

Financial Management

PROGRAM - MASTERS OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

MODULE - FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

MODULE CODE - LCMB7002

STUDENT NAME - ANUJ SHARMA

STUDENT ID - 2321873

LECTURER NAME - Mr. DAVID COKER

YEAR - 2024

Table of Contents

[Part A 3](#)

[Introduction3](#)

[Part B4](#)

[Calculation of financial ratios4](#)

[Ratios Critical Evaluation8](#)

[Comparison10](#)

[Recommendations12](#)

[Part C: Investment Opportunity Analysis15](#)

[PBP, IRR, NPV calculations15](#)

[Assumed calculations15](#)

[Advantages and Shortcomings16](#)

[Non-financial factors18](#)

[References20](#)

List of Figures

[Figure 1 Net profit margin4](#)

[Figure 2 Current ratio5](#)

[Figure 3 Debt to equity5](#)

[Figure 4 Asset turnover6](#)

[Figure 5 Gross profit7](#)

[Figure 6 Interest coverage7](#)

[Figure 7 Operating margin8](#)

List of tables

[Table 1 Ratios Calculation10](#)

[Table 2 Payback period calculation17](#)

[Table 3 NPV calculation19](#)

Part A

Introduction

Microsoft Corporation, a major player in the technology sector, has its global presence and headquarters in Redmond, Washington. The company was founded on April 4, 1975, by Paul Allen and Bill Gates, and it has grown to become a significant historical figure in many facets of the digital world. The many operations of Microsoft include the development, manufacturing, licensing, support, and marketing of a wide range of consumer electronics, personal computers, computer software, and related services. The Microsoft Office suite is one of its renowned offerings and is a cornerstone of productivity software used by millions of people worldwide (Microsoft, 2022). The company's web browsers, including as the former Internet Explorer and the current Edge, have been essential in influencing users' experiences on the internet worldwide. Moreover, the Microsoft Windows line of operating systems has anchored people's and businesses' digital experiences by acting as a solid foundation for computer environments. similar.



Apart from its expertise in software development, Microsoft has made noteworthy advancements in hardware innovation. Xbox video game consoles have captured the attention of gamers with their immersive gaming experiences, while Microsoft's Surface line of touchscreen PCs has redefined creativity and productivity in the digital age. According to Joppa et al. (2021), Microsoft's commitment to provide seamless integration across software and hardware ecosystems is supported by these harsh offerings. In summary, Microsoft's journey from humble beginnings to its current position as

one of the leading technological companies in the world is testament to its unwavering commitment to empowering people and organizations through technology, as well as its relentless pursuit of innovation and strategic foresight.

The top software development platform in the world, GitHub, was purchased by Microsoft in 2018 for a reported \$7.5 billion. By facilitating tighter engagement with developers and encouraging the use of its cloud services, this calculated move aims to increase Microsoft's influence in the open-source community (Lohr, 2018). Nonetheless, in 2019, Microsoft proved its dedication to cloud computing by winning the \$10 billion Joint Enterprise Defense Infrastructure (JEDI) contract from the Pentagon, highlighting its technological and security prowess to meet the cloud infrastructure requirements of the US military (Macias and Feiner, 2021). This victory against Amazon Web Services (AWS) was a major accomplishment, and it demonstrated Microsoft's increasing dominance in the fiercely competitive cloud business. However, Microsoft made a risky purchase of Activision Blizzard in 2022 for a whopping \$68.7 billion, making it the company's greatest acquisition to that point. This purchase places Microsoft as a dominant player in the gaming industry, home to well-known properties like Call of Duty and World of Warcraft. Its goals are to improve Microsoft's gaming ecosystem and accelerate its mobile, PC, console, and cloud gaming strategies (Economic times, 2023).

Furthermore, employing crude methods, Russian state hackers broke into the inboxes of key executives during Microsoft's most recent security problem. Beginning in late November, emails and documents from Microsoft's legal and cybersecurity divisions were the focus of this attack; nevertheless, according to reports, source code and client environments were unaffected (Riotta, 2023). Even though there was no urgent need for extensive system fixes, the incident made some question the company's security protocols. This event highlights the need to update cybersecurity infrastructure in order to fight off sophisticated assaults and the susceptibility of old systems.

