



















































































The Variance of Very Large Portfolios □ What happens when a portfolio contains many stocks - for example the entire S&P500? □ Suppose we have equal proportions of N stocks in the portfolios □ Then the covariances totally dominate the variances □ The general formula reduces to the following: Portfolio variance = 1/N * Average Variance + (1 – 1/N) * Average Covariance The portfolio variance converges to the average covariance. The individual variances become insignificant. How to explain this? Slide 47 Fundamentals of Valuation © J. Favaro 2004 27 October 2004

Fundamentals of Valuation

 \bigcirc

















_	_	
Company	Beta	
FIAT	1.25	
Tiscali	2.41	Betas of some
Telecom Italia	1.21	Italian companies in October 2004
ENEL	0.92	
AISoftw@re	1.30	
e.Biscom SpA	1,92	

Company	Beta	Betas of some
Amazon.com	2.228	IT companies i April 2004
Sun Microsyst	ems 2.677	
Lucent	2.863	
SAP	2.549	Notice how hig
Peoplesoft	2.414	they are!
Computer Ass	ociates 2.309	

5	The Contribution of the CAPM	
	The CAPM was developed in the mid-1960s by William Shar John Lintner, and Jack Traynor	pe,
	The Capital Asset Pricing Model answered the questions aborisk and return in some concrete ways	out
	Q: Which kinds of risk should be rewarded and which not?	
	 A: Investors do not expect to be rewarded for unique risk A: Investors do expect to be rewarded for systematic/market ris 	k
	Q: How much should the reward be?	
	♦ A: The reward should be directly related to beta It works (more or loco) in practice.	
	 The correlation between risk and reward over the past decades has been reasonably close to that predicted by the CAPM 	
	Above all, the CAPM has become the standard for all resear and practice in the area of risk and return	ch
27 October 2004	Slide 60 Fundamentals of Valuation	© J. Favaro 2004



Di e e le	Dete	E	Defer
STOCK	Beta	Expected	Keturn
AI&I	0.65	10.7%	
Bristol-Myers Squibb	0.95	13.1%	Betas in
Coca-Cola	0.98	13.3%	July 1998
Compaq	1.13	14.5%	from a
Exxon	0.73	11.3%	<u>variety</u> of
General Electric	1.29	15.8%	from
McDonald's	0.95	13.1%	telecom to
Microsoft	1.26	15.6%	consumer
Reebok	0.87	12.5%	goods
Xerox	1.05	13.9%	





























S		Time	Con			
16	sung me	I IMe	-Sens	Silive		ormula
First let's	try the new fo	rmula oi	n the ori	ginal pro	oject:	
	Period	0	1	2	Totals	
	Benefits	0	\$300	\$500	\$800	
	Costs	\$400	\$200	\$100	\$700	
Now try the	0 = NPV = -3	400 + -	1+ROI version	$\frac{00}{1} + \frac{00}{(1-1)}$	+ ROI) ²	■> ROI = 13%
	Period	0	1	2	Totals	
	Benefits	0	\$500	\$300	\$800	
	Costs	\$400	\$200	\$100	\$700	
	0 = NPV = -3	\$400+\$	500 - \$2 1 + ROI	$\frac{00}{1} + \frac{$30}{(1)}$	(0-\$100)	■>ROI = 18%
			1 1 101	(1-	(KOI)	·

Needed	: a Time-Sensitive ROI Calcu	lation
Clearly we	must find a way to take our basic ROI forr	nula
	$0 = \text{NPV} = C_0 + \frac{B}{1 + \text{ROI}}$	
and make we have to a	e it sensitive to the order in which benefits o account for the time value of money someh	occur. That is, low.
What about j	iust extending the basic formula in a "disco	ounting" style
0 = N	$PV = C_0 + \frac{B_1}{1 + ROI} + \frac{B_2}{(1 + ROI)^2}$	+
where B _i	are the net benefits in each period? Would	that work?
27 October 2004	Slide 78 Fundamentals of Valuation	© J. Favaro 200













Project Ha Rate of Re	are has a n eturn) and	nuch hig faster pa	her ROI ayback i	(calculated a than Project	as Internal Tortoise
Period	0	1	2	ROI (IRR)	NPV at 10%
Hare	-500	400	800	73%	\$525
Tortoise	-500	150	etc.	30%	\$1000
But Projec – in simpl	ct Hare ha e terms, <u>it</u>	s a far lo is worth	wer NPV less		







	A Set o	f Four I	Project	ts	
Goliath	Four proje	cts, in va	rious siz	zes	David Sr.
	Project	CF0	CF1	CF2	ALC: NO
	Goliath	-500	400	800	
	Goliath Jr.	-400	300	500	-
	David Sr.	-200	200	300	
	David	-100	150	350	
Goliath Jr.	Which c	David			
7 October 2004	Eun	Slide 90	ation		© J. Favaro 20

