SAP
C_FSM_2601
SAP Certified - SAP Field Service Management

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.

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A hospital facilities partner is introducing SAP Field Service Management mobile execution for technicians who service sterilization equipment. The quality manager wants every completed service visit to include structured checklist evidence, technician comments, and completion status so dispatchers can confirm whether the visit is ready for customer follow-up.
The rollout lead proposes letting technicians close visits first and complete checklist details later when connectivity is stable. Field supervisors argue that technicians often move to restricted work areas where later reconstruction of service evidence is unreliable. The constraint is that the mobile process must remain usable in variable connectivity while still producing dependable completion evidence.
What is the best implementation recommendation?
Response:

A. Allow technicians to close visits before checklist completion and require supervisors to review missing evidence during weekly quality checks.
B. Configure the mobile workflow so required checklist evidence is captured during the visit and synchronized once connectivity is available.
C. Ask dispatchers to reopen completed visits whenever checklist information is incomplete so technicians can add details after the fact.
D. Replace structured checklist capture with free-text technician comments until the mobile process has stabilized across all service locations.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation preserves both usability and evidence quality. Required checklist capture remains part of field execution, and synchronization after connectivity is available supports dispatcher visibility without relying on technicians to reconstruct service details later.

Question: 2

A commercial waste-compactor service provider is adopting SAP Field Service Management analytics in a public cloud rollout. Service leaders want early insight into sites where repeated technician visits and delayed completion confirmations suggest possible maintenance planning issues.
The analytics lead proposes presenting suggested review priorities to dispatchers, while the regional service manager wants the highest-ranked indicators to automatically create urgent planning actions.

Dispatchers are concerned that automatic actions may change schedules before capacity and service context are reviewed. The constraint is that analytics must improve decision speed without removing accountability for planning decisions during early adoption.
What is the best recommendation for using the analytical indicators?
Response:

A. Convert high-ranked analytical indicators into automatic urgent planning actions so repeat-visit risks are addressed quickly.
B. Present indicators as dispatcher decision support, track outcomes, and keep scheduling or priority changes under dispatcher review.
C. Hide analytical indicators until several months of service history proves that the recommendations are consistently accurate.
D. Let each regional team decide whether indicators are advisory or automatic so adoption can match local operating preference.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation balances faster insight with controlled planning. Analytical indicators help dispatchers review risk earlier, outcome tracking builds confidence, and scheduling or priority changes remain accountable within the planning process.

Question: 3

A materials-handling equipment service company is preparing a first SAP Field Service Management public cloud go-live. The release includes dispatcher planning, technician mobile confirmation, and basic follow-up reporting, but the user enablement package currently contains only slide decks from workshops.
The support owner wants a lightweight go-live playbook that explains common first-level questions, ownership boundaries, and when to escalate issues to the implementation team. The project sponsor worries that creating support content may slow the launch. The constraint is that support preparation must not become a large documentation project, but users must have enough guidance to avoid preventable early-live disruption.
Which advisory response best supports a controlled go-live?
Response:

A. Launch with the workshop slide decks and create support guidance only after the most frequent live issues are identified.
B. Delay go-live until a complete knowledge base exists for every current and future SAP Field Service Management capability.
C. Assign all user questions to the implementation team during the first month so first-level support does not need separate preparation.
D. Create a concise first-release playbook covering routine questions, responsibility boundaries, and escalation paths for released activities.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation matches the release constraint. A concise playbook gives users practical first-level guidance, defines who owns common questions, and provides escalation paths without expanding support preparation beyond the first-release scope.

Question: 4

A fire-safety inspection company is moving customer site and equipment records into SAP Field Service Management as part of a public cloud implementation. The service manager wants dispatchers to plan inspection visits by customer site, equipment type, and technician availability from the first release. The data lead suggests loading only customer names first and allowing dispatchers to add equipment details during live scheduling to save preparation time. The project sponsor wants a fast rollout but also wants predictable planning results and fewer corrections after go-live. The constraint is that the recommendation must support useful scheduling without requiring a complete historical data cleanup before launch.
Which recommendation best supports the first release?
Response:

A. Load only customer names before go-live and let dispatchers complete equipment and site information during the first inspection cycle.
B. Prepare the minimum required customer, site, and equipment master data needed for planning, then validate sample inspections before go-live.
C. Delay field service scheduling until all historical customer, site, and equipment records have been fully cleansed and reconciled.
D. Allow technicians to correct customer and equipment records in the mobile application after each visit to improve data quality gradually.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation focuses on the master data needed for the released planning process. Validating sample inspections confirms that customer, site, and equipment records support scheduling decisions before live dispatching depends on that information.