Part B

Calculation of financial ratios

Profitability

Figure 1 Net profit margin

Microsoft's 2021–2023 financial results demonstrate a stable and effective business with only minor variations in profitability, liquidity, gearing, and productivity. The business maintained good profitability in 2023 despite a little decline in net profit margin, demonstrating its capacity to produce a sizable amount of money from its sales. Debt and equity ratios have been declining over time, indicating a move away from debt and towards financial stability (Morningstar, 2024). The company how well its assets are used and sufficient liquidity to meet short-term liability types are dealt with, current theories and changes are always presented.

Liquidity

Figure 2 Current ratio

Microsoft's current outlook shows a slight decline in cash flow from 2021 to 2022, but remained above 1, indicating that the business has sufficient current assets that would be helpful in meeting its short-term commitments. This shows Microsoft's financial strong environment and ability to meet short-term commitments quickly. More than one current ratio is generally considered positive and indicates that the business is in a good position to manage its short-term assets and liabilities. This is essential to preserve strategic spending and operational stability and demonstrates that Microsoft is prepared to manage unexpected costs or investments. Top of Form

Gearing

Figure 3 Debt to equity

Microsoft reflects a strategic financial position through its gearing ratio, which reflects its debt-to-equity ratio. In 2023, this coefficient decreases to 0.998, indicating a move away from debt financing to equity financing. These changes demonstrate Microsoft's commitment to maintaining its financial stability by reducing shareholder equity and future profit commitments. In addition to improving financial stability, such an approach emphasizes a responsible approach to capital planning and monetary policy by sending a strong signal to stakeholders and investors are on the company's ability to manage risk and its confidence in its operating capacity and future growth prospects.

Efficiency

Figure 4 Asset turnover

Microsoft's net assets to sales in 2023 is 0.51, up from 0.52 in 2022, indicating a slight decrease in the company's ability to generate revenue from its assets even if this means a slight decrease in operating efficiency, too is still shown to be able to convert assets into income. It depends on this efficiency to achieve profitability and competitive edge. It shows how well the business supports sales activities with its asset base, which is critical for expansion and return on investment (Morningstar, 2024). Microsoft's asset turnover remains successful despite some declines, supporting its financial stability and continued market position.

Figure 5 Gross profit

In 2021, 2022, and 2023, Microsoft's percentage of revenue is very constant, decreases slightly in 2022, and rises again to about 69% in 2023. Value creation and efficiencies in manufacturing processes mean that these percentages indicate that profits can be shifted from the cost of supply. The low margin reflects Microsoft's ability to control production costs and remain profitable over the years, despite any operational or market challenges.

Figure 6 Interest coverage

Microsoft's interest coverage ratio saw positive growth from 2021 to 2023, starting at 29.80 and increasing to 44.98. This upward trend indicates the company's ability to cover an increase in interest expense from operating income. By 2021, Microsoft could deliver nearly 30 times operating income above its interest rate, which by 2023 would have risen sharply to about 45 times the debt reflects Microsoft's strong financial health and indicates a low risk of debt-related insolvency (Morningstar, 2024). This is a sign of confidence from lenders and investors in Microsoft's ability to manage and manage its loans effectively.

Figure 7 Operating margin

For 2021, 2022 and 2023, Microsoft's operating margin percentage was 0.42 or 42%. This shows operational efficiency and effectiveness with the help of excellent, consistent control over operating costs reflected in earnings. Its strong profitability shows that Microsoft is able to maintain its profitability ratio in the market so in all circumstances. It also speaks well of the ability to control operating costs while increasing or maintaining revenue. Analysts and investors typically view such a position as an indicator of the continued success of a well-managed business.

