

At the top, Indian border security is handled by the Cabinet Committee on Security, which oversees the entire internal security apparatus. The Ministry of Home Affairs, analogous to the interior ministries responsible for internal security in many countries, is the key ministry. It handles most operational aspects of both border security and internal security, and has traditionally been a very powerful player in the Indian government. Coordination takes place with involvement from the Cabinet Secretariat, an organization broadly comparable to our White House staff but staffed by civil servants, and the prime minister’s office, which as its name suggests is directly linked to the prime minister. In addition, a number of administrative, intelligence, and enforcement agencies are involved, as are similar organizations at the state level in India’s federal government structure.

Soon after the Mumbai attacks in November 2008, former finance minister P. Chidambaram was appointed home minister. A well-respected leader and politician with a reputation for decisiveness, Chidambaram was given this portfolio in order to bring vigorous reform to India’s faltering internal security apparatus. He has introduced several new initiatives to integrate and improve Indian security. These include streamlining and strengthening intelligence agencies; creating a national, intelligence database and expanding the Indian Police Service. The merits of these proposed policies, as well as those undertaken by the Department of Border Management, will be examined later in this paper.

Within the Home Ministry, the principal department responsible solely for border security is the Department of Border Management. This was created in 2004 to be principally accountable for managing international and land borders although, as mentioned above, it carries out its responsi-
Abilities in conjunction with several state and central governmental bodies. The department oversees the strengthening of border policing and surveillance, infrastructure amelioration through the building of roads and fences, and the flood lighting of borders.\(^6\)

Intelligence responsibilities are shared among at least 12 organizations, which report to different ministries. The Intelligence Bureau, the primary agency responsible for internal intelligence, reports to the home minister. The Research and Analysis Wing (RAW), responsible for foreign intelligence, falls under the Cabinet Secretariat and therefore indirectly reports to the prime minister. The Joint Intelligence Committee (JIC), the National Technical Research Organization (NTRO), and the Aviation Research Centre are under the purview of the National Security Adviser (NSA). The NSA also manages the National Security Council and the National Security Council Secretariat. Each of the armed forces has their own intelligence agencies. There is also an umbrella body called the Defense Intelligence Agency. There are several more agencies, including the Financial Intelligence Unit, that handle financial security.\(^7\)

The enforcement arm of the land border security apparatus involves specialized paramilitary organizations. These include the Indo-Tibetan Border Police, Assam Rifles, Sahasra Seema Bal, the Border Security Force, and the Special Frontier Force—all of which report to the Home Ministry except the Special Frontier Force, which is under the control of India’s external intelligence
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wing, the RAW. Battalions of the Indo-Tibetan Border Police have also been put under operational command of the Indian Army. In addition, the Indian Army, and the Indian Police Service have responsibilities along the borders. The enforcement arm of the border security apparatus also suffers from weak coordination.

The most difficult problem is coordination between state and central agencies, and it operates both at the political level, between the national government and the elected chief ministers of the states, and especially in the area of policing. The Indian Police Service is a nationally recruited institution, though the states operate as autonomous entities carrying out policing activities with Indian Police Service officers assigned to each state. According to former special secretary to the

Cabinet Secretariat, V.P. Balanchandran, “some are very poorly equipped, totally politicized and must toe the local politicians' line to satisfy narrow political goals, which may not be in the national interest.” For example, in the northeast, politicians, with the knowledge of the local police, allowed illegal entry of foreigners to swell their vote banks.8

Police working in state governments are also responsible for finding and flushing out illegal migrants. However, their successes have been meager, illustrating another tension between the center and the state. Central agencies, like the Home Ministry, want the state police to divert resources to defending borders. State police are not interested in investing resources in something they see as the responsibility of the center. Furthermore, according to Sunil Dasgupta, nonresident fellow at the Brookings Institution, they are more “sensitive to the political necessity of allowing people to move more freely across borders.”9 To further complicate matters, state police forces are funded by the central government.