Question: 5

A marine equipment service company is preparing SAP Field Service Management for a public cloud rollout. Dispatchers must plan service visits by vessel customer account, port location, equipment category, and technician availability, but the migrated records contain some inactive locations and incomplete equipment ownership details.
The customer account lead wants to load all records quickly to avoid delaying go-live, while the dispatch manager wants only records that can support dependable planning in the first release. The

implementation consultant must recommend a practical master data approach. The constraint is that the first release must support accurate active service planning without turning the rollout into a full historical data remediation project.
Which recommendation best fits the first-release requirement?
Response:

A. Load all customer, location, and equipment records as-is so dispatchers can identify incorrect records during live planning.
B. Clean and validate active customer accounts, service locations, and equipment relationships required for first-release planning before go-live.
C. Delay go-live until every historical location and equipment ownership record has been fully reconciled across all customers.
D. Let technicians correct equipment ownership details in the mobile process after each completed visit to improve planning data over time.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation addresses the master data dependency required for the released planning scope. Validating active accounts, service locations, and equipment relationships supports dispatchable work while avoiding unnecessary remediation of records that are not needed for first-release execution.

Question: 6

A commercial ventilation service company is preparing SAP Field Service Management go-live for dispatchers, service coordinators, and mobile technicians. The first release includes service request intake, dispatcher assignment, mobile completion confirmation, and basic follow-up handling.
The project sponsor wants go-live to proceed without adding a large documentation workstream, while the support coordinator wants users to know where to report routine issues and when escalation is needed. The implementation team suggests handling questions informally through workshop participants during the first week. The constraint is that support readiness must stay lightweight but avoid inconsistent issue handling during early live operations.
Which advisory response best supports the release?
Response:

A. Use workshop participants as informal support contacts during the first week and document issues only after recurring patterns are visible.
B. Delay go-live until a complete support knowledge base exists for all released and future SAP Field Service Management scenarios.
C. Create a focused go-live support brief covering released-process questions, ownership boundaries, and escalation routes.
D. Route every first-week issue directly to the implementation team so users do not need a separate support model.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation fits the release constraint. A focused support brief gives users practical direction for the live scope, clarifies who owns common questions, and provides escalation routes without creating a large documentation workstream.

Question: 7

An industrial cleaning equipment service provider wants to use SAP Field Service Management analytics to identify repeat service visits and missed follow-up actions. The organization is modernizing from monthly supervisor summaries, but several regions still rely on locally maintained spreadsheets for service performance review.
The analytics sponsor wants a fast transition to cloud-based visibility, while regional supervisors want time to confirm that new measures match how they interpret completed and reopened visits. The constraint is that the recommendation must improve analytical visibility without allowing multiple long-term sources of truth for service performance.
What is the best recommendation for the implementation consultant?
Response:

A. Keep regional spreadsheets as the official source until every supervisor agrees that the new analytics fully match local reporting habits.
B. Define the key service performance measures, validate them with regional supervisors during a short transition period, and then make the new analytics authoritative.
C. Publish the new analytics immediately and retire all local spreadsheets before users review how completed and reopened visits are represented.
D. Allow each region to keep its own spreadsheet and use SAP Field Service Management analytics only for high-level management presentations.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation balances modernization speed with metric trust. Defining and validating key measures creates a clear interpretation basis, and making the new analytics authoritative after a controlled transition prevents long-term conflict between reporting sources.

