Cost of Conflict Calculation Worksheet

The Chapter 2 formula as a working instrument: direct, indirect and opportunity costs, the mechanism investment comparison that yields the ratio, and the worked example of the three-week blockade.

From *Grievance Mechanisms That Work: Designing and Operating Effective Non-Judicial Remedies* · Thomas Gaultier · thomasgaultier.com/resources/gmtw

This worksheet operationalizes the Cost of Conflict formula introduced in Chapter 2. Use it to quantify financial exposure from unresolved community and stakeholder disputes and to build the business case for an effective operational grievance mechanism (OGM). Apply it prospectively (estimating potential costs) or retrospectively (calculating actual costs from past incidents).

STANDARDS REFERENCE

Research by Davis and Franks (Harvard Kennedy School, 2014) documented that costs of company-community conflict in the extractive sector routinely reach tens of millions of dollars per incident. The Cost of Conflict formula structures this analysis into three categories. The formula provides the financial framework that Chapter 2 uses to justify mechanism investment to executives, boards, and lenders.

The Formula

Total Cost of Conflict = C(direct) + C(indirect) + C(opportunity)

Each component captures a different dimension of financial exposure. Complete each section using actual data for past incidents or conservative estimates for prospective analysis. Where exact figures are unavailable, use ranges and note the basis for the estimate.

Section 1: Direct Costs, C(direct)

Direct costs are expenditures incurred as a direct result of the dispute. They are typically visible in project budgets and financial records.

Cost Category	Description	Amount (US$)
Compensation payments	Payments to affected individuals or communities (financial compensation, in-kind compensation, crop or property damage payments).	
Legal fees and settlements	External legal counsel, litigation costs, court fees, out-of-court settlements, arbitration costs.	
Physical remediation	Environmental clean-up, infrastructure repair, property restoration, water treatment, land rehabilitation.	

Security expenditures	Additional security personnel, equipment, or services deployed in response to community tensions, protests, or threats.	
Consultants and advisors	Mediators, facilitators, community engagement specialists, technical experts engaged to resolve disputes.	
Communication and outreach	Public relations, community information campaigns, media management, stakeholder meetings convened specifically to address the conflict.	
Staff costs	Staff time dedicated to conflict management. Estimate as: hours spent x average hourly cost (including overheads).	
Insurance claims / premiums	Claims filed and premium increases attributable to the conflict or its consequences.	
	Subtotal: C(direct)	

Section 2: Indirect Costs, C(indirect)

Indirect costs are consequences of the conflict that affect the project's operations, reputation, or relationships without appearing as a distinct line item in the project budget. Estimating them requires judgment: be conservative and document assumptions.

Cost Category	Description	Amount (US$)
Operational delays	Production days lost due to blockades, protests, work stoppages, or access restrictions. Calculate as: days lost x daily production value.	
Regulatory delays	Permit delays, license suspensions, or regulatory conditions imposed in response to community opposition or compliance concerns.	
Staff turnover and morale	Costs of recruiting and training replacement staff if conflict leads to resignations. Estimated productivity loss from reduced morale.	
Community relationship damage	Increased difficulty in conducting routine operations (stakeholder engagement, land access, community hiring, environmental monitoring) due to deteriorated trust.	
Reputational impact	Negative media coverage, social media campaigns, NGO reports. Estimated impact on brand value, customer relationships, or investor confidence.	
Lender and investor concerns	Additional due diligence requirements, covenant renegotiations, increased scrutiny from development finance institutions, credit rating implications.	
Government relations	Deteriorated relationships with local or national government. Increased regulatory burden, reduced willingness to grant approvals or renew licenses.	
	Subtotal: C(indirect)	

Section 3: Opportunity Costs, C(opportunity)

Opportunity costs represent the value of business that the organization cannot pursue or capture because of the conflict. They are the most difficult to quantify but often the largest.

Cost Category	Description	Amount (US$)
Lost production	Revenue foregone due to reduced operational capacity, delayed commissioning, or restricted access to resources during the conflict period.	
Expansion or growth foregone	Planned expansion, new permits, or adjacent development that cannot proceed because of community opposition or regulatory barriers created by the conflict.	
Partnership and joint venture impact	Partnerships, joint ventures, or supply agreements that were not formed, were delayed, or were terminated because the conflict increased counterparty risk.	
Capital access restrictions	Higher cost of capital, inability to access specific financing (e.g., Equator Principles banks, DFIs), or dilutive financing terms imposed because of ESG risk assessment.	
Future site access	Reduced ability to access land, water, or other resources for future project phases due to community opposition generated by the current conflict.	
	Subtotal: C(opportunity)	

Section 4: Total Cost and Comparison

Component	Amount (US$)
C(direct)	
C(indirect)	
C(opportunity)	
Total Cost of Conflict	

Section 5: Mechanism Investment Comparison

Compare the total cost of conflict with the annual cost of operating an effective grievance mechanism. This comparison provides the return-on-investment framework for executive and lender audiences.

