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#### Abstract

: In India about $50 \%$ of the total population constitute women, but women workers constitute about $16 \%$ of the total population and out of these $16 \%, 82 \%$ work is in unorganised sector. With an increase in women education, more and more tend to join work force and with increase in the technically qualified women, women are finding increasing opportunities in establishing their own enterprises. For establishing their own entreprises, the investment decisions, also known as Capital Budgeting Decisions should be taken into account.It requires comparison of costs against benefits over a long period. The deployment of finances on additional plants and equipments cannot be recovered in a short run. Such investments may affect revenues for the time period ranging from 2 to 20 years or more. Such decisions involve a careful consideration of various factors such as profitability, safety, liquidity, solvency etc. The present paper deals with this important function of Women as a finance manager.
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## 1. Introduction

Self employment women are contributing in significant ways to economic health and competitiveness in countries around the world. The contribution of women in business has been increasing tremendously at global level during the last decade. Women in advanced economies own more than $25 \%$ of all the business. At present in India, only $9.5 \%$ of women entrepreneurs are managing the small enterprises. A number of factors are contributing to this phenomena. Some of these are spread of education, change in lifestyle and growth in IT \& service sector in the economy, but the most important factor which contributes a lot in a successful enterprise are financial decisions and investment decisions.
A finance manager is concerned with the financing as well as the investment decisions / Capital budgeting decisions. Financing decisions relate to:

- Determination of the amount of long -term finance required
- Sources of long term finances and
- The technique of obtaining optimum capital structure
- The capital budgeting decisions require comparison of cost against benefits over a long period. These benefits are:
- Replacement of fixed assets due to their worn out or becoming outdated on account of new technology
- Expansion of Production facility due to increase in demands.
- Diversification of business in several markets in order to reduce its risk.
- An industry where technology is rapidly changing requires funds for research and development.
- Fund for miscellaneous purposes are required such as pollution control equipments etc. which are not profit oriented.


Figure 1

|  | Funds | Differs From Past <br> Practices Of The Company |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tactical | Small | No |
| Strategic | High | Yes |

Table 1: Tactical Vs. Strategic Investment Decisions
Special care should be taken for Capital budgeting decisions due to different factors given below:


Figure 2

## 2. Importance of Capital Budgeting

There are five important factors affecting Capital Investment Decisions:

- The amount of investment ( By viewing Cost of new projects, Installation cost, Working Capital, Proceeds from sale of asset, Tax effects and investment allowance, computations of capital investment is done)
- Minimum rate of return on investment: Cut-off Point is the point below which a project would not be accepted. If $10 \%$ is the desired rate of return, it means that the cut-off point is $10 \%$. The project would be rejected, if below $10 \%$.
- Return expected from the Investment
- Ranking of the Investment proposals
- Risk and Certainty.


## 3. Capital Budgeting Process

The capital budgeting process involves different stages in the life of an investment project. Starting from the generation of the idea of a project and ending with the benefits of the project, it involves the following stages:

- Project generation-It is the first stage of investment project which recognize the various opportunities for profitable investment. At this stage various alternatives are identified.
- Preliminary Screening process - Various alternatives should be evaluated on the basis of their feasibility. A rough estimated rate of return should also be made according to entrepreneur expectations.
- Detailed project evaluation - It involves the following steps:
- Estimation of cash outflow (initial investment)
- Estimation of cash inflows
- Application of suitable capital budgeting method like payback period, ARR, NPV, IRR and PI.
- Selection of the project
- Implementation of selected project- After selection of a project, it should be implemented.
- Control of capital expenditure - During implementation, proper control should be taken on the money spent.

The main methods used for the Capital Budgeting Appraisal methods are:

### 3.1. Pay-Back Period Method

Calculation of Pay Back Period in even case inflow case:
A project requires Rs.20000/- as initial investment and the project will generate an annual cash inflow of Rs.5000/-for ten years.

| Year | Cash Inflows (Rs.) | Cumulative Case Inflows (Rs.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5000 | 5000 |
| 2 | 5000 | 10000 |
| 3 | 5000 | 15000 |
| 4 | 5000 | 20000 |
| 5 | 5000 | 25000 |
| 6 | 5000 | 30000 |
| 7 | 5000 | 35000 |
| 8 | 5000 | 40000 |
| 9 | 5000 | 45000 |
| 10 | 5000 | 50000 |

