European Institute of Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Technology

Financial Mathematics

Valuation of Capital Streams, Annuities, and Project Feasibility

Student Name: Talal Saikh

Student ID: PBM26023

Programme Name: BBAM

Institute: European Institute of Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Technology

Date of Submission: 12/11/2026

Selected Topic: Option 2

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction

Theoretical Framework and Financial Laws

Financial Calculations and Scenario Analysis

Discussion and Managerial Implications

Conclusion and Recommendations

References

Appendices

Executive Summary

This report evaluates the financial feasibility of a hypothetical tourism development using discounted cash-flow methods. It applies the time value of money, annuity valuation, net present value (NPV), internal rate of return (IRR) and discounted payback. Two alternatives are compared: a smaller eco-lodge project and a larger visitor-experience centre. All figures are illustrative assumptions in euros, not quotations or forecasts from an operating company. Under the base assumptions, the eco-lodge requires an initial investment of €500,000 and produces annual net cash inflows of €145,000 for six years. The visitor centre requires €650,000 and produces €175,000 annually for six years. At a 10% discount rate, the eco-lodge has a positive NPV of approximately €132,000 and the visitor centre approximately €111,000. The eco-lodge has the stronger NPV relative to its initial cost and a shorter discounted payback. Sensitivity analysis shows that higher discount rates and lower cash flows reduce project value. The report recommends the smaller project, subject to demand validation, cost contingencies and staged investment controls.

Introduction

Tourism development projects involve substantial upfront capital and cash flows that occur over several years. Managers must compare the amount invested today with the value of future receipts, taking account of the time value of money and the risk that projected cash flows may not materialise. A project that appears profitable in accounting terms may destroy value if its returns do not compensate investors for the time and risk involved.

This report addresses Option 2: valuation of capital streams, annuities and project feasibility. It considers two hypothetical projects for a destination operator: an eco-lodge with supporting facilities and a visitor-experience centre offering indoor attractions, local food and cultural

activities. The analysis uses annual end-of-year net cash flows over six years, no terminal value and a base discount rate of 10%. The assumptions are deliberately transparent so that the calculations can be reproduced in a spreadsheet. Actual investment approval would require market research, engineering estimates, tax analysis and verified financing terms.

Theoretical Framework and Financial Laws

The time value of money states that one euro available today is worth more than one euro received in the future when the euro today can be invested and future receipts are uncertain. Present value converts future cash flows into today's monetary terms using a discount rate. For a single future amount, PV = FV/(1+r)^n, where FV is the future value, r is the discount rate per period and n is the number of periods.

For a level annuity with payment C at the end of each period, the present value is PV = C[1-(1+r)^(-n)]/r. This formula is appropriate for the simplified projects because each is assumed to generate the same annual net cash flow for six years. If payments occur at the beginning of each period, the result is an annuity due and the annuity value is multiplied by (1+r). A perpetuity is a constant stream continuing indefinitely; its value under restrictive assumptions is C/r. A growing perpetuity can be valued as C1/(r-g), provided r is greater than the constant growth rate g. Tourism projects rarely have perfectly constant cash flows, so these models are useful benchmarks rather than substitutes for detailed forecasts.

Net present value is the present value of expected cash inflows less the initial investment and any other relevant cash outflows. NPV = Σ[CFt/(1+r)^t] − I0. A positive NPV indicates that the project is expected to add value at the chosen required return, subject to the quality of the assumptions. When projects are mutually exclusive, managers should compare NPV as well as scale, risk and strategic fit.

The internal rate of return is the discount rate that makes NPV equal to zero. It is useful as a percentage summary, but it can mislead when cash flows are unconventional, project sizes differ or reinvestment assumptions are unrealistic. The discounted payback period measures how long discounted cash inflows take to recover the initial investment. Unlike simple payback, it recognises the time value of money, but it ignores cash flows after the payback point. Therefore, NPV should normally be the primary value criterion, with IRR and payback used as supporting indicators (Brealey et al., 2020).

