IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

A Study on Portfolio Information Review, Maturity Calculations, KPI Measurement and Documentation Practices in Financial Consultancy Operations

Rohan Ranjan and Dr. Neeraja Rajendran
MBA (Banking & Finance)
Amity Business School, Amity University Maharashtra
Summer Internship Project – Research Paper
Internship Organisation: Aspire Consultants

Abstract : *Financial consultancy work brings together information about financial products, investment portfolios, calculations, performance measures and business communication. These activities are useful only when the information being reviewed is accurate, current and sufficiently documented. This paper examines the practical relationship between portfolio information review, maturity calculations, Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), Daily Sales Records (DSR) and documentation, using Rohan Ranjan's internship learning record at Aspire Consultants as its starting point.*

The study follows a descriptive and qualitative approach. Its primary source is the dated internship activity record for 14 July to 30 August 2026, supported by the related SIP report and teaching case study. Academic literature on portfolio selection, performance measurement, spreadsheet reliability and internal control is used to interpret the practical importance of the topics. The activity record documents sessions on portfolio management, product features and calculations, KPIs, maturity calculation, DSR, documentation, product launch, and marketing and sales. It does not provide confidential client files, actual product terms, completed calculation sheets, company KPI values or verified business outcomes.

The analysis indicates that reliable reporting depends on a connected process: identifying the source of information, checking product details, recording calculation assumptions, defining each KPI, validating sales records and retaining a review trail. The paper proposes a proportionate control framework that can be adapted to a small financial consultancy without assuming the use of any particular software or internal system. Any sample workflow or data illustration in this paper is conceptual and is not presented as an actual Aspire Consultants record..

Keywords: Portfolio management, maturity calculation, KPI, Daily Sales Record, financial documentation, data quality, internal control, financial consultancy.

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Financial services depend on information that helps individuals and organisations understand financial choices. Within this broad field, portfolio management concerns the way financial assets are considered in relation to investment objectives, risk and expected return. Product information explains the features and conditions attached to an investment

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

or financial offering. Calculations translate product terms and assumptions into values that can be interpreted, while performance indicators help a business monitor activity and evaluate progress.

These activities may appear separate when they are introduced in a training programme. In practice, they are closely connected. A portfolio discussion may rely on product features; a maturity value depends on the product type and calculation method; a KPI depends on a clearly defined measure and reliable source data; and a management summary depends on documentation that allows another person to review the work. If any link is weak, the final report can look complete while remaining difficult to verify.

Rohan Ranjan's internship activity record at Aspire Consultants provides a relevant setting for studying these connections. The record covers sessions from 14 July to 30 August 2026. Among the listed topics are portfolio management on 27 July, portfolio features and calculations on 30 and 31 July, KPIs on 3 August, maturity calculation on 5 August, DSR and documentation on 6 August, product launch on 10 August, portfolio and products on 11 August, and marketing and sales on 19 August 2026. These dated entries form the factual basis of the present study.

1.2 Need for the Study

The need for this study arises from a practical question: how can a financial consultancy prepare useful portfolio and performance information when product details, calculation assumptions and reporting definitions need to be checked? In a small team, reporting work is often expected to be timely. At the same time, a quick report is of limited value if its figures cannot be traced to a source or explained to a reader.

The subject is also relevant from a learning perspective. The internship record introduces a range of connected business topics, but a list of session titles does not by itself explain how the concepts work together. This paper therefore links the recorded learning areas with established ideas in portfolio theory, performance measurement and internal control. It also makes a clear distinction between documented training topics and illustrative frameworks created for academic analysis.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

The central problem examined is the risk that portfolio and performance summaries may be prepared using information that is incomplete, inconsistently defined or insufficiently documented. Missing source dates, unclear calculation assumptions, inconsistent KPI definitions and incomplete sales records can make a report difficult to reproduce. The study considers what minimum review practices can improve reliability while remaining practical for a small financial consultancy.

1.4 Scope and Significance

The study is limited to the learning areas recorded in Rohan Ranjan's internship activity record for 14 July–30 August 2026. It focuses on portfolio management, product features, calculations, maturity calculation, KPIs, DSR, documentation, product launch and marketing and sales. The paper uses academic literature to explain the relevance of these topics. It does not assess Aspire Consultants' financial performance, investment returns, client portfolios, internal policies or operational systems.

