

Andi Catalin Manea 2113863

by Andi Manea

Submission date: 29-Jul-2023 10:57AM (UTC+0100)

Submission ID: 210831252

File name: 32509_Andi_Manea_Andi_Catalin_Manea_2113863_504309_238506296.docx (20.75K)

Word count: 3161

Character count: 18242

13

Programme: BA in Business Management**Module: Project Management****Module code: LCBB5005****Student name: Andi Catalin Manea****Student id: 2113863****Lecturer name: Essa Bah**

Project 1:

This undertaking includes a huge interest in upgrading our production facilities. The redesigns will improve the functional proficiency, which will prompt yearly reserve funds of \$150,000. These reserve funds will be acknowledged through decreased working expenses and further developed creation abilities.

Project 2:

Project 2 proposes the execution of another customer relationship management (CRM) framework. This framework intends to improve the organization's associations with its current and possible clients. It's supposed to achieve an expansion in consumer loyalty and steadfastness, prompting expanded benefits of \$25,000 each year.

Project 3:

This undertaking includes putting resources into staff preparing and advancement programs. The expected result is a more gifted and effective labor force prompting further developed efficiency and cost investment funds. The task is assessed to result in \$30,000 of reserve funds each year because of diminished blunders, expanded efficiency, and less staff turnover(Viquerat et.al 2022).

Mission and vision of every one of the task

Project 1:

Mission: Our main goal is to improve functional effectiveness and efficiency by redesigning our production facilities, ultimately prompting massive expense investment funds.

Vision: We envision turning into an innovator in our industry, perceived for our effectiveness, efficiency, and imaginative creation techniques(Tian,Liu and Shu,2021).

Project 2:

Mission: Our main goal is to smooth out our client cooperations by executing a state of the art CRM framework, further developing consumer loyalty, and expanding benefits.

Vision: Our vision is to be a client driven association where each communication is customized and consumer loyalty is our essential measurement of progress (Heldman, 2020).

Project 3:

Mission: Our central goal is to put resources into our most important resources, our workers, by giving top-level preparation and advancement programs, in this way helping efficiency and diminishing expenses.

Vision: We seek to cultivate a culture of ceaseless learning and improvement, where our representatives feel esteemed and enabled, prompting a high-performing and steadfast labor force (Lovett, Rasheed and Hou, 2022).

The mission is what you expect to accomplish in the present moment with this undertaking, while the vision is where you see the task in the long haul or its definitive objective.

To survey the three undertakings, we can utilize three monetary techniques and two non-monetary strategies as explained below.

Monetary strategies:

1. **Payback Period:** This technique works out the period inside which the underlying speculation would be recuperated (Tian & Shu 2021).
2. **Profit from Venture (return on initial capital investment):** According to Laplane & Mazzucato (2020), this strategy gives a proportion of the benefit made on an undertaking when contrasted with the expense of the task.
3. **Net Present Value (NPV):** study conducted by Dobrowolski & Drozdowski (2022), found that his strategy considers the time worth of cash and works out the current worth of future incomes of the task.

Non-Monetary strategies:

1. **Multi-Weighted Scoring Model:** Nguyen & Martínez, (2020), point out that this model considers different subjective and quantitative parts of the task. Every measure is relegated a load as indicated by its significance.

2. **Checklist Model:** This model records a bunch of inquiries connected with the venture. Acknowledgment or dismissal of the undertaking depends on the solutions to these inquiries (Norgeot et al 2020).

Calculations:

Project 1

Project cost estimate: \$600.000

Anticipated savings for year: \$150.000 (cash flow)

Payback method:

Payback period = $\$600.000 / \$150.000 = 4$ years

Rate of return = $\$150.000 / \$600.000 \times 100 = 25\%$

Payback period = ²⁵4 years

Return on investment R.O.I

²⁴

Formula = Average Annual Profit x 100% / Initial Investment

Investment: \$600.000

Project Duration: 4 years

Total projected profit: \$360.000

R.O.I = $\$90.000 / \$600.000 \times 100 = 15\%$ / year

R.O.I \$360.000 total profit in 4 years

N.P.V.

