

**Submission date: July 25, 2010**

**Word count 5226**

9 Tables

0 Figures

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

**Economic Impact of International Freight Transportation Projects in Landlocked Countries: The Case of Lao PDR**

**Takafumi Iwata**

Department of Civil Engineering, University of Tokyo  
7-3-1, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan  
Phone: +81-3-5841-7451; Fax: +81-3-5841-7496  
E-mail: iwata-t@ip.civil.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

**Hironori Kato**

Department of Civil Engineering, University of Tokyo  
7-3-1, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan  
Phone: +81-3-5841-7451; Fax: +81-3-5841-7496  
E-mail: kato@civil.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

**Ryuichi Shibasaki**

National Institute for Land and Infrastructure Management, Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism  
3-1-1, Nagase, Yokosuka, Kanagawa 239-0826, Japan  
Phone: +81-46-844-502  
E-mail: shibasaki-r92y2@ysk.nilim.go.jp

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

**Abstract.** This paper analyzes the impact of international transportation infrastructure projects on a landlocked country. Landlocked countries/regions usually suffer from low economic development. Lao PDR, located in the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS), is one of them. Currently, multiple international transportation infrastructure projects are in progress in the GMS, including cross-border land transportation development, port development, and cross-border trade facilitation. These projects are expected to contribute to the economic development of Lao PDR and other GMS members. This paper analyzes their impact using the standard Global Trade Analysis Project (GTAP) model. It is one of the spatial computable general equilibrium models with which to estimate the change in economic activities caused by transportation projects. The results show that the international transportation investment in the GMS substantially increases the GDP in Lao PDR in addition to the GDPs in other GMS members.

**Keywords.** landlocked developing country, Lao PDR, Greater Mekong Subregion, spatial computable general equilibrium model, GTAP

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Landlocked countries usually suffer from low economic development. Sachs and Warner (1) point out that  
3 landlocked countries have lower steady-state incomes and therefore, lower growth from any initial level of GDP.  
4 Gallup et al. (2) show that being landlocked reduces growth by at least half a percentage point. The World Bank  
5 (3), however, mentions that being landlocked is no reason for poverty. For example, Switzerland, Luxembourg,  
6 and Austria are landlocked but not developing countries. Most landlocked countries tend to have two problems:  
7 poor neighbors and inaccessible markets. Poor neighbors would make few spillovers to the landlocked region  
8 while rich neighbors would be a market for the landlocked region and would allow the landlocked region to use  
9 their well-developed transportation infrastructure for international trade. The long distance from markets results  
10 in higher transportation cost for the landlocked region. The higher transportation cost makes the landlocked  
11 region's goods less competitive in the market. It also weakens the purchasing power of the consumer in the  
12 landlocked region.

13 Lao PDR is a landlocked developing country that is surrounded by Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam,  
14 China, and Myanmar. Lao PDR incurs high transportation costs to access the world markets. In 1992, under the  
15 initiative of the Asian Development Bank (ADB), Cambodia, China, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand, and  
16 Vietnam entered into a program of economic cooperation in the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS), designed to  
17 enhance economic relations among the countries. The program has contributed to infrastructure development  
18 that enables regional development and the sharing of the resource base and promotes the free flow of goods and  
19 people in the subregion. It has also led to international recognition of the subregion as a growth area. The  
20 program covers the following nine sectors: transportation, energy, telecommunications, environment, human  
21 resource development, tourism, trade, private sector investment, and agriculture. The transportation sector plays  
22 an important role in the program. Most of the transportation projects are classified into the following four  
23 categories: land transportation infrastructure development, facilitation of border crossing, port development, and  
24 airport development. The transportation projects in the GMS development program are expected to accelerate  
25 the development of Lao PDR by helping the country overcome the problem of transportation.

26 This paper analyzes the impact of the international transportation infrastructure projects in the GMS on  
27 Lao PDR. Note that this paper covers land and sea transportation, not air transportation. The paper estimates the  
28 economic impact using the standard Global Trade Analysis Project (GTAP) model. It is one of the spatial  
29 computable general equilibrium models with which to estimate the changes in economic activities caused by  
30 transportation projects.

31 A similar approach was adopted by Stone and Strutt (4), who quantified the potential economic impact  
32 of land transportation infrastructure development and border crossing facilitation in the GMS. Some of the key  
33 linkages between upgraded infrastructure, economic growth, and sectoral responses are explored using a spatial  
34 computable general equilibrium framework. The study provides a static view of one-off gains from a  
35 conservative estimate of a reduction in transportation costs and improvements in trade facilitation. The results  
36 show that Lao PDR and other GMS members enjoy welfare and GDP growth thanks to the GMS development  
37 program. The intra-GMS trade increases while trades between GMS members and non-GMS countries generally  
38 decrease. However, Stone and Strutt did not cover the following three issues. First, they did not take into  
39 consideration the improvement of sea transportation between the GMS members and the rest of the world. A  
40 number of ports in the GMS are now under development. The improvement of sea transportation between the  
41 GMS members and the rest of the world might have a negative impact on Lao PDR. For example, Thailand and  
42 Vietnam, relatively developed countries in the GMS, may enhance their trade with the rest of the world rather  
43 than with Lao PDR, due to port development. Thus, this paper incorporates the sea transportation to and from  
44 GMS explicitly. Second, Stone and Strutt did not consider the difference between transportation modes.  
45 Although multiple transportation modes are widely used in the GMS, Stone and Strutt assumed that the same  
46 level of service improvement is uniformly given to all transportation modes. This might bias the evaluation  
47 results. Thus, this paper considers explicitly the difference in level-of-service among transportation modes.  
48 Finally, Stone and Strutt analyzed the economic impact using a database that contained information available as  
49 of the year 2004. As the GMS has been developing drastically, a more current database on the international  
50 economy should be used for the analysis rather than the 2004 database to evaluate the projects. Thus, this paper  
51 uses the estimated results in 2020 for a baseline scenario.

52 The paper is organized as follows. Next section includes overviews of Lao PDR and the GMS  
53 development program. Next, the paper introduces the methodology, including the spatial computable general  
54 equilibrium model and the future international economy forecast method. The scenarios used in the scenario  
55 analysis after explaining the expected reductions in transportation time and cost are described. Then, the results  
56 of the scenario analysis are presented and discussed. Finally, the paper is concluded and further research issues  
57 are highlighted.

58  
59

## 1 OVERVIEWS OF LAO PDR AND THE GMS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

2 Lao PDR is a landlocked developing country located in the GMS. Its population is 6.21 million as of 2008. Its  
3 Gross Domestic Product is USD 5.2 billion and the growth rate is 7.5 percent. The Gross National Income per  
4 capita based on purchasing power parity is USD 2,040. Lao PDR is classified as a Least Developed Country by  
5 The United Nations Committee for Development Planning.

6 Infrastructure development of land transportation and facilitation of border crossing are carried out  
7 along the three economic corridors in the GMS. During the Eighth GMS Ministerial Meeting held in Manila in  
8 1998, three economic corridors were identified to connect infrastructure development with investment activities  
9 and then to effectively promote regional economic development. The three economic corridors include East-  
10 West Economic Corridor (EWEC), Southern Economic Corridor (SEC), and North-South Economic Corridor  
11 (NSEC). The EWEC extends from Da Nang in Vietnam to Mawlamyine in Myanmar, crossing the central area  
12 of Lao PDR and the northern part of Thailand. Main routes of the NSEC connect Kunming and Bangkok via  
13 Lao PDR and Myanmar. Main routes of the SEC connect Bangkok, Phnom Penh and Ho Chi Minh City.

