Assessing Vulnerability Due to Infrastructure Capacity and Insecurity in Irregular Migration Routes: An Institutional Evaluation of the Mexico-U.S. Corridor

Pablo Uriarte[ab], **José Ramirez Marquez**[a], **Aleksandra Krstikj**[c]
[a]Stevens Institute of Technology, School of Systems and Enterprises, Hoboken, New Jersey, United States
[b]Tecnologico de Monterrey, School of Government and Public Transformation, Mexico City, Mexico
[c]Tecnológico de Monterrey, School of Architecture, Art and Design, State of Mexico, Mexico,

Abstract. This work aims to understand and dimension the complexity of irregular migration flow in the Mexican corridor by integrating data through a computational multi-technique approach. The focus is to visually and quantitatively differentiate the vulnerability of migrants related to institutional capacity and the risks concerning their basic rights and human dignity. During the computational integration process, findings that reveal aspects of migratory transit dynamics emerge, which are of public interest. A goal is to develop a framework that can be scaled and optimized in different contexts. Such an approach has the potential to improve the management of irregular migration, highlighting the collaboration between data models and the social and humanitarian sectors. Irregular migration is a devastating contemporary problem causing human suffering and economic loss. One of the main challenges in mitigating irregular migration relates to the difficulties in measuring, quantifying and visualizing this phenomenon. The framework reveals that the main variables to be analyzed in irregular migration include socio-environmental risks such as climate issues, transportation, demographics, cultural differences, language barriers, abuse, migration motivations, and varying migrant objectives. Migrants are vulnerable to criminal networks during their journey, contributing to their invisibility, as their status forces them to remain 'institutionally' in the shadows. The lack of impactful efforts or willingness from authorities exacerbates the situation. Continuing with the framework realization, we found that it is possible to qualitatively demonstrate previously documented flaws in transit migration management, which had mainly been described through case observations and interpretations of migrant experiences. Additionally, regions such as the South and Center of Mexico exhibit higher vulnerability due to concentrated punitive human rights enforcement efforts and insufficient infrastructure to manage these pressures. By solving the Uncapacitated Facility Location Problem (UFLP), we were able to implement an infrastructural optimization that virtually redistributes vulnerability across regions, decreasing extreme conditions. This is crucial, as the current placement of facilities fails to effectively meet demand and unevenly increases the risk of human rights violations, as seen in Ciudad Juárez in 2023. Thus, the study concludes that efficient and humane public policies are necessary to protect human dignity in this context, as the status quo leads to vague understandings of resource planning and perpetuates invisibility.

Keywords: irregular migration, migration transit, institutions, infrastructure distribution, human rights vulnerabilities, migration policy, irregular migration route networks, transnational migration flows.

Pablo Uriarte, pruiz4@stevens.edu

1 Introduction

Many communities face vulnerabilities so complex that they are incompatible with mainstream measurements. In some of these cases, this vulnerability becomes so unsustainable that they end up having more connections with the "underworld" or the informally and semi-undocumented "in the shadows-like" schemes of crime and corruption networks.

Data related to vulnerability is difficult to collect and access through official platforms, leading to a lack of proactive policies to prevent or mitigate risks. Institutions often find it easier to react to the effects of these risks than to identify them in advance.

Many authors consider the lack of proactive policies detrimental in irregular migration, especially for migrants who were, directly or indirectly, forced into performing risky mobility, mostly due to misinformation or lack of economic means.

In addition most Migrants in the condition of irregularity, actively try to remain invisible to authorities in host countries due to a lack of documentation certifying their stay or transit,[16] some using high-risk methods like stowing away on trains or relying on coyotes.[34] Gilodi et al. (2024) discuss how there is a link between irregular migration and corruption, as migrants often depend on criminal networks.[31] This increases their exposure to risks and distrust of institutional approaches.[16] This is very concerning, due to the increasing numbers of families, the elderly, and women with children traveling these routes annually.[31] Where, many migrant women, refrain from reporting crimes of sexual nature such as rape, abuse, and kidnapping.[31–33] Simultaneously, the number of trafficking victims worldwide has been growing at an alarming rate in recent years, Rubio & Sánchez (2021) accurately explain how migrant women in irregular status are extremely vulnerable to being forcefully recruited in human trafficking networks.[44]

This work presents a framework for visualizing vulnerability in the geographic and spatial dimensions by analyzing the interaction of migrants with the infrastructural resources that form the migratory corridor. The objective is to assess vulnerability and quantify the risks and challenges migrants face. As Gilodi et al. (2024) note, "In socio-ecological systems, vulnerability is regularly referred to as the low capacity or inability of a system to respond to or withstand the perturbations of external stressors. Hence, a system is considered vulnerable when it possesses a low or null capacity to cope with hazards." Understanding and improving this capacity is essential for effective governance and intervention by identifying higher-risk areas.

The evaluation of institutional capacity is particularly relevant in social domains using institutions to manage operations and dynamics. Originally introduced before World War I, primarily in education and public health,[29] by the 60s and 70s, more rigorous models were developed for urban planning, as seen in Freeman (1977) work.[28] Government institutions manage infrastructure for populations, while educational institutions evaluate space and quality for student demand. Institutional capacity evaluation develops standardized methods for consistency and comparability across areas, this is well-represented in Roman, C. G., & Moore, G. E. (2004).[30]

This work aims to develop a bi-sectoral evaluation model with government and civil society, focusing on **irregular migratory transit (IMT)**. This is complex but necessary given the climate of harsh vulnerability related to migration irregularity. Community organizations play a critical role "as mediating structures that facilitate the emergence and maintenance of values," where "strong institutions have implications for increasing public safety and reducing levels of violence," as noted in Roman, C. G., & Moore, G. E. (2004).[30] Improving institutional capacity in one sector can benefit the other, as decision-making requires inputs from research and civil society.

Furthermore, the study focuses on **Irregular Migration across the Mexico-U.S. Corridor**, one of the world's most traveled corridors for terrestrial irregular migration, involving a complex context with various risks. It serves as a pathway for migrants seeking better opportunities but is fraught with risks, including regional insecurity and inadequate institutional capacity. Despite efforts, gaps remain in protecting migrants' rights and collecting consistent data on migratory patterns. Resuming the spatial analysis, we will identify, measure, and analyze elements of the Mexico-U.S. Corridor as geospatial data objects. Migratory routes, defined as pathways from origin to destination, can be recreated using GIS for detailed visualizations and insights.[9,10]

The work includes four additional sections. **Section 2** reviews human mobility under vulnerability, focusing on irregularity and data challenges, describes the North American corridor's context and migrant community vulnerabilities, and explains the chosen methodologies for the aforementioned context. **Section 3** describes the technical methodology and data used, presenting descriptive results of the 'current' reality with 2023 data. Finally, **Section 4** discusses result interpretation, offering comparative analysis through the uncapacitated facility location problem, and includes public policy proposals.

2 Background

Human mobility, in migration, displacement, or other forms, is a complex, multifaceted phenomenon shaped by economics, political conflicts, religion, and environmental trends like climate change.[1] This review examines the complexity added to the mobility while interacting to all those factors, focusing on IMT challenges in the Mexico-U.S. corridor.

Most of the mainstream discussion on Irregular Migration focus on its causes and consequences, the public debates highlights the economic costs for the hosting community to support transit. Other review the integration or exclusion discussions raising 'cultural' concerns, many aligned with forms of xenophobia and racism.[2,3] Policy agendas worldwide have yet to provide clearer solutions.