The study is useful to students of banking and finance because it shows how classroom concepts can be connected with the discipline of day-to-day business reporting. It is also relevant to small service organisations because it identifies simple controls that do not depend on a large technology investment. More broadly, it highlights that the quality of a management decision is influenced not only by the number presented, but also by the source, definition, assumptions and review history behind that number.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Portfolio Management and Investment Decisions

Markowitz's (1952) work on portfolio selection established a formal way of thinking about the relationship between expected return and risk across a collection of investments. The key implication for practical review is that a portfolio should not be understood by looking at one product or one return figure in isolation. Investment characteristics, the relationship between assets and the investor's objectives all matter. Although the internship record confirms a session on portfolio management, it does not identify specific portfolios or investment recommendations. Markowitz's framework is therefore used here as theoretical context rather than as evidence of an activity performed by the intern.

In a consultancy setting, portfolio information should be presented with enough context for a reader to understand what is being described. Product names, investment purpose, relevant terms, risk and liquidity considerations, and the date of the information can all affect interpretation. A summary that omits these details may be easy to read but may not support a sound decision.

2.2 Performance Measurement and KPIs

Neely, Gregory and Platts (1995) describe performance measurement system design as an important management concern and review the relationship between measures and organisational performance. Their work supports a basic principle: a performance measure should be selected and designed with a clear purpose. A KPI label alone does not explain what is counted, how it is calculated or which period it covers.

Kaplan and Norton (1992) emphasise that performance assessment should not rely on a single financial measure. Their balanced scorecard approach draws attention to the need to consider different dimensions of organisational performance. For a small consultancy, this does not necessarily mean introducing a full scorecard. It does suggest that management should understand the question each indicator is intended to answer and should avoid treating one number as a complete picture.

For example, a conversion rate is meaningful only when the organisation defines the starting population and the event counted as a conversion. The numerator, denominator, reporting period and source should be recorded. If one month counts enquiries and another counts qualified leads, the percentages may not be directly comparable even when the label remains unchanged.

2.3 Spreadsheet Reliability and Calculation Controls

Panko (1998) reviews research on spreadsheet errors and explains why spreadsheet-based work requires attention to accuracy and control. Spreadsheets are flexible and accessible, but their formulas, references, ranges and manually entered values can be difficult to inspect. A result can be mathematically correct for the formula entered and still be unsuitable if the inputs or assumptions are wrong.

This point is relevant to maturity calculations and KPI summaries. A maturity value should be traceable to the product type, principal or investment amount, rate, duration, compounding convention and formula used. The calculation should also identify whether the rate and period are expressed in compatible units. A reviewer should be able to reproduce the result from the recorded inputs rather than relying only on a final number.

2.4 Internal Control and Documentation

The COSO Internal Control—Integrated Framework (2013) treats internal control as a process that supports operations, reporting and compliance objectives. It places importance on control activities, information and communication, and monitoring. Applied to routine reporting, this means that checks should be built into the process rather than added only after an error is found.

Documentation is one way to make these controls visible. A source reference, preparation date, reporting period, version number, calculation basis and reviewer confirmation help establish how a figure entered a report.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

Documentation also supports continuity when work moves between team members. A small organisation may not need a complex approval chain, but it still benefits from a consistent record of what was checked and what remains pending.

2.5 Research Gap

The literature provides established principles for portfolio selection, performance measurement, spreadsheet reliability and internal control. The internship record provides a practical learning context in which these principles can be considered together. The present study does not claim to test a new theory or measure the operational performance of Aspire Consultants. Its contribution is a focused, internship-based synthesis of the recorded topics and a practical review framework that can be discussed in an academic setting.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The study adopts a descriptive and qualitative research design. It describes the internship topics recorded in the activity log and interprets their relevance using secondary literature. No survey, interview, experiment or statistical test was conducted for this paper. The approach is appropriate because the available primary material is a dated record of learning sessions rather than a dataset of company transactions or customer outcomes.

3.2 Sources of Data

The primary documentary source is Rohan Ranjan's internship activity record, as reflected in the SIP report and the related case study prepared for Aspire Consultants. The case study provides a fictional review scenario to illustrate incomplete product sources, maturity assumptions, KPI definitions and DSR records. Secondary sources include academic publications on portfolio selection, performance measurement and spreadsheet reliability, together with the COSO framework on internal control.