14 In addition to the current framework of cross-border facilitation, the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure,  
15 Transport and Tourism, Japan (5) suggests the potential to facilitate further border crossing. For example, the  
16 introduction of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), such as logistics management using Radio  
17 Frequency Identification and the Global Positioning System, could advance cross-border facilitation. ICT will  
18 drastically reduce cross-border procedures in the GMS countries by intensively administrating the cross-border  
19 transportation flows.

20 The GMS development program includes ports development as well. There are development projects at  
21 ports in Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Myanmar. New ports slated for development are Lien Chieu Seaport,  
22 Cai Mep-Thi Vai deepwater port, and Van Phong Port in Vietnam and Dawei deepwater port in Myanmar.  
23 Upgrades of existing ports are also planned. Most of the upgrading projects aim to enhance capacity, improve  
24 cargo handling, and increase accessibility to land transportation.  
25

## 26 METHOD

### 27 *Spatial Computable General Equilibrium Model*

28 The standard GTAP model is used for the scenario analysis with the GTAP database version 7 (Hertel, 6). The  
29 model is one of the spatial computable general equilibrium models, with which the changes in economic  
30 activities caused by transportation projects are estimated. It covers multiple sectors in multiple regions, with the  
31 assumptions of perfect competition and constant returns to scale. The database covers a publicly available global  
32 database, which contains complete bilateral trade information, transportation, and protection linkages among  
33 113 regions for all 57 commodities in a single year. Note that the GTAP 7 database contains the data for 2004.  
34 For analytical simplicity and for the purpose of our analysis, the 113 original regions are aggregated into 38  
35 regions while the 57 original commodities are aggregated into 17 commodities.

36 First, the international economy in 2020 is forecasted with the GTAP model and the database version 7.  
37 This result is regarded as a baseline scenario. Then, the changes in economic activities in each country are  
38 estimated by inputting the expected reduction in transportation time and cost into the GTAP model. Although  
39 the GTAP model in itself does not include transportation time, the reduction in transportation time is  
40 incorporated into the model by assuming the iceberg transportation cost (Samuelson, 7). This is because the  
41 transportation time, most of which is time involving border procedures, could have a great effect on  
42 international trade volume (OECD, 8).  
43

### 44 *Forecasts of Baseline Scenario in 2020*

45 The baseline scenario in 2020 is estimated by following Shibasaki *et al.* (9). In this scenario, the changes in the  
46 following factors in each region are estimated: population, skilled labor, unskilled labor, capital, natural  
47 resource, and GDP. The international economy in 2020 is estimated by the sequential three simulations. The  
48 first simulation estimates the changes from 2004 to 2010 by inputting the changes in the above factors into the  
49 GTAP model with the data from 2004. Next, the second simulation estimates the changes from 2010 to 2015 by  
50 inputting the changes in the above factors into the GTAP model with the data for 2010 estimated by the first  
51 simulation. Finally, the third simulation estimates the changes from 2015 to 2020 by inputting the changes in the  
52 above factors into the GTAP model with the data for 2015 estimated by the second simulation. It should be  
53 noted that the other factors including tariff rates are assumed to be constant in those simulations.

54 The changes in the above factors in the three simulations are estimated as follows. First, the changes in  
55 regional populations are estimated based on the population forecasted by the United Nations (10) and CEPD  
56 (11). Next, the populations of skilled labor and unskilled labor are estimated by using the population between 15  
57 and 64 years old forecasted by the United Nations (10) and CEPD (11). It is assumed that the share of skilled

labor and unskilled labor is constant in each region. Then, the annual growth rate of capital is assumed to be 50 percent of the annual growth rate of real GDP while the production of natural resources is assumed to increase by 2 percent annually. These assumptions follow Shibasaki et al. (9). Finally, the change in real GDP is assumed based on Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport, and Tourism, Japan (2004) and International Monetary Fund (12). The details of data assigned to the GTAP model in the simulations are shown in TABLE 1.

## SCENARIOS

### Development of Scenarios

Four scenarios are prepared for the scenario analysis. The conditions applied to the land transportation in the four scenarios are summarized in TABLE 2 while the conditions applied to the sea transportation in the four