Finally, despite the fact that there are a multitude of agencies responsible for the physical patrolling of borders, there are fewer coordination issues between those agencies. This is partly because there are no conflicting or competing jurisdictions and partly because most of the internal security enforcement agencies report to the Home Ministry. The internal security apparatus faces additional challenges with a poorly trained and understaffed police force, an outdated and overburdened legal system, and insufficient modern equipment.10

Since at least 2003, there has been an effort under way to improve the equipment of the various border security organizations. In 2003, the Ministry of Home Affairs allocated roughly $51 million for the modernization of the Border Security Force (BSF). The modernization process was expected to include procurement of surveillance equipment (particularly thermal imagers), more modern weaponry, as well as hovercraft and floating platforms for riverine borders. The procurement was to enhance the interception and deterrence capability of the BSF.11

The problems that plague India’s security apparatus are illustrated by the case of Mukhtar Ahmed.12 According to a newspaper report, soon after the Mumbai attacks, Ahmed was detained by the West Bengal police for procuring mobile-phone cards for Lashkar-e-Taiba, the Pakistan-based organization that is believed to have perpetrated the Mumbai attacks. His arrest would have been a victory for Indian intelligence, except that Ahmed was quickly reported to be an undercover intelligence operative for the Jammu and Kashmir police. Ahmed had supplied militants with phone cards that allowed security forces to monitor some of their communications.

The embarrassment was further compounded when the police who arrested Ahmed failed to check with Jammu and Kashmir police to determine if Ahmed’s claims were true. Instead, they immediately divulged his identity to the media, blowing his cover, endangering this family and costing the Indian intelligence community a potentially valuable informant.13 While the Ahmed
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8. V.P. Balachandran, letter to the authors, March 14, 2010.
13. Ibid.
The complex bureaucratic relationships described above play out differently on each of India’s borders, reflecting the different problems faced in each segment.

India-Pakistan Border

The border between India and Pakistan, the most sensitive of India’s frontiers, spans 3,325 kilometers. Most of this border, along the Indian states of Gujarat, Rajasthan, and Punjab, represents an agreed international boundary, with the exception of one small area near the Arabian Sea coast that has been demarcated. The 740-kilometer line of control (LOC) separating the Indian- and Pakistani-administered parts of the disputed area of Jammu and Kashmir (J&K) grew out of the cease-fire line established at the conclusion of the first India-Pakistan war.

This J&K boundary is the most militarily active border in India, having been the site of three wars and one near war. It has been the de facto boundary virtually since the two countries became independent. It is not recognized as an international frontier, but India and the major regional and global powers regard it as a frontier that should not be disturbed. Most of the LOC has been precisely defined. Its easternmost segment, a virtually unpopulated frozen waste, however, has not. India’s decision to occupy the Siachen Glacier in this area where the line is undefined has been the subject of bitter dispute between the two countries, and Pakistan’s decision to establish an adjacent position created what may be the world’s most desolate zone of military confrontation.

India’s primary concern along this portion of its land border is to deter actions that directly threaten India and, in the extreme case, could spark a war between the two nuclear armed neighbors. These include both military actions and infiltration of militants or saboteurs.

Different parts of the India-Pakistan border are managed differently, reflecting the history of conflict in certain areas. The Indian Army has primary responsibility for the line of control. Its role along the border and in internal security in Kashmir is supported by other paramilitary forces such as the BSF. Other portions of the border have been relatively peaceful in recent years and are managed by the BSF, under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Home Affairs.

For many years, there was daily firing across parts of the LOC, which India argued was carried out by the Pakistan Army in order to provide cover for infiltrators. A cease-fire that has held reasonably well since November 2003 has reduced this particular problem, but there are still reports of infiltration attempts accompanied by exchanges of fire, including one on January 26, 2010, India’s Republic Day.14 India and Pakistan have conducted intermittent dialogues aimed at resolving the many problems between them. These discussions are important in setting the tone for India-Pakistan relations and ultimately may lead the two countries to resolve their political differences, but the discussions have relatively little impact on the day to day management of the land border.

The most critical current threat is infiltration across the border by militants from Pakistan. Kashmir is currently the primary area of infiltration by militants, though there were times in the past when infiltration of militants also took place elsewhere (notably in Punjab, at the time of a local insurgency on the Indian side). In the 20 years since the insurgency on the Indian side of Kashmir revived, these militants, supported directly or indirectly by Pakistan, have promoted instability in the state and have carried out violence in other parts of the country as well. The quasi-military quality of the infiltrations is illustrated by the Indian government’s discovery in 2003 of an underground tunnel originating in Pakistan. The 20-meter-long structure, the fifth of its kind discovered in six years, was being used to funnel militants and arms into Indian-controlled territory.\textsuperscript{15} The level of infiltration has risen and fallen in response to the pace of the insurgency in Kashmir, the Pakistani authorities’ willingness to curb their activities from time to time, and the effectiveness of India’s border controls.