Ratios Critical Evaluation

	Microsoft			Unisys		
Profitability	2021	2022	2023	2021	2022	2023
NetProfitMargin	36.45	36.69	34.15	(21.83)	(5.35)	(21.37)
Liquidity						
CurrentRatio	2.08	1.78	1.77	1.51	1.43	1.49
Gearing						
DebtToEquity	1.35	1.19	1.00			
Efficiency						
AssetTurnover	0.50	0.54	0.51	0.8	0.88	1
	Microsoft			Unisys		
	2021	2022	2023	2021	2022	2023
Gross Margin %	0.69	0.68	0.69	27.84	26.75	27.35
Operating Margin %	0.42	0.42	0.42	6.07	1	3.49
Interest Coverage	29.80	40.42	44.98	(12.04)	(0.93)	(10.29)

Financial ratio play an important role in assessing a company’s financial health and operating efficiency. These concepts distill complex financial reports into relevant choices, enabling various shareholders, stakeholders to make informed decisions. For investors, ratios provide a picture of profitability, earnings, gearing and efficiency, which are important to analyze to assess investment potential and risk. Profitability reflects how a company turns money around getting it right into profitability, which is a key indicator of business success and sustainability.

Liquidity ratios, like current ratios, assess a company's ability to meet short-term obligations, meaning financial stability and volatility (Hussain and Sunardi, 2020) Gearing ratios provide insight into a company's debt and equity, and it focuses on financial management and risk exposure. Similar to asset conversion, an enterprise uses its assets efficiently to generate income, i.e. efficiency and asset management.

In addition to helping with investment decisions, these considerations are important for a company's strategic planning. They help identify strengths and weaknesses in manufacturing processes that require intervention, providing targeted improvements in productivity, cost management and strategic investment so is easy. Financial metrics are therefore an indispensable tool for internal management and external stakeholders to guide strategic decisions, budgeting and risk assessment in pursuit of sustainable growth and profitability

Financial metrics calculated for Microsoft from 2021 to 2023 reveal several important insights into the company's financial health and operating efficiency, identifying strengths and areas for cautious improvement Slight decline in profitability in 2023 implies a slight deterioration in performance in terms of cash conversion into real interest. This may be due to increased costs or decreased revenues, which may indicate the need for cost management or revenue growth strategies (Schroeder et al., 2022). However, maintaining strong profitability indicates that Microsoft has a strong margin, underscoring its financial flexibility and operational efficiency.

Liquidity ratios, showed a slight decrease from 2021 to 2022 but remained above 1. This indicates that Microsoft retained the ability to pay short-term liabilities with its current assets, which is financing internal health is an important indicator of financial health This stage is important for business stability and financial flexibility, indicating that the company is well prepared to meet its short-term obligations and unexpected expenses of the economy, thereby ensuring continued employment This move towards equity financing reduces the potential interest rates and risks associated with high levels of leverage, increasing financial stability (Wild and Shaw, 2019). This prudent approach to capitalization reflects a strong risk management strategy and gives investors and stakeholders confidence in the financial health and future growth prospects of the company.

A slight decline in business efficiency metrics such as asset turnover indicates a slight decline in the company's performance in using its assets to generate sales This slight increase could indicate an area where Microsoft could focus by improving operational efficiency. But the asset-to-cash ratio still indicates that Microsoft makes good use of its assets, contributing to its market position and sustained financial strength This growth and pattern reflects a company that is strong in financial health has performed despite minor changes, reflecting operational efficiency and strategic budget management Calculated ratios reflect Microsoft's strong position to manage finances, assets and costs effectively (Warren et al colleagues, 2020). Moving to a limited debt financing ratio is particularly beneficial, as it reduces financial risk and increases stability. While requiring a slightly reduced focus on operations and finances, these changes are small and do not significantly alleviate Microsoft's overall difficult financial position To maintain and adjust the way it operates on in these areas will be key to maintaining and further strengthening Microsoft's market dominance and financial health.

Comparison

However, an important comparison is made based on ratio calculations which will help in getting a proper insight into the financial performance of the two companies. In addition, Unisys Corporation is a global information technology company that specializes in providing integrated solutions for customers in the government, financial services, and commercial markets with a history dating back to 1873, Unisys celebrates many technological advances forward today including the first commercial typewriter and the sophisticated ENIAC computer (Unisys, 2024). Unisys offers a range of services, including cloud and infrastructure services, application services, security solutions and advanced data analytics. Headquartered in Blue Bell, Pennsylvania, Unisys continues its focus on innovation and entrepreneurship, helping organizations transform their operations and achieve significant improvements in productivity and efficiency.