Project	CF0	CF1	CF2	NPV at 10%	
Goliath	-500	400	800	+525]
Goliath Jr.	-400	300	500	+286	All have
David Sr.	-200	200	300	+230	NPV
David	-100	150	350	+326	J
Totals	-1200	1050	1950	+1366	
Total investn	nent			То	tal NPV

	L11		ouuget			
But what if you only have 700 to invest?						
Project	CF0	CF1	CF2	NPV at 10%		
Goliath	-500	400	800	+525		
Goliath Jr.	-400	300	500	+286		
David Sr.	-200	200	300	+230		
David	-100	150	350	+326		
Totals	-1200	1050	1950	+1366		
Soliath + Goli Soliath + Dav	ath Jr. = 90 id Sr. + Dav	0 /id Jr. = 8(00	Isn't there some systematic way to decide which		





\$	Ranking Proje	cts
	"Getting the biggest bang for the buck" involves ranking projects We have already seen that ROI is unreliable for ranking projects	8 7 9
	 bosin capitale the discount rate The profitability measure that comes closest is the profitability index Ratio of NPV to investment cost 	ranking projects
	Variation: benefit/cost ratio	NPV
	Calculates NPV per unit of investment	Unit of Investment
27 Octobe	Silde 95 er 2004 Fundamentals of Valuation	© J. Favaro 2004

fitabilitv Ind	lex tells u	s which pro	piects are mos	t profitable
CF0	CF1	CF2	NPV at 10%	Profitability Index
-500	400	800	+525	1.05
-400	300	500	+286	0.71
-200	200	300	+230	1.15
-100	150	350	+326	3.26
-1200	1050	1950	+1366	
-1200 Da	1050 avid is the	1950 e most prof	+1366 itable project	
-	mowed by	Daviu Si.		
Fo	bllowed by	/ Goliath		
	Fitability Inco -500 -400 -200 -100 -1200 Da For For	CF0 CF1 -500 400 -400 300 -200 200 -100 150 -1200 1050	CF0 CF1 CF2 -500 400 800 -400 300 500 -200 200 300 -100 150 350 -1200 1050 1950 David is the most prof Followed by David Sr. Followed by Goliath Followed by Goliath	fitability Index tells us which projects are most CF0 CF1 CF2 NPV at 10% -500 400 800 +525 -400 300 500 +286 -200 200 300 +230 -100 150 350 +326 -1200 1050 1950 +1366 David is the most profitable project Followed by David Sr. Followed by Goliath

lleina	the Pro	fitahili	ity Inde	y to Selec	t Projecte
Using		mabin			
Rule: take th	ne most pro	fitable pro	ojects until	the budget of 3	700 is exhausted
Project	CF0	CF1	CF2	NPV at 10%	Profitability Index
Goliath	-500	400	800	+525	1.05
Goliath Jr.	-400	300	500	+286	0.71
David Sr.	-200	200	300	+230	1.15
David	-100	150	350	+326	3.26
Totals	-1200	1050	1950	+1366	
5	Select Davi	d first, lea	aving 600 n	nore to invest	
1	Then David	Sr. leavi	ng 400 mo	re to invest	
5	Skip <mark>Goliat</mark>	h becaus	e it would p	out us over bud	lget
1	Take Golia	t <mark>h Jr.</mark> whi	ch exhaust	s the budget e	xactly
7 October 2004		Fund	Slide 97 damentals of Valua	ation	© J. Favaro 20







	Organiz Line	zing a L i ear program ending on I	i near Pro nming can be now you orga	o gramı e simple o anize you	ming Pr r confusing, rself	oblem				
	A1	В	С	D	E	F				
1	/ Selected	Project	CF0	CF1	CF2	NPV				
2) 1	Goliath	-500	400	800	525				
3	1	Goliath Jr.	-400	300	500	286				
4	1	David Sr.	-200	200	300	230				
5	<u>ار</u> 1	David	-100	150	350	326				
6	Jan-1	Totals	-1200	1050	1950	1366				
Cre	Create a Selected column Give Names to key areas such as the initial investment and the NPV of the project									
27 Octob	er 2004	ng LP simp	Slide 10 Fundamentals of	1 Valuation		© J. Favaro 200				

