

Evaluating an International Cooperation Project  
- from Beneficiaries' Perspective -

Nobuko Fujita  
Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development

1-6-17, Kudan-Minami, Chiyoda-ku,  
Tokyo 102-0074, Japan  
Tel 81-3-5226-0305  
Fax 81-3-5226-0023  
fujita@fasid.or.jp

## **Abstract**

Development evaluation is entering into a new stage in which beneficiaries' viewpoints are the prime consideration. This study was conducted in order to see what exactly are the viewpoints of beneficiaries and how they may differ from those of funders, using the Second Mekong International Bridge project ex-post evaluation as an example.

The bridge was built over the Mekong River between Thailand and Lao PDR (hereafter Laos) in December 2006 using a concessional loan from the Japanese government. Usually, ex-post evaluation is conducted two years after the project's completion and is conducted by an implementing agency. The evaluation criteria used are relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

However, partner governments (in this case Laos and Thailand), too, have accountability towards their people. This study asked beneficiaries which aspects should be looked at in evaluating this transnational bridge construction project.

The findings, which constitute the differences between the donor and the beneficiaries' perspectives, were noteworthy. Beneficiaries are more interested in economic benefit (impact) rather than increased traffic (immediate outcome). Also, they expect a prescription for moving the current situation forward rather than evaluating the project's accomplishment. Lastly, the beneficiaries are very much concerned about the social influence of the project, although a direct correlation with the project may not be clear.

The implication from this study is that to evaluate an international cooperation project, instead of applying mechanically pre-set questions by donors, it is essential to study the beneficiaries' evaluation needs before planning the project evaluation.

## I. Background

### 1.1 From donor-driven to partner country-led evaluation

In the field of international development, the Paris Declaration (2005) and its follow up in the Accra Agenda for Action stress the importance of working through systems in partner countries. However, the reality is far from the ideals of international commitments. So much evaluation work is still donor-driven and designed to meet the needs of outside funders (O'Brien, 2009).

Donor-centered evaluation tends to “de-motivate those involved from the partner side” □ Lundgren & Kennedy, 2009 □. The resulting evaluations may be of little use to local decision-makers, implementers and beneficiaries. Little involvement in turn results in low interest in utilizing its results.

That is why partner country-led evaluation (in which the country directly concerned leads and owns the evaluation process by determining what policy or program will be evaluated, what evaluation questions will be asked, what methods will be used, and how the findings will be communicated and used) is advocated by the international aid community (Segone,2009). After all, partner countries' ownership is critical; public policy evaluation is important beyond international development co-operation programs as there are accountability and information needs to be met throughout the public sector in partner countries as well.

### 1.2 Challenges of partner country-led evaluation

Although independent partner country-led evaluation may be ideal, it may not be realistic for some countries for several reasons.

First, the evaluation needs are often lacking. Accountability of public administration is not considered a priority issue in some cases. Donors have been taking the lead in development evaluation for some time while partner countries were not strongly motivated to take it over, but instead responded rather diplomatically to donors.

Secondly, not all the countries are prepared for information disclosure. If evaluation is for ensuring accountability to the public, evaluation results should be made public. Even if evaluations are conducted by the recipient countries, if they are not made available to the general public, their use will be limited.

Thirdly, independent evaluation on donor-assisted projects or programs could trigger political tensions between partner countries and donors. Fourth, donors will still have their agenda and information needs, and country-led evaluation's timing and evaluation criteria may not fit those needs.

### 1.3 Needs of Joint Evaluation in transitional phase

As we wait for evaluation needs to increase and a culture of valuing accountability for public administration to be nurtured, donor-partner joint evaluations seem to be a realistic approach. However, joint evaluations may require different criteria since what each side expects from the evaluation may be different.