The financial ratios provided for Microsoft and Unisys from 2021 to 2023 provide a valuable comparison between the two firms of technology. Microsoft's consistent high margin highlights their proficiency in converting sales into profit. Unisys, however, demonstrates fluctuating profitability with substantial losses in 2021 and 2023, and a smaller loss in 2022. Unisys' inability to cover its operating costs from its earnings in these years is a significant concern, as it reflects a negative net profit margin. Microsoft's current ratio has shown a decline from 2.08 in 2021 to 1.77 in 2023. However, it still remains comfortably above the 1.0 threshold, indicating that the company has a solid cushion to meet its short-term obligations with its current assets. Unisys demonstrates a slightly less stable current ratio compared to Microsoft's, but it still indicates the ability to fulfill short-term obligations. It's worth mentioning, though, that the modest rise for Unisys in 2023 to 1.49 could indicate an improvement in liquidity management.

Microsoft's debt-to-equity ratio is falling, reaching 1.00 by 2023. This shift, which reflects a balanced approach between debt and equity, reflects efforts to reduce risk and interest expense. Unisys debt-to-equity ratios are not provided, which limits comparison; However, Microsoft's ratio suggests a conservative capital structure that could be attractive to risk-averse investors. The assets and cash flows of both companies show how efficiently they are using their assets to generate revenue (Panigrahi, 2019). Microsoft's asset turnover is lower than that of Unisys, although it will decline slightly in 2023. Unisys has shown growth in this area, going from 0.8 in 2021 to 1 in 2023, indicating steady sales from its asset base of .0, indicating that it has become more efficient in using its assets to generate income.

Microsoft's gross margins have remained stable and increasing over three years, demonstrating its ability to manage cost of goods sold (COGS) relative to sales. Consistent gross margins of around 69% reflect Microsoft's robust and enhanced pricing power and cost efficiency. Unisys claims a lower percentage of gross margin compared to Microsoft, but it is still significant, which means that although Unisys has a fair amount of control over COGS, it is not dominant pricing or cost control such as Microsoft. Unisys has a significantly higher operating margin in 2021, which then declines sharply in 2022, and recovers slightly in 2023. This suggests that Unisys' operating dynamics will fluctuate, possibly due to earnings volatility or due to fluctuating operating costs.

nual reports.

Profitability: Microsoft is consistently profitable, reflecting strong market demand and careful cost control (Microsoft, 2023). Unisys has faced profitability challenges, which may reflect competitive pressures or operating instability.

Liquidity: Microsoft shows a robust performance in their company valuation, albeit slightly decreased, financial position, but shows it is well organized. Unisys, while less liquid, shows higher growth rates, reflecting efforts to increase financial stability (Unisys, 2023).

Efficiency: Microsoft's stable asset turnover indicates efficient use of assets, albeit somewhat low. The improvement in Unisys' asset sales suggests an increase in operating efficiency, possibly as a result of restructuring or liquidation.

In comparison, Microsoft exhibits strong financial health and profitability, albeit with a slight decline in operating and cash flow, which should be monitored if Unisys seems unable to sustain much profitability but shows signs it shows improving economies and profitability. The outlook suggests that although Microsoft is a financially strong company, Unisys may be on its way towards greater efficiency and better cash flow, although it needs to deal with a significant sustained loss issue address in order to compete. The comparison highlights Microsoft's excellent financial health and stability with strong margins and comfortable interest payment capacity, suggesting low financial risk. In contrast, Unisys's financial outlook shows that it operates with thin cash flow and may face challenges in meeting its financial obligations, which implies higher operating financial risk. Microsoft maintains a stable and robust interest coverage ratio, reflecting its capital gains compared to interest expense and highlighting its financial strength (Ayoush et al., 2021). A higher ratio indicates a lower risk of debt-related insolvency. Unisys' poor interest rate coverage indicates that the company is not generating enough cash to cover its interest expenses, which is a red flag for potential financial stress or the risk of default.