**TABLE 1: Changes in the factors input into the GTAP model in the three simulations (%)**

	Population			Unskilled labor			Skilled labor			Capital			Natural resources			Change in real GDP		
	2004–2010	2010–2015	2015–2020	2004–2010	2010–2015	2015–2020	2004–2010	2010–2015	2015–2020	2004–2010	2010–2015	2015–2020	2004–2010	2010–2015	2015–2020	2004–2010	2010–2015	2015–2020
jpn	-0.13	-0.9	-1.67	-4.13	-5.45	-4.01	-4.13	-5.45	-4.01	3.7	3.1	2.6	12.62	10.4	10.4	7.42	6.1	5.1
kor	2.02	0.91	0.21	4.3	1.67	-1.77	4.3	1.67	-1.77	17.55	12.9	12.9	12.62	10.4	10.4	35.55	25.8	25.8
hkg	6.19	4.38	3.82	6.98	3.04	-1.43	6.98	3.04	-1.43	36.75	30.5	30.5	12.62	10.4	10.4	28.01	27.6	27.6
prc	3.53	2.74	2.35	6.41	2.55	-0.21	6.41	2.55	-0.21	13.86	13.8	13.8	12.62	10.4	10.4	75.23	61.1	61.1
twn	2.29	1.54	1.04	2.29	1.54	1.04	2.29	1.54	1.04	13.86	11.4	11.4	12.62	10.4	10.4	28	22.8	22.8
xea	11.26	9.44	3.85	8.06	4.82	3.27	8.06	4.82	3.27	29.21	13.8	13.8	12.62	10.4	10.4	59.57	27.6	27.6
phl	12.09	8.7	7.58	15.18	11.09	9.15	15.18	11.09	9.15	14.95	15.3	15.3	12.62	10.4	10.4	30.23	30.7	30.7
vnm	8.26	6.19	5.38	14.97	7.77	4.86	14.97	7.77	4.86	21.41	21.4	21.4	12.62	10.4	10.4	43.47	42.9	42.9
tha	4.05	2.52	1.84	5.55	2.18	0.44	5.55	2.18	0.44	17.55	16.9	16.9	12.62	10.4	10.4	35.55	33.8	33.8
mys	10.7	7.62	6.57	14.46	9.12	7.51	14.46	9.12	7.51	20.62	16.9	16.9	12.62	10.4	10.4	41.85	33.8	33.8
sgp	7.38	4.71	3.24	20.68	3.7	-1.78	20.68	3.7	-1.78	17.55	15.3	15.3	12.62	10.4	10.4	35.55	30.7	30.7
idn	7.23	4.99	4.09	9.59	6.96	5.81	9.59	6.96	5.81	21.8	19.1	19.1	12.62	10.4	10.4	44.28	38.3	38.3
lao	11.26	9.44	3.85	8.06	4.82	3.27	8.06	4.82	3.27	13.14	13.8	13.8	12.62	10.4	10.4	26.53	27.6	27.6
cmb	11.26	9.44	3.85	8.06	4.82	3.27	8.06	4.82	3.27	13.14	13.8	13.8	12.62	10.4	10.4	26.53	27.6	27.6
mmr	11.26	9.44	3.85	8.06	4.82	3.27	8.06	4.82	3.27	13.14	13.8	13.8	12.62	10.4	10.4	26.53	27.6	27.6
xse	11.26	9.44	3.85	8.06	4.82	3.27	8.06	4.82	3.27	13.14	13.8	13.8	12.62	10.4	10.4	26.53	27.6	27.6
bgd	10.55	8.09	7.34	14.44	10.27	8.2	14.44	10.27	8.2	16.05	19.1	19.1	12.62	10.4	10.4	32.49	38.3	38.3
ind	9.14	6.75	5.89	13.07	9.27	7.43	13.07	9.27	7.43	27.51	23.5	23.5	12.62	10.4	10.4	56.06	46.9	46.9
lka	2.87	1.96	1.35	4.32	0.54	1.33	4.32	0.54	1.33	18.31	13.8	13.8	12.62	10.4	10.4	37.1	27.6	27.6
xsa	11.26	9.44	3.85	8.06	4.82	3.27	8.06	4.82	3.27	24.62	16.9	16.9	12.62	10.4	10.4	50.07	33.8	33.8
xme	11.26	9.44	3.85	8.06	4.82	3.27	8.06	4.82	3.27	20.23	15	15	12.62	10.4	10.4	41.05	30.1	30.1
med	3.89	2.49	1.9	5.54	2.78	1.72	5.54	2.78	1.72	11.01	13.8	13.8	12.62	10.4	10.4	22.21	27.6	27.6
eur	1.13	0.67	0.5	1.31	-0.97	-1.56	1.31	-0.97	-1.56	4.02	3.3	3.3	12.62	10.4	10.4	8.06	6.7	6.7
rus	-3.02	-2.74	-2.98	-0.7	-4.33	-5.11	-0.7	-4.33	-5.11	18.69	15.3	15.3	12.62	10.4	10.4	37.88	30.7	30.7
xsu	11.26	9.44	3.85	8.06	4.82	3.27	8.06	4.82	3.27	19.46	15.7	15.7	12.62	10.4	10.4	39.46	31.3	31.3
afr	12.46	9.94	9.61	14.89	12.58	12.94	14.89	12.58	12.94	20.62	15	15	12.62	10.4	10.4	41.85	30.1	30.1
usa	5.97	4.55	4.11	6.01	3.15	2.16	6.01	3.15	2.16	6.28	6	6	12.62	10.4	10.4	12.62	12	12
can	5.53	4.26	3.97	6.45	2.65	1.22	6.45	2.65	1.22	8.95	7.4	7.4	12.62	10.4	10.4	18.02	14.8	14.8
mex	6.98	4.95	4.15	10.05	7.04	4.95	10.05	7.04	4.95	12.07	12	12	12.62	10.4	10.4	24.36	24	24
xna	11.26	9.44	3.85	8.06	4.82	3.27	8.06	4.82	3.27	9.63	12.9	12.9	12.62	10.4	10.4	19.41	25.8	25.8
xcm	11.26	9.44	3.85	8.06	4.82	3.27	8.06	4.82	3.27	10.32	11.4	11.4	12.62	10.4	10.4	20.8	22.8	22.8
per	7.17	6.49	5.76	10.16	7.94	7.02	10.16	7.94	7.02	22.6	18.5	18.5	12.62	10.4	10.4	45.91	37	37
chl	6.21	4.62	3.98	9.02	4.72	2.67	9.02	4.72	2.67	14.95	13.8	13.8	12.62	10.4	10.4	30.23	27.6	27.6
xap	11.26	9.44	3.85	8.06	4.82	3.27	8.06	4.82	3.27	10.32	11.4	11.4	12.62	10.4	10.4	20.8	22.8	22.8
sae	7.82	5.65	4.88	9.39	6.56	5.11	9.39	6.56	5.11	10.32	11.4	11.4	12.62	10.4	10.4	20.8	22.8	22.8
aus	6.25	4.84	4.56	6.39	3.05	2.4	6.39	3.05	2.4	9.97	9.7	9.7	12.62	10.4	10.4	20.1	19.3	19.3
nzl	5.53	4.01	3.57	6.5	2.91	2.22	6.5	2.91	2.22	7.27	7.7	7.7	12.62	10.4	10.4	14.62	15.4	15.4
xoc	11.26	9.44	3.85	8.06	4.82	3.27	8.06	4.82	3.27	11.01	6.8	6.8	12.62	10.4	10.4	22.21	13.7	13.7

Note: The definitions of area codes are shown in Appendix 1.

**TABLE 2: Conditions of time and cost of land transportation in the scenario analysis**

Scenarios	Time	Cost
Scenario 1	Reduction by 30%	Reduction by 45%
Scenario 2	-	-
Scenario 3	Reduction by 30%	Reduction by 45%
Scenario 4	Reduction by 40%	Reduction by 45%

**TABLE 3: Conditions of process time to export/import at ports by sea transportation in GMS countries in the scenario analysis**

(days)	Thailand	Lao PDR	Vietnam	Cambodia	Myanmar	China
Time to export	2009	6	17	10	8	8
	Scenario 1	6	11	10	8	8
	Scenario 2	4	15	5	5	5
	Scenario 3, 4	4	9	5	5	5
Time to import	2009	5	17	9	11	11
	Scenario 1	5	10	9	11	11
	Scenario 2	4	16	5	5	5
	Scenario 3, 4	4	9	5	5	5

Note: Data for Myanmar are not available in the database, so they are assumed to be equal to Cambodia.

scenarios by country are summarized in TABLE 3. First, Scenario 1 describes the case where the land transportation projects in the GMS have been completed. It is assumed that the land transportation time among the GMS members is uniformly reduced by 30 percent while the land transportation cost among the GMS members is uniformly reduced by 45 percent. Note that the process time to export/import to and from Lao PDR is reduced for sea transportation whereas the time to export/import to and from other countries is not reduced. This is because the improvement of the cross-border land transportation will reduce the sea transportation time in addition to the land transportation time. Second, Scenario 2 presents the case where only port development projects in the GMS have been completed. It is assumed that the process time to export out of and import into Vietnam, Cambodia, and Myanmar is reduced to five days, which is close to the process time at ports in developed countries. It should be noted that the process time in Thailand is reduced, not to five days but to four days exceptionally. This is because the ports in Thailand already have a more modernized trade system than do other GMS members. Third, Scenario 3 shows the case where both land transportation projects and port development projects in the GMS have been completed. Here, it is assumed that the process time to export/import to and from Lao PDR is reduced by eight days. This follows Nathan Associates (13), which shows that the expected reduction in transportation time of the route from Vientiane to Laem Chabang port is eight days. Finally, Scenario 4 assumes the case where further cross-border facilitation is carried out in addition to Scenario 3. Land transportation time in the GMS is reduced further than in Scenario 3, by 40 percent.

#### *Analytical Assumptions in the GTAP Model for Scenario Analysis*

#### **Reductions in Transportation Cost**

The reductions in transportation cost are reflected by changing a technology-related coefficient in the GTAP model. The quantity of goods transported by a specific mode satisfies the following equation in the GTAP model:

$$QTMFSD^*(i, r, s, m) = \{1 + atmfsd(i, r, s, m)\} \times QTMFSD(i, r, s, m) \quad (1)$$

where  $QTMFSD^*(i, r, s, m)$  is the quantity of commodity  $i$  imported from region  $r$  to region  $s$  by mode  $m$ ;  $QTMFSD(i, r, s, m)$  is the quantity of commodity  $i$  exported from region  $r$  to region  $s$  by mode  $m$ ; and  $atmfsd(i, r, s, m)$  is the technical change coefficient on transportation of commodity  $i$  from region  $r$  to region  $s$  by mode  $m$ . This reflects the assumption of the iceberg transportation cost, in which transporting a good uses up only some fraction of the good itself rather than using any other resources. The technical coefficient is regarded as the efficiency of transporting goods. In the GTAP model, the variable  $atmfsd$  is defined for each commodity, each bilateral trade, and each mode. Then, the increase in  $atmfsd$  by 20 percent causes a 20 percent increase in the quantity of commodity imported by the corresponding mode.