Net Present Value

Formula $PV = S / (1 + R/100)^t$ or $S / (1 + r/100)^t$

PV = Present Value is the amount to calculate

S = Future Value or Cash flow of the \$600.000 in 4 years or yearly \$150.000

r = discount rate the 10%

t = time period in years, 4 years

$$YR1:PV = 150000 / (1 + 10/100) = 150000 / 1.10 = 136363.63$$

$$YR2:PV = 136363.63 / 1.10 = 123966.93$$

$$YR3:PV = 123966.93 / 1.10 = 112697.2$$

$$YR4:PV = 112697.2 / 1.10 = 102452$$

$$NPV = PV - \text{INITIAL INVESTMENT}$$

$$NPV = 475479.76 - 600000 = -124520.24$$

Project 2

Project cost estimate: \$50.000

Anticipated savings per year: \$25.000 (cash flow)

Payback method:

Payback period = $50.000 / 25000 = 2$ years

Payback period: 2 years

Rate of return = $25000 / 50000 \times 100 = 50\%$

Return on investment R.O.I

Investment: \$50000

Project duration: 2 years

Total projected profit: \$10.000

R.O.I = $5000 / 50000 \times 100 = 10\%$ / per year

R.O.I \$10.000 total profit in 2 years

21

Net present value: N.P.V Project 2

PV = Present value

S = Future cash flow \$50000 in 2 years or yearly \$25000

r = discount rate 10%

t = time period in 2 years

YR1 : PV = $25000 / (1 + 10/100) = 25000 / 1.10 = 22727.272$

YR2 : PV = $22727.27 / 1.10 = 20661.156$

NPV = $43388.428 - 50000 = -6611.572$

Project 3

Project cost estimate: \$90.000

Savings (cash flow) per year: \$30.000

Payback method

Payback period: $90000/30000 = 3$ years

Payback period: 3 years

Rate of return: $30000 / 90000 \times 100 = 33.33\%$

Return of investment R.O.I

Investment: 90000

Project duration: 3 years

Total projected profit: 54.000

R.O.I: $18000 / 90000 \times 100 = 20\%$ / year

R.O.I: 54000 total profit in 3 years

21 Net present value NPV

P.V = Present value

S = Future cash flow \$90000 in 3 years or yearly \$30000

r = discount rate 10%

t = time period

YR1 : $PV = 30000 / (1 + 10/100) = 30000 / 1.10 = 27272.72$

YR 2 : $PV = 27272.727 / 1.10 = 24793.288$

YR3 : $PV = 24793.388 / 1.10 = 22539.443$

NPV = $74605.558 - 90000 = -15394.442$

Project 1

- **Payback Period:** According to Mehonic et al (2020) the Compensation Time frame is the time taken to recover the underlying speculation. In light of your previous computation, Venture 1 has a recompense time of 4 years (Heldman, 2020).
- **Profit from Venture (return for capital invested):** Block et al (2019) argue that this is a proportion of productivity. It is determined as the net profit from the speculation partitioned by the expense of the venture, and communicated as a rate. The return on initial capital investment for Venture 1 is 15% each year.

- **Net Present value (NPV):** This is the amount of the present values (PVs) of approaching and active incomes throughout some stretch of time (Abdelhady 2021). The NPV for Venture 1 is negative, at - 124520.24.

Project 2

- **Compensation Period:** The Restitution Time frame for Task 2 will be 2 years.
- **Profit from Venture (return for capital invested):** The return on initial capital investment for Venture 2 is 10% each year.
- **Net Present Worth (NPV):** The NPV for Task 2 is likewise negative, at - 6611.572.

Project 3

- **Restitution Period:** The Recompense Time frame for Venture 3 will be 3 years.
- **Profit from Venture (return for capital invested):** The return on initial capital investment for Task 3 is 20% each year.
- **Net Present Worth (NPV):** The NPV for Undertaking 3 is negative, at - 15394.442.

According to Guno & Agaton 2022). a negative NPV demonstrates that the undertaking's return would be not exactly the normal return. At the end of the day, these ventures may not be advantageous speculations given their projected incomes and the picked rebate rate (10% in these cases). These figures ought to be utilized to assess the ventures comparative with one another, and against other potential speculations or utilizations of capital.

Chan et al (2021) argue that the monetary techniques used to assess these activities are Recompense Period, Profit from Venture (return for capital invested), and Net Present Worth (NPV). How about we check out at the benefits and detriments of each.

1. Payback Period:

- **Benefits:** According to Buttice et al (2020) ,the Recompense Time frame is clear and straightforward. It gives a straightforward proportion of the liquidity and hazard of a venture, giving a sign of how rapidly the underlying speculation can be recuperated.

- **Drawbacks:** It doesn't take into account the investment worth of cash, or any incomes that happen after the compensation period. In that capacity, Lovett et al (2022) argues it could not precisely mirror the genuine productivity or hazard of a venture.

