## D18 Investments - Solutions
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a Intangible investment
b Fixed or expansion investment
c Financial investment
d Fixed or expansion investment
e Fixed or replacement investment
f Intangible investment
g Intangible investment
h Fixed or rationalization investment
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a Cost comparison:
Annual interest on average committed capital $=[(\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{L}) / 2] \cdot \mathrm{i}$
A: $[(1,000+0) / 2] \cdot 0.08=40$
B: $[(1,800+0) / 2] \cdot 0.08=72$
Annual depreciation (d) $=\mathrm{I} / \mathrm{n}$
A: 1,000/4 = 250
B: $1,800 / 6=300$

| Cost comparison | Chairlift A |  | Chairlift B |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Annual operating costs | CHF | 500 | CHF | 400 |
| + Annual interest on comm.cap. | CHF | 40 | CHF | 72 |
| + Annual depreciation | CHF | 250 | CHF | 300 |
| = Total annual costs | CHF | 790 | CHF | 772 |

Chairlift B would be more advantageous, as it costs less than chairlift A.

| b |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Cost comparison | Chairlift A |  | Chairlift B |  |
| Annual operating costs | CHF | 500 | CHF | 400 |
| + Annual interest on comm.cap. | CHF | 75 | CHF | 135 |
| + Annual depreciation | CHF | 250 | CHF | 300 |
| = Total annual costs | CHF | $\mathbf{8 2 5}$ | CHF | 835 |

Based on cost considerations, the ski area would select chairlift A, because it is less expensive.
c The cost comparison takes into account the imputed interest in the form of costs. The amount of imputed interest rate is an assumption (estimate) and is therefore subject to some uncertainties and unknowns. If the reality does not match the assumptions in the model, the result can be distortions of the decision-making basis in investment planning. The example, therefore, well shows the uncertainty of planning.
d Advantage: Easy to use
Disadvantage: A comparison of assets with different revenues is not possible because they are not included in the calculation.
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Cost and profit comparison:
Annual interest on average committed capital $=[(\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{L}) / 2] \cdot \mathrm{i}$
Woodchip system: $(2,500+0) / 2 \cdot 0.08=100$
Heating-oil system: $(2,000+0) / 2 \cdot 0.08=80$
Annual depreciation = I / n
Woodchip system: 2,500 / $20=125$
Heating-oil system: 2,000 / 18=111

| Cost comparison | Woodchip system | Oil system: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Annual operating costs | CHF | 500 | CHF | 400 |
| + Annual interest on comm.cap. | CHF | 100 | CHF | 80 |
| + Annual depreciation | CHF | 125 | CHF | 111 |
| = Total annual costs | CHF | 725 | CHF | $\mathbf{5 9 1}$ |

On the basis of a cost comparison, the oil system must be preferred.

| Profit comparison | Woodchip system |  | Oil system |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Annual revenue | CHF | 1050 | CHF | 870 |
| - Annual operating costs | CHF | 500 | CHF | 400 |
| - Annual interest on comm.cap. | CHF | 100 | CHF | 80 |
| - Annual depreciation | CHF | 125 | CHF | 111 |
| = Total annual costs | CHF | $\mathbf{3 2 5}$ | CHF | 279 |

On the basis of a profit comparison, the woodchip system is preferable.
b - $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ issue (consider emissions)

- Quality of service and maintenance
- Security of supply
- Susceptibility to interference
- Warranty
- etc.

Individual solutions (depending on the choice and weighting of criteria). Suggestion:

|  |  | Woodchip system |  | Heating-oil system |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Criteria | Weighting <br> W | Points <br> P | Product <br> $=\mathrm{W} \cdot \mathrm{P}$ | Points <br> P | Product <br> $=\mathrm{W} \cdot \mathrm{P}$ |
| $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | 40 | 5 | 200 | 2 | 80 |
| Low tendency to fail | 30 | 4 | 120 | 3 | 90 |
| Service and maintenance | 20 | 3 | 60 | 3 | 60 |
| Security of supply | 10 | 3 | 30 | 4 | 40 |
| Total | 100 |  | $\mathbf{4 1 0}$ |  | 270 |
| Ranking | $\mathbf{1}$ |  | 2 |  |  |

