The American Journal of Management and Economics Innovations
ISSN 2693-0811 | Open Access

TYPE Original Research
PAGE NO. 66-73
DOI 10.37547/tajmei/Volume07Issue06-06

Check for updates

Methodology For Evaluating Investment Projects Under Uncertainty

Avag Simonyan

Co-Founder & Managing Partner at Triple S Venture Capital Los Angeles, California, USA

OPEN ACCESS
SUBMITED 29 Arpil 2025
ACCEPTED 22May 2025
PUBLISHED 18 June 2025
VOLUME Vol.07 Issue 06 2025

CITATION
Avag Simonyan. (2025). Methodology For Evaluating Investment Projects Under Uncertainty. The American Journal of Management and Economics Innovations, 7(06), 66–73. https://doi.org/10.37547/tajmei/Volume07Issue06-06.

Abstract: This paper examines contemporary approaches to evaluating investment projects under conditions of uncertainty. It centers on the mathematical formalization of discounted cash-flow and annuity methods, and on their integration with sensitivity analysis and stress-testing frameworks. The study justifies the need for an integrated model that accounts for asymmetric project perceptions as well as a range of additional risk factors influencing financial outcomes. Practical feasibility is demonstrated through the use of programmable spreadsheets, enabling flexible parameterization and rapid updating of inputs. The results not only facilitate an objective assessment of a project's investment appeal but also yield concrete risk-management recommendations, thereby enhancing project resilience in a dynamic economic environment. This work will interest researchers, graduate students and practitioners in finance and investment analysis who seek to fuse theoretically sound models with empirical evaluation to derive robust strategic decisions under market uncertainty. Moreover, the paper offers value to academics and executives engaged in interdisciplinary research aimed at critically refining and optimizing investment appraisal techniques through advanced econometric and mathematical methods.

Keywords: financial modeling; investment performance evaluation; NPV; IRR; risk analysis; stress testing; investment attractiveness.

INTRODUCTION

The current business environment is marked by a high degree of uncertainty and volatility, rendering the assessment of early-stage startups' investment appeal both timely and essential. Traditional valuation methods (such as DCF and comparables) prove inadequate for ventures facing extreme ambiguity, obliging investors to devise adaptive methodologies tailored to startup realities. Consequently, there is a pressing need for dynamic appraisal frameworks that combine investment-performance metrics with sensitivity analysis and stress-testing tools. This direction is especially critical for capital-intensive projects, where precise financial calculations must be paired with capabilities for rapid risk management [2].

The literature on early-stage startup investment appraisal models reveals a diverse array of approaches, encompassing both methodological foundations and practical applications across various economic sectors. Researchers employ classical financial-analysis techniques alongside innovative instruments designed to capture sector-specific risks and constraints, thereby providing a multifaceted perspective on the subject. The existing work can be grouped into three thematic categories.

First group: Theoretical and methodological foundations of financial modeling and investment-efficiency measurement. This category emphasizes universal principles and technologies for evaluating capital commitments. For instance, Minin A. E. [3] identifies core principles and technological approaches, underscoring the necessity of integrating traditional methods with modern analytical tools. Sickles R. and Zelenyuk V. [7] similarly develop productivity-and-efficiency measurement techniques that enhance the interpretability of investment-analysis outcomes. Harakoz Yu. K. [8] offers a comprehensive methodological review of financial-appraisal techniques, establishing a foundation for subsequent empirical investigations.

Second group: Application of financial models under constraints and within specific sectors. Lisitsa M. I. and Popov V. P. [2] propose models that incorporate parameter restrictions to deliver accurate efficiency measurements amid market uncertainty. Comparable approaches appear in the work of Ryabov E. V., Ferulev N. V., and Zamotaev O. A. [5], which evaluates oil-industry projects where fiscal and regulatory factors are decisive. Kadzhametov T. N. [4] complements these studies by focusing on economic tools for appraising financial provisions in the tourism-recreation complex, demonstrating the cross-sector applicability of financial models.

Third group: Financial models for digital-transformation and large-scale infrastructure projects. Firsova T. A. [1] develops a risk-oriented financial model for digital-transformation initiatives in manufacturing services, integrating risk-management elements with classical appraisal methods. Kuropyatnik E. [6] compares large-infrastructure financing experiences in China and Russia, highlighting the peculiarities of applying financial models under interregional differences and varied regulatory regimes.

