International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management
ISSN: 3108-1754 (Online)
Volume 02 Issue 10 October-2026 | Impact Factor: 3.5



DSPF Process and Compliance Management in Special Economic Zones: A Case Study of Moon SEZ Consultants LLP

Shreya Pravin Chougule

School of Business, Indira University, Pune, Maharashtra, India

How to Cite this Article:

Chougule, S. P. (2026). DSPF Process and Compliance Management in Special Economic Zones: A Case Study of Moon SEZ Consultants LLP. International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management, 02(05), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i10.155

License:

This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

© The Author(s). Published by International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management.





https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i10.155

Abstract

This paper studies the day-to-day documentation and compliance activities associated with the Domestic Tariff Area Service Procurement Form (DSPF) workflow at Moon SEZ Consultants LLP, Pune. It is based on an internship describing practical work in invoice renaming and uploading, annexure checking, GST-related record verification, Request ID creation, trade-data downloading, print-trial checking, tracker updating and reconciliation. The study uses a descriptive case-study approach to organize these activities into workflow stages and examine how each stage contributes to document completeness, traceability and process control. The case shows that DSPF-related work is not simply a matter of uploading files: it requires consistent transaction details, clear references, systematic status updates and checks before a request is treated as complete. The report also highlights the practical importance of managing incomplete documents, following up on discrepancies and maintaining records that can be retrieved when needed. Since the source material does not provide a verified transaction-level dataset, measured error rates or processing-time records, this paper does not claim statistical effects or quantified improvements. It recommends a common document-naming convention, stage-wise checklists, structured exception tracking, clearly defined tracker fields and documented reconciliation before closure. The paper offers practical learning from one organizational case and identifies opportunities for future research using anonymized workflow data.

Keywords: Special Economic Zones; DSPF; GST compliance; invoice verification; documentation management; process control

1. Introduction

Special Economic Zones (SEZs) are an important part of India's export-oriented industrial and service ecosystem. Businesses operating in these zones work within a framework of regulatory procedures, documentation requirements and reporting obligations. In this environment, finance and compliance activities help ensure that transaction records are complete, consistent and available for review. Even when a task appears routine—such as naming an invoice file or updating a tracker—it can affect the smooth movement of a request through the wider process.

This paper is based on the On-the-Job Training (OJT) report prepared after an internship at Moon SEZ Consultants LLP in Pune. The report describes work connected with the Domestic Tariff Area Service Procurement Form (DSPF) workflow. The tasks included invoice renaming, annexure checking, invoice uploading, Request ID creation, trade-data downloading, print-trial checking, tracker updating and



reconciliation. These activities provided practical exposure to the relationship between documentation, compliance review and transaction tracking.

The purpose of this paper is to explain the workflow in a clear, process-oriented way and identify practical controls that may support reliable execution. It does not attempt to evaluate the legal validity of individual transactions or measure the overall performance of the organization. Instead, it focuses on the operational lessons that can be drawn from the internship activities described in the report.

The study addresses three questions: (1) What are the main stages and activities involved in the DSPF workflow described in the OJT report? (2) What documentation and tracking risks can arise across these stages? (3) What practical measures may improve consistency, traceability and closure discipline? These questions are relevant to teams that handle repeated documentation tasks, where small errors can lead to clarification requests, rework or delays.

2. Background and Regulatory Context

A Special Economic Zone is a designated area established under the applicable Indian legal framework to support export-oriented activity and related economic objectives. The Special Economic Zones Act, 2005 and the Special Economic Zones Rules, 2006 provide the principal statutory framework for SEZ establishment and operation [1], [2]. Transactions involving SEZ units may also engage goods and services tax provisions, depending on the nature of the supply and the applicable conditions [3]. The specific treatment of any transaction must be determined with reference to current law and the facts of that transaction.

The Domestic Tariff Area (DTA) generally refers to the area of India outside an SEZ. The OJT report describes the DSPF workflow as part of the documentation process for service procurement involving DTA suppliers and SEZ units. In practical terms, the workflow brings together invoices, annexures and other supporting records so that information can be reviewed and tracked through the required stages.

