Library Progress International *Print version ISSN 0970 1052*
Vol.43, No.2, Jul-Dec 2023: P. 2201-2208 *Online version ISSN 2320 317X*

Original Article *Available online at www.bpasjournals.com*

Risk-Driven Capital Investment Strategies In The Coal Mining Sector: A Fuzzy Ahp Perspective

Akankika Tripathy[1] and Debendra Kumar Mahalik[2]

[1] Doctoral Scholar and [2]Professor, Department of Business Administration, Sambalpur University, Odisha, 768019
[1]akankika@suniv.ac.in and [2]dkmahalik@suniv.ac.in

How to cite this article: Akankika Tripathy and Debendra Kumar Mahalik (2024). Risk-Driven Capital Investment Strategies In The Coal Mining Sector: A Fuzzy Ahp Perspective, 43(2), 2201-2208

ABSTRACT

Purpose*: Coal mining industry plays a pivotal role in structuring the country's economy and are associated with inherent risk and volatility that impact the operational and financial efficiency of this industry. So, considering these associated risk factor. the primary objective of this study to identify the nature of these risk and to evaluate their proportional effect on the capital decision making process using the Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process (Fuzzy AHP). Given the capital-intensive and high-risk nature of coal mining, a systematic approach to risk evaluation is essential for sustainable operations and informed decision-making.*

Methodology: *In order to study the risk factor in mining operations a case study of Mahanadi Coalfield Ltd, a coal producing subsidiary of CIL has been taken into consideration. Moreover, to address the uncertainty and subjectivity in the prospectives of experts, a structured framework of Fuzzy AHP has been implemented to the capital investment process. Key risk factors are identified and categorized into Preliminary Survey, Exploration, and Feasibility Study risks, mine Development & Operation-Production risk, product Marketing & Sales and Financial Management risk, Post-Mine Closures risks. Data is collected through expert surveys, and fuzzy logic is applied to derive the relative importance of each risk factor.*

Findings*: The study reveals that environmental and regulatory risks are the most significant, followed by operational hazards, emphasizing the need for proactive mitigation measures. The fuzzy approach provides nuanced insights into risk prioritization, offering a clearer understanding of the complex interdependencies between risk factors.*

Research Limitations*: The findings are based on expert opinions fand may be context-specific to the coal mining industry and generalized based on the prospective of a single company. These methodologies could be applied not only to the mining industry but also to any such resource intensive industry in future researches for broader prospectives.*

Practical Implications*: This study will facilitate a tool for decision maker with comprehensive consideration and prioritization of risk and uncertainty, with significant alignment with strategic objectives and sustainability goals. The framework provides for better allocation of resources and planning for risk mitigation.*

Originality Value*: The combine approach of fuzzy logic with AHP provides a novel approach to address the uncertainty in risk analysis, and hereby enhance the reliability and adaptability of the present findings for the coal mining sector. The study contributes to the literature on risk management in capital-intensive*

industries, bridging the gap between theory and practice.
Keywords: *Coal mining sector, capital investment decision, Risk, Fuzzy AHP*

INTRODUCTION

Coal remains the backbone of India's energy sector, supplying over three-quarters of the country's electricity needs. Despite rapid advancements in renewable energy, coal still plays a dominant role in power generation (Maguire, 2025). However, recent trends indicate a gradual structural shift, with coal's share in installed capacity dropping below 50% for the first time in over six decades (Press Trust of India, 2024). In this evolving energy landscape, investments in coal mining must navigate increasing complexities, making risk-informed capital decision-making more critical than ever.

The coal mining industry faces a wide array of risks ranging from geological uncertainties and environmental regulations to market volatility and post-operational obligations. These risks often extend across the entire project lifecycle, from preliminary surveys to post-closure reclamation.

Traditional investment appraisal methods, such as Net Present Value (NPV) and Internal Rate of Return (IRR), often fail to capture the full spectrum of qualitative and uncertain risk factors associated with coal mining. In response, researchers have increasingly turned to multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) approaches specifically the Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process (FAHP)—to incorporate expert judgment under uncertainty (Kursunoglu, 2024). FAHP combines the strength of hierarchical decision structures with fuzzy logic, allowing for the inclusion of subjective assessments where precise data is either unavailable or insufficient.

As a key subsidiary of Coal India Limited (CIL), Mahanadi Coalfields Limited (MCL) plays a crucial role in supporting India's coal production and energy security. With operations primarily based in Odisha, MCL contributes significantly to the country's power supply through the excavation and distribution of thermal coal. In this context, the present study explores capital investment strategies at MCL through the lens of FAHP. The case study focuses on identifying and prioritizing key risk factors across various phases of mining operations, including preliminary survey and feasibility risks, development and operational risks, marketing and financial risks, and post-closure responsibilities. Data was gathered through expert surveys involving MCL managers, geologists, financial planners, and environmental officers. The resulting fuzzy pairwise comparisons were used to construct a risk prioritization framework tailored to MCL's operational realities.