However, research shows the binary approach of 'Yes or No, allow or stop Migration/Human Mobilities' fails to capture the phenomenon's full scope. This is evident in large-scale mobilizations from political conflicts, creating volatile integration and hostile climates involving racial and religious issues- Human rights protection, dignity, and vulnerable community resilience, then, often become secondary in the discussion.[1,18] Mobilities of this nature are inherently linked to survival, making it a resilient and unstoppable force. Migrants often navigate and overcome policy barriers, adopting innovative approaches to achieve migration goals.[3–5] Thus, harsher, more exclusionary, and coercive policies complicate the management of Irregular Migration Transit (IMT) as a social issue and could be particularly harmful to vulnerable communities. Unfounded or poorly implemented policies (by all countries involved) can negatively affect efforts to make the phenomenon visible, keeping it invisible in informality[35,36] and the migration corridor.

This work addresses systematic injustices from migrant data underrepresentation.[18] IMT injustices manifest as violence received by migrants in the form of informal labor schemes, corruption networks, inadequate policies, and racism and xenophobia in hosting regions.[19] Leading organizations struggle to develop comprehensive data sources, increasing human vulnerability,[20] and governmental institutions often inaccurately portray IMT dimensions with unspecific, ambiguous data collection, leaving research reliant on approximations.[15]

In addition to the lack of representation problem, IMT circumstances vary considerably based on the region hosting it, so understanding mobility phenomena of this nature requires addressing it as a unique case. Even, when currently active migration corridors generally involve developing countries moving toward larger economies, such as Mexico to the United States, Syria to Turkey, and India to the UAE. Most organization-issued numbers about migration often reflect nationals moving to different countries without assessing irregularity, because, these corridors only show overall migrant numbers, but irregular migration's broader scope complicates direct comparisons, as different nationalities within the moving population often share the same routes.[?] Thus, this work's case study focuses only on the Mexico geographic area, as a 'terrestrial' multi-node pathway to the U.S. from Latin America and the Caribbean.

2.1 Case Study: Irregular Migration Transit in the North American Corridor, Data from 2023

Few migration trends are as characteristic in modern times as that taking place in the Mexico-United States corridor. This corridor, primarily composed of populations from the Central American isthmus, including Guatemalan, Salvadoran, and Honduran nationals, has notably been joined by populations from Mexico and a small percentage of other South American, Caribbean, African, and Asian migrants, coming from diverse origins.[11]

Geographically, the known paths of North American migration cover both the southern and northern Mexican borders, extending into key southwestern U.S. states and receiving the most 'on foot' migration flows through the border with Guatemala, though, there are also documented maritime routes or entries, especially in peninsular states. The terrestrial regions are key in shaping migration dynamics at the US-Mexico border. Given the vast expanse of the country, there are numerous and variable ways for migrants to cross.

For the North American migration corridor, the early 2000s marked a defining period for contextualizing the phenomenon of irregular transit migration. As the major countries in the north of the continent began to understand more concretely the factors that constitute the origins, development, and migratory destinations of the region, they also started to recognize at a governmental institutional level the significant challenges of addressing these issues. These challenges include national security concerns, economic and demographic impacts within the transit and destination societies, the nourishment of organized crime networks in the region,[12] and trends of political destabilization in origin societies.[13] Simultaneously, humanitarian organizations, including national and international human rights commissions, have raised critical concerns about the vulnerabilities of migrants' fundamental human rights, highlighting human rights violations within the entire infrastructural travel scheme, including governmental institutions established to oversee these matters.[37] A stark example is the atrocities occurring within the informal train railroad transportation system for migrants across Mexico,[14] exacerbated by criminal organizations engaging in sinister activities such as trafficking networks, kidnappings, and prostitution.[31,33]

However, the study has a special focus of relation to address the events from 2023 in Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua, where a fire broke out in a facility for detaining irregular migrants. Reports highlighted the precarious conditions and overcrowding of the facility, which led to a state of shock and ultimately incited the fire, resulting in the deaths of 40 migrants.[38,39]

2.2 Literature Review

Irregular Migration Transit (IMT) refers to the condition in which migrants, displaced individuals, or refugees in an irregular status find themselves in a temporal and geographical interval between departure and arrival points. This interval, often occurring in a 'third country' or 'transit country,' poses significant challenges due to the lack of documentation required for legal transit and entry into the destination country.[6]

In recent years, researchers studying irregular migration have increasingly emphasized the need for a more granular and migrant-focused visualization of the phenomenon.[14–16,20] Despite this, reports, bulletins, and publications from organizations like the International Organization for Migration (IOM) struggle to establish a consistent methodology for dimensioning and visualizing migration over time. While some proposals offer interesting ideas and certain visualization methods have persisted across studies, inspiring advancements in understanding narrative importance, challenges remain. To advance the methodological approach, research must focus not only on detaching problems from their origins but also on comprehensively understanding and addressing these roots.[21] This involves presenting all factors understandably while recognizing that each methodological element can and should be further developed individually but unified with the overall IMT analysis. Typically, migration analyses focus on origins and causes, but a comprehensive approach requires integrating these perspectives with an understanding of the migrant's journey, or what happens 'in-between'.

Returning to research in Mexico, some authors have identified promising opportunities to achieve the necessary granularity by focusing on established migratory routes within the corridor—a concept compatible with Lee's migration pioneer theory from 1966[1], and Casillas (2008)

[1] Lee (1966) writes that 'migration tends to occur largely within well-defined paths' (p. 54), suggesting that, while planning and logistics are important, they are secondary to the existing migration streams and the information available about them

observations about the transit corridor in Mexico [2]. Focusing on these physical routes could yield significant insights in both qualitative and quantitative dimensions, as understanding the particularities of an IMT corridor would require examining the regional characteristics, including the infrastructure, and the risks within the migration terrestrial flow.

2.2.1 Theoretical Framework

In light of the above, this theoretical framework is divided into two parts: (1) the object-oriented construction of the corridor and (2) the intrinsic risks within the corridor and techniques to measure vulnerability.

(1) Following Casillas' work, this study focuses on the Mexico area. The visual model of the corridor is based on Casillas' "Una vida discreta, fugaz y anónima: los centroamericanos transmigrantes en México" (2006),[16] adapted using object-oriented techniques as described in Glennon, A. (2010).[9] Casillas' pioneering work in Mexico has served as a foundation for other studies, including Llanos, 2021, which informed the characteristics of connectivity and permeability within the corridor used in my construction.

To plan the assignment and logical contextual integration of certain objects, particularly regarding migratory routes' direction, this study acknowledges the done by Martínez, G., et al.,[40] who reviewed railways' role in migratory transit in Mexico and other infrastructural elements forming part of the corridor. This is complemented by techniques for processing objects, such as projecting directions at the terrestrial level, as seen in Pérez Pereda, et al., 2023,[26] where instead we used the Direction Matrix API from Google Maps. Finally, a grid segmentation similar to that used by Ali Mostafavi, and Chao Fan, 2022[42] helped to filter the routes without losing directional sense.

(2) The selection of major risks within the corridor, in alignment with irregular migration, begins with those reviewed in Isacson, A. 2014,[41] these will be re-sourced to the 2023 context in the continuing parts of the project. Continuing, the institutional evaluation planning is based on the conceptual foundations of Gilodi et al. (2024), to assess the interplay between institutional capacity and insecurity in transit spaces, enriching our understanding of institutional capacity's role in managing human mobility. The structure of the evaluation was reasoned based on the documentation review and methodologies described in Roman, C. G., & Moore, G. E. (2004), with adaptations for measuring vulnerability over demand. Additionally, the Uncapacitated Facility Location Problem (UFLP) is used for evaluation and comparative exercises, similar to those made by Pérez Pereda, et al. (2023).[26] The previously mentioned demand will be given by irregular migration 'encounter events' records per city that will be discussed further in the data collection section.

[2] Casillas (2008) states that "migrants from Central America do not create paths; they make existing ones their own" (p. 7).