Recommendations

There are a variety that can help with planning. Integrating these recommendations into Microsoft's budget can improve financial ratios, such as efficient asset conversion by generating more cash effectively through current asset base. Furthermore, through cybersecurity by prioritizing it, Microsoft can avoid infringement-related costs and maintain its

reputation as a secure and reliable company, which is especially important for its growing cloud services sector. This development can help drive profitability and improve financial conditions in a highly competitive technology market. These strategies can help sustain and potentially increase Microsoft's profitability by ensuring cost-effective operations, expanding market opportunities. Not only does an efficient cost structure and revenue diversification support financial stability, but it also positions the company for competitive advantage in dynamic technology (Markonah et al., 2020). By implementing these strategies, Microsoft can aim to further strengthen its financial performance and market leadership position.

Top of Form

Asset utilization efficiency and operational efficiency: Although Microsoft has demonstrated fairly consistent asset utilization, it has declined slightly in recent years. This metric shows how the company is using its assets well to make money. To further this, Microsoft could take a closer look at its current legacy management strategies. This may involve rethinking its capital expenditures, simplifying operations, or selling off non-core assets (Chen et al., 2021). In line with its cloud and gaming sector growth, as evidenced by its acquisition and contract wins, Microsoft could make more money in these areas by investing in higher-margin projects. This could be an exception and developing new game themes to improve services or extend cloud infrastructure. Asset conversions can be increased.

Strengthening cybersecurity policies: Reports of security breaches from Russian state hackers in the inboxes of senior Microsoft executives point to a serious risk that cybersecurity is not just an IT issue but an operational one, a strategic concern with potential economic implications. Microsoft should enhance its cyber security measures to protect against such breaches, which could otherwise lead to loss of customer confidence and possible financial loss. Establish an internal security measure, strengthen diversity, continue to monitor cybersecurity measures, and invest in advanced risk response systems. Stakeholders will also be assured that Microsoft's commitment to security can create revenue safeguarding and even promote.

Enhanced Cost Management: Despite Microsoft's strong net profit margin, a slight decline has been noticed in Part A. To counter this trend, Microsoft needs to adopt more aggressive measures to manage costs. To identify and eliminate inefficiencies, a company can benefit from a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis of its operations. This may involve automating processes, renegotiating supplier agreements, or taking leaner approaches to manufacturing and operational tasks. Reducing operating costs can improve profitability and provide a better platform. This process also includes reviewing R&D investments to ensure they are aligned with strategic objectives and have clear commercial strategies to take advantage of Microsoft's strong innovation culture.

Revenue diversification: Microsoft owns portfolios, but the financial statements indicate some reliance on certain products and services. Microsoft may explore other revenue stream strategies to reduce the risk associated with market fluctuations in the on these areas. For example, Microsoft may consider expanding its presence in emerging technology areas such as artificial intelligence, machine learning, and the Internet of Things (IoT). If leveraged by its existing cloud infrastructure role, Microsoft can offer new AI and IoT services to enterprise customers, thus creating new revenue streams. Additionally, given its foothold in gaming following its acquisition of Activision Blizzard, Microsoft could also explore synergies between gaming and other segments such as mobile devices or educational technologies to create integrated offerings.

Part C: Investment Opportunity Analysis

PBP, IRR, NPV calculations

With a complicated cash flow pattern and a low Internal Rate of Return (IRR) of 1%, Project A has a complex financial profile. The initiative initially requires a substantial £5,000 investment, which prompts a detailed examination using several financial measures.

The Payback Period (PBP) computation, which seems to have produced an unusual result of -86.21, is meant to indicate how long it will take a project's net cash flows to recover its original investment. The negative outcome in this case, however, points to a misreading or computation mistake since PBP should, in theory, provide a positive timeline for the recovery of the original investment. Knowing precisely when cumulative cash flows become positive is important for Project A, and based on the cash flow trend presented, it seems like the project does this in a little over three years.