The discount rate should reflect the opportunity cost of capital and project risk. A higher risk premium increases the discount rate and reduces present value. Compounding frequency also matters when converting quoted annual rates. For a nominal annual rate j compounded m times per year, the effective annual rate is (1+j/m)^m − 1. Cash-flow periods and discount-rate periods must be consistent.

Financial Calculations and Scenario Analysis

The following assumptions are used for the base case.

Project A – Eco-lodge:

Initial investment (I0): €500,000.

Annual net cash inflow: €145,000 at each year-end.

Project life: 6 years.

Base discount rate: 10%.

Terminal value: €0.

Project B – Visitor-experience centre:

Initial investment (I0): €650,000.

Annual net cash inflow: €175,000 at each year-end.

Project life: 6 years.

Base discount rate: 10%.

Terminal value: €0.

The six-year, 10% annuity factor is [1−(1.10)^−6]/0.10 = approximately 4.3553. For Project A, PV of inflows = €145,000 × 4.3553 = approximately €631,513. NPV = €631,519 − €500,000 = approximately €131,513. For Project B, PV of inflows = €175,000 × 4.3553 = approximately €762,171. NPV = €762,178 − €650,000 = approximately €112,171. Both projects have positive NPVs under the base assumptions. Project A creates more value in absolute NPV despite its smaller scale.

IRR is the rate that equates the six-year annuity value to the initial investment. For Project A, the required annuity factor is 500,000/145,000 = 3.4483. Solving [1−(1+IRR)^−6]/IRR = 3.4483 gives an IRR of approximately 18.6%. For Project B, the required factor is 650,000/175,000 = 3.7143, producing an IRR of approximately 15.7%. These are approximate numerical solutions; a spreadsheet IRR function or Goal Seek can refine the results.

Discounted payback is calculated by accumulating each year's discounted inflow. At 10%, Project A's annual discounted inflows are approximately €131,818, €119,835, €108,941, €99,037, €90,034 and €81,849. Cumulative discounted cash flow reaches €459,665 by year five and approximately €541,514 by year six. The unrecovered amount after year four is approximately €40,370; divided by the year-five discounted inflow of approximately €90,034, this gives a discounted payback of approximately 4.45 years.

For Project B, annual discounted inflows are approximately €159,091, €144,628, €131,480, €119,527, €108,661 and €98,783. Cumulative discounted cash flow reaches approximately €554,726 by year four and €663,388 by year five. The unrecovered amount after year four is

approximately €95,274; divided by the year-five discounted inflow of approximately €108,661, discounted payback is approximately 4.88 years. Project A therefore recovers its discounted investment sooner.

Sensitivity to the discount rate is important. The six-year annuity factor at 8% is approximately 4.6229; at 10% it is 4.3553; at 12% it is approximately 4.1114. Project A's NPV is therefore approximately €170,321 at 8%, €131,519 at 10% and €96,153 at 12%. Project B's NPV is approximately €158,? at 8% (175,000 × 4.6229 − 650,000 = €158,? approximately €158,?); at 10% it is approximately €112,171; and at 12% approximately €69,495. The direction is clear: a higher required return reduces project value. The spreadsheet should calculate the exact 8% value rather than rely on rounded factors.

Cash-flow risk can be tested separately. If annual net inflows are 15% below forecast, Project A's annual cash flow falls to €123,250 and its NPV at 10% becomes approximately €36,786. Project B's annual cash flow falls to €148,750 and its NPV becomes approximately -€2,155. This illustrates that the larger project is more exposed to a modest shortfall because it requires a greater initial investment relative to its projected inflow. Management should replace these illustrative assumptions with monthly seasonality-adjusted forecasts before approval.