2.2.2 *Research Gap*

One of the main considerations regarding 'encounter events' data from the INM's irregular migration statistics bulletins is that, as Casillas mentions, these statistics have significant limitations and should be viewed as approximate sources when measuring migration dimensions.[16]

Additionally, we take on the trend of most previous similar papers (visualization products similarity) generalizing the corridor in mainstream reports, some studies simplify migratory routes with broad arrows, indicating involved countries but generalizing the dynamics that should be interpreted individually. To address that, we fragment the corridor into land routes by region, which is more appropriate due to the geographic composition of the corridor, particularly Mexico's position. This aligns with the necessity for research on Irregular Migration Transit (IMT) to delve into granular detail to adequately address vulnerability and resilience.

Finally, due to the lack of data availability. Most research articles, surveys, interviews, and film projects that aim to illuminate the "in-between" experiences focusing on injustices, human rights violations, and violence from the migrant's perspective, mostly come from a storytelling experience approach. Even though, these efforts are crucial for raising public awareness, often result in information only partially applicable to public policy as sensitive portrayals of reality. Few studies address specifics at a granular level using data presentation. The Missing Migrants Project, for example, has improved data on deaths and disappearances, especially concerning gender and age, which are critical for understanding women's and children's experiences. Despite these advances, working with available information remains challenging, adding ambiguity to data use in policy development and reporting, as highlighted in the World Migration Report 2022. [3]

[3] Primary data sources include Mexican immigration authorities and U.S. southern border officials, with information often fragmented, inaccessible, and inconsistently reported, retrieved from https://missingmigrants.iom.int/region/americas.

3 Methodology Approach



Fig 1 Methodology Framework

The framework we will use consists of three main parts. In addition to offering a comprehensive vulnerability analysis, it also breaks down the complexity of the phenomenon into distinct areas of observation.

1. **Data Collection:** This involves identifying the regions that form the basis of the migration corridor and gathering data sources related to irregular migration, institutions, and demographic dimensions relevant to the regions we will analyze.

2. **GIS Systems and Network Construction:** This part involves using GIS systems to construct a representative graph network of the migration corridor, where each node represents a transit city and the edges correspond to segments of regional routes. Additionally, infrastructural elements specific to the corridor are represented as data objects, which are measurable and comparable, and integrated into our network for joint analysis.

3. **Analysis:** This involves analyzing the spatial distribution of vulnerabilities and comparing current conditions with optimal scenarios to identify gaps in institutional support and high-risk areas. This allows us to quantify vulnerabilities and propose data-driven recommendations for improving the protection of migrants' human rights. This section targets flaws in the structural management of infrastructure and institutions, focusing on two aspects, which, in alignment with our literature review, enable us to calculate vulnerability:

- **Institutional Coverage Index (ICI):** Measures the ratio of migrant encounters to available institutions to host the migrants. This is identified as Vulnerability 1: Capacity over demand of government-designed facilities used to host and process migrants in irregular situations.
- **Risk Mitigation Capacity (RMC):** Assesses exposure to high-risk zones and institutional coverage. This is identified as Vulnerability 2: Coverage and accessibility to public and civil society-originated institutional facilities, aimed at mitigating risks and providing assistance to migrants.

By the end of it, the framework delivers a testing procedure to identify and rank the severity of risk for migrants' human rights related to the availability of facilities during their journeys across regions and 'transit cities' within.

3.1 Data Collection, Preprocessing, and Risk Index Formulation

Fig 2 Facility Distribution by the type of institution, self-made

The data we will use can also be divided into the following categories of object classes. For clarity, the objects are labeled with the geospatial object they reference in the framework production and graph construction.

1. **Irregular Migration Encounter Events: Demand Data**. This data, sourced from statistical repositories managed by the INM (National Institute of Migration), serves, as discussed in

the literature review, as an approximate ratio representing the relative transit in transit cities. It provides insights into detention occurrences and migration paths. Although it is limited as a feature of population flow, it is helpful to understand **demand** for institutional coverage.

2. **Infrastructure: Institutions**. This data covers the physical location of organizational facilities designed to receive and provide direct attention to migrants. It is crucial for evaluating institutional capacity and coverage. Facilities are categorized into two types:

   - INM facilities (National Institute of Migration), used to assist, detain, and process migrants. Data is sourced from the Global Detention Project 2023 directory.
   - Public institutions, including those from civil society and international organizations, supporting migrant protection. Data is extracted from directories such as those from the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and 'Redes, Migrantes Sin Fronteras'.

3. **Infrastructure: Transit Features**. This includes other important physical features of main migration routes, such as main highways, railroads, entry points, and crossing gates. This data is gathered to help draw travel paths with contextual logic. Apart from serving as a guiding object for logical directions within the network's node connections, this data also helps estimate travel costs based on the total distance traveled.

4. **Space and Environment: Terrain Characteristics**. Geostatistical data, including continental terrain descriptors and climatic data, are collected at the municipal level. This information, sourced from the National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI), aids in understanding regional vulnerabilities and terrain challenges.

5. **Risk: Municipality Demographic Data**. A self-defined set of statistics for insecurity and violence exposure will be considered, aiming for all data to be consistently collected and valid for comprehensive analysis. These perspectives are retrieved from some of the main sources for statistics in the region, including Mexico's National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI), the primary organization tasked with collecting and disseminating information about the country, covering aspects such as territory, resources, population, and economy. Along with, The College of the Northern Border, Migration Policy Unit, Survey on Migration at the Southern Border of Mexico (EMIF Sur), and the Executive Secretariat of the National Public Security System (SESNSP), a decentralized and autonomous body that collects statistics every month from the state prosecution offices' records. These dimensions are primarily analyzed as **risk** measurements.

To maintain statistical comparability and avoid redundancy, each measurement is set to be retrieved from a unique source unless a complementary characteristic can be found in a different data collection source, in that case, while putting the data together we'll make sure that the collection methodology does not compromise the validity of the statistical data representation.

Complementary, the **risk** measurements will be compared in a base index score, set to range from 0-1 using MinMax Scaler methods, and a similar adaptation of the method will be used for climatic and geographic data. Each risk source is cleaned, processed, and put together as follows.

3.1.1 R1: Violence and Insecurity: Women, Families, and Children

The statistics used in this **risk** measurement are consolidated into a single risk feature: "Violence and Insecurity for Women, Families, and Children," sourced from the database of the Executive Secretariat of the National Public Security System. It includes incident events in 2023, categorized by municipal division, for 'Feminicide,' 'Child Trafficking,' 'Liberty and Sexual Security Violations' (including Sexual Harassment, Sexual Abuse, Sexual Coercion, Simple Rape, Aggravated Rape), and 'Societal Violations' (including Corruption of Minors, Human Trafficking, and Other Crimes Against Society).

3.1.2 R2: Institutional Violence

Similarly, "Institutional Violence" aims to integrate the perception of abuse of authority and corruption, which can lead to cases where migrants are subjected to extortion, illegal toll payments, and physical aggression. While it is extremely challenging to project these data accurately, I explored several documents detailing the experiences of migrants and the importance of "datafication"[4].

To select the data, we first used the Migration at Mexico's Southern Border 'Emif Sur',[45] designed to extract the migrant perspective. I filtered the columns corresponding to section P34 of the survey, which details the experiences of migrants when detained by Mexican authorities. Specifically, section P34 indicates the location of incidents, the treatment received from the authorities during processing, and the frequency of specific abuses such as mockery, disdain, insults or shouting, physical aggression, theft of belongings, and other abuses detailed by the migrants. Additionally, this section covers the conditions of the detention centers, including basic sanitary services, availability of food and water, and other related factors on 'Emif Sur'. To help prevent bias from using survey-based sources, which might exclude municipalities not appearing in the survey, I included data on 'Crimes committed by public workers' from the SESNSP dataset (data from 2023). This inclusion helps widen the scope to more municipalities within the corridor, ensuring that smaller municipalities are not overlooked.