This study tried to identify beneficiaries' interests in evaluating an international cooperation project, taking the Second Mekong International Bridge as an example. The outline of the study is explained in section 2, and the result is summarized in section 3. Section 4 lays out how beneficiaries' viewpoints could be incorporated into joint evaluations. Section 5 provides concluding remarks.

## 2. Outline of the study

### 2.1 Research questions

The following were the research questions.

- In partner countries, what do they expect from evaluations of development assistance projects, or, what "evaluation needs" do they have? In other words, how do they utilize the information generated by evaluations in partner countries?
- Who should be included in the evaluation team?

### 2.2 Project Outline

The Second Mekong International Bridge was built over the Mekong River between Mukdahan, Thailand, and Savannakhet, Laos, as one of the infrastructure projects on the East-West Corridor. (East-West Corridor is a transnational road connecting Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, and Myanmar. See Figure1). The bridge was built to promote trade between Laos and Thailand and economic development in the area. In addition, through the East-West Corridor, trade of agricultural products was supposed to be promoted and that would contribute to the development of the regional economy. The Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC) provided a concessional loan to Thailand (4,079mil.yen) and Laos (4,011mil.yen) for construction and consulting services. The bridge opened in December 2006.

The expected output, outcome, and impact of the project are summarized below (JBIC, 2006):

- Output: bridge (1600km), approach road, intersection, boarder immigration and related facilities.
- Outcome: Increase of traffic, reduction in time necessary for border crossing, and an extension of immigration office hours.
- Impact: Increase of trade between Laos and Thailand, economic development of cities by the

bridge, an increase in trade of agricultural products, and promotion of economic development in the region.

### 2.3 Reason for choosing this project

The reason for choosing this project was three-fold. Firstly, beneficiaries' viewpoints were expected to be different in the two countries. It was the first yen loan JBIC made to an infrastructure project encompassing two countries, and almost the same conditions (loan amount, interest rate, repayment period) were applied to the two countries despite their very different economies. Compared to Laos, Thailand has an eleven times larger population (2006), 5.5 times bigger GDP per capita (2007), and 61 times larger GDP(2007). Secondly, even within one country, different stakeholders i.e. the central government, local government, local residents, private sector, etc., could have different opinions. Thirdly, different characteristics of Thai and Lao people could also be reflected in their interest in public service evaluation.

### 2.4 Scope of the study

Since the East-West Corridor is part of Greater Mekong Sub-Region (GMS) initiative which supported the development of the entire GMS, the beneficiaries of this project included not only Thailand and Laos, but also Vietnam, Myanmar, Cambodia, and China. Besides, multinational cooperation invested in this region and international tourists also benefit from the bridge. However, this study focused on the people in Thailand and Laos because they are considered to be the first impacttees. Due to time constraints, more emphasis was placed on Laos. The major stakeholders were identified as central government, local government, local people by the bridge, residents alongside the East West Corridor, and the private sector.

### 2.5 Method of the study

The following semi-structured interviews were conducted.

In Laos,

- Six central government ministries and institutions (\*),
- Nine local government offices (\*\*)
- (\*, \*\*: Interviewees were high-ranking officials who could represent the voice of each organization.)
- Three business-related associations, one University, and one think-tank (three separate interviews)
- 21 Savannakhet residents and business people (who live or run business near the bridge, ferry terminal, in the markets, alongside Highway No.9, or inside the city)

In Thailand,

- Three central government institutions,
- Two local offices of central government institutions
- Three business-related associations, one University, and one think-tank.
- Eight Mukdahan residents and business persons (who live or run businesses near the bridge, ferry terminal, or inside the city)

A total of 60 interviews were conducted between July 9th and July 16th, 2008 (See Table 1).

