

SAP C_S4CS

**SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - SAP S/4HANA
Cloud Public Edition, Sales**

For More Information – Visit link below:

<https://www.examsempire.com/>

Product Version

- 1. Up to Date products, reliable and verified.**
- 2. Questions and Answers in PDF Format.**



<https://examsempire.com/>

Visit us at: <https://www.examsempire.com/c-s4cs>

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A consultant is testing sales contract processing in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, Sales. A sales order can reference the contract, but the expected contract price is not applied during order pricing. The pricing analysis shows that the contract-related condition was found but marked inactive for the order item.

The business wants the issue resolved without manually overwriting prices because price governance must remain consistent for future orders. The implementation team must determine whether the issue belongs to transactional entry, condition validity, or sales configuration behavior.

Which action best fits the observed pricing artifact and project constraint?

Response:

- A. Manually overwrite the order item price and add a note explaining that the sales contract was referenced.
- B. Remove the contract reference from the order and maintain the same price directly in the sales order.
- C. Change the customer master data broadly so all future orders default to the expected contract price.
- D. Validate the contract condition applicability and pricing configuration that controls whether the found condition becomes active for the item.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This targets the correct pricing layer shown by the system artifact. A condition that is found but inactive requires validation of applicability and configuration behavior before changing transaction data or creating manual price exceptions.

Question: 2

A consultant is validating delivery processing rules in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, Sales. A sales order is created successfully in the web-based UI, and the item is confirmed for the requested quantity. However, the follow-on delivery proposal includes only part of the order quantity even though the business expects the delivery to wait until the full quantity can be processed together.

The delivery processing evidence shows that the order was eligible for delivery, but the rule applied during follow-on processing allowed partial fulfillment. The project constraint is to preserve the standard cloud order-to-delivery flow and avoid manual delivery quantity corrections during testing.

What should the consultant validate first to resolve the delivery processing mismatch?

Response:

- A. Validate the delivery processing control that determines whether the order item can be partially delivered or must wait for complete fulfillment.
- B. Manually reduce the sales order quantity so the partial delivery proposal matches the available follow-on quantity.
- C. Ask the user to create a second sales order for the remaining quantity after the first delivery is completed.
- D. Change the customer address details so the system recalculates the delivery proposal during follow-on processing.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This targets the process control that governs how confirmed order quantity is translated into delivery eligibility. The item can be delivered, but the applied rule permits partial fulfillment, so the relevant configuration must be validated before changing transaction quantities.

Question: 3

A sales team is piloting AI-assisted sales order entry in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, Sales. The assistant proposes an order draft from customer input, but the draft consistently omits a contract reference that users normally select manually. The created draft can still be reviewed before saving. The business wants faster order creation, but the implementation lead requires that contract-controlled pricing and governance remain intact. The constraint is to use the standard cloud process and avoid accepting AI-generated drafts without validating business-critical sales controls.

Which action best balances automation speed with governed sales execution?

Response:

- A. Disable AI-assisted order entry entirely because any omitted contract reference makes automation unsuitable.
- B. Accept the AI-generated draft and correct pricing later if the customer notices a contract mismatch.
- C. Require users to validate the contract reference and pricing-relevant fields before saving AI-assisted order drafts.
- D. Replace contract-based pricing with general customer pricing so AI-assisted drafts do not need contract selection.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This uses the human validation step at the correct point in the assisted process. The draft can accelerate entry, but contract reference and pricing-relevant fields must be confirmed before saving so governed sales execution remains intact.

Question: 4

During controlled testing in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, Sales, a downstream validation process receives sales order data but rejects one group of orders because a required migrated customer identifier is blank. The sales orders are visible in the web-based UI, and the migration report shows successful technical load for the affected customer records.

The validation evidence shows that order execution succeeded, but the integration consumption path could not retrieve the identifier required by the downstream test. The project constraint is to preserve migration and integration governance without asking users to maintain the identifier manually on each order.

What should the consultant do first to resolve the second-order cause?

Response:

- A. Ask users to enter the missing identifier manually on each sales order before downstream validation.
- B. Continue testing only with customer records whose downstream identifier is already available.
- C. Correct the migration mapping or preparation for the customer identifier and reload or update the affected records.
- D. Loosen downstream validation so orders can pass when the customer identifier is technically blank.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This addresses the gap between technical load success and business-process usability. The customer records exist, but the identifier required by downstream integration must be correctly mapped and available for retrieval.