## 1 Reductions in Transportation Time

2 The GTAP model in itself does not include the variables of transportation time. Thus, the reductions in  
3 transportation time are reflected in the GTAP model by using an approach introduced by Hertel *et al.* (14) and  
4 Minor and Tsigas (15). The approach adopts again the assumption of the iceberg transportation cost, which  
5 identifies reduction in transportation time with an increase of the traded commodity.

6 To incorporate the transportation time, the variable  $atmfsd$  is formulated by multiplying the reduction  
7 in transportation time with a tariff equivalent for value of time. This means:

$$8 \quad atmfsd(i, r, s, m) = TE(i, s) \times \Delta DAYS(r, s, m) \quad (2)$$

9 where

10  $TE(i, s)$ : Tariff equivalent for value of time per day for commodity  $i$  imported by region  $s$  (% ad-valorem); and

11  $\Delta DAYS(r, s, m)$ : Change in transportation time of mode  $m$  for the bilateral trade from region  $r$  to region  $s$ .

12 The tariff equivalent for value of time per day is calculated by aggregating the data of Hummels *et al.*  
13 (16) to match the aggregated 17 commodities and services and the aggregated 38 importing regions. The change  
14 in transportation time is defined as:

15 If  $m$  = land transportation,

$$16 \quad \Delta DAYS(r, s, m) = \{EXDAY(r) + IMDAY(s)\} * TIMEREDRATE(r, s, m) \quad (3)$$

17 If  $m$  = sea transportation,

$$18 \quad \Delta DAYS(r, s, m) = EXDAYRED(r, m) + IMDAYRED(s, m) \quad (4)$$

19 where

20  $EXDAY(r)$ : Days to export in region  $r$  (Source: Doing Business Database 2009);

21  $IMDAY(s)$ : Days to import in region  $r$  (Source: Doing Business Database 2009);

22  $TIMEREDRATE(r, s, m)$ : Time reduction rate regarding transportation from region  $r$  to  $s$  by mode  $m$ ;

23  $EXDAYRED(r, m)$ : Reduced days to export in region  $r$  by mode  $m$ ; and

24  $IMDAYRED(s, m)$ : Reduced days to import in region  $s$  by mode  $m$ .

## 26 RESULTS

### 27 Results of Scenario Analysis

28 TABLE 4 presents the changes in real GDP in the GMS countries in the four scenarios with the real GDPs in the  
29 baseline scenario in 2020. First, GMS members enjoy GDP growth in all scenarios. This means that the  
30 international transportation infrastructure development projects in the GMS impart benefit to many countries in  
31 the GMS. Second, the estimated results show that the GDP growth rate is higher in Lao PDR and in Cambodia  
32 than the GDP growth rate in other countries. This is mainly because Lao PDR and Cambodia depend on the  
33 other GMS members for their trade more than the others do. This probably indicates that the cross-border  
34 transportation projects in the GMS contribute to the improvement of the national economy, particularly in the  
35 low-income countries that depend on the external effects from neighbor regions. Third, the GDP growth rate in  
36 Lao PDR is positive in Scenario 2 as well as in Scenario 1. This means that the port development in neighbor  
37 countries contributes to the GDP growth even without the improvement of land transportation. This probably  
38 reflects the external effect of infrastructure investment in neighborhood regions on the landlocked country.  
39 Fourth, the GDP growth rate in Lao PDR is 4.82 percent in Scenario 1 while it is 0.70 percent in Scenario 2.

**TABLE 4: Real GDP changes in the GMS countries in the four Scenarios**

		Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China
Baseline scenario	GDP (million	74,657	287,535	3,718	6,585	10,763	3,984,447
in 2020	USD)						
Scenario 1	GDP change	2.77	0.26	4.82	0.28	1.25	0.02
	(%)						
Scenario 2	GDP change	2.14	0.49	0.7	5.82	1.42	0.03
	(%)						
Scenario 3	GDP change	4.62	0.75	5.71	6.19	2.6	0.05
	(%)						
Scenario 4	GDP change	5.4	0.83	6.02	6.24	2.97	0.06
	(%)						

Note: GDPs are estimated with the price as of 2020.

1 This is because Lao PDR is more dependent on land transportation than on sea transportation. On the contrary,  
 2 the GDP growth rate of Cambodia is 0.28 percent in Scenario 1 while it is 5.82 percent in Scenario 2. This is  
 3 because Cambodia owns some ports where the port management is potentially improved. Fifth, the GDP growth  
 4 rates in Scenario 4 are higher than the GDP growth rates in Scenario 3 in all countries while the GDP growth  
 5 rates in Scenario 3 are higher than the GDP growth rates in Scenarios 1 and 2 in all countries. This simply  
 6 reflects the improvement levels of transportation service in the Scenarios. Finally, China and Thailand have  
 7 relatively smaller GDP growth rates than other countries. Thailand gains 0.26 percent growth in Scenario 1, 0.49  
 8 percent in Scenario 2, 0.75 percent in Scenario 3, and 0.83 percent in Scenario 4. China enjoys only 0.02 percent  
 9 growth in Scenario 1, 0.03 percent in Scenario 2, 0.05 percent in Scenario 3, and 0.06 percent in Scenario 4. The  
 10 low growth rate is due to China's and Thailand's trading less with other GMS members than the others do.

11 TABLE 5 shows the changes in international trades between the GMS members and the rest of the  
 12 world in Scenarios 1, 2, 3, and 4. First, TABLE 5 shows that in Scenario 1, the trades from one country to  
 13 neighbor countries increase by a high percentage, for example, the trade from Cambodia to Thailand and from  
 14 Vietnam to Lao PDR. This reflects the improvement of cross-border transportation caused by the time reduction  
 15 in land transportation service. Second, interestingly, TABLE 5 shows that in Scenario 1, the trade from the  
 16 ROW to Lao PDR increases by 8.4 percent while the trade from Lao PDR to the ROW decreases by 11.6  
 17 percent. More consumption goods are imported from out of GMS to Lao PDR, mainly because the land  
 18 transportation projects improve accessibility from the international market to Lao PDR. The goods from Lao  
 19 PDR are exported not out of the GMS but to the GMS members, probably because the sharp economic growth  
 20 in neighbor countries including Thailand and Cambodia attracts the goods exported from Lao PDR. Third,  
 21 TABLE 5 shows that the trades between the GMS and the ROW increase except for the trade from the rest of

**TABLE 5: Real GDP changes in the GMS countries in the four Scenarios**

Scenario 1	Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China	ROW
Vietnam		0.60%	53.40%	0.60%	-17.6%	44.70%	-5.4%
Thailand	-9.5%		20.00%	2.40%	19.30%	0.20%	-0.3%
Lao PDR	14.50%	43.80%		17.50%	-20.0%	11.20%	-11.6%
Cambodia	44.40%	88.90%	-10.4%		-13.8%	-2.3%	-2.1%
Myanmar	-10.9%	12.80%	-9.1%	-1.1%		31.10%	-3.1%
China	38.80%	9.60%	4.50%	-0.3%	16.00%		-0.4%
ROW	-12.3%	-1.9%	8.40%	2.10%	-10.5%	0.00%	0.00%
Scenario 2	Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China	ROW
Vietnam		6.90%	8.10%	21.80%	32.60%	20.10%	2.50%
Thailand	17.60%		-0.1%	10.10%	-6.7%	3.60%	0.20%
Lao PDR	-0.2%	-0.4%		17.50%	20.00%	-0.2%	0.80%
Cambodia	-1.2%	2.50%	6.90%		20.70%	10.60%	3.50%
Myanmar	18.80%	-3.6%	-9.1%	9.90%		5.50%	5.80%
China	-4.9%	3.00%	-0.2%	1.30%	-2.6%		0.00%
ROW	11.40%	3.00%	2.70%	3.80%	10.70%	-0.3%	-0.1%
Scenario 3	Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China	ROW
Vietnam		8.20%	65.50%	22.20%	10.10%	64.20%	-2.7%
Thailand	7.80%		19.90%	12.90%	11.70%	3.80%	-0.1%
Lao PDR	15.50%	42.90%		32.20%	-16.0%	13.40%	-10.0%
Cambodia	46.20%	95.00%	-2.9%		5.50%	7.60%	1.20%
Myanmar	5.30%	8.70%	9.10%	7.10%		42.00%	2.00%
China	34.00%	12.80%	5.10%	1.00%	13.60%		-0.4%
ROW	-1.2%	1.10%	11.50%	5.90%	-0.5%	-0.3%	0.00%
Scenario 4	Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China	ROW
Vietnam		8.00%	67.30%	22.00%	4.80%	75.30%	-4.1%
Thailand	5.00%		23.00%	13.40%	15.40%	3.90%	-0.2%
Lao PDR	23.70%	56.60%		25.90%	-16.0%	20.10%	-13.8%
Cambodia	55.40%	107.90%	1.90%		2.80%	7.00%	0.90%
Myanmar	2.80%	10.60%	9.10%	6.90%		52.80%	1.40%
China	42.20%	14.90%	8.30%	0.90%	17.00%		-0.5%
ROW	-4.0%	0.60%	9.90%	6.30%	-3.1%	-0.3%	0.00%