By analysing the risk landscape using FAHP, this study aims to offer a practical, data-supported decision support tool for MCL's leadership. This framework enhances the objectivity of investment decisions, ensuring that resource allocation aligns with both strategic goals and long-term sustainability imperatives. Furthermore, the case study contributes to the broader academic and industrial discourse by demonstrating how structured decision-making models can be effectively applied in capital-intensive sectors facing multidimensional risk challenges.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Decision-making in capital investments especially within sectors characterized by complexity and uncertainty often requires evaluating both quantitative and qualitative criteria. This is particularly true in the mining industry, where long-term commitments and unpredictable external variables make the process more challenging. The difficulty lies in quantifying the effects of non-financial factors such as quality improvements, environmental compliance, and responsiveness to market dynamics, all of which may influence future returns (Franz et al., 1995; Kaplan, 1986; Sutardi et al., 1995; Tang, 2003).

To address this, a number of methodological tools have been developed to structure and support managerial decision-making under uncertainty. These include the Conjoint Weighting (CW) method (Wang, 1997), the widely recognized Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) (Saaty, 1980), and more recent adaptations like the Java-AHP model (Zhu & Dale, 2001) and the Randomized Expert Panel Opinion Marginalizing Procedure (Tenekedjiev et al., 2004). Among them, AHP stands out due to its ability to break down complex problems into structured hierarchies. However, traditional AHP has limitations when dealing with vagueness or hesitation in expert judgments. To overcome this, the Fuzzy AHP (FAHP) model was introduced by (Laarhoven & Pedrycz, 1983), incorporating fuzzy set theory to better reflect human reasoning by using triangular fuzzy numbers (TFNs). Since then, the FAHP approach has been applied across various disciplines, including spatial planning (Wu et al., 2004), decision-making under uncertainty (Mikhailov, 2003), and resource allocation (Hsieh et al., 2004; Buckley et al., 2001).

The specific method employed in this study is the synthetic extent analysis approach, proposed by Chang (1996) and applied in subsequent works (Bozdağ et al., 2003; Zhu, 1999). This technique allows for fuzzy representation of pairwise comparisons, providing a more realistic assessment of subjective evaluations. It applies triangular membership functions to capture the imprecision embedded in expert inputs, a practice that has been refined over time (Chiou & Tzeng, 2001; Sohn et al., 2001; Cheng et al., 1999; Deng, 1999).

RISK CATEGORIZATION ACROSS MINING PHASES

The mining industry is inherently capital-intensive, involving substantial initial and ongoing investments in infrastructure, equipment, and environmental safeguards. It also faces multifaceted risks at each stage of its value chain. These risks are not only financial but also operational, environmental, and social in nature. As such, an effective risk assessment framework must capture these interrelated dimensions. Drawing upon expert consultation and industry guidance (Tura Consulting, 2023), the key risk categories are structured according to the phases of a mining project as follows:

A. Preliminary Survey, Exploration, and Feasibility Risks

- **R1: Geological Uncertainty –** Incomplete or inaccurate geological data may lead to mis judgments in resource estimation.
- **R2: Techno-Economic Evaluation Risk –** Mistakes in cost forecasting and mine planning may compromise project viability.
- **R3: Regulatory Risk –** Early-stage compliance challenges with environmental and land-use regulations may delay approvals.
- **R4: Environmental Impact Risk –** Potential harm to ecosystems or surrounding communities must be anticipated from the beginning.

B. Mine Development and Operations

- **R5: Production and Engineering Risk –** Equipment breakdowns and process inefficiencies increase operational exposure.
- **R6: Technology Obsolescence –** Rapid changes in mining technologies may render existing systems outdated.
- **R7: Occupational Safety Risk –** High-risk working conditions demand rigorous safety protocols.
- **R8: Environmental Compliance during Operations –** Operational phases must meet stringent environmental benchmarks.

C. Social, Political, and Regulatory Risks

- **R9: Reputational Risk –** Negative media attention or community conflict can harm public image.
- **R10: Political/Regulatory Instability –** Changes in local policies or governance can unpredictably impact project continuity.

D. Marketing, Sales, and Financial Risks

- **R11: Commodity Price Volatility –** Fluctuations in global coal prices directly influence revenue streams.
- **R12: Market Demand Shifts –** Changes in customer preferences or competitor dynamics pose business risks.
- **R13: Financial Management Risk –** Budget overruns and foreign exchange fluctuations can jeopardize financial stability.