Analysis of the surveyed literature reveals certain contradictions in approach: some authors emphasize universal methodological foundations and quantitative efficiency analysis, while others focus on sector-specific constraints and external factors that influence investment-attractiveness assessments [3, 5]. Moreover, many studies insufficiently address the integration of traditional techniques with modern digital technologies and big-data analytics tools—a pressing gap given the rapid digitalization of the economy [7]. At the same time, questions of model comparability across diverse sectors (from oil and gas to tourism and recreation) remain underdeveloped, creating fertile ground for future research on unifying and adapting investment-appraisal frameworks amid growing uncertainty.

The aim of this paper is to examine existing methodologies for evaluating early-stage investment projects under conditions of uncertainty. Its scientific novelty lies in analyzing the application of scenario-analysis and stress-testing methods with graphical visualization capabilities, enabling rapid response to changing inputs and clear identification of key risk factors. The author's central hypothesis posits that the mechanism by which this smoothing occurs is as follows: all key assumptions (discount rate, revenue forecasts, cost estimates) are entered into well-documented spreadsheet cells, creating a single source of truth that both founder and investor reference and thereby eliminating divergent "back-of-envelope" figures; the computational logic for NPV, IRR, sensitivity, and scenario analyses is fixed in locked formulas or macros, so that neither party can alter the calculation flow without mutual agreement, ensuring reliance on an identical mathematical backbone; and transparent visualizations—such as tornado charts and scenario envelopes—immediately reveal how changes in each assumption affect core outputs, providing a shared visual language that focuses discussions on parameter sensitivity rather than hidden assumptions. Through these design choices, the model becomes a neutral platform: founders and investors interact with one coherent set of numbers and formulas, minimizing information gaps or subjective misinterpretations.

l. Such a model—grounded in rigorous mathematical formalization and automated calculation—can eliminate opportunities for appraisal manipulation and provide objective measurement of a project's financial metrics despite limited input data. This investigation adopts a methodology based on a structured literature review of prior work in this field.

2. Theoretical Foundations of Financial Modeling

Financial modeling serves as a tool for analyzing an investment project's viability by uniting mathematical formalization, economic analysis and quantitative evaluation methods. This section examines the essence and conceptual framework of financial models, outlines core principles for their construction and implementation requirements, and reviews the key metrics used to assess investment attractiveness.

A financial model is a formal representation of an investment project expressed through a set of interrelated mathematical equations and logical dependencies, enabling quantitative appraisal of its economic characteristics. This approach allows even users with basic financial knowledge to perform automated calculations of project metrics [1, 5]. Developing an effective financial model requires adherence to several fundamental principles:

- Transparency and clarity. The model's logical structure and mathematical formulation must be readily understandable by end users. Transparency enables independent verification of calculation accuracy, while clarity supports effective visualization of analytical results [2].

- Flexibility and adaptability. The model should accommodate rapid changes in input parameters and external conditions. This is achieved by allowing adjustments to assumptions and parameters without rebuilding the entire calculation framework—an essential feature when evaluating high-uncertainty projects [4].

- Validity of underlying assumptions. Model reliability depends on the accuracy and justification of its input data. Correct mathematical formulations, a logically coherent calculation flow and the ability to audit results (for example, via a spreadsheet's Solver add-in) are critical quality requirements.

- Integration of project aspects. Modern models must encompass not only a project's technical and operational logic but also its financial dimensions, reflecting specific investment characteristics and attendant risks. This holistic approach minimizes the impact of subjective assumptions on the overall assessment [2].

Assessment of an investment project's efficiency typically relies on a set of core financial metrics that quantify changes in investor wealth and the returns on deployed capital. Table 1 presents these principal indicators and their significance.

Table 1. Key indicators for assessing a project's investment attractiveness [1].

Indicator	Definition	Significance
Net Present Value (NPV)	Difference between the present value of expected cash flows and the initial capital outlay.	Primary measure of a project's capacity to enhance investor wealth.
Internal Rate	Discount rate at which NPV equals	Represents the maximum return per unit of

Indicator	Definition	Significance
of Return (IRR)	zero.	investment and serves as a comparative metric across projects.
Payback Period (PBP)	Time required to recover the initial investment from generated cash flows.	Simple to compute, though it ignores the time value of money and project risks.
Profitability Index (PI)	Ratio of the present value of future cash flows to the amount of capital invested.	Enables relative comparison of project profitability and ranking of alternative investments.