Question: 8

You are advising a municipal elevator maintenance contractor using SAP Field Service Management in a public cloud environment. The dispatcher manager wants emergency repair visits to be visible immediately, but the planning lead also wants preventive maintenance capacity protected so contractual maintenance windows are not missed.
A proposal is made to let dispatchers assign emergency work to any available technician first and rebalance preventive visits at the end of the day. The service director is concerned that this may improve emergency response while creating late preventive maintenance and unclear technician

workload visibility. The constraint is that the recommendation must support urgent repair handling without sacrificing planned maintenance commitments.
Which recommendation best balances urgent service response with planned maintenance reliability?
Response:

A. Reserve planning capacity for preventive maintenance while allowing dispatchers to reprioritize emergency visits against visible technician availability and workload.
B. Assign emergency repairs first to any technician with open time and let preventive maintenance visits move automatically to the next available day.
C. Keep emergency repairs outside the planned schedule so dispatchers can handle them separately without affecting preventive maintenance assignments.
D. Require all preventive maintenance visits to be completed before emergency repair visits can be added to the same technician schedule.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation supports the service priority while preserving planning discipline. It keeps preventive maintenance capacity visible in the scheduling process and allows emergency work to be evaluated against technician availability, workload impact, and dispatch feasibility before assignments are changed.

Question: 9

A building automation service provider is preparing a first SAP Field Service Management public cloud release for dispatchers and mobile technicians. The business sponsor wants users to start with planning, mobile confirmation, and basic service follow-up, while the support lead wants clear guidance for handling common early issues.
The project coordinator suggests relying on the implementation team chat channel for all go-live questions to avoid spending time on formal support preparation. The support lead warns that this may create inconsistent answers and slow issue routing during the first week. The constraint is that support readiness must stay lightweight but provide enough structure for users to resolve routine first-release questions without delaying go-live.
Which advisory recommendation best supports the first release?
Response:

A. Route all go-live questions through the implementation team chat channel and create documentation only after recurring questions are known.
B. Delay the release until a complete support catalog exists for all future planning, mobile, reporting, and integration scenarios.
C. Provide a focused first-release support guide with routine issue handling, ownership boundaries, and escalation criteria for released activities.
D. Ask dispatchers and technicians to resolve issues locally during the first week so the project team can avoid unnecessary support overhead.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation provides the right support layer for a controlled first release. Focused guidance for released activities gives users practical help, defines ownership boundaries, and establishes escalation criteria without expanding preparation beyond the immediate go-live scope.

Question: 10

A commercial pest-control equipment service company is modernizing from supervisor-maintained spreadsheets to SAP Field Service Management reporting. The business wants dashboards showing overdue visits, repeat callouts, and technician follow-up status, but regional teams currently define "overdue" differently based on local service habits.
The reporting owner recommends adopting one shared overdue definition immediately, while regional supervisors request a brief comparison period to check how their local lists translate into the new reports. The constraint is that the first release must improve decision consistency without creating a long coexistence period with competing performance definitions.
What is the best recommendation for the implementation consultant?
Response:

A. Allow each region to keep its local overdue definition so dashboards reflect familiar operating practices during the first release.
B. Keep spreadsheets as the official source and use SAP Field Service Management reporting only for leadership review until all regions agree.
C. Define the shared overdue measure, compare it with regional lists during a short validation window, and then make the dashboard measure authoritative.
D. Replace all local lists on the first day and treat any mismatch with regional overdue views as a training issue rather than a reporting concern.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation balances standardization with adoption confidence. A shared measure creates consistent reporting logic, and a short validation window lets regional teams reconcile local interpretations before the dashboard becomes the authoritative decision source.
Topic: 2
Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Intake Classification for Facility Service Priorities
During the adoption review, CivicSort service calls are linked to the correct conveyor equipment, but dispatchers cannot consistently tell whether the call affects live intake operations or a scheduled downtime inspection. Experienced coordinators can infer the priority from supervisor comments.

Which recommendation best supports rollout to additional facilities?
Response:

A. Continue using supervisor comments because experienced coordinators can identify urgent plant work.
B. Validate that SAP FSM service-call classification shows the operational context needed for dispatcher prioritization.
C. Expand to additional facilities and let service desk users correct priority after technician completion.
D. Remove operational context from dispatcher review and prioritize calls only by equipment type.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
Correct equipment linkage does not prove that dispatchers can prioritize the work. Structured service-call classification supports repeatable distinction between live intake disruption, downtime work, and post-shift inspection.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 1 — Intake Classification for Facility Service Priorities
A baler service call has the correct facility location and equipment record, but the category does not show whether the request came from live production intake or planned downtime.
What is the most appropriate diagnosis?
Response:

A. The service flow has an intake-classification dependency that is not fully validated for prioritization.
B. The mobile SmartForm is incomplete because priority should be selected only after field completion.
C. Contractor eligibility is the root cause because all baler work should be assigned to contractors.
D. The rollout is ready because facility and equipment data are already correct.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
The second-order dependency is between intake context and prioritization behavior. Correct facility and equipment data do not prove that the service call can be prioritized consistently.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 1 — Intake Classification for Facility Service Priorities
A plant supervisor asks to keep live-intake urgency in free-text comments because supervisors can describe the situation faster during peak sorting hours.
Which response best balances speed with repeatable service processing?
Response:

A. Accept free-text urgency as the primary method because plant supervisors know the operational impact best.
B. Use comments as supporting context while validating structured classification for priority and dispatcher visibility.
C. Remove supervisor comments entirely so dispatchers use only standard category values.
D. Delay all urgent calls until the next shift so priority classification can be reviewed later.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This keeps supervisor context available without making free text the primary control. Structured classification is needed for repeatable dispatcher prioritization across facilities.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 1 — Intake Classification for Facility Service Priorities
CivicSort wants to add two more facilities before the next reporting cycle. First-go-live reporting shows service-call volumes but not whether calls were live intake disruptions, downtime work, or post-shift inspections.
Which evidence should be prioritized before expansion?
Response:

A. Classification visibility that separates operational service contexts in planning and reporting.
B. Total number of calls created because volume proves the intake process is working.
C. Number of supervisor comments entered because more comments improve interpretation.
D. Number of completed technician visits because completion proves prioritization was correct.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
Expansion readiness depends on whether the process can distinguish service contexts consistently. Volume and completion counts do not prove that prioritization logic is visible or repeatable.

Question: 15

CHALLENGE 2 — Shift-Aware Dispatching for Plant Availability
A routine compactor inspection is planned with an available technician in the correct territory, but the facility only permits access during a scheduled downtime window not visible to the dispatcher.
Which recommendation best supports reliable planning?
Response:

A. Validate that facility access timing is visible in planning before treating the activity as schedulable.
B. Keep the assignment because technician availability and territory coverage are sufficient.
C. Ask the technician to negotiate the access window after arriving at the plant.

D. Remove routine inspections from SAP FSM because shift windows make planning unreliable.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
A schedulable activity is not necessarily reliable if the facility window is missing. Planning should reflect both technician availability and plant access timing.

Question: 16

CHALLENGE 2 — Shift-Aware Dispatching for Plant Availability
Dispatchers want to schedule emergency conveyor repairs as quickly as possible. Some facilities restrict line access during peak intake, even for urgent work.
Which validation action best balances response speed with facility availability control?
Response:

A. Confirm whether urgent activities show access timing or exception handling before they are treated as release-ready.
B. Release all emergency repairs immediately because urgency should override facility timing.
C. Hold every emergency repair until all facilities adopt identical shift calendars.
D. Let service desk users determine after completion whether the timing was appropriate.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
Urgency increases the need for timely planning, but it does not remove facility access constraints. SAP FSM planning should show whether urgent work is release-ready within the facility context.

Question: 17

CHALLENGE 2 — Shift-Aware Dispatching for Plant Availability
A dispatcher sees a technician available for a baler inspection, but the activity timing overlaps with the plant's high-volume intake shift. The supervisor says the work can be moved if needed.
What is the strongest interpretation?
Response:

A. The plan should not be treated as reliable until activity timing reflects the facility access window.
B. The plan is reliable because supervisor flexibility replaces the need for visible shift timing.
C. The issue belongs only to mobile completion because the technician can document the delay later.
D. The facility location should be removed from the activity to avoid shift restrictions.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
Planning reliability depends on the relationship between technician availability, activity timing, and the facility access window. Supervisor flexibility may help, but it does not validate the SAP FSM scheduling behavior.

Question: 18

CHALLENGE 2 — Shift-Aware Dispatching for Plant Availability
The operations lead wants planning speed improved for all routine inspections. The dispatch lead prefers to include only inspections with confirmed shift windows in the next rollout wave.
Which advisory response best handles the competing priorities?
Response:

A. Include only inspections with visible shift-window evidence while preparing remaining activities for later rollout.
B. Include all routine inspections because faster planning is the main modernization objective.
C. Block routine inspections entirely until all plants use the same shift pattern.
D. Let each dispatcher decide whether shift-window evidence is needed for their assigned facilities.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
This supports planning modernization where the service flow is testable and protects schedule reliability for weaker areas. It balances speed with controlled rollout evidence.

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/