Note: ROW means Rest of the World.



1 the world to China in Scenario 2. This is contrastive to the results of Scenario 1, in which most of the trades  
 2 between the GMS and the ROW decrease. This is because the port development promotes the trades between  
 3 the GMS and the ROW. Fourth, TABLE 5 also shows that the trade between Lao PDR and the ROW increases  
 4 because of the port development in neighbor countries without the improvement of land transportation. This is  
 5 probably because of the external effect of the development of neighbor countries. This means that the  
 6 infrastructure development in the neighborhood regions contributes to improving the accessibility of the  
 7 landlocked region to the international market. Fifth, TABLE 5 further shows that in Scenario 2, the trades  
 8 between non-neighbor countries in the GMS increase by a higher percentage, for example, the trades between  
 9 Thailand and Vietnam; Myanmar and Vietnam; and Cambodia and Myanmar; while some trades between  
 10 neighbor countries decrease, such as the trades between Lao PDR and Thailand and between Myanmar and  
 11 Thailand. Additionally, the unbalanced changes are observed, for example, the trade from Lao PDR to Vietnam  
 12 decreases while the trade from Vietnam to Lao PDR increases. Sixth, TABLE 5 shows that the results in  
 13 Scenario 3 are almost equal to the sum of the results of Scenario 1 and 2. The impact of Scenario 1 may be  
 14 larger than the impact of Scenario 2. The trades to Lao PDR increase except for the trade from Cambodia to Lao  
 15 PDR while the trades from Lao PDR also increase except for the trades from Lao PDR to Myanmar and to the  
 16 ROW. Finally, TABLE 5 shows that the trade from Lao PDR to Myanmar decreases even in Scenario 4  
 17 although other trades among the GMS members increase. This may mean that it is quite difficult to increase all  
 18 trades in the GMS through the international transportation infrastructure development.

19 TABLE 6 shows the estimated changes in output by industry in the GMS members in Scenarios 1, 2, 3,  
 20 and 4, while TABLE 7 shows the output in the GMS members estimated in the baseline scenario for 2020.  
 21 TABLE 6 shows that the change in output in Lao PDR is the highest among the GMS members in Scenario 1.  
 22 This is supported mainly by the development of grains and mining industries. It should be noted that the outputs  
 23 in heavy manufacturing and in utilities and construction increase by 12.4 percent and 11.4 percent, respectively,  
 24 while the outputs in livestock and meat products and in textiles and clothing decrease by 12.9 percent and 22.1  
 25 percent, respectively. This may mean that the industrial structure in Lao PDR is changed by the international  
 26 transportation project in Scenario 1 from a resource-production-oriented industrial structure to a manufacture-  
 27 oriented industrial structure. Similar changes in the industrial structure of Lao PDR are also observed in  
 28 Scenarios 3 and 4, as shown in TABLE 6. TABLE 6 shows that the output in Myanmar increases at the highest  
 29 rate while the output in Thailand decreases at the highest rate in Scenario 2. The industry in Lao PDR is not  
 30 greatly affected in Scenario 2.

### 32 *Discussion*

33 First, the scenario analysis shows that the international transportation projects in the GMS will accelerate the  
 34 development of Lao PDR and the other GMS members by enhancing economic integration among the GMS  
 35 members. The economic impact on Lao PDR is high particularly in Scenarios 1, 3, and 4. This is mainly because  
 36 the transportation time and cost to and from Lao PDR are significantly reduced by the transportation projects.  
 37 The significant reductions in the transportation time and cost result in high economic growth in Lao PDR in the  
 38 following two ways. The first way is that the reductions in transportation time and cost enable the local  
 39 industries and/or consumers in Lao PDR to purchase more goods imported from other countries at lower prices.  
 40 As local industries can save the input cost by using cheaper imported goods, they can increase the outputs. The  
 41 second is that the reductions in transportation time and cost improve the accessibility to markets in other  
 42 countries. This increases the exports from the local industries and leads to the increase of outputs in Lao PDR.

43 Second, the results of Scenario 2 show that the port development in neighborhood regions increases the  
 44 GDP in Lao PDR as well as the trades between Lao PDR and the rest of the world. This may reflect the external  
 45 effect of the development of neighbor countries on the landlocked country.

46 Third, the international land transportation projects in the GMS decrease the trades between the GMS  
 47 and the rest of the world while the port developments increase the trades between the GMS and the rest of the  
 48 world. The results of the analysis in Scenario 3 indicate that the impact of land transportation projects is larger  
 49 than the impact of port development projects.

50 Fourth, the international transportation projects stimulate the local economic activities in Lao PDR.  
 51 Particularly, the mining industry increases its output by 51.0 percent, 58.0 percent, and 57.2 percent in Scenarios  
 52 1, 3, and 4, respectively.

53 Fifth, the international transportation projects may influence the industrial structure in local countries.  
 54 The results of Scenarios 1, 3, and 4 show that the international transportation projects change the local industrial  
 55 structures in Lao PDR. The outputs in heavy manufacturing and in utilities and construction increase, while the  
 56 outputs in livestock and meat products and in textiles and clothing decrease.