Question: 5

A project team is preparing validation after a standard process decision for sales contract usage in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, Sales. The fit-to-standard decision is documented, and users can access the sales order app. However, the validation script still references a draft process variant that does not include the agreed contract dependency.

The evidence shows that the executable test content is not aligned with the signed-off process decision, even though the environment itself is available. The project constraint is to avoid test sign-off based on outdated validation content and preserve lifecycle governance.

Which action best addresses the lifecycle validation gap?

Response:

- A. Align the executable validation script with the signed-off contract process before running the test.
- B. Continue with the draft process variant because the sales order app is available to users.
- C. Ask users to describe the contract dependency verbally and mark the process as validated.
- D. Add the contract information into a sales order note so the draft script resembles the agreed process.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This targets the validation artifact before execution. The signed-off process decision must be represented in the runnable test content so the team validates the intended cloud implementation scope.

Question: 6

A sales team is validating order rejection handling in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, Sales. A user applies a rejection reason to a sales order item in the web-based UI, and the item status changes visually. However, the item still appears in a follow-on processing review where the business expects rejected items to be excluded.

The process evidence shows that the rejection reason was entered, but the item was not removed from the relevant execution path. The project constraint is to preserve standard order control and avoid asking users to manually filter rejected items during each review.

Which action best addresses the upstream reason the rejected item remains available for follow-on processing?

Response:

- A. Delete the item from the sales order after entering the rejection reason so it no longer appears in review.
- B. Ask users to ignore rejected items manually during follow-on processing reviews.
- C. Change the requested delivery date so the rejected item is recalculated and removed from the execution path.
- D. Validate the rejection-reason control and item status behavior that determines exclusion from follow-on processing.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This targets the relationship between the entered rejection reason and item execution status. The reason is present, but the item remains available because the exclusion behavior has not been applied as expected.

Question: 7

During end-to-end testing in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, Sales, a migrated product record can be selected during sales order creation. The order saves successfully, but downstream validation fails because the product is missing a sales-relevant classification needed by the connected test scenario. The migration report shows successful technical load, and the product is visible in the web-based UI. The project constraint is to preserve migration quality governance and avoid adding the missing classification manually during each sales order test.

What should the consultant do first to resolve the second-order cause?

Response:

- A. Correct the migration mapping or preparation for the missing sales-relevant product classification and reload or update affected records.
- B. Continue testing only with migrated products that already pass downstream validation.
- C. Ask users to manually add the missing classification during each sales order test.
- D. Loosen the downstream validation so technically loaded products can pass without complete sales classification.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This addresses the difference between technical migration success and business-process readiness. The product is visible and usable for order entry, but downstream validation depends on sales-relevant classification being available through migrated data.

Question: 8

A consultant is validating sales document copying behavior in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, Sales. A follow-on sales order is created with reference to a prior sales document in the web-based UI, and the document flow shows the reference. However, one agreed process-control field is not copied into the new order.

The validation evidence shows that reference creation succeeded, but the copied data set does not include the field needed to control follow-on execution. The project constraint is to correct standard reference-based behavior without asking users to re-enter the field manually during every follow-on order.

What should the consultant validate first to resolve the missing copied field?

Response:

- A. Train users to copy the missing value manually from the source document before saving the follow-on order.
- B. Create follow-on orders without reference so users can enter all required values directly.
- C. Validate the copy behavior that controls which source-document values transfer into the follow-on sales order.
- D. Add the missing value to the order text so reviewers can interpret the intended process control.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This targets the configuration layer that binds source-document values to the follow-on order. The document flow exists, so the issue is not reference creation itself but which values are copied into the new execution context.

Question: 9

A sales team is validating schedule-line behavior in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, Sales. A sales order is created successfully in the web-based UI, and the item is accepted for the requested customer and product. However, no expected schedule line is generated for follow-on processing.

The process evidence shows that the item was saved, but the scheduling-relevant execution detail was not created for the item context. The project constraint is to preserve standard order-to-fulfillment control and avoid asking users to create follow-on execution details manually.

Which action best addresses the upstream reason the schedule line was not generated?

Response:

- A. Validate the item and process setup that determines whether the sales order item is relevant for schedule-line generation.
- B. Ask users to create the missing execution detail manually after the order is saved.
- C. Change the requested delivery date so the system recalculates the order during the next save.
- D. Create a second sales order for the same product so the follow-on process can start from a clean document.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This targets the configuration and item-context layer that controls whether scheduling details are created. The order item can be saved, but follow-on processing depends on the item being relevant for schedule-line generation.