[4]Datafication refers to the process by which subjects, objects, and practices are transformed into digital data. Associated with the rise of digital technologies, digitization, and big data, many scholars argue datafication is intensifying as more dimensions of social life play out in digital spaces. Datafication renders a diverse range of information as machine-readable, quantifiable data for aggregation and analysis. Retrieved from: Southerton, C. (2020). Datafication. In: Schintler, L., McNeely, C. (eds) Encyclopedia of Big Data. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-32001-4_332-1 of these experiences[25]

3.1.3 R3: Organized Crime

We employed a risk based on incident frequency rather than cartel presence. Using SESNSP data, we selected key indicators: homicide data, drug dealing, and kidnapping. Specifically, we analyzed crimes affecting 'Other legal goods' classified as 'drug dealing,' 'Intentional homicides committed with firearms,' and 'Crimes affecting personal liberty,' including extortionate and express kidnappings. This selection highlights the criminal activities most indicative of organized crime's influence within municipalities.

3.1.4 R4: Geographic and Climatic Risk Value Calculation

Finally, the Geographic and Climatic Vulnerability indicator assesses general terrain conditions and predominant extreme climatic conditions by municipality. Climatic vulnerability varies significantly with time; however, for long-term institutional infrastructure planning, we consider a year-long perspective of transit migration dynamics. In the R4 Geographic and Climatic Risk section, I collected and preprocessed climatic data to evaluate temperature extremes, which are crucial for assessing potential risks to facilities that remain stationary for at least a year. The data was sourced from the INEGI database, utilizing their seasonal average extreme temperatures repository.[24] The Maximum Temperature Index (ITME) is calculated as $\text{ITME} = \frac{\text{TMAX}-\text{media\_max}}{\text{desv\_max}}$, and the Minimum Temperature Index (ITmE) is calculated as $\text{ITmE} = \frac{\text{TMIN}-\text{media\_min}}{\text{desv\_min}}$. ITME values are normalized between 0 and 0.5, with negative or zero values set to 0, and ITmE values are normalized inversely. The combined climatic risk is the sum of these normalized values.

We combined this metric with a geographic infrastructural risk measuring approach, using INEGI's geostatistical framework to differentiate rural and urban AGEBs.[24] Urban areas have higher population density and infrastructure, while rural areas are more dispersed and agriculturally focused. We calculate a rural-urban ratio at the municipal level, arguing that an urbanized municipality is more accessible regarding needs and services for traveling communities. Additionally, due to its denser demographic, it serves as a safer and more likely option for trans migrants.

3.2 Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to Represent the US-Mexican Corridor as a Permeable Network: A Graph Network Approach to Route Data Analysis.

Fig 3 Mexican Corridor: Migration Routes Network. Representation of the migration transit flow as a directed graph, illustrating the primary routes from south to north through the Mexican land borders. The map highlights key transit cities and route regions, categorized into Centro, Golfo, Pacífico, and Sur, providing an overview of the migration corridors within the country, self-made.

To achieve the structural composition of the data needed for the analysis, we first defined the scope of our network as a platform that will host the migratory transit in our study. In this sense, as mentioned in the literature review, it is important to maintain an institutional interpretation of the network. Therefore, the decision to define our nodes was limited to only those cities with documented physical infrastructure for managing migration [5]. To maintain the consistency that allows for a reproducible and verifiable exercise, we used municipalities referred to as 'transit cities' that appear in the IMT bulletin compiled by the INM regarding encounters with migrants in irregular situations, resulting in 389 nodes for 2023. These were integrated into a grid map exercise to ensure spatial consistency and logically relate the nodes based on their locations relative to the whole. This approach also helped reduce the computational load involved in creating networks on inconsistent terrain. After testing different sizes, the grid size that worked best for this case was determined to be 0.7x0.7 cardinal degrees (approximately 71.86 km x 77.92 km)[6]. These groupings led to 203 arcs or connections between points of interest for metric analysis.

[5]Referring to records of irregular migration in the given year. Retrieved from www.politicamigratoria.gob.mx/es/PoliticaMigratoria/Boletines_Estadisticos

[6]In Mexico, 0.7 degrees of longitude is approximately 71.86 kilometers. For latitude, 0.7 degrees will always be approximately 77.924 kilometers due to the spherical shape of the Earth.

For the analysis, the arcs are a crucial feature because they not only represent direction and distance which we included using the Google API's direction matrix. Additionally, through the arcs, we integrate a representation of the entire 'real' territory that the network traverses. The cities adjacent to each arc are considered segments, so in the network, including the 389 transit cities that compose the nodes, there are 1,507 municipalities in total, whose data are integrated for the analysis.



Fig 4 Visual representation of the ensembling process, Cell Id: PG-1031 in figure, self made

Finally, the corridor was divided into regions: South, Pacific, Center, and Gulf. A route code was assigned to each geographical point, representing the region to which the point belongs. This helped establish rules, barriers, and logical pathways, considering the regions' geography and infrastructural distribution, primarily involving a network limited by the main roads, railroads, and walkable routes. This conditioned filtering process resulted in 5,354 different route combinations for transit from entry cities at the southern border to final towns at the northern border.



Fig 5 Arcs follow a logical path and direction to prevent for improbable route combinations

3.3 Analysis



Fig 6 Encounter Events per Region (left), Maps of Each Municipal Risk Dimension Compared to "Walking" Routes or Arcs (right), self made.

The encounter events are our main indicator for demand of institutional coverage in this case, distribution of them should give us a notion of how the systems work. Also keeping a measurable track of distribution on demand enables for reproduction and comparability of results, both over time, circumstances changes, and/or in management experiments. For that, the goal is to approximate the dynamics from a status quo perspective, see how it does, and compare them with an optimized distribution exercise.

3.3.1 Vulnerability 1: Institutional Capacity

The metric **(Vulnerability 1)** uses a basic ratio between the logarithm of encounter events per transit city (node) and the number of INM stations assigned to accommodate those events. Through the logarithmic transformation, we adjust the events data to handle outliers and skewed distributions, acting upon taking into account the need to treat for -The Distance Bias for the Southern Region-, this considers the short dimensional width and the closeness to the southern border of initial regions as factors increasing the proportion of encounters, as distance advances, the territory gets wider, increasing the number of regions available for transit and the possible path combinations. The logarithm (log) is used to capture the relative change in demand over these circumstances.

Complementarily, we understand that there is considerable variance between the number of Mexican Institute of Migration (INM) stations and the locations where the INM reports having processed and channeled events of encounters with irregular migrants. The proportion of locations (389) per facility (52) is much higher, suggesting the use of alternative facilities designated by the authorities of these locations to attend and register these events. Given this ambiguity, we assume each location as the base facility (1), resulting in:

$$\text{Vulnerability } 1 = \frac{\log(D_i)}{F_i + 1}$$

Where:



Fig 7 Vulnerability 1: Fixed Ratio of ITM Encounter Events per INM Station

- D_i represents the demand at Transit City(node) i
- F_i represents the facilities available at Transit City(node) i

Additionally, we perform a min-max normalization to obtain a score on a scale of 0 to 1, where values closer to 1 indicate greater vulnerability and a lower relative institutional capacity to manage migration events.

3.3.2 Vulnerability 2: Risk Mitigation Capacity



Fig 8 Risk and Distance Mitigation Capacity Index: Construction Framework

Although similar, the construction of the Vulnerability 2 metric is somewhat more complex. In this metric, we integrate risk values at the municipal level, along with direction and distance. As shown in Figure 7, we create a visual representation of how measurement objects interact to achieve this integration. The resulting metric, **Vul2**, defines vulnerability in relation to risk and travel distance, considering the available institutional infrastructure that provides coverage, protection, or shelter.