E. Post-Mining Closure Risks

- **R14: Closure & Rehabilitation Risk –** Inadequate post-mine care can lead to ecological damage and legal liabilities.

- **R15: Ongoing Regulatory Compliance –** Even after operations cease, companies must fulfil long-term compliance obligations.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The overarching goal of this study is to establish a robust risk prioritization framework for capital investment decisions in coal mining, using the FAHP methodology. Specifically, the objectives include identifying and classifying risk factors across different mining phases, evaluating their relative severity using fuzzy logic, integrating expert judgment to address subjectivity in assessments and assigning priority weights to each risk to support managerial decision-making.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Fuzzy Logic

Originally introduced by Lotfi Zadeh in 1965, fuzzy logic is a mathematical framework that enables reasoning under conditions of uncertainty and imprecision. Unlike traditional binary logic that operates with crisp values either true or false fuzzy logic allows for partial truths, representing data in degrees ranging from 0 to 1. This approach enables elements to partially belong to multiple sets, which makes it especially valuable in modelling systems where information is vague or ambiguous.

Fuzzy logic utilizes linguistic descriptors such as "low," "moderate," or "high," along with rule-based structures (e.g., if-then rules), to emulate human-like reasoning processes. This capability to manage ambiguity has made fuzzy logic a preferred technique in a variety of domains, including decision-support systems, control engineering, intelligent systems, and environmental impact assessment. Its strength lies in its adaptability and effectiveness in situations where data is incomplete, imprecise, or qualitatively described.

Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process (Fuzzy AHP)

Fuzzy AHP represents an enhancement of the classical Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), developed to better accommodate uncertainty and vagueness in decision-making inputs. It retains AHP's hierarchical structuring of complex problems but introduces fuzzy numbers—typically triangular fuzzy numbers (TFNs) to model the pairwise comparison judgments of decision-makers more realistically.

In Fuzzy AHP, elements at each level of the hierarchy are compared with respect to their influence on a higher-level criterion. These comparisons are based on linguistic assessments (e.g., "slightly more important," "significantly less important"), which are then translated into TFNs expressed as a triplet (l, m, u), where l denotes the lower bound, m the most probable value, and u the upper bound. These fuzzy comparisons are aggregated to compute fuzzy weights using methods such as Chang's extent analysis or the fuzzy geometric mean method.

To facilitate interpretation, the fuzzy weights are then transformed into crisp values through defuzzification techniques such as the centroid method or the mean of maximum approach—allowing for clear prioritization. The resulting crisp scores are normalized to ensure comparability. An important step in this process is verifying the consistency of the pairwise comparisons by calculating a Consistency Ratio (CR). If CR exceeds the acceptable threshold (typically 0.1), the comparisons are revisited to improve coherence. Once validated, the final weights are used to rank alternatives, thereby identifying the most critical elements in the decision-making context.

Application of the Method

In the current study, the integration of fuzzy logic with AHP has been employed to assess the relative severity and importance of risks associated with different phases of mining operations. This approach allows for a structured evaluation of how these risks influence capital investment decisions. Expert elicitation was conducted to gather subjective judgments on the relative impact of each identified risk, and these inputs were represented using triangular fuzzy numbers to reflect uncertainty and variability in expert opinions.

Subsequently, fuzzy pairwise comparison matrices were constructed and processed to derive fuzzy weights. These were then defuzzified to obtain crisp values, which facilitated direct comparison and prioritization of the risks.

This methodology ensures that the imprecise nature of human judgment is systematically captured and quantified, enabling a more accurate and insightful evaluation of which risk factors warrant the greatest attention in strategic investment planning within the mining sector.

RESULTS AND STRATEGIC RISK PRIORITIZATION USING FUZZY AHP

Table 1: Fuzzy matrix:

Risks	Fuzzy Weights			Defuzzied weights	Rank
R1	1.581895	1.383469	1.44225	0.082107	5
R2	1.07599	1.426362	0.950671	0.064177	9
R3	0.68019	0.913436	0.603606	0.040838	13
R4	0.947373	1.288885	0.961572	0.059563	10
R5	1.110238	1.333534	1.064989	0.065331	8
R6	0.466306	0.506076	0.410567	0.025724	15
R7	1	1.19786	0.922872	0.058069	6
R8	1.93991	2.106672	3.339539	0.139133	1
R9	1.715521	2.120362	1.74874	0.104078	3
R10	1.203025	1.168745	1.444554	0.071427	4
R11	0.52136	0.422259	0.466306	0.026263	14
R12	1.100725	0.781333	1.128763	0.056261	11
R13	0.737647	0.69205	0.5384	0.036511	12
R14	1.933182	1.567876	2.414071	0.110899	2
R15	0.880467	1.162128	1.143767	0.059619	7