The report uses terms such as GST verification, GSTR-2B/GST data checking, Letter of Intent (LOI), Request ID and Maker ID. These terms refer to different kinds of checks, supporting records or workflow stages described during the internship. Their use in this paper follows the terminology of the source report. This paper does not provide independent legal advice or suggest that a single internal workflow applies uniformly to every SEZ transaction.

From an operations perspective, the key challenge is making sure that information remains consistent as it moves from one stage to another. A correct invoice can still be difficult to process if it is stored under an unclear file name, linked to the wrong request, or not accompanied by the expected annexure. Similarly, a tracker is useful only when it reflects the current status of the request. The regulatory context therefore makes disciplined documentation and reliable records important operational practices.

3. Review of Related Concepts

Documentation control and process consistency. In document-intensive operations, staff rely on records that are complete, identifiable and retrievable. A standardized file-naming rule can reduce ambiguity when several invoices or requests are being handled at the same time. A checklist can help ensure that the same verification points are considered for each request. These tools do not replace professional judgment, but they reduce reliance on memory and make handovers easier.

Traceability and status tracking. Traceability means being able to follow a transaction from initiation to completion and identify the records associated with each stage. A unique Request ID, together with an up-to-



date tracker, can provide a common reference for follow-ups and status checks. A tracker that only records a general status, however, may not show what is pending, who needs to act next or whether the request has been fully closed. Clear fields and consistent updates are therefore as important as the existence of the tracker itself.

Reconciliation and exception handling. Reconciliation involves comparing related records and resolving differences before a process is treated as complete. Exceptions may include missing supporting documents, inconsistent invoice details or incomplete status information. Recording an exception explicitly is more useful than relying on informal reminders, because it helps teams distinguish between requests that are progressing normally and requests that require attention.

Digital workflow support. Digital uploading and tracker systems can make records easier to store, search and monitor. Yet digital tools do not automatically guarantee accuracy. Poor naming practices, incomplete data entry and inconsistent status definitions can reproduce manual problems in a digital environment. Technology is most useful when supported by agreed procedures, clear responsibility and basic quality checks.

The internship report is an account of practical work rather than a systematic review of a large body of empirical research. Accordingly, this section presents general process-management concepts as a lens for interpreting the reported tasks. It does not claim that the internship independently tested these concepts or established causal relationships.

4. Research Objectives

The study has four objectives. First, it describes the major activities undertaken as part of the DSPF-related workflow during the internship. Second, it explains the role of document verification, transaction identification and tracker maintenance in supporting process continuity. Third, it identifies operational risks that may arise when records are incomplete, inconsistent or not updated in time. Fourth, it proposes practical measures that could make routine processing more consistent and easier to monitor.

The objectives are deliberately process-focused. The available OJT report does not provide a complete, anonymized dataset of individual requests, processing durations, error counts or rejection rates. For that reason, the study does not attempt to calculate a numerical compliance score or claim that any particular control reduced errors by a specific percentage.

5. Methodology

Research design. The paper adopts a descriptive qualitative case-study approach. The case is the DSPF-related work described in the OJT report for Moon SEZ Consultants LLP, Pune. The primary source is the internship report itself, including its descriptions of assigned tasks, workflow stages, observations and learning outcomes. The analysis is intended to organize and interpret the reported work, not to provide an independent audit of the organization.

Analytical procedure. The tasks were grouped into four stages: (1) preparation and identification of documents; (2) verification of invoices, annexures and GST-related information; (3) request identification, submission support and status tracking; and (4) print-trial checking, reconciliation and record maintenance. Each stage was considered in terms of its purpose, the information it depends on and the kinds of operational risks that could interrupt it.

Scope. The study covers practical activities associated with the DSPF workflow during the internship. It does not cover strategic tax advisory, statutory auditing or a comparative assessment of multiple SEZ consulting



firms. The findings should therefore be understood as a focused account of one internship experience rather than a sector-wide conclusion.