### 3. Result of the study

#### 3.1 Evaluation Needs (What evaluation needs do they have?)

Interviewees were asked “If the evaluation of the construction of the Second Mekong International Bridge is conducted, what aspects would you like to look at?” For some central government officials, this question was puzzling, since, for them, evaluation of international cooperation was supposed to be conducted by the donors. Since so many evaluations and studies have been conducted by donors and foreign researchers concerning East-West Corridor and GMS initiatives, they did not feel the necessity of doing it by themselves. If one donor does not conduct the evaluation for some reason, other donors will do it for them. Because of this situation, the question was changed to “What results or effects (“impact” has a negative connotation in Laos, and was therefore not used) of the bridge construction you would like to know more about, or are you concerned about?”

The responses are summarized in table 2. Their answers were grouped in six categories:

- a. Actual economic benefits
- b. Social impacts
- c. Impact on other countries
- d. Immediate issues
- e. Cost-benefit analysis
- f. Prescription

Interestingly, only one official responded that DAC 5 criteria are just fine.

#### a. Actual Economic Benefit

All the groups interviewed in Laos and Thailand were interested in the economic benefit of the bridge. As direct effects, increase of transportation, export, cross border trade, business opportunities and investment, activation of the tourism industry, and improvement of income and standard of living.

#### b. Social impacts

Social impacts were mentioned by all the groups in Laos. Central government officials raised labor migration, HIV/AIDS, drugs, human trafficking, sexual abuse, traffic accidents, and environmental issues. Local government officials had similar concerns. In addition, people in Savannakhet said noise (from vehicles and people), dust and garbage, exhaust gas from increased traffic, dump trucks with toxic substances run at full speed, and increase of prostitution. Drugs brought by tourists, an increase of crime (murder, robbery) and smuggling were also raised by local people with actual cases that had recently transpired.

Savannakhet is a prefecture with fertile farm land and the main industry is agriculture. A decrease of paddy fields was another concern, since farmers face opportunities to get quick cash by selling their farm land. As for income and standard of living, some interviewees said that regional integration tends to benefit only rich people. The difference of impact on various income groups was also raised as an evaluation question.

*“National Road No.9 and opening of the international bridge benefitted only rich people, and left poor people poor. All the while, poor people are negatively affected by HIV/AIDS, drugs, human trafficking, and forest degradation.” (a central government official, Laos)*

*“Prices such as for grilled chicken got higher after the opening of the bridge, so low income people’s standard of living has declined” (a local government official, Laos)*

*“Minorities living by the border are faced with severe competition from the Vietnamese traders” (a local government official, Laos)*

In Thailand, there was little interest in these issues. The reason is that the most notable change in Mukdahan seems to be the increase of tour buses from Bangkok (on their way to Vietnam), resulting in relatively minor global social impact.

#### c. Impact on other countries

In Laos, more people thought the bridge provides greater benefits to Thailand and Vietnam. They said the benefit or negative influence on other countries should also be evaluated (for example, increase in foreign currency revenue, use of local airport across the border). Labor migration is a common issue for both Laos and Thailand because convenience could bring more migration from Laos and Vietnam. Respondents in Thailand were also interested in mutual benefit and overall impacts including the possibility of narrowing the income gap within the region.

#### d. Cost benefit and impact of regional integration

Some respondents were interested in the cost benefit analysis of the project, cost being the bridge

construction cost and benefit being profit by increased trade etc., and calculated for both Laos and Thailand. Related to this point is whether or not the bridge benefits Laos, and, if not, how they could best utilize this opportunity to create economic benefit.

e. Immediate issues

Evaluating the transparency of immigration was mentioned by some respondents. Complaints about the complicated tariff system and the immigration services were often heard. Finding ways to shorten immigration time was another concern.

f. Prescription

Interviewees were interested in prescription more than reviewing the project itself. According to local statistics, the number of tourists to Savannakhet province increased 2.4 times in 2007 compared to 2006. Investment in Savannakhet province in 2007 also increased 27% by number of investment and 76% by amount of investment in US\$ compared to 2006 (Savannakhet province, 2008). However, the actual benefit from it was hardly visible in Laos, they felt.