Question: 10

A consultant is testing contract price protection in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, Sales. A sales order can be created with reference to an active contract, and the order saves successfully. However, the order accepts a price change that the business expected the contract reference to prevent. The validation evidence shows that the contract reference exists, but the pricing protection behavior was not applied during order entry. The project constraint is to keep contract governance traceable and avoid relying on manual price review for contract-referenced orders.

What should the consultant validate first to resolve the missing contract price protection?

Response:

- A. Ask users to compare contract prices manually before saving each referenced order.
- B. Remove the contract reference and add the contract price in the order text for review.
- C. Create a new contract record for the same customer and product so the price can be protected separately.
- D. Validate the contract reference and pricing-control setup that determines whether contract pricing restricts order price changes.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This targets the relationship between contract reference and pricing control. The reference exists, but the missing restriction indicates that the configured pricing protection behavior must be validated for the contract-referenced order.

Topic: 2

Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Dealer Order Entry Readiness Across Sales Areas

During UAT, a dealer order for a stocked part saves successfully in one sales organization but requires manual enrichment when entered through another first-wave sales area. The project lead wants the quickest validation step before changing process design.

Which action best supports the required system-based validation?

Response:

- A. Compare the dealer customer sales-area data and material sales data for both first-wave sales areas before retesting order entry.
- B. Give the UAT tester broader sales access so the order can be saved consistently across both sales organizations.
- C. Create a temporary manual checklist for dealers so missing fulfillment data can be added after the order is saved.
- D. Move the affected dealer orders to the sales area that already supports clean order entry during UAT.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario shows that the same dealer order behaves differently across sales areas, so the first validation should confirm whether customer and material sales data are complete in both contexts. This targets the configuration and master data dependency before changing the process or adding workarounds.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 1 — Dealer Order Entry Readiness Across Sales Areas

A dealer order for a service bundle saves with the correct customer and pricing details, but the order does not carry the same downstream fulfillment relevance as a stocked part. The business asks whether this can be accepted because order entry appears successful.

What is the best conclusion?

Response:

- A. Accept the behavior because successful order save proves the sales process is ready for UAT completion.
- B. Treat it as a second-order configuration dependency involving material sales behavior and item processing, then validate the downstream path.
- C. Resolve it by training users to select only stocked parts until the first rollout wave has stabilized.

D. Prioritize analytics validation first because fulfillment relevance can be adjusted after reporting is approved.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The successful save only proves the first step of the process, while the missing fulfillment relevance shows a downstream dependency. The best response is to validate how the bundle is configured for sales and item processing before accepting readiness.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 2 — Delivery Promise Control for Regional Fulfillment

The fulfillment team sees fast confirmation for a high-volume spare part, but delivery creation is inconsistent when regional plant assignment changes. Sales wants to keep the faster confirmation behavior because dealer service levels are visible to management.

Which option best balances performance and governance?

Response:

- A. Keep the faster confirmation behavior and allow fulfillment users to correct delivery details only for affected regions.
- B. Validate plant, shipping, and delivery scheduling dependencies before accepting the faster confirmation as rollout-ready.
- C. Disable availability checking for the affected material so order entry remains consistent across all regions.
- D. Approve regional exceptions during UAT because delivery scheduling can be reviewed after go-live stabilization.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario requires balancing fast confirmation with governed delivery readiness. Validating plant, shipping, and scheduling dependencies confirms whether performance gains are supported by reliable delivery processing.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 2 — Delivery Promise Control for Regional Fulfillment

Two sales areas use the same material and customer type, but one produces a confirmed schedule line that supports delivery processing while the other confirms without predictable delivery readiness. No custom logic has been introduced.

What should the consultant investigate first?

Response:

- A. Whether the affected order was created by a user with a regional sales role rather than a central role.
- B. Whether delivery plant, shipping data, and scheduling-relevant configuration differ between the two sales areas.
- C. Whether the sales director has approved predictive analytics before the delivery process is tested.
- D. Whether the legacy portal should continue creating delivery requests until the public cloud process is mature.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The difference appears in delivery readiness, not simply in order authorization or reporting. Plant, shipping, and scheduling settings are the most relevant configuration dependencies to investigate first.

Thank You for Trying Our Product
Special 16 USD Discount Coupon: NSZUBG3X

Email: support@examsempire.com

**Check our Customer Testimonials and ratings
available on every product page.**

Visit our website.

<https://examsempire.com/>