The Indian government has relied heavily on patrolling to secure the border, but it has also tried to use fencing and flood lighting projects to greater effect, an enterprise complicated by the inhospitable terrain in much of the border area, especially along the LOC. The Indian government carried out several fencing and flood lighting projects. The entire western border of Punjab has been fenced, with only riverine areas left unfenced. In Rajasthan, fencing and flood lighting has also been completed, with the exception of shifting sand dune areas that cannot be fenced. Fencing in Kashmir is complete, although flood lighting remains to be finished. A portion of the LOC has also been fenced. Gujarat is the last state to complete the fencing process.\textsuperscript{16} As of November 2009, of the 2,044 kilometers identified for fencing along the India-Pakistan border, 1,916 kilometers had been completed, 1,862 kilometers had been floodlit, and 148 kilometers of planned floodlighting remains to be completed.\textsuperscript{17}

Beyond infrastructure development, the Indian government has realized the necessity of deploying more specialized technologies on all its borders, including in Kashmir. In 2006, India started procuring surveillance equipment such as night vision devices, hand-held thermal imagers, battlefield surveillance radars, direction finders, unattended ground sensors, high-powered telescopes, etc.\textsuperscript{18} India spent roughly $22 million on procurement of this sort between 2006 and February 2008. Analysts expect that procurement, and the funds allocated to it, will only increase.\textsuperscript{19}

Intra-Kashmir traffic moves infrequently, across specifically designated crossing points. There is one legal land crossing point on the India-Pakistan border, at Wagah and Atari, between the Indian city of Amritsar and the Pakistani city of Lahore. In addition, the Indian and Pakistani governments agreed in 2005 to permit bus service for Kashmiris between the Indian- and Pakistani-administered parts of the state and in 2007 to permit limited truck traffic. However, the documentation required for using these routes is so complicated that in practice very few people have been able to take advantage of it.

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
Because of the tense security situation on the border between India and Pakistan, it is more intensely patrolled and better equipped than India’s other land boundaries and is consequently one of the more secure borders, benefiting more from infrastructure development and use of technology than the other Indian borders.

India-China Border

The 4,056-kilometer India-China border passes through some of the most forbidding terrain in the world, the high Himalayas. Most of the border is very sparsely inhabited. Like its India-Pakistan counterpart, the border between Indian and China is primarily a military area for which the army is responsible.

As with the border that India shares with Pakistan, conflict prevention is the primary concern. The bilateral relationship between these two Asian giants was shaped by the 1962 border war, in which China gained control of a large section of the Tibetan plateau in India’s northwest. The two countries still dispute large sections of the border. The most difficult section politically, and the one area where the military character of the border is complicated by the presence of substantial civilian populations, is the Indian state of Arunachal Pradesh, which China claims. There is also a border trade agreement between India and China that permits local populations to cross the border for trade in the area bordering Sikkim, one of the few parts of the India-China border with regular movement of people.

The line of actual control (LAC), or effective border between and India and China, is managed by a host of military and paramilitary organizations and is a particularly good example of the splintering of responsibility that characterizes India’s border security apparatus. The western section of the border, situated in Ladakh, Uttarakhand, and Himachal Pradesh, is manned by battalions of the Special Frontier Force (SFF), which officially reports to the Cabinet Secretariat and parts of which unofficially report to India’s major foreign intelligence organization, the RAW. The SFF was originally created to carry out covert operations on the border. However, as the nature of the India-China relationship has changed, it is now responsible for counterterrorism measures and intelligence gathering. The fact that sections of the SFF report to the RAW makes it hard to verify its role on the border with any certainty. In addition, the Indo-Tibetan border police, a Ministry of Home Affairs police force, is responsible for promoting a sense of security among residents and maintaining vigilance on the northern borders. This includes apprehending illegal immigrants and transborder smugglers, as well as generally promoting internal security.

The Sikkim portion of the India-China border is manned by infantry battalions of the Indian Army and units of Assam Rifles (AR), a paramilitary force under the Ministry of Home Affairs staffed by regular army officers. Some units of the AR are under the operational control of the...
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21. The Cabinet Secretariat is a staff organization that reports to the Indian Cabinet through the person who holds the post of cabinet secretary. The cabinet secretary is the most senior civil servant in the Indian government and is partly responsible for overseeing the all-India services including the Indian Police Service (IPS), Indian Administrative Service (IAS), and the Indian Forest Service (IFS).
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army. The arrangement ensures complicated relationships between commanders and their subordinates.24

Beyond being an example of the complex organization that characterizes India's border security apparatus, the India-China border is affected by issues of conflict prevention. The line of actual control has not been demarcated. However, soldiers and paramilitary groups are stationed on the India-China border with the purpose of protecting the LAC. As the additional director for the Centre for Land Warfare Studies, Gurmeet Kanwal, points out, “there is an inherent contradiction in sending soldiers to patrol what they are told and believe are Indian areas and then tell them they must not under any circumstances fire on intruding Chinese soldiers.”25 The problems caused by the dearth of recognizable terrain can be surmounted with global positioning system (GPS) technology. This would avoid crossing the border accidentally and prevent conflict escalation. Demarcation of the LAC, however, could only take place in cooperation with the Chinese, and the process of discussing the India-China border dispute has proceeded slowly for nearly half a century.