TABLE 6: Estimated changes in output by industry in the four Scenarios

Scenario 1												
Industry	Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China	Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China
Grains	-1.4%	0.00%	4.20%	-0.1%	0.80%	0.80%	0.00%	-2.1%	-1.8%	0.50%	-0.1%	0.30%
VegfFruit	0.20%	-0.6%	0.00%	0.80%	-1.1%	0.00%	0.00%	0.30%	0.30%	0.40%	-0.5%	-0.6%
OthCrops	-2.9%	-0.2%	-3.9%	0.60%	-0.8%	0.00%	0.00%	-4.1%	-0.5%	0.10%	-2.0%	-0.1%
MeatLstk	3.90%	0.20%	-13.9%	3.00%	1.00%	0.00%	3.70%	3.70%	-0.1%	-2.3%	-5.0%	-0.2%
Forestry	-2.4%	-0.8%	-0.2%	3.80%	-1.7%	0.00%	-2.2%	-0.6%	-0.6%	-0.2%	-0.4%	-0.5%
Fishing	1.70%	0.00%	1.90%	0.00%	1.60%	0.00%	1.50%	-0.2%	0.40%	0.40%	-0.4%	-0.1%
Mining	0.60%	-0.2%	51.00%	1.00%	1.20%	-0.1%	0.90%	-1.5%	0.70%	0.70%	-1.6%	-1.2%
ProcFood	-1.2%	0.00%	-2.8%	-0.8%	0.70%	0.00%	-1.8%	-1.2%	0.00%	0.00%	-6.4%	0.30%
TextWapp	1.10%	-0.9%	-22.1%	-2.2%	2.70%	0.00%	-0.2%	-2.7%	0.20%	0.20%	2.80%	9.70%
LightMnfc	-2.6%	-0.2%	5.60%	3.00%	1.80%	0.00%	1.10%	-0.6%	-1.3%	2.30%	0.40%	0.00%
HeavyMnfc	-3.6%	-0.4%	12.40%	10.90%	-8.1%	0.10%	-3.8%	0.50%	1.60%	-10.4%	-4.6%	0.00%
Util_Cons	3.90%	0.60%	11.40%	0.90%	1.50%	0.00%	4.50%	2.30%	1.10%	10.20%	1.30%	0.00%
TransNec	1.90%	0.00%	-4.7%	-0.3%	0.80%	0.00%	0.50%	-0.8%	-0.4%	-4.3%	3.70%	0.00%
SeaTrans	3.50%	-0.3%	-8.9%	0.20%	2.70%	0.00%	1.50%	-2.5%	-0.7%	-1.1%	5.30%	0.00%
AirTrans	3.90%	-0.7%	-5.2%	-0.9%	2.60%	-0.1%	1.50%	-4.8%	-0.4%	-5.8%	5.30%	0.10%
TransComm	-1.8%	0.10%	5.20%	0.10%	0.30%	0.00%	-3.1%	0.20%	0.40%	-1.7%	0.50%	0.00%
OthServices	0.80%	0.10%	2.90%	-0.1%	0.90%	0.00%	-0.7%	-0.2%	0.20%	0.60%	0.30%	0.00%
Total	11.30%	-2.3%	48.50%	17.40%	9.80%	-0.2%	4.30%	-11.1%	2.00%	-8.3%	22.00%	0.20%
Scenario 2												
Industry	Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China	Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China
Grains	-3.4%	-1.8%	4.90%	-0.2%	1.10%	0.00%	-3.7%	-1.8%	5.10%	-0.2%	1.30%	0.00%
VegfFruit	0.40%	-0.3%	0.50%	0.40%	-1.7%	0.00%	0.50%	-0.4%	0.70%	0.60%	-1.9%	0.00%
OthCrops	-6.9%	-0.6%	-3.3%	-1.3%	-1.0%	0.10%	-7.6%	-0.7%	-5.3%	-1.2%	-1.3%	0.00%
MeatLstk	7.30%	0.20%	-18.0%	-4.9%	0.80%	0.00%	8.20%	0.10%	-16.3%	-4.8%	1.00%	0.00%
Forestry	-4.6%	-1.4%	-0.4%	3.40%	-2.3%	0.00%	-5.3%	-1.5%	0.10%	4.00%	-2.8%	0.00%
Fishing	3.00%	-0.2%	2.50%	-0.4%	1.50%	0.00%	3.40%	-0.2%	2.30%	-0.4%	1.40%	0.00%
Mining	1.60%	-1.7%	58.00%	-0.9%	0.10%	-0.2%	2.00%	-1.8%	57.20%	-0.8%	0.50%	-0.2%
ProcFood	-3.0%	-1.2%	-2.6%	-7.2%	0.90%	0.00%	-3.6%	-1.2%	-3.2%	-7.3%	1.00%	0.00%
TextWapp	0.80%	-3.7%	-21.8%	0.40%	11.90%	0.00%	0.80%	-3.8%	-27.3%	0.00%	12.30%	0.00%
LightMnfc	-1.7%	-0.9%	4.30%	5.60%	2.10%	-0.1%	-2.5%	-0.9%	6.70%	6.10%	2.10%	-0.1%
HeavyMnfc	-7.1%	0.10%	14.80%	0.90%	-12.2%	0.10%	-8.0%	0.00%	14.10%	2.90%	-13.9%	0.10%
Util_Cons	8.00%	2.90%	12.90%	11.20%	2.80%	0.00%	8.80%	3.00%	13.50%	11.40%	3.10%	0.00%
TransNec	2.10%	-0.7%	-4.7%	-4.5%	4.50%	0.00%	2.50%	-0.7%	-5.9%	-4.5%	5.00%	0.00%
SeaTrans	4.60%	-2.8%	-9.4%	-0.8%	8.00%	0.00%	5.40%	-2.8%	-11.1%	-0.8%	9.00%	0.00%
AirTrans	4.90%	-5.4%	-5.5%	-6.6%	7.90%	0.00%	5.70%	-5.5%	-6.6%	-6.7%	8.80%	-0.1%
TransComm	-4.8%	0.40%	5.80%	-1.6%	0.80%	0.00%	-5.3%	0.40%	6.10%	-1.6%	1.00%	0.00%
OthServices	0.20%	-0.1%	3.10%	0.60%	1.10%	0.00%	0.50%	-0.1%	3.50%	0.60%	1.40%	0.00%
Total	13.30%	-13.4%	58.60%	10.00%	31.40%	-0.1%	15.00%	-13.8%	51.90%	13.10%	33.60%	-0.1%
Scenario 3												
Industry	Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China	Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China
Grains	-3.4%	-1.8%	4.90%	-0.2%	1.10%	0.00%	-3.7%	-1.8%	5.10%	-0.2%	1.30%	0.00%
VegfFruit	0.40%	-0.3%	0.50%	0.40%	-1.7%	0.00%	0.50%	-0.4%	0.70%	0.60%	-1.9%	0.00%
OthCrops	-6.9%	-0.6%	-3.3%	-1.3%	-1.0%	0.10%	-7.6%	-0.7%	-5.3%	-1.2%	-1.3%	0.00%
MeatLstk	7.30%	0.20%	-18.0%	-4.9%	0.80%	0.00%	8.20%	0.10%	-16.3%	-4.8%	1.00%	0.00%
Forestry	-4.6%	-1.4%	-0.4%	3.40%	-2.3%	0.00%	-5.3%	-1.5%	0.10%	4.00%	-2.8%	0.00%
Fishing	3.00%	-0.2%	2.50%	-0.4%	1.50%	0.00%	3.40%	-0.2%	2.30%	-0.4%	1.40%	0.00%
Mining	1.60%	-1.7%	58.00%	-0.9%	0.10%	-0.2%	2.00%	-1.8%	57.20%	-0.8%	0.50%	-0.2%
ProcFood	-3.0%	-1.2%	-2.6%	-7.2%	0.90%	0.00%	-3.6%	-1.2%	-3.2%	-7.3%	1.00%	0.00%
TextWapp	0.80%	-3.7%	-21.8%	0.40%	11.90%	0.00%	0.80%	-3.8%	-27.3%	0.00%	12.30%	0.00%
LightMnfc	-1.7%	-0.9%	4.30%	5.60%	2.10%	-0.1%	-2.5%	-0.9%	6.70%	6.10%	2.10%	-0.1%
HeavyMnfc	-7.1%	0.10%	14.80%	0.90%	-12.2%	0.10%	-8.0%	0.00%	14.10%	2.90%	-13.9%	0.10%
Util_Cons	8.00%	2.90%	12.90%	11.20%	2.80%	0.00%	8.80%	3.00%	13.50%	11.40%	3.10%	0.00%
TransNec	2.10%	-0.7%	-4.7%	-4.5%	4.50%	0.00%	2.50%	-0.7%	-5.9%	-4.5%	5.00%	0.00%
SeaTrans	4.60%	-2.8%	-9.4%	-0.8%	8.00%	0.00%	5.40%	-2.8%	-11.1%	-0.8%	9.00%	0.00%
AirTrans	4.90%	-5.4%	-5.5%	-6.6%	7.90%	0.00%	5.70%	-5.5%	-6.6%	-6.7%	8.80%	-0.1%
TransComm	-4.8%	0.40%	5.80%	-1.6%	0.80%	0.00%	-5.3%	0.40%	6.10%	-1.6%	1.00%	0.00%
OthServices	0.20%	-0.1%	3.10%	0.60%	1.10%	0.00%	0.50%	-0.1%	3.50%	0.60%	1.40%	0.00%
Total	13.30%	-13.4%	58.60%	10.00%	31.40%	-0.1%	15.00%	-13.8%	51.90%	13.10%	33.60%	-0.1%
Scenario 4												
Industry	Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China	Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China
Grains	-3.4%	-1.8%	4.90%	-0.2%	1.10%	0.00%	-3.7%	-1.8%	5.10%	-0.2%	1.30%	0.00%
VegfFruit	0.40%	-0.3%	0.50%	0.40%	-1.7%	0.00%	0.50%	-0.4%	0.70%	0.60%	-1.9%	0.00%
OthCrops	-6.9%	-0.6%	-3.3%	-1.3%	-1.0%	0.10%	-7.6%	-0.7%	-5.3%	-1.2%	-1.3%	0.00%
MeatLstk	7.30%	0.20%	-18.0%	-4.9%	0.80%	0.00%	8.20%	0.10%	-16.3%	-4.8%	1.00%	0.00%
Forestry	-4.6%	-1.4%	-0.4%	3.40%	-2.3%	0.00%	-5.3%	-1.5%	0.10%	4.00%	-2.8%	0.00%
Fishing	3.00%	-0.2%	2.50%	-0.4%	1.50%	0.00%	3.40%	-0.2%	2.30%	-0.4%	1.40%	0.00%
Mining	1.60%	-1.7%	58.00%	-0.9%	0.10%	-0.2%	2.00%	-1.8%	57.20%	-0.8%	0.50%	-0.2%
ProcFood	-3.0%	-1.2%	-2.6%	-7.2%	0.90%	0.00%	-3.6%	-1.2%	-3.2%	-7.3%	1.00%	0.00%
TextWapp	0.80%	-3.7%	-21.8%	0.40%	11.90%	0.00%	0.80%	-3.8%	-27.3%	0.00%	12.30%	0.00%
LightMnfc	-1.7%	-0.9%	4.30%	5.60%	2.10%	-0.1%	-2.5%	-0.9%	6.70%	6.10%	2.10%	-0.1%
HeavyMnfc	-7.1%	0.10%	14.80%	0.90%	-12.2%	0.10%	-8.0%	0.00%	14.10%	2.90%	-13.9%	0.10%
Util_Cons	8.00%	2.90%	12.90%	11.20%	2.80%	0.00%	8.80%	3.00%	13.50%	11.40%	3.10%	0.00%
TransNec	2.10%	-0.7%	-4.7%	-4.5%	4.50%	0.00%	2.50%	-0.7%	-5.9%	-4.5%	5.00%	0.00%
SeaTrans	4.60%	-2.8%	-9.4%	-0.8%	8.00%	0.00%	5.40%	-2.8%	-11.1%	-0.8%	9.00%	0.00%
AirTrans	4.90%	-5.4%	-5.5%	-6.6%	7.90%	0.00%	5.70%	-5.5%	-6.6%	-6.7%	8.80%	-0.1%
TransComm	-4.8%	0.40%	5.80%	-1.6%	0.80%	0.00%	-5.3%	0.40%	6.10%	-1.6%	1.00%	0.00%
OthServices	0.20%	-0.1%	3.10%	0.60%	1.10%	0.00%	0.50%	-0.1%	3.50%	0.60%	1.40%	0.00%
Total	13.30%	-13.4%	58.60%	10.00%	31.40%	-0.1%	15.00%	-13.8%	51.90%	13.10%	33.60%	-0.1%