3.3 Method of Analysis

The dated topics were grouped into five connected themes: portfolio and product understanding; calculations and maturity values; KPI and performance measurement; DSR and documentation; and product launch and marketing/sales context. Each theme was considered in relation to the literature and to the reporting risks raised in the teaching case. The analysis focuses on process quality and does not calculate actual company results.

3.4 Ethical Considerations and Limitations

The study does not reproduce personal financial information, confidential client information or internal company figures. The internship record does not include actual product terms, completed maturity worksheets, KPI datasets, a DSR file, a company dashboard or a verified final assignment output. Accordingly, no such item is claimed as completed work. The sample workflow and examples in the analysis are conceptual teaching aids and should not be mistaken for Aspire Consultants' operational records.

The findings are limited by the nature of the available records. The activity log identifies dates and topics but does not provide session duration, trainer details, exact task instructions, software used, submitted work, supervisor feedback or measured outcomes. The study is therefore not a company audit and cannot establish whether a particular control is currently used at Aspire Consultants. Its conclusions are educational and process-oriented.

IV. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To examine the internship learning areas related to portfolio management, product features, calculations, KPIs, maturity calculation, DSR, documentation and marketing/sales.
2. To explain the importance of reliable source information and reproducible calculations in financial reporting.
3. To analyse how clearly defined KPIs can support meaningful monitoring and comparison across reporting periods.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

4. To identify practical documentation and review controls that can reduce avoidable reporting errors.
5. To propose a proportionate review workflow suitable for discussion in the context of a small financial consultancy.

V. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION / ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.1 Portfolio and Product Information Review

The activity record places portfolio management on 27 July 2026 and portfolio features and calculations on 30 and 31 July 2026. These topics suggest a learning sequence that moves from the broader idea of managing a portfolio to the features and calculations associated with financial products. The record does not name the products or identify any customer portfolio, so the analysis remains at the level of process and concept.

A useful review begins by recording where each product detail came from and when it was last checked. Product information can change, and a statement that was accurate at one point may become outdated. A reviewer should distinguish product description from suitability or recommendation. Product purpose, eligibility, cost, liquidity, risk and terms are relevant fields to understand, but their presence in a review does not automatically establish that a product is suitable for a particular investor.

Portfolio review also benefits from a consistent structure. If products are described in different ways, comparison becomes difficult. A common template can help ensure that the same categories are considered for each item. However, standardisation should not remove important differences between product types. The reviewer should record exceptions and avoid forcing unlike products into a misleading comparison.

5.2 Maturity Calculations and Reproducibility

The activity record lists a maturity-calculation session on 5 August 2026. A maturity figure can influence how a product is understood, but the final value is only meaningful when its calculation basis is clear. Depending on the product, the relevant inputs may include the principal or investment amount, interest or return rate, investment period, compounding frequency, contribution pattern, charges and applicable terms. Not every input applies to every product; the method must match the actual product structure.

A sound calculation record should identify the source of each input, the date on which the input was obtained, the formula or method used, the units and assumptions, and the person who checked the result. If a value is estimated or illustrative, it should be labelled accordingly. This makes it possible for another reviewer to reproduce the result and identify whether a difference arises from an input, an assumption or a formula.

A practical review should also include basic reasonableness checks. The reviewer can confirm that the period and rate are expressed consistently, that the correct product method has been selected, that formulas have been copied across the intended range and that the displayed result is not being interpreted as guaranteed where the underlying product does not guarantee it. These are general control recommendations, not a claim that a particular calculation was performed during the internship.

5.3 KPI Definition and Performance Interpretation

A KPI session is recorded on 3 August 2026. KPIs are often used in business reporting because they condense activity into a measure that can be monitored over time. Their usefulness, however, depends on definition. A label such as sales, conversion, engagement or growth is not sufficient by itself. The measure needs a clear formula, a defined population, a time period and an identifiable data source.

Consider conversion rate as a conceptual example. Before calculating it, the organisation must decide what counts as an opportunity and what event counts as conversion. It must also decide whether the measure is based on enquiries, qualified leads, product demonstrations or another defined stage. The same definition should be applied in each reporting period if the results are to be compared. Changes in the definition should be documented rather than silently incorporated.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

A KPI should also be interpreted with context. An increase may reflect stronger performance, a change in the number or quality of leads, a revised recording process or a different reporting period. A percentage should therefore be read alongside its underlying counts. Where relevant, management may also consider service quality, customer experience and process reliability rather than relying only on volume-based measures.