Another challenge on the India-China border is poor road connectivity. While China has spent the last four decades developing infrastructure around the border, India has not. The lack of road links to the main Indian highway system has hampered the operational capabilities of the forces guarding the border. The Indian government has decided to construct 27 roads in areas along the India-China border. The roads will cost approximately about $200 million.26

Like the Pakistan border, the border with China is considered to be better managed than most other Indian borders, in part because the threats affecting this border are overwhelmingly military.

India-Bangladesh Border

The 4,339-kilometer Indian border with Bangladesh, unlike the two previously discussed, is an area where paramilitaries and civilians have the primary responsibility, and the primary challenge comes from illegal or unauthorized crossing of a border where there is ample provision for legal crossing. The India-Bangladesh border is staffed by the Border Security Force, with 45 battalions working out of 725 Border Outpost Posts (BOPs), each normally staffed with 20 to 25 people.27 The terrain is flat and riverine along Bangladesh's western border, but mountainous to the north and east. In contrast to the borders with Pakistan and China, India does not face a military threat along the border with Bangladesh. However, it faces other kinds of threats to internal security and stability. It has 20 legal land crossing points; and trains, buses, and other vehicular traffic move between the two countries.

This porous border has long been a conduit for illegal trade (particularly cattle, narcotics, and arms trafficking) and illegal migration in search of land or economic opportunity. At times of political crisis, such population movements have spiked. In 1971, during the crisis that ultimately ended Pakistan's rule of this area, some 9 million refugees from what is now Bangladesh entered India, and the pressure of this enormous influx helped persuade India to intervene militarily.
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The issues affecting the India-Bangladesh border are further complicated by the fact that India and Bangladesh each have “exclaves” surrounded by each other’s territory. These are “convenient points for smuggling, avoiding customs and excise duties, importing of contraband, and are a point of entry for illegal aliens.”

For every illegal migrant from Bangladesh that is caught, Indian analysts estimate that four more successfully evade the system. Bangladesh is the most densely populated country in the world, and land is at a premium. This has made migration to India an attractive option. From the Indian perspective, the influx of illegal migrants from Bangladesh not only changes the political and social makeup of states along that border but also strains their economy and hampers their development. Politicians and Indian citizens alike are concerned that illegal migration from Bangladesh brings individuals whose “loyalty to India is untested.”

India also believes that Pakistan has used this border as a channel for terrorism carried out by Islamist extremists based in Bangladesh. A major challenge for India’s internal security is the possibility of movement of terrorists into India from Bangladesh. Newspaper reports over at least the past decade have quoted Indian intelligence sources as stating that this is taking place, with support from Pakistani intelligence services. Indian and U.S. analysts have found evidence of training facilities for extremist groups near the Bangladesh-India border. One problem that is particularly relevant to India’s border with Bangladesh is support for insurgent groups in India’s northeast, such as the United Liberation Front of Assam (UFLA) and Nationalist Socialist Council of Nagaland (NSCN-IM).

An important aspect of India’s approach to the problems on the Bangladesh border is its political relationship with Bangladesh. Historically, the border and infiltration problems have been worst during periods when the Bangladesh Nationalist Party governed Bangladesh. Since the coming to power of an Awami League government in Bangladesh in early 2009, India has made a strong bid to improve relations and to persuade the Bangladesh government to take a sterner line on its own internal and border security problems. This has had some effect. In March 2010, the chief of Bangladesh’s army, General Mohammed Abdul Mubeen, visited Delhi. His visit was not only evidence of improved relations but will also engender further cooperation on issues of border infiltration.

India has tried a number of approaches in dealing with its own side of the border. It has fenced large portions of the India-Bangladesh border. This has helped somewhat to reduce illegal cross-border movement. The government of India has also allocated funds for the construction of border roads and bridges. The amelioration of infrastructure will also facilitate patrolling by the BSF and help to stem infiltration and cross-border smuggling. India has also taken steps to secure better intelligence coordination and to strengthen border patrol and surveillance. Indian defense analyst Pushpita Das writes, “Patrolling on these roads and along the border has further improved with the recent acquisition by the BSF of Global Positioning System (GPS) gadgets, night vision
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binoculars and hand held thermal image intensifiers. Whilst the night vision gadgets help track infiltrators, the GPS instruments help the BSF personnel to navigate the winding riverine border.\textsuperscript{33}

While rapid and complete implementation of all these solutions will mitigate the threats posed by this border, India could also gain from increasing the number of BSF battalions. However, despite a BSF policy of not firing on civilians except as a last resort, shooting incidents have caused considerable tensions between India and Bangladesh.