The project's cash flows do not provide a positive return over the cost of capital at a discount rate of 0.75%, according to Project A's Net Present Value (NPV), a crucial statistic that is computed as -£488.47. Given that completing the project will basically lower the firm's worth by this amount, it is suggested that the project is not financially feasible given current predictions and the stipulated cost of capital.

The project's modest profitability is further explained by the IRR of 1%, which indicates that profits barely outweigh capital costs. Typically, in order to justify the risks involved in the investment, stakeholders search for projects with internal rates of return that are noticeably higher than the cost of capital.

Even though Project A was able to recoup its original investment, its low IRR and negative net present value indicate a worrying financial picture. These measures together imply that the project is still an unappealing investment from a profitability and risk-return standpoint if neither the cost structure nor the projected cash flows are changed. Therefore, the financial analysis emphasizes how crucial it is to not only recover the cash that was spent, but also to make sure that the investment produces enough return beyond the cost of capital in order to be deemed sustainable.

Assumed calculations

Project A's Net Present Value (NPV) is greatly affected by modifying its financial statements to account for a 10% increase in the original investment and a 10% reduction in the cash flows that follow. The updated starting investment rises to £5,500, and subsequent cash inflows fall in line with it. The last year displays an adjusted cash flow that becomes positive as a result of the original negative value being decreased.

The reevaluated Net Present Value (NPV) of Project A is -£8819.63 based on the altered financial scenario, which involves a 10% increase in starting expenses and a 10% drop in future cash flows. The project's sensitivity to financial factors that has been shown by this fall in NPV that significantly reduces the project's appeal as an investment. Project A was initially seen as having challenging but maybe controllable financial results, but the changes cast it in a more negative light and make it seem like a much riskier and less practical choice.

This significant change emphasizes the need of having a strong financial foundation and the necessity of carefully weighing income and expense estimates when making investment choices. The modified scenario indicates a higher level of risk, which implies that even little variations from anticipated expenses and income might have a substantial negative impact. This serves as a sobering reminder to investors and decision-makers of how important it is to take possible variances and uncertainties into consideration when planning and evaluating projects. The NPV post-adjustment has decreased, suggesting that investing in Project A under the new terms would probably result in a significant loss of value. As such, it is advised not to be selected in favor of more reliable and predictable alternatives.

Advantages and Shortcomings

Evaluating capital investment projects is important for companies to allocate resources efficiently and drive growth. Payback period (PBP), accounting rate of return (ARR), and net present value (NPV) are common methods, and each has advantages and disadvantages

Payback Period (PBP)

Table 2 Payback period calculation

Year	Cash Flow Project A (£)	Cumulative Cash Flow Project A (£)
1	-5,000	
2	2,500	-2,500
3	2,000	-500
4	1,000	500
5	-442	58
Project		A
Initial Investment (£)		-5,000
PBP		-86.20689655

Advantages:

Simplicity and Ease of Understanding: PBP is straightforward to calculate and interpret, making it accessible to non-financial managers (Illés, 2020). It answers a simple question: How long will it take to recover the initial investment?

Risk Mitigation: By focusing on the time to recover the investment, PBP can help assess the liquidity risk and short-term viability of a project, appealing to businesses prioritizing cash flow.

Shortcomings:

Ignores Cash Flows After the Payback Period: This method does not account for the total profitability of a project, overlooking any benefits that occur after the initial investment is recouped.

Does Not Consider the Time Value of Money (TVM): PBP treats all cash flows equally, regardless of when they occur, missing the fundamental finance principle that money available today is worth more than the same amount in the future.

Accounting Rate of Return (ARR)

Advantages:

Utilizes Accounting Information: ARR calculates returns based on accounting profits, making it easy to compute with readily available financial statements (Yan et al., 2020).

Relative Performance Measure: It provides a percentage return, offering a relative measure of profitability that can be compared across projects or investment opportunities.

Shortcomings:

Reliance on Accounting Profits Rather Than Cash Flow: Profits can be influenced by non-cash items and accounting policies, potentially leading to a distorted picture of a project's financial health.