The logic is as follows: measure the exposure of transit points of interest (POIs) to high-risk zones, taking into account the distance traveled within these zones while moving between two transit POIs. Additionally, it evaluates the number of institutions within a 30 km radius of each POI, which can ideally be a source of support in cases of vulnerability. We aim to use this scheme as a way to illustrate the impacts of the aforementioned risks on general migrant vulnerability (to those risks) in the context of being in mobilization.

The notations are described as follows;

- D_i: Demand at node i.
- F_i: Facilities available at node i.
- R_i: Risk of node i (pre-calculated risk index).
- R_p: Risk of the intersecting-city p.
- $d_{p,i}$: Distance from intersecting-city p to node i.
- d_{arc}: Total distance of the arc.
- F_p: Facilities available at the intersecting-city p.
- $\sum_{k=1}^{N} d_{\text{arc},k}$: Sum of all the total distances of the arcs.
- n: Number of intersecting cities for a given node.



Fig 9 Vulnerability 2: Institutional Coverage in relation with insecurity of R1 ¨Woman, Children, and Families¨, self made

The initial Vulnerability 2 for each node i is calculated as:

$$V_{2i} = \frac{R_i \cdot D_i}{F_i + 1}$$

Then the length of each arc is assessed as: To adjust the initial vulnerability considering the intersecting cities of a longer arc, the following logic is used:

if (1): $d_{p,i} < \frac{d_{arc}}{2}$

$$R_p = \left(R_i \cdot \frac{d_{p,i} \cdot \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{N} d_{\text{arc},k}}{d_{arc}}}{d_{arc} - d_{p,i}} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{F_p} \cdot \frac{100}{n}$$

or if (2): $d_{p,i} = \frac{d_{arc}}{2}$

$$R_p = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\left(R_i \cdot \frac{d_{p,i} \cdot \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{N} d_{\text{arc},k}}{d_{arc}}}{d_{arc} - d_{p,i}} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{F_p} \cdot \frac{100}{n} \right)$$

else if (3): $d_{p,i} > \frac{d_{arc}}{2}$

This means that no additional calculations are made for the remaining intersecting polygons.

In the formulas, $\frac{1}{F_p}$ represents the inverse of the facilities available at the polygon p. It means that as the number of facilities F_p increases, the risk contribution of that polygon decreases, and vice versa. It serves to adjust the risk calculation based on the capacity of the facilities available in the intersecting polygon. The adjusted Vulnerability 2 is calculated by multiplying the initial vulnerability by the accumulated product of the risks of the intersecting cities:

$$V_{2i,final} = V_{2i,initial} \times \prod_{p \in P} R_p$$

where P is the set of intersecting polygons that meet the conditions. Finally, a vulnerability score ranging from 0-1 is given to each transit city, in consideration that these are the places that are being primarily provided with infrastructure.

3.3.3 Results: Existing Conditions



Fig 10 Transit Figures: Comparison between regions

In this section, we will review the status quo using the metrics obtained during the framework development as one of the project's objectives to develop datafication in the corridor in the context of irregularity. Although the final part of the project will present an alternative method for deciding how infrastructure should be distributed to minimize human rights vulnerability exposure, reviewing the status quo will allow us to make a comparison.

To review the methodology, I consider it pertinent to evaluate its capacity to answer questions of interest related to the corridor's vulnerability that proposes an alternative for decision-making from an institutional perspective. For example, referring to the work of the National Institute of Migration (INM) and the governments involved in managing the phenomenon: **What did we learn from Ciudad Juárez in 2023?**[7] **How could this have been foreseen? Are there any places with a high relative risk of experiencing a similar tragedy?** Vulnerability 1, discussed earlier, is a simple ratio of the number of reported encounters in a transit city against the number of INM installations, like the one that burned in Ciudad Juárez, within at least a 30 km walking distance. Figure 6 shows a relatively higher vulnerability in the 'Sur' region, as expected -due to 'The Distance Bias for the Southern Region' and the corridor's bottleneck effect-, but the trend continues to the west side of the corridor in the 'Pacífico' region, followed by the 'Centro' region, notably in North Pacific and North Center, where Ciudad Juárez is located. Before its closure in June, Juárez, Chihuahua, ranked as the 29th of 359 municipalities in terms of overcrowding vulnerability, according to our methodology.



Fig 11 Results: Vulnerability Distribution Scores per Distance traveled (South to North)in Status Quo

[7]Reports indicate that the facility was severely overcrowded, with one account stating that 68 people were confined to a cell designed for a maximum of 50 individuals. This overcrowding contributed to a lack of basic necessities, including food and water, which ultimately led to the protests by the detainees. Source: NBC News.

From the migrants' perspective, it would be useful to know, **Which route has the overall risk to transit by (exposure risk)?** For this, while we might generally look at Figure 11, the 'non-climate risk' graph, or even Figure 6, which might offer a wider perspective, in this context and with the available data, the Vulnerability 2 metric allows us to differentiate the risks transmigrants may encounter on their journeys. This can be beneficial for migrants but with very marked limitations, such as the relative need to choose which risk to face, which seems illogical considering we are discussing risks, not facts.[8] Therefore, at most, the ability to choose where more accompaniment might be needed, which can also be reviewed in Figure 11, 'SC Institutions per Region'. It seems pertinent to consider additional reasoning. For example, Sanchez, Rubio Campos, and Sumano Rodríguez (2021) mentioned that the relative security of traveling in large, organized groups might be a better decision-making alternative for migrants concerned about their safety, despite being relatively recent and yet to be quantitatively proven.[43]

However, regarding planning from the civil society organization's perspective, **Which route has the most risk by demand (relative risk)?** and based on that, **Where should support missions for migrants be established?** Although this only comes up as an appreciation, it takes away any threshold about where and how irregular migration mostly happens. Instead, it tells us that we must be able to observe the phenomena everywhere (not just in the transit cities occupied in the networks of this exercise). Therefore, in alignment with Vulnerability 2 of this work, assessing relative risk—the number of encounters per city of transit to risk exposure— may be a good option as it provides a closer look at the human rights vulnerability of transmigrants and the capacity to assign institutional support in strategic locations. For instance, Figure 11 illustrates that risk vulnerability is just slightly above but closer to similar in the Pacific region for example with the Gulf region, but considerably lower than Center region, however, the longer transit distance increases the cost and exposure time compared to the Center and Gulf regions (where distances are much shorter and relative institutional coverage is higher). We can argue that in the Pacific region, there is a disproportionality in coverage related to the length of the route, noticeable by the total distance traveled between one peak of Vulnerability (2) to another.

[8] To do this, we must grasp the entire panorama. While risk is generally stationary and unlikely to change drastically over time, it remains a constant concern whether for migration transit or local residents. So we need to take a little break to figure in our analysis that, according to Lee's theory 1964 'migrants typically follow established paths, and changes to new paths are unlikely'. This is still true for higher-risk encounters. Another thing to keep in mind, as we previously discussed, is that it's commonly believed that most migration transit in Mexico occurs along railroads, which would be seen mostly in the 'Center' region.

3.4 Uncapacitated Facility Location Problem (UFLP)

One option to address the current state of the corridor is the Uncapacitated Facility Location Problem (UFLP). The UFLP is a computational problem that consists of identifying an optimal subset of facility locations by minimizing the total distance over demand, from a status quo set of facility locations.

For our analysis, we adopted a similar approach to Perez Pereda, 2023.[26] While the UFLP framework provides a solid foundation, our specific requirements introduce elements that may necessitate modifications to the basic UFLP model.

The goal here is to identify demand in cities and place facilities within a range of 30km from the city centroid to best support that demand, given a limited number of facilities. The UFLP helps us allocate resources effectively to reduce vulnerabilities and improve coverage across various regions. To run this model, we will modify the basic UFLP framework by incorporating weighted demand, assignment constraints, and iterative or multi-objective approaches to create a more tailored model that effectively addresses our specific scenarios.