Indian analysts also urge their government to take political and administrative actions to improve the long-term prospects for this border. One proposal urged by analysts at the New Delhi–based Institute for Defense Studies and Analysis is for the Indian government to introduce special identity cards for border populations, reexamine the visa system, and “engage Bangladesh in developing infrastructure and trade along the border.”\textsuperscript{34} No matter what solution India selects to secure this border, cooperation with Bangladesh is essential.

**India-Nepal Border**

India’s 1,751-kilometer border with Nepal is, once again, an area where paramilitaries and civilians are in charge—but unlike any of the other land borders, it is an open border. Consistent with a 1950 treaty, Nepalese citizens are allowed to work and live in India freely. The challenge here is not so much illegal crossing as the activities of people who have already crossed an open border. One particular problem stems from the loose links between the Maoists, who after some 10 years of insurgency now dominate the government in Nepal, and India’s most serious internal insurgency movement, known as the Naxalites, who operate in many parts of eastern and central India.\textsuperscript{35}

Until recently, this open border was virtually unattended. It is patrolled by the Sahastra Seema Bal (SSB), a paramilitary organization reporting to the Home Ministry.\textsuperscript{36} The SSB was set up in the wake of the India-China war in early 1963. Its primary responsibility was to “inculcate feelings of national belonging to border populations.” However, in 2008, after the Mumbai attacks, the recommendations of the Group of Ministers on reforming the National Security System came out, and the SSB “was declared as a border guarding force and the lead intelligence agency on the India-Nepal border.”

Despite the fact that the border has several check posts including those for bilateral trade, citizens from both nations can cross the border at any point. The border also has six points of transit for nationals of other countries who require entry and exit visas to enter India. The problems posed by the open nature of this border are compounded by the weak national identity documentation systems of both countries. India has recently begun an ambitious program to remedy this by creating an agency, headed by former Infosys CEO Nandan Nilekani, which will create IDs that use biometrics technology for all Indians.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{33} Das, “The India-Bangladesh Border.”
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\textsuperscript{37} Rajamohan, “The Other Border Problem.”
The major problem along the India-Nepal border, because of its open nature, is its use as a conduit for the smuggling of goods, drugs, and arms, along with human trafficking. Human trafficking is also prevalent on the India-Nepal border. More recently, the greatest threat to Indian internal security on the India-Nepal border has become Maoist support for Indian insurgent groups.

India is also concerned about third countries, principally Pakistan, using the weak governance of Nepal to provide a staging area for actions against India. The best-known example was the hijacking of Indian Airlines flight IC-814 from Kathmandu in December 1999. Following this incident, Indian security forces began efforts to secure the India-Nepal border. They started checking immigrants’ identity cards and citizenship papers. In 2005, they installed a pilot, border checkpoint scheme at Nepalgunj. Delegates from both Katmandu and Delhi have held meetings to discuss improving border security between the nations. India has also put more battalions of the SSB on the border.

The seriousness of the threats posed by the border, combined with inadequate efforts to improve security, makes it clear that the India-Nepal border would stand to gain greatly from a holistic approach to border security. However, the government in Nepal has very little capacity for administration or law enforcement, so it will be difficult for India to take measures on the Nepal border that require cooperation from both sides. To make matters worse, the Indian states near the Nepal border and affected by the Naxalite problem are some of the worst-governed parts of the country, thus adding a problem of basic government capacity to the existing ones of weak coordination among many central and state government players.

India-Burma Border

The Indian Army and some units of Assam Rifles manage the border with Burma. Of the 1,643-kilometer-long border only 52 kilometers are manned by security forces. Like the borders India shares with Bangladesh and Nepal, the Indian border with Burma has a huge impact on India’s northeastern states, which are home to populations ethnically and linguistically distinct from the rest of India. Many residents are Christian or followers of local animist religions. The northeast is also home to several long-standing insurgencies. The drug and arms trafficking that is prevalent along the border with Burma not only has an adverse impact on development and peace in these states but also funds several of these insurgent groups.