Ignores TVM: Like PBP, ARR does not discount future earnings, failing to reflect the reduced value of future profits.

Net Present Value (NPV)

Table 3 NPV calculation

Year 0	-5,000	-4629.62963
Year 1	2,500	2143.347051
Year 2	2,000	1587.664482
Year 3	1,000	735.0298528
Year 4	-442	-324.883195
		NPV
		-488.471439

Advantages:

Focus on Cash Flow: NPV considers the actual cash flows generated by a project, providing a more accurate picture of its financial contribution.

Incorporates TVM: By discounting future cash flows, NPV accounts for the principle that money today is worth more than the same amount received in the future, enhancing decision-making accuracy (Le, 2021).

Absolute Measure of Profitability: NPV offers a dollar figure indicating the value added to the firm by undertaking the project, aiding in the allocation of capital to maximize shareholder wealth.

Shortcomings:

Sensitivity to Discount Rates: The choice of discount rate can significantly impact NPV calculations, and determining the appropriate rate can be complex, involving assumptions about future market conditions and the cost of capital.

Complexity for Non-Financial Managers: Compared to PBP or ARR, NPV can be more difficult to understand and communicate to stakeholders without a financial background

Although PBP and ARR provide convenience and ease of use, while ignoring TVM and the broader benefits of services. NPV, although complex, provides a comprehensive analysis taking into account cash flows and timing, making it a good tool to evaluate the net benefits of investment opportunities but the options often based on specific financial circumstances, including the company's financial goals, project duration and available data And if you think it's worth it, a balanced approach is needed.

Non-financial factors

When evaluating capital investment projects, management should look beyond economic criteria to consider many non-financial factors. These factors play an important role in ensuring that investments are aligned with the company's strategic objectives, ethical standards and operational capabilities The environmental impact of the project on the environment is important by raising environmental sustainability awareness and increased regulation considered Money should be measured closure in terms of potential environmental impacts, including consumption, emissions and waste (Miletić and Latinac, 2020). Projects that contribute to a company's sustainability goals can improve its reputation and meet regulatory standards, avoid penalties and facilitate market access

Social and ethical considerations: The social impact of a business, including impact on local communities and broader social impact, is increasingly being looked at. Projects that enhance community well-being or contribute positively to social goals can underscore the company's social license to operate. Conversely, projects with a negative social impact may face resistance, damage reputation and undermine business performance.

Strategic Alignment: Ensuring that the project aligns with the company's strategic vision and long-term goals is important. The investment should complement the company's core competencies, competitive advantage and market position (Irwanto, 2022). A strategic approach ensures efficient and coordinated allocation of resources, resulting in sustainable development.

Operational and Execution Risk: Assessing a assignment's operational dangers, inclusive of the feasibility of its implementation and integration with present approaches, is vital (Tsalavoutas et al., 2020). Management ought to don't forget whether or not the employer has the essential understanding, era, and infrastructure to execute the venture efficaciously and mitigate capability operational challenges.

Regulatory Compliance and Legal Risks: Navigating the complicated landscape of legal and regulatory necessities is essential for venture success. Investments need to observe all relevant legal guidelines, which includes exertions standards, health and protection policies, and enterprise-specific law (Butler and O'Brien, 2019). Non-compliance can lead to legal consequences, assignment delays, and reputational damage.

References

- Agbeye, S.J., 2019. Capital budgeting techniques: Estimation of internal rate of returns. *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*, 13(2), pp.1-10.
- Ayoush, M.D., Toumeh, A.A. and Shabaneh, K.I., 2021. Liquidity, leverage, and solvency: What affects profitability of industrial enterprises the most. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, 18(3), pp.249-259.
- Butler, T. and O'Brien, L., 2019. Understanding RegTech for digital regulatory compliance. *Disrupting finance: FinTech and strategy in the 21st century*, pp.85-102.
- Chen, L., Zhang, L., Huang, J., Xiao, H. and Zhou, Z., 2021. Social responsibility portfolio optimization incorporating ESG criteria. *Journal of Management Science and Engineering*, 6(1), pp.75-85.
- Economic times, 2023. Microsoft's multibillion dollar acquisition of Activision Blizzard hangs in uncertainty: Who's winning this fight for gaming dominance? <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/magazines/panache/microsofts-multibillion-dollar-acquisition-of-activision-blizzard-hangs-in-uncertainty-whos-winning-this-fight-for-gaming-dominance/articleshow/101608973.cms?from=mdr>