The application of the Fuzzy AHP method enables a nuanced prioritization of diverse risk factors influencing capital investment decisions in the coal mining sector. The analysis systematically ranks these risks, offering clear guidance on their relative criticality. Among the evaluated risks, Environmental Management and Mitigation Measures emerged as the most significant, reflecting the increasing emphasis on ecological sustainability and compliance within resource-intensive industries. This prioritization highlights the growing pressure on firms like Mahanadi Coalfields Limited (MCL) to adopt environmentally responsible practices as a prerequisite for operational legitimacy and long-term viability.

Following closely, Closure and Post-Closure Risks and Reputational Risk are ranked second and third, respectively. These findings indicate the strategic necessity for MCL to address legacy issues, land reclamation responsibilities, and public perception to ensure continued community support and alignment with both national and international sustainability benchmarks. Conversely, risks associated with Technology and Equipment and Commodity Market Price Fluctuations occupy lower positions in the ranking. Although still relevant, they are perceived as relatively less critical within the current risk framework likely due to MCL's established technological base and the partial hedging of market risks through policy buffers. Within the broader categories, sub-factors such as Political and Regulatory Risk and Environmental Considerations were observed to carry considerable weight, underscoring their indirect yet substantial influence on project viability and execution. The fuzzy weights derived from the pairwise comparison matrices were defuzzified and normalized, ensuring a consistent, scalable ranking framework. This approach empowers decision-makers to focus on the most pressing risk dimensions and allocate resources accordingly, thus enhancing the robustness and agility of MCL's investment planning framework.

Expert Recommendations for Risk Mitigation

Following the risk prioritization analysis, domain experts at MCL were consulted to develop a comprehensive suite of mitigation strategies tailored to the most critical risk categories.

Given the pre-eminence of Environmental Management and Mitigation Measures, experts emphasized the urgent need to institutionalize advanced environmental safeguards. These include the deployment of real-time air and water quality monitoring systems, dust suppression technologies, and extensive afforestation and land rehabilitation programs. Conducting periodic environmental impact assessments (EIAs) and adopting adaptive mitigation planning are recommended to ensure regulatory alignment and reduce long-term environmental liabilities.

To address Closure and Post-Closure Risks, it is suggested that MCL embed mine closure strategies into the early stages of project planning. This involves the creation of dedicated escrow funds or reclamation bonds, aligned with global best practices in sustainable mine closure. These financial and operational commitments will help MCL ensure land recovery and ecological restoration even after operations cease.

In managing Reputational Risk, the reinforcement of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) initiatives is crucial. Experts advocate for structured community engagement frameworks, participatory planning processes, and transparent reporting practices aligned with Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) indicators. These efforts should be supplemented by social audits and public grievance redressal mechanisms to maintain stakeholder confidence and social legitimacy.

For managing Regulatory and Political Risks, the establishment of a regulatory affairs division is advised. This team would proactively monitor policy developments, maintain continuous engagement with government stakeholders, and ensure full legal compliance across operations. Implementing early-warning systems to detect potential regulatory changes will further safeguard MCL's strategic interests. While Technology-Related Risks are deemed less critical, MCL should nonetheless invest in predictive technologies to enhance operational reliability. These include AI-based exploration tools, 3D geological modelling systems, and automated fault detection systems. Integrating these innovations will not only improve productivity but also mitigate operational delays and failures. To mitigate Operational and Equipment Risks, MCL must enhance its maintenance protocols by adopting predictive maintenance systems and performing third-party equipment audits. In parallel, workforce reskilling programs are necessary to adapt to new technological standards and safety requirements.

On the financial front, tools such as rolling cost forecasts, inflation-adjusted budgeting, and foreign exchange hedging instruments are recommended to manage cost and market risks. A phased approach to technology upgrades—preceded by pilot testing and ROI analysis—will help ensure capital efficiency and future-proofing of operational assets. Finally, continued local community engagement remains essential. By co-developing social infrastructure projects—such as education, health, and water facilities—MCL can deepen community trust, reduce resistance, and reinforce its social license to operate.

CONCLUSION

The integrated application of Fuzzy AHP in this study has provided a data-driven, structured, and participatory framework for risk prioritization in the context of capital investment decisions at Mahanadi Coalfields Limited (MCL). The results emphasize that environmental sustainability, post-operational obligations, and social legitimacy are increasingly central to mining investment strategies. This analysis reveals a significant departure from traditional project evaluation models that tend to emphasize financial and operational metrics while downplaying external and long-term risks. By identifying Environmental, Closure, and Reputational risks as top priorities, this study underscores the necessity for a forward-looking, holistic risk management paradigm at MCL.