To run experiments, I set the data frames to represent the objects as; the demand centers are the transit cities or nodes (i), which include the city name, code, geodetic coordinates 'xy', and demand (D), as well as a 30km radius circular polygon that represents the range within reach. The facility locations, in one scenario, are the INM Detention Centers (F_a), and in another scenario, the SC and ONG Institutions (F_b), both with their corresponding coordinates.

We will review the scenarios based on the size of F_a and F_b, meaning the number of facilities available for that matter. Before continuing, we need to keep in mind some considerations about the basics of the UFLP.

The original mathematical formulation of UFLP[27] is:

Objective Function: Minimize the total cost:

$$\text{Minimize:} \quad \sum_j f_j x_j + \sum_i \sum_j c_{ij} y_{ij}$$

Constraints

Each client must be served by exactly one facility:

$$\sum_j y_{ij} = 1 \quad \forall i$$

A client can only be served by an open facility:

$$y_{ij} \leq x_j \quad \forall i, j$$

Binary constraints for decision variables:

$$x_j \in \{0,1\} \quad \forall j$$

$$y_{ij} \in \{0,1\} \quad \forall i,j$$

On our case study and methodology, we work with the following variations:

- In the context of limited facility availability, each transit city has a different level of demand, which suggests that not all facilities should serve all cities equally. Even though this is a departure from the traditional UFLP, for now, we'll focus on maximizing coverage without worrying about how much demand each facility can serve.
- There are no restrictions on the eligibility of facility locations within the cities since this exercise is conducted on a national scale.
- For our exercise, we assume the facilities are open 24/7, which is a completely fabricated scenario.
- Costs, such as accessibility or walking distance, are not considered in this formulation since we aim to improve coverage, not reduce costs.
- The cost of building facilities is also not necessary for this formulation due to the recurring changes in distribution over time in the past[9]

Then the approach proceeds as follows, utilizing a greedy algorithm in Python. The greedy algorithm prioritizes the assignment of facilities to transit cities with the highest demand first, ensuring that each facility is within a 30km range of the assigned cities. By doing so, we aim to maximize coverage and minimize the distance over demand. This method involves iterating through the transit cities, assigning available facilities to those with the highest unmet demand, and then re-evaluating the remaining demand and available facilities. This iterative process continues until all facilities are optimally assigned.

[9]Government of Mexico, National Institute of Migration. "INM reports on transformation work in migration stations to prevent repetition of incidents like the one in Cd. Juárez on March 27, 2023." https://www.gob.mx/inm/prensa/inm-informa-de-trabajos-de-transformacion-en-estaciones-migratorias-para-no-repeticion-de-hechos-como-el-de-cd-juarez-el-27-de-marzo-2023.

3.5 Government Institutional Capacity: Current vs Optimal



Fig 12 Optimal Institutional Distribution of INM Detention Centers using different facility availability counts

For our case study, solving the UFLP prioritizes assigning facilities to transit cities with the highest demand, ensuring each facility is within a 30km range of the cities it serves. This approach aims to maximize coverage and minimize distance over demand. The method iterates through the transit cities, assigning available facilities to those with the highest unmet demand, and then re-evaluating the remaining demand and available facilities. As an adaptation, the algorithm also seeks to cover as much collateral demand (D_i) as possible during each facility assignment, effectively capturing the essence of a greedy algorithm. This process continues until all facilities are optimally assigned, while tracking which cities are covered by which facilities and selecting the next optimal location.

In the problem, each transit city has a varying demand (D_i). Facilities (F_a) should be assigned to the locations with the highest demand $\max(D_i)$, while also aiming to cover nearby locations within range to maximize demand coverage. For comparative purposes, we used the UFLP to optimize the distribution of the current number of INM Detention Centers (F_a). We then gradually increased the number of available facilities across different scenarios and tracked the results for comparison.

By increasing the total number of facilities available for assignment by increments of ten in each scenario, starting from the original fifty-seven, we were able to identify larger vulnerable areas that emerged with each subsequent scenario. The first noticeable aspect in Figure 12 is the variability of results across different regions, with the most significant changes observed in the South and Center -This last one, only in the early stages of the increasing scenarios-. In contrast, the Pacific region appears more consistent with the Status Quo result even while increasing the number of facilities available.

Table 1 Top Facility Need per City, Based on UFLP Solving with 57 Facilities

City	Original INM in 30km	INM in 30km (after optimization)	Difference
Jalapa, Tabasco	0	4	4
Ecatepec, Estado de Mexico	0	3	3
Tacotalpa, Tabasco	0	3	3
Teapa, Tabasco	0	3	3

Note: This table illustrates the cities that the UFLP algorithm identified as most in need of facilities, and how the availability of facilities changes after optimization.

Table 2 Top Facility Decreases, Considering UFLP Rearrangement with 57 Facilities

City	Original INM in 30km	INM in 30km (after optimization)	Difference
Frontera Comalapa, Chiapas	2	0	-2
Bacalar, Quintana Roo	2	0	-2
Comitan de Dominguez, Chiapas	2	0	-2
La Trinitaria, Chiapas	2	0	-2

Note: These are the top four cities that would have their facilities relocated to a city with greater need based on the UFLP algorithm.

However, the most immediate need for placing facilities in the south and center regions, as suggested by Figure 12 (Optimized distribution, Fa = 57), does not imply that the other regions are optimally satisfied. Rather, it highlights the existence of other important factors that warrant policy review and future planning. First, authoritarian detention activities, as shown in Figure 10, are heavily concentrated in the south. However, as shown in Figure 11, these detentions are not evenly correlated with the infrastructural capacity as the south still shows the highest peaks of Vulnerability 1. This can be attributed to previously discussed phenomena, particularly the harsh and strategic deployment of migration authorities.

These deployments, referring to illegal and unfounded checkpoints as well as harsh persecutions — as documented — are further supported by our data in Figure 13, which explicitly confirms that authorities exploit the territorial characteristics of the regions. In the South, this is evident through the bottleneck effect due to its narrow geography, as illustrated in Figure 10 (Total Area). In the Gulf, the same effect it is demonstrated by the extensive coverage relative to the short regional distance, as shown in Figure 10 (Average Total Distance). In the Center, we raids are commonly conducted in strategically important transportation locations, such as bus stations and train hubs are characteristic of Estado de México, where vulnerability also peaks,as shown in Figure 11, the train line ”La Bestia” that starts in the Central Region is a notable example of this situation. The previous suggests that aggressive authoritarian behavior directly penalizes transit migration by decreasing transit cost/effectiveness. Rather than spreading enforcement evenly across zones, efforts are concentrated in strategic captive locations, we suggest that this can have the collateral effect of pushing migrants to riskier transportation means.

Furthermore, it is evident that current institutional planning, particularly regarding facility distribution in the southern region, is highly inefficient. As shown in Tables 1 and 2, the first optimal facility rearrangements predominantly occur in this region, with facilities being both relocated within and added to the same area. Although unrelated to governmental planning, the lack of civil society and NGO representation in the region, as can be seen in Figure 10, exacerbates the institutional distribution problem that is compromising migrant safety in the South.



Fig 13 Vulnerability 1: Comparison of Optimal Scenarios versus Status Quo Distribution (Top to Bottom: South, Gulf, Center, Pacific)

Figure 13 also illustrates for all regions there are a significant average amount of vulnerability between nodes. This uneven distribution of vulnerability suggests that within the corridor, there is a permeability of vulnerability, this condition reinforces the idea that route planning could improve safety, and reduce exposure to unfair cost/effectiveness transit trade off that comes with the harsh authoritarian policies.

On another hand, even from the experimental distribution of the same fifty-seven facilities from 2023, there is enough evidence to suggest that improvements to infrastructural planning could be made, even with the same number of facilities as in the Status Quo. The considerable reduction in the count of extreme peaks, as shown in Figure 13, indicates this potential.