In 2006 and 2007, Indian security agencies seized nearly 4,000 small arms and light weapons in the northeastern states and in Jammu and Kashmir. Of those seized, nearly half were made in China and smuggled through the border with Burma. Other than militancy and drug smuggling, the main problem in India’s northeastern states is drug use. Not only do drugs contribute to a cycle of addiction and abuse, they have been the cause of the spread of HIV: two of the small states in the northeast are among the Indian states with the highest prevalence of HIV infection. Among insurgents and militants, drugs are supposedly being used like hard cash. Indian intelligence agencies believe that drugs are the primary source of funding for many insurgent groups.
Other than more advanced technologies, the border would benefit greatly from a holistic approach to border security, with increased manpower, improved infrastructure and better coordination among intelligence agencies. The Indian government has also enlisted the help of the Burmese government to cut back on support for India’s insurgencies coming through Burma; indeed, Indian officials cite this as one of the major reasons that India has insisted on maintaining cordial relations with the military regime in Burma.

**India-Bhutan Border**

Bhutan, with which India shares a 605-kilometer border, is close to India’s insurgency-ridden northeast. India has a historical relationship with Bhutan under which Bhutan was obliged to “take Indian advice” in its defense and foreign affairs. Even after the amendment of the India-Bhutan treaty in the past year, the history of Indian prominence in Bhutan and involvement in the affairs of the Bhutan government has made it possible for India to achieve a level of cooperation on its border problems that it cannot match with any other neighbors. The heavily forested border is managed primarily by the Royal Bhutan Army on the Bhutan side and Seema Sahastra Bal on the Indian side.

The major problem for India is movement by insurgent groups along the Bhutan border based in northeastern India. In 2003, Bhutan, with cooperation from India, began a campaign to flush out these insurgents from the border. Since the camps were located in Bhutanese territory, India was unable to take police action against them, but Bhutan successfully shut down training camps of the United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA), the National Democratic Front of Bodoland (NDFB), and the Kamtampur Liberation Organization (KLO). The Foreign Ministry of Bhutan released the following statement describing their activities:

> The three separatist groups are scattered across southern Bhutan bordering Arunachal Pradesh in the east to Sikkim in the west, thereby covering the entire stretch of Bhutan’s southern boundary with India. Bhutan is particularly sensitive to India’s security concerns in the region. The separatists use their camps in the dense forest to train their cadres, store arms and ammunition, and to launch surprise attacks inside India. The ULFA has 13 camps, the NDFB 12 camps, and the KLO 5 camps.

In practice, a major factor in India’s management of its border with Bhutan is the fact that Bhutan makes it difficult for foreigners to enter and remain in Bhutan. Partly as a result, this border is better managed than most.

**Broader, Border-wide Solutions**

Despite the tremendous differences among India’s different borders, some of the challenges recur in different places: limited coordination between various administrative, intelligence, and enforcement agencies; slow deployment of technological resources; a complicated interface between state
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and center authorities; and fraught relationships with neighboring countries. The 2008 Mumbai attacks demonstrated India’s compromised security situation and provided the impetus for the Indian government to restructure India’s internal security apparatus. Home Minister Chidambaram has proposed several radical reforms that should serve as, at least partial, solutions to India’s border security challenges.

The centerpiece of Chidambaram’s internal security reform proposal is consolidation of responsibility. The Home Ministry currently handles issues pertaining to India’s internal security, as well as center-state relations, disaster management, and census taking. Chidambaram has proposed that current Home Ministry functions unrelated to internal security should now be handled by a separate ministry or a department under the Home Ministry. This will allow the Home Ministry to focus exclusively on the management of internal security. The home minister has also created a Multi-Agency Centre (MAC) that will work at both the center and state level to compile intelligence from and disperse intelligence to the participating agencies.

Chidambaram’s proposal also calls for the creation of a National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) modeled after the U.S. National Counterterrorism Center, which Chidambaram visited last year. India’s NCTC would have the latitude to handle all functions related to terrorist violence, including intelligence gathering, investigation, and special operations. Preexisting agencies with these responsibilities, such as the National Intelligence Agency and the National Security Group, would be subsumed by the NCTC. The reorganization would help to “create a unified command that could issue directions.” The restructuring of India’s security architecture will also include an overhaul of the police force (with plans to hire many more policemen and policewomen). India’s intelligence agencies will also install new data systems. In addition, the plan includes provisions for expanding central paramilitary forces and the BSF. There is roughly $72 million allocated for this endeavor.

The Indian government is also moving ahead on its plans to establish a Land Port Authority and Integrated Border Check Posts. Each of these institutions is intended to ensure that India’s efforts to secure its borders will not hamper its trade ambitions. The Integrated Border Check Posts are meant to secure the country’s borders against hostile groups while facilitating legitimate trade and commerce across borders. They include representatives of different agencies, including those who can deal with “security, immigration, customs, and quarantine, while also providing support facilities for smooth cross-border movement of persons, goods and transport.”