Table 2
Then, the payback period $=\quad$ Initial Investment/Annual Cash Inflow
$=\quad$ Rs. 20000/-/Rs.5000/-
$=4$ Years.
Calculation of Pay Back Period in uneven case inflow case:
A project requires Rs.20000/- as initial investment and the project will generate an annual uneven cash inflow as follows:

| Year | Cash Inflows (Rs.) | Cumulative Case Inflows (Rs.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6000 | 6000 |
| 2 | 8000 | 14000 |
| 3 | 5000 | 19000 |
| 4 | 4000 | 23000 |
| 5 | 4000 | 27000 |

Table 3

$$
\text { Then, the payback period } \quad=\quad 3 \text { years }+1000 / 4000
$$

$$
=\quad 3.25 \text { years. }
$$

A project whose actual payback period is more than what has been pre-determined by the management, in that case the project is straightway rejected.

### 3.1.1. Case Study- I

XYZ company Ltd. is producing materials mostly by manual labour. Now, the company wants to replace manual labour by a new machine. Two models $M \& N$ of a new machine are available. Which machine is preferable by payback method from the following information?

Machine M Machine N
Estimated life of machine
Cost of machine
Estimated savings in scrap
Estimated savings in direct wages
Additional cost of maintenance
Additional cost of supervision

| 4 Years | 5 Years |
| :--- | :---: |
| Rs. $9000 /-$ | Rs. $18000 /-$ |
| Rs. $500 /-$ | Rs. $800 /-$ |
| Rs.6000/- | Rs. $8000 /-$ |
| Rs. $800 /-$ | Rs. $1000 /-$ |
| Rs. $1200 /-$ | Rs. $1800 /-$ |

## Ignore Taxation

### 3.1.2. Solution

|  | Machine M | Machine N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rs. | Rs. |
| Estimated savings in scrap | 500 | 800 |
| Estimated savings in direct wages | 6000 | 8000 |
| Total savings(i) | 6500 | 8800 |
| Additional cost of maintenance | 800 | 1000 |
| Additional cost of supervision | 1200 | 1800 |
| Total additional costs(ii) | 2000 | 2800 |
| Net cash inflow = (i) -(ii) | 4500 | 6000 |

Table 4

Then, the payback period = Initial Investment/Annual Cash Inflow
$\mathrm{M}=9000 / 4500=2$ Years $\quad \mathrm{N}=18000 / 6000=3$ Years
Machine M has a shorter payback period, hence it should be preferred to machine N . Limitation: But, sometimes this method ignores the returns after the payback period. For e.g.:

Initial Investments
Cash Inflows (Year wise) in Rs.
1
2
3
4
5
Payback period

## Project A

Rs.10000/-
Rs.4000/-
Rs.4000/-
Rs.2000/-

3 years

Project B
Rs.10000/-

Rs.3000/-
Rs.3000/-
Rs.3000/-
Rs.3000/-
Rs.3000/-
3. 33 years

In this case, project $A$ has a shorter payback period in comparison to project $B$. Hence, it should be preferred. But it is not a rational decision because Project B continues to give returns after payback period also, hence Project B is profitable.

### 3.2. Discounted Cash Flow Method

It comprises of three methods-
Net Present Value (NPV) Method: If NPV is greater than zero, accept the proposal and if NPV is less than zero, reject the proposal.

### 3.2.1. Case Study - II

XYZ Ltd. wants to replace the plant. Three proposals are there, each costing Rs. $250000 /$ - and have an estimated life of 5 years, 4 years and 3 years respectively. The Plant's required rate of return is $10 \%$. The anticipated net cash inflows after taxes for the three plants are as follows:

| Years | Plant I | Plant II | Plant III |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rs. | Rs. | Rs. |
| 1 | 80000 | 110000 | 130000 |
| 2 | 60000 | 90000 | 110000 |
| 3 | 60000 | 85000 | 20000 |
| 4 | 60000 | 35000 | - |
| 5 | 180000 | - | - |

Table 5
Solution: Firstly, we will calculate the PVF at $10 \%$ for $1,2,3,4$ and 5 years respectively with the help of the formula: PVF $=\left(1-(1+i)^{-n}\right) / i$

| Yr. | $\begin{gathered} \text { PVF } \\ (\mathbf{1 0 \%}) \end{gathered}$ | Plant I |  | Plant II |  | Plant III |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Inflow | P.V. | Inflow | P.V. | Inflow | P.V. |
| 1 | 0.909 | 80000 | 72720 | 110000 | 99990 | 130000 | 118170 |
| 2 | 0.826 | 60000 | 49560 | 90000 | 74340 | 110000 | 90860 |
| 3 | 0.751 | 60000 | 45060 | 85000 | 63835 | 20000 | 15020 |
| 4 | 0.683 | 60000 | 40980 | 35000 | 23905 | - | - |
| 5 | 0.621 | 180000 | 111780 | - | - | - | - |
| Gross P.V. |  |  | 320100 |  | 262070 |  | 224050 |
| Cash Outflow |  |  | 250000 |  | 250000 |  | 250000 |
| Net Present Value |  |  | 70100 |  | 12070 |  | 25950 |