2. Return on Investment (ROI):

- **Benefits:** According to Devarakonda (2019), the return for capital invested is a generally utilized benefit proportion that can assist with looking at the proficiency or productivity of various speculations. It tends to be effectively imparted and perceived.
- **Drawbacks:** A study by Kusuma et al (2021) deliberated that ROI does not require into account the investment worth of cash, nor does it consider the length of the speculation or the size of the incomes. It can likewise be controlled by changing the data sources, like the computation of expenses or returns.

3. Net Present Value (NPV):

- **Benefits:** The NPV is an exhaustive measure that considers the time worth of cash, every one of the incomes of the venture, and the gamble of those incomes (Knoke & Paul (2020). Positive NPV projects increase the value of the firm and ought to be considered for speculation.
- **Drawbacks:** The NPV estimation can be perplexing and requires a rebate rate. The outcome is intensely reliant upon this rebate rate, and picking a proper rate can be abstract and troublesome as cited by Buckwell et al (2020). Besides, it doesn't give a sign of the size of the venture, so it could incline toward huge tasks over little ones, regardless of whether the more modest ones offer a higher rate return.

Given the data, you've already calculated the financial aspects. Let's focus on the non-financial methods:

Project 1

Multi-Weighted Scoring Model:

Assume you've settled on the accompanying four significant measures for your activities:

Criteria Weight	Vital Arrangement	Risk	Benefits	Asset Accessibility	Weighted total
/	4.0	3.0	2.0	1,5	10,5
Project 1	7	5	4	6	142.85
Project 2	8	6	7	9	184.52
Project 3	4	7	6	5	134.51

Formula

13

Weight for each criteria= Actual score given/Total weight given X (WS)

Project 1

$$AC/TW \times (WS) = 7/10,5 \times (4.0) = 2.66 \times 100 = 266,66 \%$$

$$AC/TW \times (WS) = 5/10,5 \times (3.0) = 1,428 \times 100 = 142,85 \%$$

$$AC/TW \times (WS) = 4/10,5 \times ((2.0) = 0.761 \times 100 = 76,19 \%$$

$$AC/TW \times (WS) = 6/10,5 \times (1.5) = 0,857 \times 100 = 85.71\%$$

Adding all them up and divide by 4 = 142,85

Project 2

$$AC/TW \times (WS) = 8/10.5 \times (4.0) = 3.047 \times 100 = 304.76\%$$

$$AC/TW \times (WS) = 6/10,5 \times (3.0) = 1,714 \times 100 = 171.42 \%$$

$$AC/TW \times (WS) = 7/10,5 \times ((2.0) = 1.333 \times 100 = 133, 33 \%$$

$$AC/TW \times (WS) = 9 /10,5 \times (1.5) = 1.285 \times 100 = 128.57\%$$

Adding all them up and divide by 4 = 184,52

Project 3

$$AC/TW \times (WS) = 4/10,5 \times (4.0) = 1.523 \times 100 = 152.38 \%$$

$$AC/TW \times (WS) = 7/10,5 \times (3.0) = 1.999 \times 100 = 199.99 \%$$

$$AC/TW \times (WS) = 6/10,5 \times (2.0) = 1.142 \times 100 = 114.28 \%$$

$$AC/TW \times (WS) = 5/10,5 \times (1.5) = 0.714 \times 100 = 71.42\%$$

Adding all them up and divide by 4 = 134.51

According to the Multi-Weighted Scoring Model, Project 2 receives the highest score and is deemed the most preferred.

Checklist Model Project 1

1. Does this project line up with our essential objectives? Yes
2. What are the dangers related with this task? Moderate
3. What advantages are generally anticipated from this venture? High
4. Are the vital assets accessible for this venture? Indeed

Checklist Model Project 2

1. Does this project line up with our essential objectives? Yes
2. What are the dangers related with this task? High
3. What advantages are generally anticipated from this venture? Moderate
4. Are the vital assets accessible for this venture? Indeed

Checklist Model Project 3

1. Does this project line up with our essential objectives? Yes
2. What are the dangers related with this task? Moderate
3. What advantages are generally anticipated from this venture? High

4. Are the vital assets accessible for this venture? Moderate

In an assumption that Project 2 was chosen in view of our past examination. The following are three expected wellsprings of financing:

1. **Internal Funding:** This includes utilizing the association's own stores to finance the undertaking. The principal advantage of this choice is that it includes no extra expense with regards to intrigue installments or loss of value. Likewise, it gives more prominent command over the venture since there are no outside parties included (Alcon et al. (2020).
2. **Bank Advances:** Another choice is to take a credit from a bank or other monetary establishment. According to Kuratko & Audretsch (2021), the benefit of bank advances is that it can give a huge amount of cash front and center, permitting the venture to rapidly continue. Notwithstanding, the association would have to pay interest on the credit, which could influence the benefit of the undertaking.
3. **Equity Financing:** This includes raising assets by offering partakes in the organization to financial backers. This can be a decent choice if the association would rather not increment its degree of obligation or on the other hand in the event that getting a loan can't. The fundamental benefit of this choice is that it requires no month to month reimbursements and it doesn't expand the association's obligation level. Nonetheless, it implies surrendering a piece of the responsibility for organization, which could bring about loss of control.
4. **Crowdfunding:** According to Cai & Stam (2021) Crowdfunding is a generally new type of financing where assets are raised from an enormous number of individuals, commonly by means of the Web. The advantage of crowdfunding is that it gives assets to the task, yet in addition helps in promoting the venture and measuring public interest.

Every one of these money sources enjoys its own benefits and ought to be chosen in view of the particular prerequisites of the venture and the monetary methodology of the association.

The most common way of choosing a venture includes a complex methodology that thinks about both monetary and non-monetary elements. The usage of techniques like Payback Period, Profit from Venture, and Net Present Worth, as well as non-monetary strategies, for example, the Multi-Weighted Scoring Model and the Checklist Model, consider a more far reaching investigation of undertaking practicality.

On account of the three undertakings assessed, Task 2 stood apart as the most great choice. Notwithstanding its negative Net Present Worth, the venture has the most brief restitution time frame and the most elevated pace of return. Besides, its arrangement with vital objectives, the effect of not executing it, its reasonable dangers, and generally speaking fit inside the association's portfolio and culture steered the results in support of its.

Subsidizing the chose task can be moved toward in more than one way, including inward subsidizing, bank credits, value supporting, or crowdfunding. The decision would rely upon the association's monetary wellbeing, risk craving, and long haul masterful courses of action.

By and by, it is significant to take note of that no strategy for investigation is awesome. The monetary measurements, while quantitative and apparently evenhanded, rely upon assessments and suspicions about the future, which can be dubious. The non-monetary techniques, albeit basic for catching subjective angles, can be abstract and defenseless to control. In this way, a successful venture choice cycle would require a decent and basic utilization of these strategies. The choice eventually ought to help the association's essential objectives and be sufficiently adaptable to adjust to evolving conditions.

References

- 1 Abdelhady, S. (2021). Performance and cost evaluation of solar dish power plant: sensitivity analysis of levelized cost of electricity (LCOE) and net present value (NPV). *Renewable Energy*, 168, 332-342. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960148120320140>
- 11 Alcon, F., Marín-Miñano, C., Zabala, J. A., de-Miguel, M. D., & Martínez-Paz, J. M. (2020). Valuing diversification benefits through intercropping in Mediterranean agroecosystems: A choice experiment approach. *Ecological Economics*, 171, 106593. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800919314429>
- 8 Block, J., Fisch, C., Vismara, S., & Andres, R. (2019). Private equity investment criteria: An experimental conjoint analysis of venture capital, business angels, and family offices. *Journal of corporate finance*, 58, 329-352. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0929119918307132>
- 5 Buckwell, A., Ware, D., Fleming, C., Smart, J. C., Mackey, B., Nalau, J., & Dan, A. (2020). Social benefit cost analysis of ecosystem-based climate change adaptations: a community-level case study in Tanna Island, Vanuatu. *Climate and Development*, 12(6), 495-510. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17565529.2019.1642179>
- 15 Buttice, V., Di Pietro, F., & Tenca, F. (2020). Is equity crowdfunding always good? Deal structure and the attraction of venture capital investors. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 65, 101773. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0929119920302170>
- 9 Cai, W., Polzin, F., & Stam, E. (2021). Crowdfunding and social capital: A systematic review using a dynamic perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 162, 120412. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0040162520312385>
- 10 Chan, H. F., Moy, N., Schaffner, M., & Torgler, B. (2021). The effects of money saliency and sustainability orientation on reward based crowdfunding success. *Journal of Business Research*, 125, 443-455. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0148296319304540>
- 2 Devarakonda, S. (2019). Calculating the Economic Viability of Corporate Trainings (Traditional & eLearning) using Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) and Return On Investment (ROI). *Int. J. Adv.*