Another effort to secure India’s borders that has long been underway is the Border Area Development Programme (BADP), under the auspices of the Department of Border Management. This involves using development as a border management tool. The BADP was started by the Home Ministry in 1985 with the “twin objectives of balanced development of sensitive border
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areas in the Western region through adequate provision of infrastructure facilities and promotion of a sense of security amongst the local population." In 1994, the program was restructured to extend to states that shared an international border with Bangladesh. Between 1997 and 2002, the program was extended to all 17 states that have an international border (with Pakistan, Bangladesh, China, Nepal, Burma, or Bhutan).

Finally, the plan proposed by Minister Chidambaram introduces several schemes to revamp India’s immigration control apparatus. The specifics of these programs are beyond the scope of this report, but in general they make it more difficult to obtain an Indian visa and place additional restrictions on the frequency of tourist visits to India. These have been controversial: Chidambaram has argued that they will increase security, but his critics believe that these are measures that will inconvenience legitimate tourists while doing little about terrorism.

**Slow to Succeed?**

Minister Chidambaram’s proposed reforms rely heavily on bureaucratic streamlining and on his own track record as a determined and focused administrator. They also rely on increased staffing in the organizations responsible for border security. India has always been a capital-short economy with an abundance of people, and this generally predisposes Indian officials to shy away from technological solutions that promise the ability to accomplish a task with fewer people. New technology will only impress Indian decisionmakers if it improves the quality, timing, and usability of the end result: unlike their U.S. counterparts, they see little benefit to reducing staffing.

The measures outlined by Chidambaram comprise the greatest internal security restructuring in Indian history, but they do not guarantee immediate success. We believe coordination remains the main problem plaguing the security apparatus. The restructured Home Ministry would alleviate these concerns but changes will be slow. Consolidating intelligence agencies will be difficult. It will require changes in mental attitudes and behavior on the ground. Furthermore, internal security in India is hampered by institutional weaknesses that Chidambaram’s plan does not address, specifically the interface between the center and state agencies. As always with India, improvement of Indian border security relies heavily on implementation.

The emphasis on all these land borders is on preventing unwanted crossing. That is understandable given India’s security problems and the relatively small share of trade that moves across the land borders. However, as India’s economy grows, and as early efforts at trade liberalization expand (e.g., a trade agreement with Bangladesh and India’s participation in the South Asian Preferential Trade Area), it may become more important to streamline the rather cumbersome procedures at legal crossing points in order to facilitate legitimate trade. The mechanics of doing so are beyond the scope of this paper, but it is an issue that India’s policymakers could usefully begin thinking about so that the barriers to unwanted crossing do not wind up preventing border contacts that India wants to cultivate.
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The above case studies reveal the diversity of challenges that just two of many emerging economies face in developing border security strategies. Polish efforts have been dominated by issues related to EU and Schengen integration. This experience has brought significant technological and systems-based innovation, but it also has often proved challenging given the array of new requirements. Indian officials continue to be consumed by a daunting challenge: how to ensure physical security—and by extension, continued economic growth—in a region troubled by terrorism and instability. Within this context, India has undertaken a significant reorganization of its bureaucratic processes for internal and border security following the Mumbai attacks.

So what do the Polish and Indian experiences reveal about border security more broadly, especially as it applies to developing states? Below, we offer several considerations for policymakers and government officials.

■ **There can be no “cookie-cutter” approaches to developing border security strategies.** Different states face different threats, and this diversity necessitates flexibility in devising and implementing practical, rather than rigid, solutions. Poland and India illustrate this simple but powerful principle. The former state is primarily concerned with illegal immigration and economic crime, such as illicit smuggling. India, meanwhile, worries mostly about violent threats. These disparate concerns suggest important differences in their approaches to border security and refute the idea of a universal border security strategy.

■ **Despite this, even countries that face disparate challenges must take strategic, “holistic” approaches to securing their borders.** As discussed in the introduction, under “Border Security in Theory and Practice,” states should design their border security initiatives in a comprehensive, strategic, and sequential fashion. This means first defining strategic imperatives, then identifying the necessary corollaries (e.g., a system to interdict smuggled goods) to meet these strategic imperatives, and finally deploying specific tools to execute the strategy.