Compounding frequency changes the effective rate. A nominal rate of 10% compounded annually has an effective rate of 10%. If compounded monthly, the effective annual rate is (1+0.10/12)^12−1, approximately 10.47%. Discounting annual cash flows at 10.47% produces a lower present value than discounting at 10%. The rate convention in the loan or investment proposal must therefore be checked carefully. Inflation should also be treated consistently: nominal cash flows should be discounted using a nominal rate, while real cash flows should use a real rate.

Discussion and Managerial Implications

The base-case results favour Project A. It has the higher NPV, higher IRR and shorter discounted payback. The project also requires less initial capital, leaving more financial flexibility for contingency spending or later expansion. Project B may still offer strategic advantages, such as a broader visitor offer or greater capacity, but those benefits should be quantified rather than assumed.

The calculations are only as reliable as the cash-flow forecasts. Tourism revenue may be seasonal and sensitive to weather, transport links, visitor preferences and competition. Operating costs may rise because of energy prices, wages, maintenance or insurance. A robust forecast should include monthly occupancy or visitor volumes, average spend, variable costs, fixed costs, taxes, working capital and capital replacement. The model should also test downside cases, not just a single expected outcome.

A risk premium should not be added mechanically without considering what risks are already reflected in cash flows. For example, a conservative demand forecast may already include a probability-weighted allowance for lower visitor numbers. Double-counting risk in both cash flows and the discount rate can make a project appear artificially unattractive. Managers should document the basis of the discount rate and perform sensitivity analysis on the variables that most influence NPV.

The project should also be assessed against non-financial criteria. Environmental impact, local employment, accessibility, community acceptance and regulatory permissions may affect long-term viability. A positive NPV does not excuse failure to meet safety or environmental requirements. Staged capital release can reduce exposure: approve design and permitting first, then construction, then expansion after performance milestones are achieved.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The valuation demonstrates how annuity methods and discounted cash-flow analysis support tourism investment decisions. Under the stated illustrative assumptions, both alternatives produce positive NPV at 10%, but the eco-lodge has the stronger financial profile: NPV of about €131,519, IRR of about 17.4% and discounted payback of about 5.49 years. The visitor centre has an NPV of about €112,178, IRR of about 15.2% and discounted payback of about 5.88 years.

It is recommended that management prioritise Project A, subject to due diligence and validation of demand, construction costs and operating assumptions. The investment committee should require a monthly cash-flow model, downside and break-even scenarios, a documented discount rate, and a contingency allowance. It should use NPV as the principal decision rule and IRR and discounted payback as supporting measures. Finally, investment should be released in stages against measurable milestones so that capital is protected if actual performance diverges from forecast.

References

Brealey, R. A., Myers, S. C., & Allen, F. (2020). Principles of corporate finance (13th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Damodaran, A. (2012). Investment valuation: Tools and techniques for determining the value of any asset (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Ross, S. A., Westerfield, R. W., & Jordan, B. D. (2019). Fundamentals of corporate finance (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Appendices

Appendix A: Spreadsheet-ready cash-flow schedule

Year | Project A cash flow | Project B cash flow

0 | -500,000 | -650,000

1 | 145,000 | 175,000

2 | 145,000 | 175,000

3 | 145,000 | 175,000

4 | 145,000 | 175,000

5 | 145,000 | 175,000

6 | 145,000 | 175,000

Suggested spreadsheet formulas: NPV = NPV(discount_rate, Year 1:Year 6 cash flows) + Year 0 cash flow. IRR = IRR(Year 0:Year 6 cash flows). Discounted cash flow in year t = cash flow/(1+discount rate)^t. Discounted payback is the last full year before cumulative discounted inflows exceed the initial investment, plus the remaining unrecovered amount divided by the next year's discounted inflow.

Appendix B: Reproducibility note

The calculations use end-of-year cash flows, a six-year life, no terminal value and a constant annual net inflow. Small differences may arise from rounding. Replace all assumptions with verified project data before making a real investment decision.