Table 6
The NPV of Plant I is higher, i.e. Rs. $70100 /-$, hence it should be recommended to management for acceptance.
NPV Method does not ignore 'Time Value of Money' and also takes into account return after payback period also, but payback does not have these advantages.
Excess Present Value Index Method:
In CASE STUDY II, if we calculate the Present Value Index (PVI) of the three plants I, II and III, then we get:
PVI of Plant $\mathrm{I}=320100 / 250000=1.2804$
PVI of Plant II $=262070 / 250000=1.04828$
PVI of Plant III $=224050 / 250000=0.8962$
Since, PVI of Plant I is highest, hence Plant I is preferable.
Internal Rate of Return Method:

### 3.2.2. Case Study III

XYZ Ltd. Wants to buy machine A or B. Machine A costing Rs.75000/- and its expected life is 6 years with no salvage value. It would generate a net cash flow of Rs.20000/- per year. Machine B, costing Rs.50000/- and its expected life is 6 years with no salvage value. It would generate a net cash flow of Rs. 15000/- per year. Assuming the cost of capital of both the machines is $10 \%$. Which machine is to be recommended.

| Year | $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 \%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-6$ | 3.889 | 3.784 | 3.685 | 3.589 | 3.498 | 3.326 |

Table 7
The present value factors at $10 \%$ rate of discount for the years 1 to 6 are given as follows:

| Year | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P.V. factor at <br> $10 \%$ | 0.909 | 0.826 | 0.751 | 0.683 | 0.621 | 0.564 |

Table 8

### 3.2.2.1. Solution <br> Computations of NPV of machines

| Year | Net Cash Flows <br> Of Machine A <br> (Rs.) | Net Cash <br> Flows Of <br> Machine B <br> (Rs.) | PV factor at <br> $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ (Rs.) | PV of <br> machine A <br> (Rs.) | PV of machine B <br> (Rs.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 20000 | 15000 | 0.909 | 18180 | 13635 |
| 2 | 20000 | 15000 | 0.826 | 16520 | 12390 |
| 3 | 20000 | 15000 | 0.751 | 15020 | 11265 |
| 4 | 20000 | 15000 | 0.683 | 13660 | 10245 |
| 5 | 20000 | 15000 | 0.621 | 12420 | 9315 |
| 6 | 20000 | 15000 | 0.564 | 11280 | 8460 |
| Total present value of cash inflows |  |  |  |  | 87080 |
| Total present value of cash outflows |  |  |  |  | 65310 |
| NPV | 75000 | 50000 |  |  |  |


| Year | $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-6$ | 3.889 | 3.784 | 3.685 | 3.589 | 3.498 | 3.326 |
| Present value of annual cash | $20000 \times$ | $20000 \times$ | $20000 \times$ | $20000 \times$ | $20000 \times$ | $20000 \times$ |
| inflows of machine A for 6 | $3.889=$ | $3.784=$ | $3.685=$ | $3.589=$ | $3.498=$ | $3.326=$ |
| years | 77780 | 75680 | 73700 | 71780 | 69960 | 66520 |
| Present value of annual cash | $15000 \times$ | $15000 \times$ | $15000 \times$ | $15000 \times$ | $15000 \times$ | $15000 \times$ |
| inflows of machine B for 6 | $3.889=$ | $3.784=$ | $3.685=$ | $3.589=$ | $3.498=$ | $3.326=$ |
| years | 58335 | 56760 | 55275 | 53835 | 52470 | 498900 |

Computation of Internal Rate of Return:
Machine A:
The present value of annual cash inflows @ $16 \%$ for 6 years is close to Rs. 75000/-, i.e. Rs.73700/-
Less present value of cash outflows Rs.75000/-
Net present value
Rs.1300/-
So, at $10 \%$ NPV is
Rs.12080/-
And at $16 \%$ NPV is
Rs.1300/-
Therefore, Internal Rate of Return for Machine A is $10 \%+\{12080 /(12080+1300)\} \times 6=15.4 \%$
Similarly, for Machine B:
The present value of annual cash inflows @ $20 \%$ for 6 years is close to Rs. 50000/-, i.e. Rs.49890/-
Less present value of cash outflows
Rs.50000/-
Net present value
Rs.110/-
So, at $10 \%$ NPV is
Rs.15310/-
And at $16 \%$ NPV is
Rs.110/-