*“Our interest now is how to maximize the benefit of the bridge” (a central government official, Laos)*

*“The Economic Corridor is only a transport corridor in Laos. Laos is just a transit country at this moment” (private sector, Laos)*

Many respondents raised the necessity of writing a prescription or drawing a blueprint of what should be done next. That includes which processing industry Laos can promote instead of relying on cement or lime exports. A Special Economic Zone is being developed in Savannakhet and investment in it is promoted, with a similar plan underway in Mukdahan.

*“In order to become an export country and not a transit country, Lao needs value-added export goods. What is the processing industry which takes advantage of our human resources and geographical location?” (private sector, Laos)*

*“A Special Economic Zone will only bring more Vietnamese into Laos. We need a way to promote Lao industry by utilizing the bridge.” (private sector, Laos)*

*“Two Special Economic Zones on both sides of the bridge? We have to better coordinate otherwise both plans will fail (private sector, Thailand)*

Also, cooperation between Laos and Thailand is sought.

*“Laos can provide low cost labor and Thailand can provide capital. So, we need to know what we can do together.” (private sector, Laos)*

*“Mukdahan and Quang Tri[Vietnam], have the same problem of “passing” in terms of tourism. We need to cooperate so that tourists stop over along the corridor.” □ a local government official, Laos)*

*“New tourism planning in terms of CLMV [Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, and Vietnam] is what we need” (a central government official, Thailand)*

Prescription includes the one for negative impact as well.

*“Infrastructure like this bridge is regional public goods, but could become “public bads.” We need to know how to manage the negative effect.” (a central government official, Laos)*

In summary, for partner countries, evaluation is useful to acquire information for the next step rather than the effect of the project itself. Moreover, since it was part of GMS development, knowing the effect on other countries is important to deal with positive/negative impact of the bridge for Laos. For Thailand, reviewing the project effect from both micro-and macro-perspectives is useful for immigration management and export promotion. The respondents in Laos were also interested in the regional effects so that they can use it as a reference for future development planning.

### 3.2 Composition of evaluation team

Who should be included in evaluation team?

In Laos, the answers were “donor(s),” “jointly,” and “it depends.”

The reasons for donor-driven evaluation were,

- Since they provided funding, they are entitled.
- Since multiple countries are involved, the donor should do it as a “third party,” with a single standard instead of each country bringing its own standards and criteria.
- If partner countries are requested to comment on the draft, their opinion is reflected, and that is sufficient.

For joint evaluation, the compositions suggested were,

- Thailand and Laos,
- Thailand, Laos, and Japan,
- Thailand, Laos, Japan and Vietnam
- Thailand, Laos, Japan, and ADB or Australia
- Thailand, Laos, and ADB or Australia

Some Lao respondents said that depending on what is evaluated, especially subjects related to sensitive issues such as human trafficking, labor migration, smuggling, increase in crime, etc., Laos should conduct evaluation by herself. Also, in order to avoid friction over any negative impacts of the bridge, the importance of avoiding accusations and gathering accurate information and data were highlighted.

In Thailand, donor-driven evaluation to avoid bias, joint evaluation by GMS countries, and Thai-driven (government, research institutes, universities, consultants, etc.) evaluation (for both Thailand and Laos) were suggested.

## 4. Findings

### 4.1 Differences from donor's evaluation criteria

Comparing the above hearing results and donor's (this case, former JBIC's) evaluation guideline, there are noticeable differences in the following points:

- a. Recognition of "outcome"
- b. Scope of "recommendation" or "lessons learned"
- c. Importance of "impact" and its scope

#### a. Recognition of outcome

Both partner countries and JBIC are interested in cost-benefit, although the meaning of "benefit" is different. JBIC calculates FIRR (Financial Internal Rate of Return) and EIRR (Economic Internal Rate of Return) to compare input and outcome. Outcome, in this case, were an increase of traffic and convenience for crossing border (compared to use of ferry as they did before). That way, outcome includes "transit" or "just passing" which respondents in Laos did not consider a benefit. The fee for crossing the bridge has to be allocated for its maintenance. Lao respondents consider benefit to be something economically tangible such as an increase in employment or exports. Traffic increase is commonly used as an indicator for infrastructure projects. However, in this case, a traffic increase may be a benefit for GMS countries, but may not be a suitable benefit indicator for Laos. (Note: Although since actual evaluation of this project has not been conducted, it is merely a hypothetical discussion.)