Ethical considerations. Confidential client details, invoice values, GST identification numbers and commercially sensitive records are not reproduced. The paper does not infer client-specific information from the task descriptions. Any future quantitative study should use organization-approved, anonymized data and follow applicable confidentiality requirements.

Limitations of method. The source material does not supply a transaction-level dataset that could be independently reanalysed. There are no verified counts of mismatches, rejected requests, average processing times or follow-up cycles. As a result, the analysis is descriptive and the recommendations are practical suggestions. They should be tested against actual workflow data before being treated as evidence of improved performance.

6. Description of the DSPF Workflow

6.1 Invoice renaming and file identification. The report describes invoice renaming as one of the initial tasks. The purpose of this step is to make a file identifiable and easier to retrieve during later stages. A consistent naming rule can include approved elements such as a supplier or client reference, invoice number and date, subject to the organization's confidentiality and file-management rules. The precise naming format should be set by the organization rather than improvised by individual users.

6.2 GST-related data verification. The internship report describes checking GST-related information against invoices and available records. Details mentioned include GSTIN, invoice number, tax amount, supplier information and service description. This activity requires attention to consistency: if the invoice and the supporting record do not match, the difference should be checked rather than silently overlooked. The paper does not determine tax eligibility for any individual transaction.

6.3 Annexure checking. Annexures provide structured information associated with a procurement request. Checking them involves confirming that required fields are completed and that the information agrees with the relevant invoice and supporting documents. Where information is missing, the request may need clarification or correction before it moves forward. A simple checklist can help ensure that the same core items are checked each time.

6.4 Invoice uploading and supporting documents. Uploading is not only a technical step. The correct document must be attached to the correct request, and its legibility and completeness should be confirmed. The report also refers to supporting records such as LOIs and payment proofs. The required documents can vary by case, so a checklist should reflect the organization's approved procedure and current requirements.

6.5 Request ID creation. The report describes Request ID creation as a way to identify and track a procurement request. A unique reference helps team members find the right records and discuss a request without relying only on names or informal descriptions. The reference should be recorded consistently in the relevant tracker and associated files.

6.6 Trade-data downloading and print-trial checking. These tasks formed part of the internship activities. The report does not provide enough detail to reconstruct every system screen or technical rule used. At a process level, downloading trade data and checking a print trial are review points where users should confirm that the expected information is available and that the output corresponds to the intended request.



6.7 Tracker updating and reconciliation. The tracker records progress and supports follow-up. Updating it after a task is completed helps prevent outdated status information from misleading the next person handling the request. Reconciliation provides an additional check that related information is consistent before the request is treated as closed. Closure should be supported by the required evidence and should not rely only on a verbal confirmation.

Table 1. DSPF workflow activities and control relevance

Workflow activity	Purpose	Control relevance
Invoice renaming and uploading	Organized file identification and storage	Improves retrievability and consistency
Annexure and invoice checking	Review completeness and compare related details	Helps identify missing or mismatched information
GST-related data verification	Check transaction details against available records	Supports the review process
Workflow activity	Purpose	Control relevance
Request ID and tracker updates	Identify the request and record progress	Improves traceability and pending-action visibility
Print-trial checking and reconciliation	Review output and compare related records	Provides a checkpoint before closure

7. Findings and Discussion

The internship report indicates that DSPF processing consists of connected tasks whose quality depends on the consistency of records across stages. Document naming, verification, uploading, identification and tracking are interdependent. If an early-stage file is unclear or a key detail is missing, later stages may require additional checks or follow-up. This is a process observation drawn from the activities described in the report, not a quantified measurement of the frequency of such events.

A first finding is the importance of document consistency. Invoices, annexures and supporting documents serve different purposes, but they must refer to the same underlying transaction. Checking each document in isolation may not reveal a mismatch between them. A cross-document check is therefore useful before a request moves to the next stage.

A second finding is the role of unique references and tracker discipline. Request IDs and tracker updates help maintain continuity when tasks pass between people or when several requests are in progress. If the tracker is updated late, the team may have to spend time confirming whether a request is waiting for documents, under review or already completed. The tracker should therefore record not just a status label but also the next action and the date of the latest update.