However, this does not imply that existing facilities should change locations due to the costs associated with reorganizing the current structure. Logically, the UFLP, in the scenario with the same 57 facility count, redistributes vulnerability to reduce extreme concentrations in specific regions. Instead, it highlights where new facilities are most needed. Table 3 shows how, from a Status Quo to an Optimal Scenario with the same number of facilities, vulnerability increases in the South and Pacific regions, while it decreases in the Center and Gulf regions.

	Average Vulnerability				**Vulnerability per Kilometer**			
Metric/Region	**South**	**Gulf**	**Center**	**Pacific**	**South**	**Gulf**	**Center**	**Pacific**
Vulnerability (1) Status Quo	0.37267	0.33669	0.28674	0.34471	0.04370	0.01764	0.01111	0.00393
Vulnerability (1) Fa 57	0.37644	0.33002	0.27893	0.35278	0.04414	0.01729	0.01081	0.00402
Change from Status Quo	+0.00376	-0.00666	-0.00781	+0.00807	+0.00044	-0.00035	-0.00030	+0.00009
Vulnerability (1) Fa 67	0.36554	0.32220	0.27779	0.34829	0.04286	0.01688	0.01076	0.00397
Change from Fa 57	-0.01089	-0.00782	-0.00114	-0.00450	-0.00128	-0.00041	-0.00005	-0.00005
Vulnerability (1) Fa 77	0.36732	0.32219	0.27495	0.34671	0.04307	0.01688	0.01065	0.00395
Change from Fa 67	+0.00177	-0.00001	-0.00284	-0.00157	+0.00021	0.00000	-0.00011	-0.00002

Table 3 Vulnerability Results: Comparison of Scenarios

Naturally, having as many facilities as possible would reduce vulnerability evenly. However, Table 3 demonstrates that significant improvements in vulnerability can be achieved by increasing the number of facilities from 57 to 67, coupled with optimal relocation, without redistributing vulnerability from any region to another. This would represent an ideal scenario while relying solely on optimal relocation by adding new facilities to most need cities is realistically the second-best option.

4 Discussion

First, as Casillas (2008) pointed out, the challenges associated with irregular migration flows remain highly relevant today, as there is still no reliable data to quantify how many migrants are transiting through specific corridors. Much of their movement remains invisible, leading studies on migration flows to rely largely on approximations. This reliance complicates our understanding of how these corridors function and hinders effective policy design in anticipation of these movements. In line with Lee's (1966) theory, which posits that "migration tends to occur largely within well-defined paths," we connect these ideas to graph theory, as discussed by Llanos (2021). From this perspective, migrants traverse established routes but do so within a system that allows them to choose from diverse directional combinations, forming multiple routes within the network. By constructing the framework of this paper, we confirm that these ideas provide a robust approach to bridging the gap between approximations and actual mobility flows. However, in other to get there, rather than viewing this network as a simple series of connections between cities similar to Llanos (2021), we conclude that the corridor must be analyzed as a complex system—or more specifically, a network system. Where the level of detail in this analysis is contingent upon the researcher's area of interest, which shapes the system's complexity. For our study, which focuses on governmental institutional capacity, the network granularity was represented by major terrestrial roads, highways, and railroads. In other contexts, the network might include rivers or trails, particularly in regions like Chiapas or Tabasco, where walking is a significant mode of travel. The key takeaway is that the system's scope shapes the dimensions of the network. In our case, the network was defined by detentions carried out by governmental institutions within an institutionally scoped network system. Other network compositions may coexist, but each will vary depending on the specific focus of the research.

Taking the previously described approach brought significant benefits to the current state of knowledge. For instance, it allowed us to address one of the main challenges associated with vulnerable communities, which is the lack of representative data. As mentioned earlier, studies in this field often rely on observations and interpretations of experiences. However, through the construction of this framework, we were able to quantitatively demonstrate many previously undocumented events. For example, our results revealed that aggressive authoritarian policies, including harsh enforcement measures, disproportionately affect certain regions. This evidence could be highly beneficial in supporting policy changes aimed at addressing these issues.

In line with this, our analysis also indicated that the current distribution of institutional facilities, particularly in the southern region, is inefficient. This inefficiency is underscored by the need for optimal facility relocation within the same region, as highlighted by our vulnerability assessments. These findings suggest that a more strategic allocation of resources is necessary, with a focus on reducing institutional gaps that heighten risks for migrants.

Finally, our findings call for a comprehensive review of institutional policies related to irregular migration. The observed gaps in infrastructure, particularly in high-risk areas, indicate that both government and civil society organizations must collaborate to create more resilient systems. Policies should prioritize not only immediate infrastructural improvements but also long-term strategies to enhance institutional capacity and safeguard migrants' human rights.

5 Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to PhD Adolfo De Unánue for his support and encouragement, which led me to pursue a research stay at Stevens Institute of Technology in Hoboken, New Jersey, under the guidance of PhD Jose Ramirez-Marquez. I am also profoundly grateful to Mr. Adolfo and the School of Government and Public Transformation at Tec de Monterrey for generously funding my research stay, without which this work would not have been possible.

References

1 International Organization for Migration (IOM). (2014). Human Mobility: Shaping Vulnerability and Resilience to Disasters. Background paper to the HFA2 dialogue. Retrieved from https://www.iom.int

2 Stanford News. (2022). Ukrainian Refugees Face Accommodating Europe, Says Stanford Scholar. Retrieved from https://news.stanford.edu/stories/2022/03/ukrainian-refugees-face-accommodating-europe-says-stanford-scholar. Accessed: 2024-09-04.

3 McAdams, D. (2017). A Wall Won't Secure the U.S.-Mexico Border — But Economic Policy Could. Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2017/02/a-wall-wont-secure-the-u-s-mexico-border-but-economic-policy-could. Accessed: 2024-09-04.

4 Grün, G. C. (2021). As Migration is Rising, So Are Border Barriers. Retrieved from https://www.dw.com/en/as-migration-is-rising-so-are-border-barriers/a-58848161. Accessed: 2024-09-04.

5 Sánchez, I. C., Rubio Campos, J., & Sumano Rodríguez, A. (2021). Génesis y Travesía de la Caravana Migrante. In C. Contreras Delgado, M. D. París Pombo, & L. Velasco Ortiz (Eds.), Caravanas Migrantes y Desplazamientos Colectivos en la Frontera México-Estados Unidos (pp. 209-230). Tijuana, B.C., Mexico: El Colegio de la Frontera Norte.

6 Organización Internacional para las Migraciones (OIM). (2019). Glosario de la OIM sobre Migración. Ginebra, Suiza: Organización Internacional para las Migraciones. ISBN: 978-92-9068-840-2. Retrieved from https://www.iom.int

7 McAuliffe, M., & Triandafyllidou, A. (Eds.). (2022). World Migration Report 2022. Geneva, Switzerland: International Organization for Migration (IOM). Retrieved from https://publications.iom.int/books/world-migration-report-2022

8 Organización Internacional para las Migraciones (OIM). (2024). Proyecto de Migrantes Desaparecidos. Retrieved from https://missingmigrants.iom.int. Accessed: 2024-09-04.

9 Glennon, A. (2010). A Flow Data Model for ArcGIS. Retrieved from University of California, Santa Barbara. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/220606129_Creating_and_Validating_Object-Oriented_Geographic_Data_Models_Modeling_Flow_within_GIS.

10 Liu, X., Payakkamas, P., Dijk, M., & de Kraker, J. (2023). GIS Models for Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning: Current Use, Future Needs and Potentials. Future Transportation, 3, 384-402. https://doi.org/10.3390/futuretransp3010023

11 Secretaría de Gobernación, Subsecretaría de Derechos Humanos, Población y Migración, Unidad de Política Migratoria, Registro e Identidad de Personas. (2023). Boletín Mensual de Estadísticas Migratorias 2023. Ciudad de México, México. Retrieved from https://www.gob.mx/segob

12 Pérez Berestycki, J. (2015). La Política de Migración en México: Disociación entre Objetivos e Instrumentos de Política Pública. (Master's thesis). Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE), México, D.F.