Poland and India demonstrate how two particular countries are looking to follow this model. In adopting Schengen requirements, Polish officials are embracing a sort of border security “grand strategy.” And with the recent arrival of Home Minister P. Chidambaram, India’s government is considering reforms that would streamline the country’s border security process. These plans include a National Counterterrorism Center, modeled on the U.S. version, that would subsume preexisting terrorism-related agencies like the National Intelligence Agency and the National Security Group.

■ **Poland and India offer concrete lessons for states considering regional and internal approaches to border control, respectively.** For countries that specifically look to enter regional frameworks for border control, Poland offers some important lessons. Because shared
borders imply cooperation and coordination between member states, it is important that these states share at least some set of common interests relating to security and the movement of people and goods across national boundaries. Poland and its EU partners seem to have reached some consensus on the idea that economic crime and illegal immigration—rather than, say, “hard” security threats such as hostile invasion—now represent the most important border control challenges in the region.

Poland’s Schengen accession also demonstrates the critical importance of financial assistance in integrating new (and often expensive) regional tools and entities with existing national capabilities. Since 1999, Poland has received or will receive nearly €800 million to implement technological and systems-based Schengen initiatives, like SIS. Without assistance from the European Union and countries such as Norway, Poland would not have been able to finance this effort. And even with this financial support, border security officials have struggled, at times, to fully unify Polish and EU efforts. One example is the ambiguous relationship between the Polish Border Guard and FRONTEX. As mentioned earlier, these two entities would benefit from a deeper and more well-defined strategic partnership, especially in the areas of joint training and equipment integration. These facts suggest that states looking to join preexisting regional border security frameworks must remain conscious of the need to efficiently merge national and regional systems and capabilities.

India’s recent history provides some key considerations for states that turn inward for border control reforms. One of the most important may be the need to address bureaucratic tension among various border security stakeholder institutions. As noted in the earlier case study, India suffers from poor coordination between the myriad administrative, intelligence, and law enforcement agencies responsible for border control. Relations between state and central agencies (local and national authorities) have been particularly strained, marked by disputes over funding and responsibilities. Where explicit disagreements have not emerged, there still exist numerous agencies with overlapping responsibility. No fewer than 12 organizations, for instance, share responsibility for intelligence gathering.

Responding to this bureaucratic entanglement, Chidambaram has proposed a series of reforms, some along the lines of the United States’ post-9/11 national security reorganization, to consolidate and streamline certain aspects of Indian border control. Such reorganizations are likely to prove necessary for other states—especially those suffering from bureaucratic entanglement—looking to improve their internal approaches to border control.

- **Large acquisitions and technological innovations are the twin, “double-edged swords” of border control.** As mentioned earlier, border control policies should be designed so that operational requirements drive technical requirements. Sometimes, though, this process is reversed, and available technology drives procurements, which in turn forces operational border agencies to adopt tools and solutions before they possess a clear concept of operations. At best, this scenario leads to wasteful spending. At worst, it leaves states with shortfalls in capabilities and opens up crucial gaps in national defense. Therefore, states should be careful to ensure that large acquisitions have a clear, strategic underpinning.

Even well-planned border security strategies often suffer technological delays. In principle, for instance, Poland’s adoption of Schengen-based technologies and systems makes perfect sense.
In practice, however, Poland’s accession to the Schengen area has been marked by frustration over the unsteady implementation of SIS II and EUROSUR. For their part, Indian officials, usually skeptical of expensive new technologies, tend simply to avoid large technological acquisitions and focus instead on labor-intensive forms of border control.

But even given the justified anger and frustration at acquisitions that deliver less than has been promised, technological innovation still is central to the development of long-term border security strategies. For India today, border security revolves around preventing “hard” threats, like Kashmir-based terrorists, from entering the country. And massing people—soldiers, intelligence, and law enforcement officials—along the borders is the surest way to prevent this type of infiltration. But eventually, India hopes to move toward a situation in which borders serve more as facilitators of trade and movement than as bulwarks against invasion. If and when that day comes, labor-intensive border control will become costly and inefficient. Simply put, technological innovations, if implemented appropriately, can help speed global trade and the legal movement of people. So, while states should be wary of flashy new technologies and be sure to acquire such assets based on strategic need, senior policymakers and officials must avoid instinctively rejecting these tools.

The above conclusions and recommendations are by no means a comprehensive assessment of the challenges and considerations that states face when developing border security strategies. But they do represent a handful of key insights for policymakers and officials to keep in mind when devising policy. One of the difficulties inherent in a study such as this is the relative lack of authoritative literature on Polish, Indian, and other developing-state border security strategies. By offering this analysis, we hope to make a small but important contribution to a series of issues that is likely to grow in importance in the coming years.
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