Investment Category	Description	Annual Cost (US$)
Staffing	Dedicated mechanism staff (Grievance Officers, intake workers, data analysts). Include salary, benefits, and overheads.	
Training	Annual training for mechanism staff, operational managers, and community liaison officers (see Chapter 9, Table 9.2).	

Systems and technology	Case management database, reporting tools, data storage (see Chapter 9, Table 9.1 for maturity-level guidance).	
Mediation and external support	Mediator retainer or per-case fees, external facilitators for consultations or reviews (see Chapter 7).	
Community engagement	Awareness campaigns, feedback sessions, consultation logistics, translation services.	
Monitoring and evaluation	Surveys, community perception assessments, data analysis, external evaluations (see Chapter 8).	
	Total Annual Mechanism Investment	

Cost Ratio: Total Cost of Conflict / Total Annual Mechanism Investment = ________

A ratio greater than 1.0 means the conflict costs more than the mechanism. In the extractive sector, ratios of 10:1 to 50:1 are common for significant disputes: one prevented escalation pays for the mechanism for a decade or more.

PRACTITIONER TIP

When presenting this analysis to executives or boards, lead with the ratio. A statement such as "The water access dispute at Site B cost US$3.6 million in direct and indirect costs. Our annual mechanism budget is US$180,000. One prevented escalation of this type pays for the mechanism for 20 years" is more persuasive than any policy argument. Use Chapter 2 for additional framing of the business case.

Section 6: Assumptions and Limitations

Document all assumptions, data sources, and estimation methods. Note the categories where data was unavailable and estimates were used. This record carries the credibility of the analysis with executives, boards, and lenders.

Key Assumptions	
Data Sources	
Limitations and Caveats	
Prepared By	
Date	
Reviewed By	

WARNING / PITFALL

Do not inflate estimates to make the business case more dramatic. Conservative, well-documented estimates are more credible and more useful than optimistic projections. If the business case requires inflated numbers to justify the mechanism, the mechanism is probably already justified by the conservative estimate, and the inflated version will undermine your credibility with finance teams and lenders who will scrutinize the assumptions.

Appendix D.2: Worked Example: The Three-Week Blockade

This is the case dissected in Chapter 2: a three-week blockade of the main access road at a large copper operation, after months of unresolved water-contamination grievances. The worksheet is completed retrospectively, from the operation's records.

Worksheet Section	Line Item	Amount (US$)
Section 1: C(direct)	Lost production (three weeks of blocked access)	4,200,000
Section 1: C(direct)	Security and logistics	800,000
Section 1: C(direct)	Legal and negotiation fees	350,000
	Subtotal: C(direct)	**5,350,000**
Sections 2 and 3: C(indirect) + C(opportunity)	Government relations damage and six-month expansion-permit delay (conservative combined estimate)	15,000,000
	Total Cost of Conflict	**≈ 20,350,000**
Section 5: Mechanism comparison	Annual mechanism investment: one Grievance Officer, two community liaisons, training, case management database, standing mediation reserve	240,000
	Cost Ratio: Total Cost of Conflict / Annual Mechanism Investment	**≈ 85:1**

Assumptions and limitations, as documented at Section 6: the direct items came from the operation's own systems: production reports, the security budget, the legal department's invoices. The indirect and opportunity items were limited to the two effects that could be conservatively estimated, the damaged government relationship and the permit delay. Excluded entirely, rather than guessed at: reputational and media impact, staff turnover and morale, lender due diligence costs, any increase in the cost of capital, and the long-term damage to community relationships. The true total is therefore higher than US$20.35 million, and the 85:1 ratio is a floor, not a flourish. One classification note: the operation booked lost production as a direct cost because it was immediate and visible in production reports; a prospective analysis may carry it under operational delays (Section 2) or lost production (Section 3) instead. Classification matters less than discipline: count every item once, and document where. Resolution at intake, while the water complaints were still individual grievances rather than a community position, would have cost less than 2% of what the episode consumed.

One prevented escalation pays for the mechanism for a decade.