5.4 Daily Sales Records and Documentation

The activity record includes DSR and documentation on 6 August 2026. A Daily Sales Record can provide a day-level view of sales-related activity, but it is only useful when entries are complete and consistently recorded. A generic record might include date, reference number, product or service category, status and follow-up action. The exact fields should be determined by the organisation's approved process; this paper does not claim that Aspire Consultants used a particular DSR format.

Basic checks can identify missing dates, duplicate references, inconsistent status labels and entries assigned to the wrong reporting period. Totals in a summary should reconcile with the underlying records. If a record is amended, the change should be traceable. Access to customer-related information should be limited to authorised users, and any academic example should use anonymised or fictional data.

Documentation connects the product, calculation and KPI parts of the process. A report should make it possible to answer five questions: What is the source? When was it obtained? What definition or assumption was applied? Who reviewed it? Which version was approved? These questions are simple, but answering them consistently improves the reliability of the report.

5.5 Product Launch and Marketing/Sales Context

The internship record lists a final product-launch session on 10 August, portfolio and products on 11 August, and a marketing and sales module on 19 August 2026. These entries indicate exposure to the business side of product communication. The source does not identify a named campaign, target audience, launch result or sales performance figure. The discussion therefore focuses on the relationship between accurate product information and responsible communication.

Marketing materials should be consistent with the approved product information. If a product feature, cost, condition or expected outcome is described inaccurately, the problem is not limited to presentation; it can affect the expectations formed by a prospective customer. A practical review process should connect the source product information with the content used in presentations, messages and sales summaries. Any performance claim should be supported by a defined measure and a traceable source.

5.6 Integrated Review Workflow

The themes discussed above can be combined into a single workflow. The sequence below is a proposed academic framework developed from the internship topics and the fictional case study. It is not a verified internal procedure of Aspire Consultants.

Stage	Review activity	Minimum control / evidence
1	Collect product and portfolio information	Record source, date and version; identify pending items.
2	Review product features	Check purpose, eligibility, cost, liquidity, risk and terms where applicable.
3	Verify maturity calculations	Record product type, inputs, rate, period, method, formula and reviewer.
4	Define and check KPIs	Specify measure, numerator, denominator, source and reporting period.
5	Validate DSR and supporting records	Check missing fields, duplicates, date consistency and reconciliation.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

6	Prepare management summary	Separate verified information from items awaiting confirmation.
7	Approve and retain the report	Record reviewer, approval status and final version reference.

5.7 Discussion of the Teaching Case

The related case study presents a fictional review meeting in which product sources, maturity assumptions, KPI definitions and sales records are not consistently documented. The team must decide whether to share the draft immediately, pause for a manual review, introduce a standard checklist or move to a dedicated reporting system. The case is useful because it turns general principles into a decision involving time, reliability and cost.

A proportionate response would be to pause the release of any material figure that cannot be reproduced or traced, while allowing clearly verified sections to proceed if they are separated and labelled correctly. A short checklist and second-person review of high-impact figures offer a practical middle path. A dedicated system may become relevant when reporting volume, complexity or control requirements justify the cost, but technology cannot replace clear definitions and sound source data.

This discussion is consistent with the COSO emphasis on control activities and information quality. It also reflects the spreadsheet concerns described by Panko: a spreadsheet should not be treated as reliable simply because it produces a neat result. The process around the spreadsheet—input checks, formula review, version control and approval—is part of the control environment.

VI. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

1. The internship activity record documents learning sessions related to portfolio management, product features and calculations, KPIs, maturity calculation, DSR, documentation, product launch, and marketing and sales.
2. Portfolio and product information needs a traceable source and a review date. A consistent format can improve comparison, but it should preserve differences between product types.
3. Maturity values are difficult to verify when the product method, inputs, time period, rate basis or formula are not recorded.
4. KPI percentages cannot be interpreted reliably unless the measure, numerator, denominator, data source and reporting period are defined.
5. Daily sales records are more useful when entries are complete, dates and status labels are consistent, duplicates are identified and summary totals reconcile to source records.
6. Documentation provides continuity and accountability by recording the source, assumptions, version, reviewer and approval status.
7. Marketing and sales communication should use product information that has been checked and should avoid performance claims that are not supported by a defined measure.
8. The available internship materials do not establish actual client outcomes, company KPI results, product returns or the independent completion of operational assignments. The findings are about documented learning and general process requirements, not measured company performance.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Introduce a Short Product Information Checklist

A common checklist should capture the product name or category, source document, date checked, key features, relevant costs and conditions, and the status of any unresolved item. The checklist should be adjusted to the type of product being reviewed and should not be treated as a substitute for approved product documentation.