#### b. Scope of "recommendation" or "lessons learned"

An evaluation by donors usually ends with recommendations and lessons learned. It includes, 1) in the case the expected outputs and outcome are not realized, what should be done, and 2) what lessons they can take for designing and managing future projects. For partner countries, the first part is more or less similar, except the emphasis is on realizing impact not output or outcome. How they fully utilize the opportunities provided by the project is exactly what they like to get out of the evaluation. The meaning is different for the second part. Lessons for the donor could be lessons for any other projects in the world. For partner countries, it is a lesson which they can use for future negotiation of international cooperation projects. Also, an analysis of possible negative impacts and how to deal with them is another "recommendation" they wish to hear.

#### c. Importance of "impact" and its scope

JBIC's evaluation criteria are based on OECD-DAC (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Development Assistance Committee) Principles for Evaluation of

Development Assistance, i.e., relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. Looking at these five criteria from the partner countries' viewpoints, the relevance for this project is clear since it is part of the GMS initiative. Efficiency is no longer an issue since the bridge is completed and being operated. Seeing effectiveness, how much the project achieved its goal, is rather a preparatory step to seeing the impact for their part. Exactly how much the pre-set goal was achieved matters very much for donors, but is not very relevant for partner countries. For local people, what matters more is the changes actually realized. As for sustainability, if it relates to the continuous use of the bridge, Thailand and Laos are taking care of it and no problem is foreseen.

Out of the five DAC criteria, impact seems to be the most important for partner countries as discussed in the previous section. Also, the social impact, which is often treated as “unexpected negative impact” and limited to the facts that directly relate to the intervention, is an equally important criteria for partner countries. The social aspects mentioned in this study may not be included in donor's evaluation since it would be hard to prove they are strongly related to the bridge construction.

#### 4.2 Reasons for difference

What are the reasons behind these differences? It could be the difference in the purpose of evaluation, timing of the evaluation use, importance of causality, and ideal unit of evaluation.

First, the purpose of evaluation is different. The donor's purpose for evaluating a project is to fulfill accountability and to implement a more efficient and effective cooperation projects in the future. In other words, they are concerned with whether or not the project was useful, and will be maintained in the future. For partner countries, the purpose would be getting the prescription for prosperity and use it in future negotiations related to similar projects.

Secondly, the timing of use is different. For a donor, every project should be evaluated for ensuring accountability at a certain point in time. For JBIC's infrastructure projects, it is 2 years after project's completion. Conversely, for partner countries, it is more important to gather information on the daily operation or reviewing regulations or policies whenever issues arise. And as long as the bridge is built and working fine, mechanically-set, formalized evaluation is less useful for them.

The third point is the differing importance of causal relation. For donor countries, whether or not an effect was caused by the bridge is very important, especially the negative ones. For partner countries, it does not matter as much. If problems have become visible, regardless of what likely caused them, it is time to recognize them, and think about solutions.

Fourth, related to the third point, for partner countries, the need to evaluate project by project is not very high. In this case, since the bridge was part of GMS initiative, evaluating GMS initiatives

as a whole makes more sense to them. Of course, maintenance of the bridge and immigration services are important issues but these are already taken care of by the ministries in charge.

## 5. Conclusion

Although findings from one case study should not be generalized, in planning donor-partner joint evaluation, purpose, scope, criteria, and use of evaluation should be considered.