A third finding is that exception handling should be visible. A missing annexure or inconsistent invoice detail should be recorded as a specific pending issue, with responsibility assigned for resolving it. Without a structured exception record, follow-ups can become repetitive and the same discrepancy may be reviewed more than once. A clear exception process can also help a supervisor distinguish between routine work and cases that need escalation.



A fourth finding is that reconciliation and closure are important controls. Completing an upload or changing a tracker status should not automatically mean that the entire request is complete. The appropriate documents, checks and approvals should be confirmed in accordance with the approved procedure. A clear closure point helps ensure that records remain useful for later retrieval and review.

These findings suggest that reliable processing depends on both individual care and a consistent system. Training staff to be attentive is useful, but training alone cannot replace standardized naming rules, common checklists and clear definitions of status. The recommendations in the next section are intended to translate these observations into simple operational practices.

8. Process Risks and Recommended Controls

8.1 Inconsistent file names. When different users name similar files in different ways, retrieval becomes slower and the possibility of selecting the wrong file increases. A common naming convention should be documented with examples. If the organization uses an internal client code or request reference, that reference should be applied consistently and in line with confidentiality requirements.

8.2 Missing or mismatched supporting records. A request may be delayed when an invoice, annexure or other required record is incomplete or inconsistent. A stage-wise checklist should identify mandatory fields and documents. If an exception is found, it should be recorded with a short description, date and next action rather than left in an informal message alone.

8.3 Unclear request status. General status labels may not explain what is preventing progress. A tracker should include a unique reference, current stage, pending item, responsible person or team, last-updated date and next action. The organization should define status terms so that team members use them consistently.

8.4 Repeated follow-ups. Repeated requests for the same missing information can occur when responsibility is unclear or previous communication is not recorded. A structured exception log can record the issue, date of contact, response received and remaining action. Escalation timelines can be defined by the organization according to the urgency and type of request.

8.5 Premature closure. A request may appear complete in a tracker even though a final check or supporting record remains outstanding. Closure criteria should be documented, and reconciliation should be completed before the status is changed to closed. The closure record should make it possible to understand what was checked and when the request was finalized.

8.6 Excessive dependence on manual memory. Repeated work can lead staff to rely on experience instead of checking each required item. Short checklists, standard operating procedures and periodic team reviews can make the process less dependent on individual memory. These controls should be proportionate to the work and should not create unnecessary duplication.

The controls suggested here are recommendations inferred from the reported workflow. Their effectiveness has not been measured in this case. A pilot should be evaluated using practical indicators such as the number of requests returned for correction, average time spent waiting for documents, frequency of repeated follow-ups and proportion of requests completed with all required records on the first review.



Table 2. Potential process risks and suggested controls

Potential risk	Suggested control
Inconsistent file naming	Adopt a standard naming convention with examples
Missing or mismatched documents	Use a stage-wise checklist and record exceptions
Unclear request status	Maintain unique reference, current stage, owner and next action
Repeated follow-ups	Keep an exception log and define escalation responsibility
Premature closure	Require reconciliation and closure evidence before final status update

9. Practical Improvement Framework

A simple improvement framework can be implemented in stages. The first stage is standardization: agree on document-naming rules, mandatory tracker fields and the checklist applicable to each type of request. The second stage is adoption: explain the rules to team members and use a small set of examples to demonstrate how a complete request should look. The third stage is monitoring: review a sample of completed and pending requests to identify recurring gaps. The fourth stage is refinement: update the checklist or tracker where evidence shows that an item is unclear or frequently missed.

A suggested tracker could include the following fields: unique Request ID; date received; document category; invoice reference; annexure status; GST-related verification status; supporting-document status; current stage; pending issue; responsible person or team; last-updated date; next action; and closure date. Only fields necessary for the workflow should be used, and sensitive data should be handled according to company policy.