7.2 Make Calculation Records Reproducible

Every maturity calculation or other material financial calculation should retain its inputs, method, formula, assumptions and source. A second reviewer should check high-impact values before they are used in a management or customer-facing summary. If an assumption is not confirmed, the output should be labelled as an estimate or pending item.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

7.3 Maintain a KPI Definition Register

For each KPI, record its purpose, formula, numerator, denominator, data source, reporting frequency, owner and any exclusions. Definitions should remain stable across reporting periods unless a change is approved and explained. This will make comparisons more meaningful and reduce disagreement about what a reported percentage represents.

7.4 Apply Basic DSR Validation

A DSR review should check completeness, duplicate references, date ranges, status consistency and reconciliation between detailed entries and summary totals. Any correction should be traceable. The organisation should use only fields that are necessary for its process and should protect customer information through appropriate access restrictions.

7.5 Use a Risk-Based Review

Not every field requires the same level of review. Missing formatting details may be corrected during routine preparation, while a material calculation, unclear product term or unsupported performance claim should be resolved before release. A short second-person check can be focused on the items most likely to affect decisions.

7.6 Keep Marketing Information Consistent

Product descriptions and sales communication should be checked against the current approved source. Any claim about returns, benefits, eligibility or performance should be supported and presented with the relevant conditions.

7.7 Retain Evidence of Internship Learning

For academic documentation, the student should retain genuine permitted evidence where available, such as session records, assignment instructions, anonymised worksheets or supervisor-confirmed outputs. A training topic should not be described as an independently completed task unless the original work or another reliable record supports that statement.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This study examined the relationship between portfolio information review, maturity calculations, KPI measurement, DSR and documentation in the context of Rohan Ranjan's internship learning at Aspire Consultants. The dated activity record shows exposure to these topics between July and August 2026, alongside product launch and marketing/sales sessions. The related case study provides a fictional situation in which incomplete sources and definitions create uncertainty about whether a performance summary is ready to be shared.

The analysis shows that reliable financial reporting is not achieved by presentation alone. Product information must be current and traceable; calculations must disclose their inputs and method; KPIs must be defined consistently; sales records must be checked; and the final report should retain a clear review trail. These practices are consistent with established literature on portfolio selection, performance measurement, spreadsheet reliability and internal control.

A short, risk-based checklist is a practical starting point for a small consultancy. It can improve consistency without immediately requiring a specialised system. As reporting needs grow, the organisation may consider more advanced tools, but the underlying definitions and review habits should be established first. The study is limited to documented internship topics and secondary interpretation; it does not claim to measure Aspire Consultants' actual performance or to verify specific operational outputs.

REFERENCES

1. Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. (2013). Internal Control—Integrated Framework. COSO.
2. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard—Measures that drive performance. Harvard Business Review, 70(1), 71–79.
3. Markowitz, H. (1952). Portfolio selection. The Journal of Finance, 7(1), 77–91.
4. Neely, A., Gregory, M., & Platts, K. (1995). Performance measurement system design: A literature review and research agenda. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 15(4), 80–116.
5. Panko, R. R. (1998). What we know about spreadsheet errors. Journal of End User Computing, 10(2), 15–21.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 6, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

6. Ranjan, R. (2026). Internship activity record, Aspire Consultants, entries dated 14 July–30 August 2026. Unpublished internship record.
7. Ranjan, R. (2026). A case study on portfolio review, maturity calculations and performance documentation at a financial consultancy: The case of Aspire Consultants. Unpublished academic case study.

Research note: This paper has been prepared from the supplied internship activity record, the related case study and the cited literature. The proposed workflow is an academic recommendation. No fictional figures or illustrative examples are represented as actual Aspire Consultants data.