Each metric bears its own advantages and limitations. NPV offers an absolute measure of wealth creation but can be sensitive to the chosen discount rate; IRR facilitates project comparisons but may yield ambiguous results for multi-phase cash-flow streams. This duality underscores the need for multifactor analysis—incorporating scenario planning and stress-testing—to obtain a more comprehensive view of an investment's risk profile.

In summary, the theoretical foundations of financial modeling encompass the definition and conceptual understanding of the model as an integrative appraisal tool, the establishment of construction principles and calculation-accuracy requirements, and the systematic organization of metrics that ensure objective evaluation of investment performance. These foundations form the basis for subsequent mathematical formalization and practical implementation of a financial model capable of optimizing investment-decision processes under conditions of limited data and high uncertainty.

3. Mathematical Formalization and Model Toolkit

This section presents a detailed mathematical formalization of the financial model for evaluating a project's investment attractiveness, together with the tools used for its implementation. It focuses on integrating the equations that capture both the initial capital outlay and subsequent cash flows, thereby enabling calculation of key performance indicators such as net present value (NPV) and internal rate of return (IRR). The model rests on a set of assumptions reflecting the asymmetric perceptions of the project held by its sponsor and a potential investor, and is implemented as a programmable spreadsheet.

At its core, the model assumes three complementary components:

1. Technical blueprint – a description of the project's physical deliverables, their specifications and the timelines for achieving results;

2. Business concept – the framework for generating financial returns from the project's execution;

3. Financial design – the mathematical formalization of performance calculations, employing a disciplined approach to accounting for capital investments and subsequent cash flows.

The author hypothesizes that applying an integrated mathematical approach—treating capital investments as annuity-immediate (prepaid) and financial benefits as annuity-due (postpaid) — allows an objective assessment of investment attractiveness while reducing opportunities for input manipulation [2, 3]. Model assumptions include:

- Capital investments occur at the beginning of each project cycle (annuity-immediate).
- Cash flows are realized at the end of each accounting period (annuity-due).
- Interest rates are expressed in percent with a divisor of 100 for correct data conversion.

The mathematical framework integrates several interlinked calculation modules:

1. Discounted value of capital outlays

$$PV_{pre} = \frac{I}{(1+\frac{R}{100})^{p-1}} \quad (1)$$

where:

PV_{pre} is the present value of capital investments (RUB),

I is the amount of capital invested (RUB),

R is the required rate of return per period (percent),

p is the period index in which the investment is made.

This formula adapts the standard discounted-cash-flow model [2].

2. Discounted value of aggregate cash flows

$$PV_{pst} = \frac{100\times(NP+A)}{R}\left[1 - \frac{1}{(1+\frac{R}{100})^{n}}\right] \quad (2)$$

where:

PV_{pst} is the present value of cash flows per period (RUB),

NP is net profit per period (RUB),

A is depreciation per period (RUB),

n is the project-cycle length in periods.

This expression derives from classical annuity-due formulas [2].

1. Net Present Value (NPV)

$$NPV = PV_{pst} - PV_{pre} \quad (3),$$

This key metric measures the project's potential to increase investor wealth.

4. Internal Rate of Return (IRR)

$$NPV_{IRR} = \frac{100\times(NP+A)}{(1+\frac{IRR}{100})^{t}} - \frac{I}{\left(1+\frac{IRR}{100}\right)^{(p-1)}} = 0 \quad (4)$$

where:

IRR is the internal rate of return (percent),

t indexes the periods for cash-flow calculations.

Equation (4) is solved numerically via iterative routines, such as spreadsheet IRR functions [2].

The model is implemented in a spreadsheet environment, offering:

- Automated computation with built-in functions, macros and solver add-ins for rapid recalculation of all metrics.
- Flexible parameterization—allowing immediate updates to outcomes when inputs (rate of return, investment amounts, period definitions) change.
- Tabular and graphical visualization of NPV and IRR, supporting scenario analysis and stress testing [2].

However, exclusive reliance on spreadsheet software has limitations: when dealing with models featuring thousands of scenarios (for example, Monte Carlo simulations with millions of iterations), Excel or Google Sheets can slow down significantly or become unstable; formulas and macros may introduce hidden dependencies that are difficult to verify manually, especially without version control; and advanced statistical calculations—such as optimization, Bayesian modeling, or sophisticated Monte Carlo methods—are better handled by programming languages. Consequently, a hybrid approach is advisable: retain key calculations and the GUI in the spreadsheet for end-user convenience, while offloading heavy computations (stochastic modeling, Monte Carlo, optimization) to scripts in Python or R using libraries like NumPy, pandas, and SciPy, and then import the results back into Excel or Google Sheets.