Incorporating the expert-derived recommendations provides a comprehensive roadmap for risk mitigation, spanning technological innovation, regulatory engagement, CSR enhancement, and financial resilience. When embedded into strategic planning, this integrated approach not only strengthens investment appraisal processes but also enhances organizational resilience in an industry marked by complexity, uncertainty, and stringent oversight. Ultimately, the proposed risk-sensitive model serves as a valuable tool for guiding sustainable investment decisions, improving stakeholder engagement, and fostering long-term value creation within the Indian coal mining sector.

REFERENCES

1. Bozdağ, C.E., Kahraman,C.,Ruan,D.,Fuzzygroup decision making for selection among computer integrated manufacturing systems, Computers in Industry 51, 2003, 13-29
2. Chang, D.Y., Applications of the extent analysis method on fuzzy AHP, European Journal of Operational Research 95(3), 1996, 649-655.
3. Cheng, C.H., Evaluating weapon systems using ranking fuzzy numbers, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 107, 1999, 25-35.
4. Cheng, C.H., Lin, Y., Evaluating the best main battle tank using fuzzy decision theory with linguistic criteria evaluation, European Journal of Operational Research 142(1), 2002, 174-186.
5. Cheng, C.H., Yang, K.L., Hwang, C.L., Evaluating attack helicopters by AHP based on linguistic variable weight, European Journal of Operational Research 116(2), 1999, 423-435.
6. Chiou, H.K., Tzeng, G.H., Fuzzy hierarchical evaluation with grey relation model of green engineering for industry, International of Fuzzy System 3(3), 2001, 466-475.
7. Deng, H., Multicriteria analysis with fuzzy pairwise comparison, International Journal of Approximate Reasoning 21, 1999, 215-231.
8. Franz, D.P., Duke, J.C., Omer, K., Capital budgeting: development of a decision approach for determining expected value of cash flows, Studies in Managerial and Financial Accounting 3, 1995, 199-211.
9. Kaplan, R.S., Must CIM be justified by faith alone?, Harvard Business Review, 1986, 87-93.
10. Kursunoglu, N. (2024). Fuzzy multi-criteria decision-making framework for controlling methane explosions in coal mines. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 31*, 9045–9061. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-29763-1
11. Lipshitz, R., Strauss, O., Coping with uncertainty: A naturalistic decision-making analysis, Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 69(2), 1997, 149-163.
12. Maguire, G. (2025). India's solar boom keeps coal use in check so far in 2025. *Reuters*. https://www.reuters.com/sustainability
13. Mikhailov, L., Deriving priorities from fuzzy pairwise comparison judgements, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 134, 2003, 365-385.
14. Saaty, T.L., The Analytical Hierarchy Process, McGraw Hill, New York, 1980.
15. Sohn, K.Y., Yang, J.W., Kang, C.S., Assimilation of public opinions in nuclear decision-making using risk perception, Energy 28, 2001, 553- 563.
16. Sutardi, C.R., Bector, Goulter, I., Multi-objective water resources investment planning under budgetary uncertainty and fuzzy environment, European Journal of Operational Research 82(3), 1995, 556-591.
17. Tang, Y.C., Developing the Application of the Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process to Group Decision-Making: A Capital Investment Case Study, Thesis, Cardiff University Business School, UK, 2003.
18. Tenekedjiev, K., Kamenova, S., Nikolova, N., Formalized procedure for ranking alternatives in developing environmental programs, Journal of Cleaner Production 12, 2004, 353- 360.
19. van Laarhoven, P.J.M., Pedrycz, W., A fuzzy extensionofSaaty'spriority theory,Fuzzy Sets and Systems 11, 1983, 229-241.
20. Wang, W., Subjective estimation of the delay time distribution in maintenance modeling, European Journal of Operational Research 99(3), 1997, 516-529.
21. Wu, F.G., Lee, Y.J., Lin, M.C., Using the fuzzy analytic hierarchy process on optimum spatial allocation, International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics 33, 2004, 553-569
22. Zhu, X., Dale, A.P., Java AHP: a web-based decision analysis tool for natural resource and environmental management, Environmental Modelling & Software 16, 2001, 251-262.

23. Zhu, K.J., Jing, Y., Chang, D.Y., A discussion on extent analysis method and applications of fuzzy AHP, European Journal of Operational Research 116(3), 1999, 450-456.