- Corp. Learn., 12(1), 41-57.
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sri_D/publication/333486170_Paper-Calculating_the_Economic_Viability_of_Corporate_Trainings_Traditional_eLearning_using_Benefit_Cost_Ratio_BCR_and_Return_On_Investment_ROI/links/5cefe4ca4585153c3da686a3/Paper-Calculating-the-Economic-Viability-of-Corporate-Trainings-Traditional-eLearning-using-Benefit-Cost-Ratio-BCR-and-Return-On-Investment-ROI.pdf
- ¹² Dobrowolski, Z., & Drozdowski, G. (2022). Does the net present value as a financial metric fit investment in green energy security?. *Energies*, 15(1), 353. <https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/15/1/353>
- ³ Guno, C. S., & Agaton, C. B. (2022). Socio-economic and environmental analyses of solar irrigation systems for sustainable agricultural production. *Sustainability*, 14(11), 6834. <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/11/6834>
- ⁴ Knoke, T., Gosling, E., & Paul, C. (2020). Use and misuse of the net present value in environmental studies. *Ecological Economics*, 174, 106664. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800919311103>
- ⁴ Kuratko, D. F., & Audretsch, D. B. (2021). The future of entrepreneurship: the few or the many?. *Small Business Economics*, 1-10. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11187-021-00534-0>
- ¹ Kusuma, A., Syah, T. Y. R., Indradewa, R., & Fajarwati, D. (2021). Implementation of Financial Strategy Business Plan Arena Corner. *American International Journal of Business Management (AIJBM)*, 4(07), 86-89. https://digilib.esaunggul.ac.id/public/UEU-Journal-24078-11_2478.pdf
- ¹⁷ Laplane, A., & Mazzucato, M. (2020). Socializing the risks and rewards of public investments: Economic, policy, and legal issues. *Research Policy*, 49, 100008. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2590145120300025>
- ¹⁴ Lovett, S., Rasheed, A. A., & Hou, W. (2022). Stock options, restricted stock, salary, or bonus? Managing CEO compensation to maximize organizational performance. *Business Horizons*, 65(2), 115-123. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0007681321000434>

- Mehonic, A., Sebastian, A., Rajendran, B., Simeone, O., Vasilaki, E., & Kenyon, A. J. (2020). Memristors—From in- memory computing, deep learning acceleration, and spiking neural networks to the future of neuromorphic and bio- inspired computing. *Advanced Intelligent Systems*, 2(11), 2000085. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/aisy.202000085>
- 20 Nguyen, A. P., & Martínez, M. R. (2020). On quantitative aspects of model interpretability. arXiv preprint *arXiv:2007.07584*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.07584>
- 7 Norgeot, B., Quer, G., Beaulieu-Jones, B. K., Torkamani, A., Dias, R., Gianfrancesco, M., ... & Butte, A. J. (2020). Minimum information about clinical artificial intelligence modeling: the MI-CLAIM checklist. *Nature medicine*, 26(9), 1320-1324. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-020-1041-y>
- 3 Tian, H., Liu, P., & Shu, G. (2021). Challenges and opportunities of Rankine cycle for waste heat recovery from internal combustion engine. *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*, 84, 100906. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360128521000046>
- 16 Viquerat, J., Rabault, J., Kuhnle, A., Ghraieb, H., Larcher, A., & Hachem, E. (2021). Direct shape optimization through deep reinforcement learning. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 428, 110080. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021999120308548>

ORIGINALITY REPORT

25%
SIMILARITY INDEX

21%
INTERNET SOURCES

14%
PUBLICATIONS

24%
STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Submitted to PSB Academy (ACP eSolutions) Student Paper	2%
2	Submitted to Avado Learning Student Paper	2%
3	Submitted to University of Teesside Student Paper	2%
4	Submitted to Coventry University Student Paper	2%
5	Submitted to Hong Kong Baptist University Student Paper	2%
6	Submitted to Chester College of Higher Education Student Paper	1%
7	Submitted to University of Denver Student Paper	1%
8	Submitted to Kingston University Student Paper	1%
9	Submitted to The University of the West of Scotland	1%

10	ouci.dntb.gov.ua Internet Source	1 %
11	www.agriculturejournals.cz Internet Source	1 %
12	Submitted to Napier University Student Paper	1 %
13	Submitted to University of Wales, Lampeter Student Paper	1 %
14	media.neliti.com Internet Source	1 %
15	pure.ulster.ac.uk Internet Source	1 %
16	Submitted to University of South Australia Student Paper	1 %
17	Submitted to Wawasan Open University Student Paper	1 %
18	Submitted to Heriot-Watt University Student Paper	1 %
19	Submitted to Segi University College Student Paper	1 %
20	web.archive.org Internet Source	1 %
21	www.coursehero.com	

Internet Source

<1 %

22

Submitted to University College London

Student Paper

<1 %

23

www.researchgate.net

Internet Source

<1 %

24

slidetodoc.com

Internet Source

<1 %

25

www.hit.ac.zw

Internet Source

<1 %

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off