

Supplementary materials

Table S-1. Pairwise comparison of sustainability areas

S R	'a' vs 'b'	'a'		'b'		Equal	
		%	Rationalities	%	Rationalities	%	Rationalities
1	Financial vs Social	31 %	For the developing countries, the current need and goal are to deliver more infrastructure. However, budgetary constraints limit the capacity of governments. The approach is to construct infrastructure at the minimum possible cost, giving more importance to financial sustainability.	63 %	The social concerns have a direct impact on the economy so accounting for them would automatically enhance the economic concerns, at least in life cycle terms. Moreover, inclusive economic growth is not possible if the indirect social impacts are ignored.	6%	Referring to the boundary or parameter of preference; interviewees suggested that marginal costs can be spent over the significant social benefits and should not be paying billions of rupees for the benefit of a minority of people.
2	Financial vs Environment	53 %	The environmental concerns can be easily mitigated by making a little compromise on the financial part, however, the environmental performance should never be below the minimum standards. Also, the construction of road infrastructure does not have much impact on the environment, thus can be given a lower preference as it can be easily managed by minor actions such as planting trees along the highways.	47 %	The environment has a direct impact on the local community, thus should not be ignored.	0%	-
3	Social vs Environment	53 %	The environment is mitigatable and has a lesser impact in the case of road construction, thus social must be given more attention.	28 %	The environmental damage has a very immediate and direct impact on the local population, thus should be preferred.	19 %	Both are directly related to the people; hence no compromise should be made on the quality of life of people.

Table S-2. Pairwise comparison of environmental impact categories

SR	'a' vs 'b'	'a'		'b'		Equal	
		%	Rationalities	%	Rationalities	%	Rationalities
1	Ecosystem vs Resources	63%	Impact on the ecosystem may cause severe damages in the form of floods and droughts which have a direct impact on humans and the economic system of countries. Also, the resource consumption is mainly during the construction phase which is very short in the case of roads. Damage to the ecosystem is a global concern and has global impacts as compared to more country-specific resource impacts, thus ecosystem concerns should be preferred.	37%	The excessive consumption of abiotic resources is the main cause of ecosystem damage. One of the interviewees commented that priorities change demographically, particularly for developing countries. Local issues should be a priority; resource consumption is a local issue and ecosystem damage has global implications.	0%	-
2	Resources vs Human Health	16%	Resource consumption is the root cause of human health damages. Consumption of natural resources is the main cause of hazardous emissions, which causes damage to human health. Thus, more attention should be given to resource consumptions.	81%	Resource consumption would have a delayed impact, whereas human health is an immediate issue. Further, there cannot be anything that could be prioritized over human life quality. With improving technological advancement and research, there is a shift towards renewable and more energy-efficient resources day by day. Thus, depletion of natural resources should not be our concern.	3%	-
3	Ecosystem vs Human Health	19%	Referring to the chain of cause and impact in environmental impacts; human health damage is a major resultant of ecosystem damage; if we save the ecosystem, the human health damage can be prevented.	69%	Impact on human health is a direct sort of impact and can be observed immediately, thus should be given more attention. Ecosystems are a global concern and human health is localized damaged, thus, local safety must be ensured first.	13%	Equal considerations should be given to the local and global damages.

Table S-3. Pairwise comparison of social impact categories

SR	'a' vs 'b'	'a'		'b'		Equal	
		%	Rationalities	%	Rationalities	%	Rationalities
1	SER vs HR	59%	Better socioeconomic conditions warrant human rights as well and the main reason for human rights violation is built into an unfavorable socioeconomic environment. Socioeconomic concerns are the primary indicator to check project feasibility which indirectly covers the scope of human rights as well. SER concern is a matter of masses whereas human rights is a matter of individuals.	41%	Human rights cannot be compromised under any circumstances. The law of the land warrants the protection of human rights. Projects violating these rights may face worst scenarios such as protests, stoppage of work, and eventual project abandoning. So, in such a scenario, the socioeconomic condition would suffer even more.	0%	-
2	SER Vs HS	25%	Health and safety is an issue that can be mitigated easily by making some design changes and putting some cost for safety arrangements.	66%	The project should not be constructed if there is any sort of health and safety concern for the user and the local community.	9%	Health and safety should not be compromised, however, should be managed accordingly while delivering a project with good socioeconomic prospects, thus tradeoff should not be considered
3	SER vs CH	47%	For developing countries, luxuries like saving cultural heritage should not be a consideration. To develop infrastructure and promote socioeconomic conditions, cultural heritage can be compromised.	53%	Cultural heritage is not only a national asset but is also of global importance, thus compromising any sort of culturally significant heritage would not be a wise decision, even for a project having a good socioeconomic prospect. Compromising or demolishing any cultural heritage may have severe impacts, such as public protest, legal stays, and delay or abandoning the project. Saving and promoting cultural heritage can be a source of socio-economic benefits.	0%	-
4	SER vs Gov	31%	For bringing good governance, stable socioeconomic conditions are necessary	47%	Good governance would bring positive socioeconomic prospects,	22%	Both are interlinked in a forward and backward manner.
5	SR vs HS	25%	Health and safety can be managed and mitigated however there is no alternative for managing human rights, thus human rights should be considered at the project feasibility level.	41%	There can be no compromise on the life of people. An interviewee commented that the arrangements for health and safety are made for a large group of the population, whereas human rights is an individual matter, thus health and safety should be preferred.	34%	Both the impact categories are for the people and health and safety is also a sort of human right, thus both should be given equal consideration.
6	HR vs CH	19%	Compromising cultural heritage would have many immediate and severe impacts than violating an individual's rights, which can result in the cancellation of projects too.	66%	Cultural heritage is part of human rights and should not be considered a priority for developing countries.	16%	The sensitivity of cultural heritage is a contextual matter, it can be a very serious issue in some projects, or it may be an easier compromise, also, it depends on the type and extent of the heritage itself. On the other hand, there can be no other view

							that human rights supersede all other impacts. Thus, they prefer giving equal weight to both of the impact categories.
7	HR vs Gov	50%	Human rights are a basic right of the people so can't be compromised, also governance has a larger scope.	50%	The key to improve human rights is to improve the governance, thus they prioritized the governance over human rights	0%	-
8	HS vs CH	78%	Health and safety is a basic human right and cannot be compromised at any cost. Also, health and safety are about the present and future, in contrast, cultural heritage is about the past. Thus, developing nations cannot afford the luxuries of prioritizing and glorification of matters in past.	6%	-	16%	No compromise or tradeoff is possible. Both the impacts have their contextual importance.
9	SH vs Gov	50%	The safety of people is a basic human right thus should not be compromised at any cost.	31%	Good governance would govern the health and safety of the society	19%	Considering the larger scope of governance and depth of the impact on health and safety
10	CH vs Gov	25%	Compromise on cultural heritage is not an option, cultural heritage is not just a historical asset, it's also about human rights and sometimes it becomes a matter of religious sentiments of people.	56%	In longer terms, good governance can compensate and manage the worst impacts created in response to cultural heritage compromise. Compromise over the cultural heritage for sake of security and law in order like governance issue is justified. A project with positive prospects on governance is worth enough to compromise any cultural assets in its way because developing countries should focus on the future, not the past.	19%	Both are contextually significant and scenario-specific and compromise is inevitable on any of the options. Also, there are no normative aspects to establish a trade-off between them.