In sum, this mathematical formalization and toolkit deliver an integrated approach to quantifying investment-project efficiency. The combination of discounted-cash-flow analysis, annuity calculations and numerical IRR methods, together with the adaptability of spreadsheet implementation, ensures both theoretical rigor and practical applicability under conditions of high uncertainty.

4. Application of Financial Modeling to Evaluating Investment Projects under Uncertainty

Traditional project-valuation techniques—rooted in discounted cash flows and comparables—presume stable revenues, transparent market analogues and relatively predictable performance metrics. Early-stage startups, however, lack such data infrastructure: extreme scenario volatility and a dearth of financial history render classic approaches inapplicable. Investors therefore require adaptive methodologies capable of modeling a broad spectrum of potential outcomes and of providing flexible decision triggers.

One such tool is multi-layered scenario modeling. Instead of a single forecast, multiple trajectories are constructed to reflect key milestones: development and testing of a minimum viable product (MVP) with allowances for cost overruns and delay risks; acquisition of initial customers—analysing marketing channels, conversion rates and customer-acquisition-cost sensitivity; and scaling signals, such as hitting revenue thresholds (e.g. ARR), entering new markets or expanding the product line. For each scenario, a set of assumptions on core metrics (CAC, LTV, churn rate, operating expenses) is formalized in a “what-if” matrix, enabling quantitative attribution of each parameter’s impact on NPV and other financial indicators.

A complementary approach is the real-options framework, which treats each funding round as an option on future investment or abandonment. If the startup meets predefined criteria—such as achieving product–market fit—the investor exercises the option to release the next tranche; otherwise, they walk away. This structure mathematically captures expansion options (new products), deferral options (delayed scaling) and abandonment options (project termination). Valuation of these real options relies on stochastic modeling of key drivers and employs binomial trees or adapted Black-Scholes formulas for illiquid assets. and insert the new paragraph about sparse data and proxy volatilities right after.

Another effective methodology is the real-options framework, which treats each funding round as an option on future investment or abandonment. If the startup meets predefined criteria—such as achieving product–market fit—the investor exercises the option to release the next tranche; otherwise, they walk away. This structure mathematically captures expansion options (new products), deferral options (delayed scaling) and abandonment options (project termination). Valuation of these real options relies on stochastic modeling of key drivers and employs binomial trees or adapted Black–Scholes formulas for illiquid assets [3, 6].

Table 2 catalogues the principal risk factors and their effects on key financial metrics.

Table 2. The main risk factors and their impact on key financial indicators of the project [1, 2].

Risk Factor	Description	Assessment Method	Key Metrics
Realized price	Fluctuations in product sale price	Sensitivity analysis; stress testing	NPV; IRR
Sales volumes	Variability in sales quantity	Scenario analysis	NPV; payback period
Variable costs	Changes in unit production costs	Sensitivity analysis	NPV; profitability index
Investment amount	Variations in initial capital outlay	“What-if” modeling	NPV; IRR

Brief explanations of how each risk factor affects the financial metrics are as follows: fluctuations in the realized price feed directly into the present value of cash flows (PVpst) because revenue equals price multiplied by quantity—thus, a lower price reduces PVpst and, consequently, both NPV and IRR; changes in sales volumes cause proportional shifts in net profit, affecting cash inflows and lengthening the payback period when fewer units sold delay recovery of the initial investment; higher variable costs erode margin (net profit equals revenue minus variable and fixed costs), which reduces the numerator in the profitability index (PI) and shrinks PVpst, leading to a lower NPV; and an increase in the initial investment amount (I) raises PVpre, subtracting more from PVpst, thus lowering NPV and requiring higher cash flows for IRR to break even. Consequently, adjusting any single factor directly updates the model's key formulas, yielding transparent changes in NPV, IRR, payback period, and PI.

The sensitivity-analysis methodology—based on sequentially varying key inputs (for example, product-pricing levels, production volumes or the discount rate)—allows one to quantify the elasticity of target metrics such as NPV and IRR. In scenario analysis, multiple plausible development paths are combined in succession, enabling the modeling of a wide spectrum of potential project trajectories and the comparison of their effects on financial performance and liquidity resilience [2].

Complementing this, stress testing seeks to determine a financial model's "breaking point": by incrementally amplifying adverse deviations across all variables, one can identify the threshold at which a project either just maintains its required performance level or becomes unviable.