A short daily or weekly review can focus on requests that are incomplete, overdue or awaiting external information. The aim is not to add meetings for their own sake, but to make exceptions visible and ensure that responsibility for the next step is clear. Where request volume permits, the team can also maintain a brief record of why work was returned for correction. Over time, this can show whether the most common issues relate to missing documents, inconsistent details or delayed communication.

For future evaluation, the organization could establish a baseline period before changing the process and compare it with a later period. Useful measures include first-pass completion rate, average processing time, number of document-related follow-ups and percentage of requests with complete closure records. These measures should be defined clearly and calculated from approved, anonymized records. Without such evidence, improvements should be described as plausible benefits rather than confirmed outcomes.

10. Learning Outcomes

The internship activities provided practical exposure to the way finance and compliance tasks are coordinated in a professional environment. Invoice renaming and uploading reinforced the importance of organized digital records. Annexure checking and GST-related verification demonstrated the need to compare information across documents rather than assuming that each file is correct in isolation. Request ID creation and tracker updating showed how a consistent reference can support continuity across a multi-stage workflow.

The work also highlighted the value of attention to detail, time management and clear communication. When information is missing or inconsistent, the issue needs to be described accurately so that it can be resolved. Maintaining a tracker requires discipline because a status that is not updated can be as misleading as an



incorrect document. Reconciliation and record maintenance reinforced the importance of checking completion rather than treating the last visible action as proof that all requirements have been met.

From an academic perspective, the experience connects concepts of internal control, documentation, process standardization and compliance management with routine business operations. It also demonstrates a limitation of process observation: a task may appear to work smoothly, but its actual effectiveness cannot be measured without relevant data. This distinction between observation and measurement is important for both management practice and future research.

11. Limitations and Future Research

The study has several limitations. It is based on one internship and one organizational setting. The report describes tasks and learning experiences but does not provide a complete anonymized dataset of individual transactions. As a result, the paper cannot quantify error frequency, turnaround time, rework or the impact of any control. It also does not compare Moon SEZ Consultants LLP with other consulting firms.

The process description is limited to the level of detail available in the OJT report. It would not be appropriate to infer confidential internal rules or the technical configuration of systems from brief descriptions of tasks. Regulatory requirements may also change, so the legal context should be checked against current official sources when applying the findings to a specific transaction.

Future research could use an approved sample of anonymized requests over a defined period. Researchers could measure first-pass completion, document mismatch frequency, time spent awaiting clarification, total processing time and the proportion of requests with complete closure records. Interviews with staff involved at different workflow stages could explain why delays occur. A before-and-after evaluation of a checklist or tracker redesign could then assess whether the intervention is associated with measurable improvement.

A multi-organization study could also compare workflow design, document-control practices and exception-handling procedures across different SEZ service providers. Such research would require consistent definitions and appropriate permission to access operational records. These approaches would extend the present descriptive case into a more systematic assessment without disclosing confidential client information.

12. Conclusion

This paper has examined DSPF-related finance and compliance activities described in an internship at Moon SEZ Consultants LLP. The workflow included invoice renaming and uploading, annexure checking, GST-related record verification, Request ID creation, trade-data downloading, print-trial checking, tracker updating and reconciliation. Together, these tasks show how document preparation, verification and status tracking support a process in which completeness and traceability matter.

The main practical lesson is that reliable processing depends on more than completing individual tasks. Information must remain consistent across documents, each request needs a clear reference, pending issues must be visible, and closure should be supported by appropriate checks. The paper recommends standard naming conventions, stage-wise checklists, structured exception logs, clear tracker fields and documented reconciliation. These are practical suggestions based on the case, not proven numerical improvements.

The study is limited by its descriptive design and the absence of transaction-level performance data. Further work should test the recommendations using anonymized operational measures. This would help the organization determine which controls provide the greatest value and would create a stronger evidence base for improving DSPF-related workflow management.



References

[1] Government of India, The Special Economic Zones Act, 2005, Act No. 28 of 2005.

[2] Government of India, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, The Special Economic Zones Rules, 2006.

[3] Government of India, The Integrated Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017.