- Husain, T. and Sunardi, N., 2020. Firm's Value Prediction Based on Profitability Ratios and Dividend Policy. *Finance & Economics Review*, 2(2), pp.13–26.
- Illés, M., 2020. The Positive Net Present Value of Loss-making Projects: Economic Content of the Two Internal Rates of Return. *Theory, Methodology, Practice—Review of Business and Management*, 16(02), pp.41–50.
- Irwanto, R., 2022, January. Why IRR is not the right measure for return analysis and What's then?. In *International Conference on Engineering, Construction, Renewable Energy, and Advanced Materials*.
- Joppa, L., Luers, A., Willmott, E., Friedmann, S.J., Hamburg, S.P. and Broze, R., 2021. Microsoft's million-tonne CO₂-removal purchase—lessons for net zero.
- Le, S., 2021, December. The applications of NPV in different types of markets. In *2021 3rd International Conference on Economic Management and Cultural Industry (ICEMCI 2021)* (pp. 1054–1059). Atlantis Press.
- Lohr, S., 2018. Microsoft Buys GitHub for \$7.5 Billion, Moving to Grow in Coding's New Era. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/04/technology/microsoft-github-cloud-computing.html>
- Macias, A and Feiner, L., 2021. Pentagon cancels \$10 billion JEDI cloud contract that Amazon and Microsoft were fighting over. <https://www.cnn.com/2021/07/06/pentagon-cancels-10-billion-jedi-cloud-contract.html>
- Markonah, M., Salim, A. and Franciska, J., 2020. Effect of profitability, leverage, and liquidity to the firm value. *Dinasti International Journal of Economics, Finance & Accounting*, 1(1), pp.83–94.
- Microsoft, 2023. Annual report. [Online] Available at <https://www.microsoft.com/investor/reports/ar23/index.html>
- Microsoft, 2024. About us. [Online] Available at <https://www.microsoft.com/en-in/about/business-groups>
- Miletić, M. and Latinac, D., 2020. Internal rate of return method—a commonly used method with few advantages and many disadvantages?. In *4th Contemporary Issues In Economy & Technology (CIET 2020)* (pp. 315–322).
- Morningstar, 2024. Microsoft. <https://www.morningstar.com/stocks/xnas/msft/quote>
- Panigrahi, C.M.A., 2019. Liquidity and profitability relationship and financial fallacy. *Think India Journal*, ISSN, pp.0971–1260.
- Riotta, C., 2023. Microsoft's Latest Hack Sparks Major Security Concerns. <https://www.bankinfosecurity.com/microsofts-latest-hack-sparks-major-security-concerns-a-24158>
- Schroeder, R.G., Clark, M.W. and Cathey, J.M., 2022. *Financial accounting theory and analysis: text and cases*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Tsalavoutas, I., Tsoligkas, F. and Evans, L., 2020. Compliance with IFRS mandatory disclosure requirements: a structured literature review. *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation*, 40, p.100338.
- Unisys, 2023. Annual report 2023. <https://www.unisys.com/news-release/unisys-announces-4q-and-full-year-2023-results/>
- Unisys, 2024. About us. <https://www.unisys.com/about-unisys/>
- Warren, C.S., Jones, J.P. and Tayler, W.B., 2020. *Financial and managerial accounting*. Cengage Learning, Inc..
- Wild, J.J. and Shaw, K.W., 2019. *Fundamental accounting principles*. McGraw-Hill.
- Yan, J., Lianyong, F. and Shanna, F., 2020. Comparative study of discounted cash flow and energy return on investment: review of oil and gas resource economic evaluation. *Финансы: теория и практика*, 24(2), pp.50–59.