The donor's scope of evaluation is naturally limited to the particular project or program, but for partner country, it makes more sense to look at it from a wider perspective. That means, in this case, not just outcome of the bridge but development of the East-West Corridor, or even the GMS initiative itself. Therefore it is more reasonable to jointly evaluate programs or policies instead of projects as units. Even in the case of joint project evaluation, program- or policy perspectives should be emphasized.

For evaluation criteria, instead of using the checklist in a guideline, it is more meaningful for partner and donor countries to choose together evaluation questions with importance and urgency. In this case, it would not be just the effect of the bridge, but some of the important social influences as well. What to include should be discussed well before making an evaluation plan. Causality, if hard to specify, should be mentioned as such.

Regarding the purpose or use of evaluation, its role should be considered as not only reviewing the project, but also providing insights to solve various current problems, and for future planning. The latter part is already included in current donor-driven evaluation to some extent but the weight could be reconsidered.

From this study, the importance of studying partner countries' evaluation needs has become apparent. Instead of bringing in donor's viewpoints, it is crucial to discuss the design of evaluation between the donor and the partner before starting the actual evaluation. The scope and method of evaluation and composition of the team should also be discussed beforehand.

Moreover, as for evaluation capacity building, just transferring what donors are doing to partner countries is not enough. It should include the basics of evaluation and various options so that partner countries can design and conduct order-made evaluation.

Lastly, through this study, the merit of evaluating jointly has become clear. A donor can incorporate the beneficiaries' viewpoints into its evaluation, and partner countries will have opportunities to realize evaluations which incorporate various stakeholders' views in the country not just the government's.

## References

- Asian Development Bank, (2008), *Greater Mekong Sub-Region: Maturing and Moving Forward. Regional Cooperation Assistance Program Evaluation*.
- Asian Development Bank, (2007), *Midterm Review of the Greater Mekong Sub-Region Strategic Framework (2002-2012)*.
- Asian Development Bank, (2006), *Reviewing the Poverty Impact of Regional Economic Integration in the Greater Mekong Sub-Region, Regional Synthesis Report*.
- Dabelstein, N., Kliest, T., Wood, B.,(2008), *Evaluating the Paris Declaration: A Joint Cross National Evaluation*, Presented at Annual Conference of the American Evaluation Association, Nov. 6.
- Department of Statistics, Ministry of Planning and Investment,(2008), *Statistical Yearbook 2007*.
- FASID, (2006), *Public Sector and Private Sector Perception towards Tourism in Savannakhet*.
- Haraguchi,T.,Miyazaki,K., (2009),*A Practical Approach of Assistance in Evaluation Capacity Development Experience through Evaluation of ODA Loan Projects*, Trends in Development Assistance Series 5, Issues in Development Assistance Evaluation, FASID.
- JBIC,(2006), *Mid-term review, Thailand "The Second Mekong International Bridge Project"*
- Lao National Tourism Administration, (2008), *2007 Statistical Report on Tourism in Laos*.
- Lundgren, H., Kennedy, M., (2009), *Supporting Partner Country Ownership and Capacity in Development Evaluation. The OECD DAC Evaluation Network*. Country-led monitoring and evaluation systems, UNICEF.
- O'Brien F., (2009),*Preface by Director of Evaluation, UNICEF*, Country-led monitoring and evaluation systems, UNICEF.
- OECD, DAC, *Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance*, p.8, (<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/secure/9/11/31779367.pdf>)
- OECD, (2005a), *Joint Evaluations: Recent Experiences, Lessons Learned and Options for the Future*, DAC Evaluation Network Working Paper.
- OECD, (2008), *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness*  
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf>,2005b. accessed on 2008. 11. 23.
- OECD, (2006), *Guidance for Managing Joint Evaluations*, DAC Evaluation Series.
- Savannakhet Province, (2008), *Statistical Yearbook 2007*.
- .(2007a), *Statistical Yearbook 2006*.
- .(2007b), *Savannakhet Investment & Tourism Magazine*, October 2007, No.01.
- Vientiane Times, (2008), "Government decentralizes investment approvals," September 3.
- World Bank, (2008), *The Accra Agenda for Action*.  
(<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ACCRAEXT/Resources/4700790-1217425866038/AAA-4-SEPTEMBER-FINAL-16h00.pdf> accessed on 2008.11.23.)