Note: The definitions of industries are shown in Appendix 2.

**TABLE 7: Estimated output in the baseline scenario in 2020 (million USD)**

Industry	Vietnam	Thailand	Lao PDR	Cambodia	Myanmar	China
Grains	7,607	14,872	1,104	765	3,424	156,266
VegtFrut	2,319	6,740	397	238	1,478	213,764
OthCrops	2,150	3,923	51	218	99	28,347
MeatLstk	7,130	12,291	795	825	177	306,143
Forestry	1,716	916	262	148	861	78,073
Fishing	2,398	4,388	202	403	185	71,064
Mining	10,157	8,379	58	219	1,557	365,454
ProcFood	9,207	26,236	876	708	2,263	296,166
TextWapp	15,822	25,107	252	3,771	1,043	598,189
LightMnfc	35,070	70,691	354	1,480	699	1,438,663
HeavyMnfc	36,189	149,922	222	983	1,234	4,198,019
Util_Cons	22,369	77,971	476	1,063	1,916	926,502
TransNec	1,469	23,856	227	513	38	309,643
SeaTrans	1,224	3,148	33	121	87	146,264
AirTrans	1,546	5,876	50	425	102	38,444
TransComm	4,107	67,629	394	1,124	379	962,981
OthServices	22,504	119,801	1,032	2,222	2,078	1,693,279
Total	182,982	621,746	6,786	15,226	17,621	11,827,259

Note: The definitions of industries are shown in Appendix 2.

1

2 **CONCLUSIONS**

3 This paper analyzed the impact of the GMS transportation projects on the local economy, including that of the  
4 landlocked country Lao PDR. The results show that they will surely accelerate the development of Lao PDR and  
5 the other GMS members by enhancing economic integration among them. The results indicate that the economic  
6 growth in Lao PDR is particularly significant. This means that the international transportation projects will help  
7 this landlocked country overcome its geographical barriers. More imports become available in Lao PDR because  
8 the market price of imports decreases, both from other GMS members and from the rest of the world. This  
9 enhances production and consumption in the country. In addition, the exports from Lao PDR become more  
10 competitive in foreign markets due to the reductions in time and cost. The results also show that the grain and  
11 mining industries in Lao PDR will be particularly developed. As transportation within the GMS improves more  
12 drastically than transportation between the GMS and the rest of the world, Lao PDR will shift their exports from  
13 the rest of the world to other GMS members. The increase in sales to other GMS members supports GDP  
14 growth in the country.

15 However, there is still room for improvement in this research. First, although the model in this paper  
16 examined the impact of the reduction in transportation time and cost, the impact of other factors including  
17 punctuality and/or reliability of international trade may also be significant. Asian Development Bank (18, 19)  
18 point out that one of the problems with the GMS transportation is unreliability. The GMS transportation projects  
19 are expected to enhance the punctuality of freight transportation in the GMS in addition to reducing  
20 transportation time. The impact of improving punctuality should be evaluated. Second, although this paper  
21 analyzed the impact on international trade, it does not cover the impact of the GMS transportation projects on  
22 domestic transportation. As the domestic transportation industries sell their services to the international  
23 transportation sector, the improvement of international transportation has an indirect impact on the domestic  
24 transportation sector in addition to the international transportation sector. This impact should also be covered.  
25 Third, the reduction in transportation time and cost of the trade between China and other GMS members may be  
26 overestimated. Although China is a member of the GMS, only Yunnan Province and Guangxi Zhuang  
27 Autonomous Region in China have projects that are part of the GMS program. Our analysis assumes that the  
28 GMS transportation projects have an impact on the whole of China for the sake of analytical simplicity. This  
29 assumption should be reexamined. Finally, this analysis does not cover the expected negative impact on Lao  
30 PDR. JICA and ALMEC (20) point out that the transportation projects may additionally have a negative impact  
31 on the country through the increase of through-traffic flows, resulting in more traffic accidents and traffic noise.  
32 Although these external effects are not reflected in the analysis of this paper, they should be examined.