1 Selected Project CF0 CF1 CF2 NPV 2 1 Goliath -500 400 800 525 3 1 Goliath Jr. -400 300 500 286 4 1 David Sr. -200 200 300 230 5 1 David -100 150 350 326 6 Totals -1200 1050 1950 1366 7 =SUMPRODUCT (-CF0, Selected) 8 Budget 700 Total -	1 Selected P			E	F
2 1 Goliath -500 400 800 525 3 1 Goliath Jr. -400 300 500 286 4 1 David Sr. -200 200 300 230 5 1 David -100 150 350 326 6 Totals -1200 1050 1950 1366 7 = SUMPRODUCT (-CF0, Selected) 8 Budget 700 Total -100 150	- Gelecieu F	Project CF0	CF1	CF2	NPV
3 1 Goliath Jr. -400 300 500 286 4 1 David Sr. -200 200 300 230 5 1 David -100 150 350 326 6 Totals -1200 1050 1950 1366 7 =SUMPRODUCT (-CF0, Selected) 8 Budget 700	2 1 G	Goliath -500	400	800	525
4 1 David Sr. -200 200 300 230 5 1 David -100 150 350 326 6 Totals -1200 1050 1950 1366 7 =SUMPRODUCT (-CF0, Selected) 8 Budget 700	3 1 Go	oliath Jr400	300	500	286
5 1 David -100 150 350 326 6 Totals -1200 1050 1950 1366 7 = = SUMPRODUCT (-CF0, selected) = 8 Budget 700 = = =	4 1 Da	avid Sr200	200	300	230
6 Totals -1200 1050 1950 1366 Z = SUMPRODUCT (-CF0, Selected) = </td <td>5 1 C</td> <td>David -100</td> <td>150</td> <td>350</td> <td>326</td>	5 1 C	David -100	150	350	326
7 =SUMPRODUCT(-CF0, Selected) 8 Budget 700	6 T	Totals -1200	0 1050	1950	1366
8 Budget 700	7	=SUN	PRODUCT (- CF)	0. Selecte	(be
	8 Budget	700			
9 Cost 1200	9 Cost	1200			
10 Value 1366	10 Value	1366			
=SUMPRODUCT (NPV, Selected)		=S	UMPRODUCT (NF	PV, Select	ed)





© J. Favaro 2004

)		Se	electing) Partia	I Proj	ects			The Entrepreneur's Planning Game	
	Supp	ose	you relax	the constra	aint that e	ntire proj	iects mus	t be select	ed?	"Here, have another glass," said Bill, pulling the wine bottle out of the cooler wiping it off. "It's hard to find a good white in Italy, and <i>Terre dei Tufi</i> from Sa	and an
			A	В	С	D	E	F		Gimignano is one of the more interesting."	
		1	Selected	Project	CF0	CF1	CF2	NPV		"That's not true " said Greg. "You should take a closer look at what's coming	out
	partial		0.8	Goliath	-500	400	800	525		of Friuli "He picked up the sheet of paper they had been writing on "But no	out
	project		0	Goliath Jr.	-400	300	500	286		thanks, we have to wrap up this year's planning session."	
· · · ·	<u> </u>	4	1	David Sr.	-200	200	300	230			
		5	1	David	-100	150	350	326		Greg and Bill, the proud owners of a small software outsourcing firm with 15	
		9		Totals	-1200	1050	1950	1366		employees, were planning the year's activities.	
		7	Budget	700						"Look here," said Bill. "We have a great set of projects we could work on, ear	ch of
	9 Cost 700 Three projects are selected (one partial), using the <u>entire budget</u> ,				cts are se	elected (on	But we only have a budget of \$500K this year, we can't do all of them."	۷.			
					ng the <u>ent</u>	<u>ire budget</u> ,					
	I	10	value	975	and	d with a h	nigher NP	V		"Right," said Greg, "and in any case we wouldn't have enough manpower to all of them."	do
			Realisti	ic? Someti	imes yes,	sometim	es no			How can Bill and Greg maximize NPV under these constraints	?
27	October 2004			Fun	Slide 105 damentals of Val	luation		۵	J. Favaro 2004	Slide 106 27 October 2004 Fundamentals of Valuation ©) J. Fava





Fundamentals of Valuation



LP Sol	utic	on for `	Two C	Constr	aints	i		
		Α	В	С	D	E		
The real	1	Selected	Project	Persons	Cost	NPV		
advantage of	2	0	А	3	100	135		
advantage of	3		В	2	60	90		
seuing up an LP	4	0	С	4	90	130		
solution is	5	0	D	2	50	70		
apparent when	6	0	E	5	200	270		
you begin varying	7	1	F	3	110	150		
the number of	8	0	G	4	90	100		
personnel and the	9	1	н	6	250	350		
amount of the	10		1	3	60	100		
budget en inpute	11	0	J	2	55	80		
buuget as inputs,	12		Totals	34	1065	1475		
making a	13							
sensitivity analysis	14	Budget	500	Bua	Budget and personnel constraints respected			
of different	15	Personnel	15	con				
combinations	16							
	17	Costs	480					
	18	Manpower	14 🦯					
	19	Value	690					