□ Table 1 □ List of interviewees

Country	Group	Institutions
Lao PDR	Central government	Ministry of Planning and Investment
		Ministry of Public Works and Transport
		Lao National Tourism Administration
		Ministry of Foreign Affairs
		Ministry of Industry and Trade
		Savan-SENO Special Economic Zone Authority
	Local government □ Savannakhet □	Governor's Office
		Department of Public Works and Transport
		Department of Planning and Investment
		Department of Foreign Affairs
		Division of Industry and Commerce
		Provincial Tourism Department
		The Second Mekong Bridge Office of Tourism
		Department of Health
Private sector, University, think tank	Lao Women's Union	
	National Economic Research Institute	
	The National University of Laos	
	Lao National Chamber of Commerce and Industry	
	Savannakhet Chamber of Commerce Savannakhet Hotel Association	
Local residents, business people	21 residents/business people	
Thailand	Central government	Department of Highways
		Office of National Economic and Social Development Board
		Tourism Authority
	Local office of ministries	Tourism Authority Northeastern Office
		Department of Highways
	Private sector, University, think tank	Mukdahan Tourism Association
		Mukdahan Chamber of Commerce
		Khon Kaen University
		Mekong Institute Thai Industry Association
	Local residents, business people	Eight residents/business people

□ Table 2 □ Evaluation questions referred to during the interviews

Evaluation Questions		Lao PDR				Thailand	
		Central government	Local government	Private sector	Local resident	Public/private sector	Local resident
1-(1) Expected benefits	Change in overall economy					○	○
	Change in int'l trade volume	○	○			○ ○	○ ○
	Change in cross-border trade	○					
	Change in business	○	○	○		○ ○	○
	Traffic of goods, vehicles, people	○	○			○	○
	Investment	○	○			○	○
	Convenience					□	○
	Impact on tourism industry		○	○ ○		○	○ ○
	Increase in income			○			
	Living standard improvement			○			
Goal achievement					○		
1-(2) □ Social aspects	Lao-Thai exchange					○	
	Change in prices		○				
	Labor migration	□ ○	○	○		○	○
	Remittance	○					
	Traffic accidents	○ ○	○ ○				
	HIV/AIDS	○ ○ ○	○ ○ ○				
	Drugs	○ ○ ○	○		○		
	Human trafficking	□ ○ ○	○	○			
	Forest resources, water, natural resources	□ ○ ○	○ ○				
	Crime(murder, robbery)		○	○	○		
	Smuggling			○			
	Prostitution, sexual abuse	○	○		○		
	Concession on land		○				
	Impact on the poor people	○ ○					
Environmental deterioration in town(noise, pollution, trash □				○ ○			
Life of the people, in general					○		
1-(3) Impact on the other countries	Benefit on Thailand	○	○ ○				
	Benefit on Vietnam		○				
	Employment in Thailand	○					
	Satisfaction of each country					○	
1-(4) □ Issues	Immigration management	○			○	○ ○	○ ○
2. Analysis	Cost-benefit	○ ○					
	Regional cooperation	○					
3. Prescription	Overall	○	○		○		
	Industries to be promoted	○ ○			○		
	Export promotion	○	○			○	
	Tourism industry		○			○	
	Ways to increase traffic						○
4. Other	Cutting transportation time				○		
	DAC 5 criteria	○					

○ :Evaluation questions mentioned in the interview □ □ Strongly emphasized by the interviewees

【Figure 1】 Map of East-West Economic Corridor

