



Aircraft Portfolio Data Operations

Managed Services for Active
Portfolio Stewardship



A Private Aviation Investment Fund
Aviation Finance / Asset Management

CLIENT SUCCESS

ZEEVOGROUP.COM



THE PROBLEM

Your lease management platform is only as current as the data you feed into it. A mid-sized aviation fund managing a portfolio of commercial aircraft across multiple special-purpose entities had adopted a platform to centralize their lease, asset, and financial records. But without a dedicated operations function managing those inputs on an ongoing basis, the platform was falling behind the portfolio it was meant to reflect.

The result:

- ▶ Stale maintenance reserve balances that didn't reflect current claims activity;
- ▶ Technical records that lagged reality – life-limited parts recorded at status A when they'd already moved to status B;
- ▶ Return condition exposure that couldn't be quantified because the underlying data was incomplete;
- ▶ Insurance coverage tracking that relied on annual reviews rather than real-time monitoring; and
- ▶ Lease cash flow events that aged in queues waiting for someone to find time to post them.

When your platform doesn't reflect your portfolio, neither do your decisions. You can't accurately model returns. You can't quantify transition exposure. You can't catch problems before they become leverage points in redelivery negotiations. You're managing by reconstruction rather than by current facts.



THE APPROACH

Zeevo assumed ongoing responsibility for the completeness, accuracy, and health of the fund's portfolio data on a monthly operating cycle – **not as a vendor managing data entry, but as a steward managing portfolio risk.**



▶ **Monthly lease and financial processing:**

Every lease transaction – rent collections, maintenance reserve receipts, letter-of-credit activity, insurance proceeds, lease amendments – was processed and recorded in the platform with full attribution and documentation. But processing wasn't the work. The work was validating that each transaction was recorded correctly, that reserve positions reflected actual cash activity (not accrued estimates that had drifted), and that nothing aging in the queue represented an unmonitored risk.

▶ **Proactive maintenance reserve management:**

Zeevo didn't just post reserve transactions. Each period, reserves were reconciled against the fund's financial statements and validated for adequacy. When a reserve balance showed signs of being underfunded relative to the aircraft's condition and remaining lease term, that gap was flagged with quantified exposure impact – not as an accounting discrepancy, but as a return condition risk. The fund entered redelivery negotiations knowing their reserve positions were current and defensible.



THE APPROACH

▶ **Technical record validation and exposure quantification:**

Lessee-provided maintenance records were cross-referenced against prior-cycle technical logs. When discrepancies appeared – an LLP recorded at one status in a recent shop visit report but at different status in the prior period, for example – Zeevo didn't just flag the inconsistency for the client to investigate. Zeevo quantified what the discrepancy meant: "This LLP status variance increases estimated redelivery remediation cost by \$X." The fund could then prioritize resolution based on actual financial exposure, not administrative noise.

▶ **Aircraft technical records maintained with current, sourced data:**

Airframe status, engine configuration, life-limited part positions, shop visit history – all maintained at aircraft level from lessee-provided documentation, but with reconciliation discipline that caught gaps and inconsistencies before they affected asset valuations or transition planning.

▶ **Return condition monitoring and portfolio visibility:**

Lease expiry timelines, redelivery requirements, and open technical discrepancies were tracked aircraft-by-aircraft and updated each period. The fund's leadership could access current return condition data whenever they needed to model redelivery outcomes or understand transition exposure across the portfolio.

▶ **Insurance and letter-of-credit monitoring:**

Coverage expirations were tracked and flagged with lead time. LC renewal windows and collateral positioning were monitored to ensure the fund maintained current documentation and identified gaps before reporting periods or renewal discussions with banks.

▶ **Clear scope discipline:**

Every hour billed to the client mapped to identifiable work product – lease transactions processed, reserves reconciled, technical records validated, exposure quantified.



THE OUTCOME

The fund's lease management platform became a reliable, current source of truth – not a historical record that lagged behind the portfolio.

Real-time portfolio visibility.

- ▶ Leadership and investors had accurate data on portfolio performance, asset status, and financial position each period. No surprises at reporting time because data was current, not reconstructed.

Defensible redelivery positions.

- ▶ Maintenance reserve balances were current and reconciled, giving the fund leverage in return condition negotiations. Technical record discrepancies were identified and quantified early – creating lead time to investigate or remediate rather than discovering issues at the point of transition. The difference showed up in actual redelivery outcomes and compensation received.

Proactive risk flagging.

- ▶ Insurance gaps, LC renewal windows, and return condition exposure were identified as they arose – not discovered after they'd already created operational or financial friction. The fund operated from a position of anticipation, not reaction.

Operational bandwidth freed.

- ▶ The fund's asset managers and finance team could focus on deal execution, lessee relationships, and investor obligations – not on data entry, reconciliation, and platform administration. That shift alone justified the engagement.

Auditable, defensible work product.

- ▶ Every transaction, every data update, every exposure calculation left a documented trail. When auditors or lenders reviewed the fund's records, they found clean, attributable work product – not reconstructed estimates or stale positions that raised questions.





WHY THIS MATTERS.

Most aviation funds have the same constraint: asset management expertise, lessee relationships, deal flow – but not internal capacity to maintain institutional-grade data operations across a full portfolio in parallel with active deal and investor obligations.

The solution isn't to hire full-time staff. It's to access stewardship from someone who understands both aviation lease economics and portfolio operations discipline – someone who can spot a technical record discrepancy and immediately quantify what it means to your redelivery exposure. Someone who knows that a maintenance reserve drifting downward isn't just an accounting variance; it's a risk signal that affects your negotiating position.

Zeevo operates at that intersection. We bring simultaneous fluency in aviation lease mechanics, aircraft technical records, and active portfolio management – and we apply that judgment every month, every aircraft, every transaction. We don't just maintain your data. We keep your portfolio honest and give you the visibility to make real-time business decisions instead of discovering problems at transition.

For aviation funds that want institutional-grade data operations without building an internal team, that's the difference between managing by reconstruction and managing by current fact.

[ZEEVOGROUP.COM](https://zeevogroup.com)