Recommendation to the board with reference to the inclusion of quantitative and qualitative data in the calculation: The profit comparison method and cost-benefit analysis speak for a woodchip system.
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|  | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Average/year |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Profit | CHF 260,000 | CHF 220,000 | CHF 180,000 | CHF 220,000 |
| Avg. comm.cap. | CHF 5,000,000 | CHF 5,000,000 | CHF 5,000,000 | CHF 5,000,000 ${ }^{2}$ |
| Avg. profitability | $\mathbf{5 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 4 \%}^{\mathbf{3}}$ |

${ }^{1}$ Average profit per year: Sum of the profits / number of years $=660,000 / 3=220,000$
${ }^{2}$ Average committed capital per year: $(\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{L}) / 2=(10,000,000+0) / 2=5,000,000$
${ }^{3}$ Average profitability: Avg. profit / Avg. comm.cap. $=220,000 / 5,000,000=0.044$
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a

| Payback period (in CHF) | Project X | Project Y |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Investment amount (I) | 360,000 | 390,000 |
| Annual profit (P) | 80,000 | 140,000 |
| Annual depreciation $(\mathrm{d})^{1}$ | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| Payback period $(\mathbf{P B})^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 3}$ years | $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ years |

${ }^{1}$ Annual depreciation: d = I/ u
${ }^{2}$ Payback period: $\mathrm{PB}=\mathrm{I} /(\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{d})$
b Based on the calculation of the payback period, the enterprise will decide for project Y because it takes less time for the invested amount of money to be fully covered by cash flows ( 2.3 years compared to 3.3 years for project X).

\section*{6 <br> | Payback period | Packaging machine (in CHF) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Investment amount (I) | $80^{\prime} 000$ |
|  | $+10^{\prime} 000$ |
|  | $=90^{\prime} 000$ |
| Benefit (B) | $48^{\prime} 000$ |
|  | $-12^{\prime} 000$ |
|  | $=36^{\prime} 000$ |
| Payback period (I/B) | $\mathbf{2 . 5}$ years |}

b The additional costs for the purchase and installation of packaging machine are compensated for by the savings after 2.5 years. The packaging machine has a useful life of 10 years, so CHF 36,000 can be saved annually in the remaining 7.5 years.
c Social aspects: employees made redundant
Ecological aspects: environmental friendliness of the machine, noise pollution
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a - Fixed investment

- Replacement investment
- Expansion investment
- Rationalization investment

| b |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | Cash flow (Benefit) in CHF | Total (cum.) in CHF |
| 1 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| 2 | 150,000 | 250,000 |
| 3 | 170,000 | 420,000 |
|  | 100,000 | 520,000 |
| 5 | 160,000 | 680,000 |
| 6 | 160,000 | 840,000 |
| $\ldots$ |  |  |

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Investment amount }(\mathrm{I}) & =\text { purchase price }+ \text { transportation and installation costs } \\
& =450,000+70,000 \\
& =520,000
\end{aligned}
$$

According to the table, the payback period is 4 years.

| 8 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a |  |  |
| $\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{t}}=$ CHF 1 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{i}=10 \%$ |  |  |
| $\mathrm{t}=1$ year |  |  |
| $\mathrm{PV}=\mathrm{Z}_{0}=\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{t}} /(1+\mathrm{i})^{\mathrm{t}}$ |  |  |
| Time (t) | Discount rate | $\mathbf{P V}=\mathrm{Z}_{0}=$ |
|  | $=1 /(1+0.1)^{\text {t }}$ | $\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathbf{1} /(\mathbf{1}+\mathbf{0 . 1})^{\mathrm{t}}$ |
| 1 year | 0.909 | CHF 0.909 |
| 5 years | 0.621 | CHF 0.621 |
| 10 years | 0.386 | CHF 0.386 |
| 15 years | 0.239 | CHF 0.239 |
| 20 years | 0.149 | CHF 0.149 |
| 25 years | 0.092 | CHF 0.092 |

General statement: The present value of a unit of money decreases as the point at which the value is received moves further into the future.

| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{t}}=\text { CHF } 1 \\ & \mathrm{t}=4 \text { years } \\ & \mathrm{PV}=\mathrm{Z}_{0}=\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{t}} /(1+\mathrm{i})^{\mathrm{t}}=1 /(1+\mathrm{i})^{\mathrm{t}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interest rate (i) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Discount rate } \\ & =1 /(1+\mathbf{i})^{4} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PV }=\mathrm{Z}_{0}= \\ \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{t}} \cdot \mathbf{1} /(\mathbf{1 + i})^{4} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4\% | 0.855 | CHF 0.855 |
| 10\% | 0.683 | CHF 0.683 |
| 20\% | 0.482 | CHF 0.482 |
| 30\% | 0.350 | CHF 0.350 |
| 40\% | 0.260 | CHF 0.260 |

General statement: The greater the chosen interest rate, the smaller the present value.
$\left.\begin{array}{llll}\begin{array}{l}9 \\ \text { Model A }\end{array} & & \\ \hline \text { Year } & \text { Amount } \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{t}} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Discount rate } \\ =\mathbf{1} /(\mathbf{1 + 0 . 1})^{\mathbf{t}}\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { PV = Z Z }\end{array}= \\ \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{t}} \cdot \mathbf{1} /(\mathbf{1}+\mathbf{i})^{\mathbf{t}}\end{array}\right]$

| Model B |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | Amount $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{t}}$ | Discount rate <br> $=\mathbf{1} /(\mathbf{1 + 0 . 1})^{\mathbf{t}}$ | PV $=\mathbf{Z}_{0}=$ <br> $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{t}} \cdot \mathbf{1} /(\mathbf{1}+\mathbf{i})^{\mathbf{t}}$ |
| $\mathrm{t}_{0}$ | CHF $-10,000$ | 1.0 | CHF -10,000 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{1}$ | CHF | 4,000 | 0.983 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{2}$ | CHF | 4,100 | 0.797 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{3}$ | CHF | 4,100 | 0.712 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{4}$ | CHF | 4,200 | 0.636 |

Model A has an NPV that is CHF 1,046 greater. Simone and Gabriel should buy Model A.

Model A

| Year | Amount $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{t}}$ | Discount rate <br> $=\mathbf{1} /(\mathbf{1 + 0 . 1})^{\mathbf{t}}$ | PV $=\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{0}}=$ <br> $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{t}} \cdot \mathbf{1} /(\mathbf{1}+\mathbf{i})^{\mathbf{t}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{t}_{0}$ | CHF -8,000 | 1.0 | CHF -8,000 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{1}$ | CHF 3,500 | 0.983 | CHF 3,125 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{2}$ | CHF 3,800 | 0.797 | CHF 3,029 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{3}$ | CHF 3,900 | 0.712 | CHF 2,776 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{4}$ | CHF 4,000 | 0.636 | CHF 2,542 |
| L | CHF 1,000 | 0.636 | CHF 636 |
| $\mathbf{N P V}$ |  |  | CHF 4,108 |

Model B

| Year | Amount $\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{t}}$ |  | Discount rate $=1 /(1+0.1)^{t}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PV }=Z_{0}= \\ & Z_{t} \cdot 1 /(1+\mathbf{i})^{t} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{t}_{0}$ | CHF -10,000 |  | 1.0 | CHF -10,000 |  |
| $\mathrm{t}_{1}$ | CHF | 4,000 | 0.983 | CHF | 3,571 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{2}$ | CHF | 4,100 | 0.797 | CHF | 3,268 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{3}$ | CHF | 4,100 | 0.712 | CHF | 2,918 |
| $\mathrm{t}_{4}$ | CHF | 4,200 | 0.636 | CHF | 2,669 |
| L | CHF | 1,800 | 0.636 | CHF | 1,144 |
| NPV |  |  |  | CHF | 3,570 |

L: Liquidation proceeds at the end of the useful life

Model A now has an NPV that is CHF 538 higher, making it preferable to Model B.
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$\operatorname{NVP}(=0)=\left(\mathrm{R}_{1}-\mathrm{E}_{1}\right) /(1+\mathrm{i})^{1}-\mathrm{I}_{0}$
$0=(18,000-2,000) /(1+i)^{1}-15,000$
$15,000=16,000 /(1+i)^{1}$
$(1+i)^{1}=16,000 / 15,000$
$\mathrm{i}=0.0667$
$\mathrm{i}=6.7 \%$