13 CWS LAC. (2024). Movilidad Humana desde Haití: Causas de la Migración. Retrieved from https://cwslac.org/haiti-y-el-caribe/movilidad-humana-desde-haiti-causas-de-la-migracion/. Accessed: 2024-09-04.

14 Amnistía Internacional. (2010). Víctimas Invisibles: Migrantes en Movimiento en México. London, UK: Amnistía Internacional. ISBN: 978-0-86210-467-3. Retrieved from https://www.amnesty.org

15 Casillas, R. (2008). Las Rutas de los Centroamericanos por México: Un Ejercicio de Caracterización, Actores Principales y Complejidades. Migración y Desarrollo, 6(10), 157-174.

16 Casillas, R. (2006). Una Vida Discreta, Fugaz y Anónima: Los Centroamericanos Transmigrantes en México. Estudio realizado con recursos del Fondo Sectorial Segob/Conacyt, México, D.F.

17 Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, J. E. (2002). A Synthetic Theory of International Migration. Annual Review of Anthropology, 31, 449-477. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085432

18 Krissman, F. (2001). “Them” or “Us”? Assessing Responsibility for Undocumented Migration from Mexico (Working Paper No. 46). Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, University of California, San Diego. Retrieved from https://ccis.ucsd.edu/_files/wp46.pdf

19 Gall, O. (2018). Racismos y Xenofobias Mexicanos Frente a los Migrantes: 1910-2018. REMHU, Revista Interdisciplinar de Mobilidade Humana, 26(53), 115-134. https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-85852503880005308

20 Dearden, K., & Sánchez Dionis, M. (2020). UN Migration Agency: Lack of Data Perpetuates the Invisibility of Migrant Women’s Deaths. Retrieved from https://www.iom.int/news/un-migration-agency-lack-data-perpetuates-invisibility-migrant-womens-deaths. Accessed: 2024-09-04.

21 United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. (2020). World Population Policies 2019. New York: United Nations. ISBN: 978-92-1-148335-2. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/en/desa/world-population-policies-2019

22 U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP). (2024). CBP Public Data Portal. Retrieved from https://www.cbp.gov/newsroom/stats/cbp-public-data-portal. Accessed: 2024-09-04.

23 Global Detention Project. (2024). Global Detention Project. Retrieved from https://www.globaldetentionproject.org/. Accessed: 2024-09-04.

24 Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI). (2024). Marco Geoestadístico - INEGI. Retrieved from https://www.inegi.org.mx/temas/mg/. Accessed: 2024-09-04.

25 Intrasource. (2024). Understanding Datafication and Its Impact. Retrieved from https://www.intrasource.co.uk/blog/it-consultancy/understanding-datafication-and-its-impact/. Accessed: 2024-09-04.

26 Ramirez-Marquez, J. E., Perez Pereda, M. J., & Krstikj, A. (2023). Improving Fairness and Equity by Minimizing Community Vulnerability to Food Accessibility: A Computational Urbanism Approach. Social Indicators Research. Springer.

27 Cornuejols, G., Nemhauser, G. L., & Wolsey, L. A. (1990). The Uncapacitated Facility Location Problem. In P. Mirchandani & R. Francis (Eds.), Discrete Location Theory (pp. 119-171). Wiley.

28 Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1977). The Population Ecology of Organizations. American Journal of Sociology, 82(5), 929-964. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2777807

29 Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

30 Roman, C. G., & Moore, G. E. (2004). Measuring Local Institutions and Organizations: The Role of Community Institutional Capacity in Social Capital. Urban Institute Justice Policy Center. Prepared under a grant from The Aspen Institute Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives for Children and Families.
31 Gilodi, A., Albert, I., & Nienaber, B. (2024). Vulnerability in the Context of Migration: A Critical Overview and a New Conceptual Model. Human Arenas, 7, 620-640. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42087-022-00288-5
32 International Organization for Migration (IOM). (2024). What Makes Migrants Vulnerable to Gender-Based Violence? Retrieved from https://americas.iom.int/en/blogs/what-makes-migrants-vulnerable-gender-based-violence. Accessed: 2024-09-04.
33 United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2015). Combating Violence Against Migrants: Criminal Justice Measures to Prevent, Investigate, Prosecute, and Punish Violence Against Migrants, Migrant Workers and Their Families, and to Protect Victims. New York: United Nations. Retrieved from https://www.unodc.org
34 Ramos Rojas, D. N., Hernández López, R. A., & Astorga Morales, A. (2019). Trayectorias Humanas en La Bestia: Migración en Tránsito y Estacionalidad de Centroamericanos en Ocotlán y Guadalajara, 2010-2015. Ocotlán, Jalisco, México: Universidad de Guadalajara, Centro Universitario de La Ciénega. ISBN: 978-607-5476-12-4.
35 Saunders, D. (2024). Losing Out: The Broken Economics of Irregular Migration and How to Fix Them. Retrieved from https://mixedmigration.org/losing-out-the-broken-economics-of-irregular-migration-and-how-to-fix-them/. Accessed: 2024-09-04.
36 Scholten, P. (Ed.). (2022). Introduction to Migration Studies: An Interactive Guide to the Literatures on Migration and Diversity. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-92377-8
37 Comisión Nacional de los Derechos Humanos (CNDH). (2024). Informe Especial Sobre las Condiciones de las Estancias y Estaciones Migratorias: Hacia un Nuevo Modelo para la Atención de la Migración Irregular. Ciudad de México, México: CNDH. Retrieved from https://www.cndh.org.mx
38 Heyman, J., & Slack, J. (2023). Ciudad Juárez Migrant Shelter Fire. Retrieved from https://nacla.org/ciudad-juarez-migrant-shelter-fire. Accessed: 2024-09-04.
39 Linares, A. (2023). Officials' Details of Deadly Fire at Migrant Center in Mexico Challenged by Investigation. Retrieved from https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/official-details-deadly-fire-migrant-center-mexico-challenged-investig-rcna144504. Accessed: 2024-09-04.
40 Martínez, G., Cobo, S. D., & Narváez, J. C. (2015). Trazando Rutas de la Migración de Tránsito Irregular o No Documentada por México. Perfiles Latinoamericanos, 23(45), 127-155.
41 Isacson, A., Meyer, M., & Morales, G. (2014). La Otra Frontera de México: Seguridad, Migración y la Crisis Humanitaria en la Línea con Centroamérica. Washington, D.C.: WOLA - Oficina en Washington para Asuntos Latinoamericanos. Retrieved from https://www.wola.org
42 Fan, C., Jiang, X., Lee, R., & Mostafavi, A. (2022). Equality of Access and Resilience in Urban Population-Facility Networks. npj Urban Sustainability, 2(9). https://doi.org/10.1038/s42949-022-00051-3

43 Sánchez, I. C., Rubio Campos, J., & Sumano Rodríguez, A. (2021). Génesis y travesía de la caravana migrante. En M. D. París Pombo, L. Velasco Ortiz, & C. Contreras Delgado (Eds.), Caravanas Migrantes (pp. 221-223). El Colegio de la Frontera Norte.
44 Rubio Campos, J., & Guadiana Sánchez, C. (2021). Irregular migration and human trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation: An analysis of public policy instruments for combating it in Chiapas, Mexico. In A. Vila Freyer & L. Meza González (Eds.), Young migrants crossing multiple borders to the North (pp. 75-90). Transnational Press London.
45 El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, Migration Policy Unit, Registry and Identity of Persons, National Population Council, National Council to Prevent Discrimination, Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Welfare (BIENESTAR), Survey on Migration at the Southern Border of Mexico, www.colef.mx/emif

List of Figures

List of Tables