In practice, adaptive approaches demand iteration and continuous oversight. All baseline assumptions undergo stress tests against extreme deviations (for instance, a spike in customer-acquisition cost or a drop in lifetime value). Forecast models are recalibrated regularly (quarterly or more often) using actual operating data. Rather than relying on a single "average" scenario, a probability-weighted ensemble is employed, in which each scenario's outcome is aggregated according to its prior likelihood. This dynamic, iterative framework transforms the evaluation into a decision-support tool, enabling investors to adjust a startup's funding strategy as uncertainty diminishes and concrete business milestones are met.

Based on the foregoing analysis, we offer the following recommendations for effective investment-risk management in early-stage startups:

1. Phased rollout. Break the project into discrete stages with regular monitoring of core indicators to detect deviations promptly and implement corrective actions.

2. Continuous data refresh. Maintain up-to-date input parameters to ensure rapid response to shifts in external and internal conditions.

3. Risk-factor categorization. Classify risks by their impact level (high, medium, low) to prioritize focus on the most critical drivers.

4. Stress-test mapping. Use graphical "heat maps" to delineate allowable parameter ranges, facilitating swift managerial decisions to mitigate adverse effects.

5. Development of corrective measures. When deviations arise, devise and apply interventions—whether optimizing operations or revising pricing—to preserve positive NPV and IRR trajectories.

In an environment of high economic volatility, constructing multi-tiered quantitative models becomes an essential component of comprehensive project-risk management. By integrating profitability metrics with forward-looking scenario analyses, stakeholders gain a holistic view of a project's vulnerabilities and opportunities. The use of gradient-based and stochastic sensitivity analyses allows for fine-grained assessment of each parameter's influence—from interest-rate and FX-rate fluctuations to shifts in end-user demand.

Concurrently, Monte Carlo–based scenario modeling and stress-testing techniques that account for correlations among risk factors create the conditions for early detection of potential bottlenecks in the investment structure. A combined approach to model development and validation ensures ongoing data monitoring and helps minimize losses, thereby enhancing a project's adaptability and resilience amid changing macroeconomic conditions.

5. CONCLUSION

The study evaluated a highly effective financial model that merges traditional discounted-cash-flow techniques with advanced quantitative risk and sensitivity-analysis methods. Implemented as a configurable spreadsheet-based tool, this framework ensures complete transparency of calculation algorithms, enables rapid adjustment of input parameters, and provides clear visualization of key metrics at every stage of modeling.

Incorporating scenario analysis and stress testing into the risk-factor framework revealed potential bottlenecks in the project's financial parameters and projected how primary performance indicators would respond to external shocks.

By unifying the project's technical, operational and financial components into a single model, information asymmetry between sponsors and investors is reduced, the validity and reproducibility of valuation results are enhanced, and evidence-based strategic recommendations can be more readily formulated.

The practical value of this approach lies in its broad applicability: the methodology can be adapted across diverse industries. Taken together, the findings contribute to the theory of financial modeling, enrich existing methodological frameworks and expand the toolkit available for assessing the effectiveness of capital investments.

REFERENCES

Firsova T. A. Development of a financial model for evaluating the effectiveness of risk-based projects of digital transformation of production services: master's thesis : dis. – 2024. – pp.59-65.

Lisitsa M. I., Popov V. P. A financial model for assessing the investment attractiveness of a project under conditions of limitation of certain parameters //Scientific Journal of the National Research University of ITMO. The series "Economics and Environmental Management". – 2024. – Vol. 3. – pp. 14-27

Minin A. E. Principles and technologies of financial modeling in the assessment of capital investments. – 2023. - pp. 104-106.

Kajametova T.N. Economic tools for assessing the financial support of organizations of the tourist and recreational complex // Scientific notes of the Crimean Engineering and Pedagogical University. - 2022. - Vol.4. - pp. 87-92.

Ryabova E.V., Feruleva N.V., Zamotaeva O.A. Investment attractiveness of oil field development projects in the context of a tax maneuver. Assessment on the example of the West Siberian economic region // Financial Journal. - 2022. - № 3. - pp. 86-101.

Kuropyatnik E. Financing of Large Infrastructure Projects: Chinese Experience and Russian Practice // Review of Business and Economics Studies. - 2022. - № 2. - pp. 56-90.

Sickles R., Zelenyuk V. Measurement of Productivity and Efficiency. New York: Cambridge University Press. - 2019. - pp.601.

Kharakoz Yu.K. Methods of financial investment assessment //Economics and entrepreneurship. – 2022. – Vol. 2 (139). – pp. 733.