33

34

## 1 APPENDIX 1: AGGREGATION OF REGIONS

TABLE 8: Aggregation of Regions

Code	Aggregated regions	Original GTAP regions
jpn	Japan	Japan
kor	Korea	Korea
hkg	Hong Kong	Hong Kong
prc	China	China
twm	Taiwan	Taiwan
xea	Rest of East Asia	Rest of East Asia
phl	Philippines	Philippines
vnm	Vietnam	Viet Nam
tha	Thailand	Thailand
mys	Malaysia	Malaysia
sgp	Singapore	Singapore
idn	Indonesia	Indonesia
lao	Lao PDR	Lao People's Democratic Republic
cmb	Cambodia	Cambodia
mmr	Myanmar	Myanmar
xse	Rest of SEA	Rest of Southeast Asia
bgd	Bangladesh	Bangladesh
ind	India	India
lka	Sri Lanka	Sri Lanka
xsa	Rest of South Asia	Pakistan, Rest of South Asia
xme	Middle East	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Iran Islamic Republic of, Turkey, Rest of Western Asia
med	Mediterranean	Cyprus, Greece, Italy, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Egypt, Morocco, Tunisia, Rest of North Africa
eur	Europe	Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Slovakia, Sweden, United Kingdom, Switzerland, Norway, Rest of EFTA, Albania, Bulgaria, Belarus, Croatia, Romania, Rest of Europe
rus	Russia	Russian Federation
xsu	Former Soviet	Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Rest of Eastern Europe, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Rest of Former Soviet Union
afr	Africa	Nigeria, Senegal, Rest of Western Africa, Central Africa, South Central Africa, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Rest of Eastern Africa, Botswana, South Africa, Rest of South African Customs
usa	United States	United States of America
can	Canada	Canada
mex	Mexico	Mexico
xna	Rest of North America	Rest of North America
xcm	Central America	Costa Rica, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, Rest of Central America, Caribbean
per	Peru	Peru
chl	Chile	Chile
xap	Rest of West of South America	Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador
sae	East of South America	Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Venezuela, Rest of South America
aus	Australia	Australia
nzl	New Zealand	New Zealand
xoc	Rest of Oceania	Rest of Oceania

1 **APPENDIX 2: AGGREGATION OF COMODITIES****TABLE 9: Aggregation of Commodities**

No.	Aggregated commodities	Original GTAP commodities
1	Grains	Paddy rice, Wheat, Cereal grains nec, Oil seeds, Sugar cane, Sugar beet, Processed rice
2	Vegetables and Fruit	Vegetables, Fruit, Nuts
3	Other Crops	Plant-based fibers, Crops nec
4	Livestock and Meat Products	Cattle, Sheep, Goats, Horses, Animal products nec, Raw milk, Wool, Silk-worm cocoons, Meat: Cattle, Sheep, Goats, Horse, Meat products nec
5	Forestry	Forestry
6	Fishing	Fishing
7	Coal Oil Gas Mineral	Coal, Oil, Gas, Minerals nec
8	Processed Food	Vegetable oils and fats, Dairy products, Sugar, Food products nec, Beverages and tobacco products
9	Textiles and Clothing	Textiles, Wearing apparel
10	Light Manufacturing	Leather products, Wood products, Paper products, Publishing, Metal products, Motor vehicles and parts, Transport equipment nec, Manufactures nec
11	Heavy Manufacturing	Petroleum, Coal products, Chemical, Rubber, Plastic prods, Mineral products nec, Ferrous metals, Metals nec, Electronic equipment, Machinery and equipment nec
12	Utilities and Construction	Electricity, Gas manufacture, distribution, Water, Construction
13	Transport nec	Transport nec
14	Sea Transport	Sea transport
15	Air Transport	Air transport
16	Trade and Communication	Trade, Communication
17	Other Services	Financial services nec, Insurance, Business services nec, Recreation and other services, PubAdmin/Defence/Health/Educat, Dwellings

2

3 **REFERENCES**

- 4 1. Sachs, J. and A. Warner. Fundamental Sources of Long-run Growth. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 87,
- 5 No. 2, 1997, pp. 184–188.
- 6 2. Gallup, J. L., J. D. Sachs, and A. D. Mellinger. Geography and Economic Development. *International*
- 7 *Regional Science Review*, Vol. 22, No.2, 1999, pp.179–232.
- 8 3. World Bank. *World Development Report 2009: Reshaping Economic Geography*, 2009.
- 9 4. Stone, S. and A. Strutt. Transport Infrastructure and Trade Facilitation in the Greater Mekong Subregion.
- 10 *ADB Working Paper Series*, No. 130, 2009.
- 11 5. Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism, Japan. Forecast Results of Future Throughput of
- 12 Ports, Documents distributed at the 10th Meeting of Port Sub-Committee, Transport Policy Committee of
- 13 Japan, 2004.
- 14 6. Hertel, T. W. *Global Trade Analysis: Modeling and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, New York,
- 15 1997.
- 16 7. Samuelson, P. The Transfer Problem and Transport Costs: The Terms of Trade When Impediments Are
- 17 Absent. *Economic Journal*, Vol.62, 1952, pp.278–304.
- 18 8. OECD. *Quantitative Assessments of the Benefits of Trade Facilitation*. TD/TC/WP (2003), 31/FINAL, 2003.
- 19 9. Shibasaki, R., H. Onodera, and T. Watanabe. Forecasting the Future Amount of Trade and Maritime
- 20 Container Cargo based on International Economic Scenario, A paper presented at the 3rd International
- 21 Conference on Transportation Logistics, Fukuoka, Japan, September 2010.
- 22 10. United Nations. *World Population Prospects: The 2006 Revision*, 2007.
- 23 11. Council for Economic Planning and Development (CEPD). *Population Projections for Taiwan Areas 2008–*
- 24 *2056*, 2008.

- 1 12. International Monetary Fund. *World Economic Outlook*, 2008.
- 2 13. Nathan Associates. *Toward a Roadmap for Integration of the ASEAN Logistics Sector: Rapid Assessment*  
3 *and Concept Paper*. A paper for review by USAID, Mimeo, 2007.
- 4 14. Hertel, T. W., T. Walmsley, and K. Itakura. Dynamic Effects of the “New Age” Free Trade Agreement  
5 *Between Japan and Singapore*. *Journal of Economic Integration*, Vol. 16, No.4, 2001, pp.446–484.
- 6 15. Minor, P. and M. Tsigas. Impacts of Better Trade Facilitation in Developing Countries: Analysis with a  
7 *New GTAP Database for the Value of Time in Trade*. A paper presented at the GTAP 11th Annual  
8 *Conference*, Helsinki, May 2008.
- 9 16. Hummels, D., M. P. Reisman, and E. Endean. *Calculating Tariff Equivalents for Time in Trade*, Mimeo,  
10 *March 2007*.
- 11 17. World Bank. *Doing Business Database 2009*, 2008.
- 12 18. Asian Development Bank. *Sharing Growth and Prosperity: A Strategy and Action Plan for the Southern*  
13 *Economic Corridor*. Background document for Governor Forum in the 2nd GMS Economic Corridors  
14 *Forum*, September 2009.
- 15 19. Asian Development Bank. *East-West Economic Corridor (EWEC) Strategy and Action Plan*. Background  
16 *Document for Governor Forum in the 2nd GMS Economic Corridors Forum*, May 2009.
- 17 20. JICA and ALMEC Corporation. *The Research on the Cross-border Transportation Infrastructure: Phase 2,*  
18 *Final Report*. December 2007.