Therefore, Internal Rate of Return for Machine A is $10 \%+\{15310 /(15310+110)\} \times 10=19.90 \%$
Since, Machine B has a higher internal rate of Return. Hence it is preferred over Machine A.
Accounting or Average Rate of Return (ARR) Method

### 3.2.3. Case Study IV

A new machine costing Rs. $50000 /-$ with a life of 5 years and no salvage value is to be installed. The company's tax rate is $50 \%$ and no investment allowance is allowed. The company uses the straight line method of depreciation. From the following information, calculate the ARR.

Year:
Net Income before Depreciation:

| 1 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 10000 | 11000 |

3
14000

| 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 15000 | 25000 |

And tax (Rs.)

### 3.2.3.1. Solution

| Year | Net Income <br>  <br> Tax (Rs.) | Depreciation | Net Income <br> (Rs.) | Tax (Rs.) | Income <br> after tax <br> (Rs.) | Cash Flow <br> (Rs.) | Cumulative <br> cash flow <br> (Rs.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | $(7)$ | $(8)$ |
| 1 | 10000 | 10000 | - | - | - | 10000 | 10000 |
| 2 | 11000 | 10000 | 1000 | 500 | 500 | 10500 | 20500 |
| 3 | 14000 | 10000 | 4000 | 2000 | 2000 | 12000 | 32500 |
| 4 | 15000 | 10000 | 5000 | 2500 | 2500 | 12500 | 45000 |
| 5 | 25000 | 10000 | 15000 | 7500 | 7500 | 17500 | 62500 |

Table 10
Average Income after tax: $(0+500+2000+2500+7500) / 5=$ Rs. $2500 /-$
Average Investment $=50000 / 2=$ Rs. $25000 /-$
ARR $=$ Average Income after tax $/$ Average Investment $=(2500 / 25000) \times 100=10 \%$
Sometimes in Capital Budgeting, Capital Rationing is adopted. Capital Rationing is thus, the allocation of funds to most desirable projects due to limitations on the availability of financing.

### 3.2.4. Case Study V

A Firm has Rs. $600000 /$ - available for investment. The cost of capital is $10 \%$. There are 10 proposals. Which proposals to choose.

| Proposals | Cost of the <br> Project (Rs.) | Internal Rate of <br> Return (\%) | NPV (Rs.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 200000 | 7 | 14000 |
| 2 | 230000 | 8 | 27000 |
| 3 | 200000 | 9 | 7000 |
| 4 | 200000 | 23 | 120000 |
| 5 | 120000 | 19 | 54000 |
| 6 | 150000 | 17 | 57000 |
| 7 | 90000 | 16 | 22500 |
| 8 | 300000 | 13 | 64800 |
| 9 | 360000 | 12 | 42000 |
| 10 | 500000 | 11 | 40000 |

Table 11

### 3.2.4.1. Solution

First we will rank the proposals:

| Proposals | Cost of the <br> Project (Rs.) | Cumulative Total <br> Costs (Rs.) | Internal Rate of <br> Return (\%) | NPV (Rs.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 200000 | 200000 | 23 | 120000 |
| 5 | 120000 | 320000 | 19 | 54000 |
| 6 | 150000 | 470000 | 17 | 57000 |
| 7 | 90000 | 560000 | 16 | 22500 |
| 8 | 300000 | 860000 | 13 | 64800 |
| 9 | 360000 | 1220000 | 12 | 42000 |
| 10 | 500000 | 1720000 | 11 | 40000 |
| Cut Off |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 200000 | 1920000 | 9 | 7000 |
| 2 | 230000 | 2150000 | 8 | 27000 |
| 1 | 200000 | 2350000 | 7 | 14000 |

The proposals 1, 2 and 3 are below $10 \%$ cost of capital, hence rejected.
Other proposals are above $10 \%$ and thus their combinations can be selected.
Since, a firm has Rs. $600000 /-$ available for investment, hence the firm should accept proposals from 4 to 7 involving a capital expenditure of Rs.560000/-.

## 4. Recommendations and Conclusion

Through Capital Budgeting Techniques, the objective is to correlate the benefits to costs in a manner which is consistent with the profit maximization objective of the business. It helps in planning the deployment of available capital for the purpose of maximizing the long term profitability of the firm.
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