

SAP

C_ARCON_2601

SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - SAP Ariba Contracts

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-arcon-2601>

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

You are advising a specialty food importer implementing SAP Ariba Contracts in a public cloud, web-based environment. The procurement team wants contract owners to create supplier agreement workspaces quickly from approved requests, but finance requires each workspace to include the correct contract value range, commodity classification, and owner assignment before approval tasks begin. During pilot review, one manager proposes allowing contract owners to create workspaces with minimal required fields and complete missing values later. Another recommends enforcing the required workspace creation inputs up front so approval tasks, reporting, and contract ownership are based on reliable data from the beginning.

The implementation lead wants a recommendation that supports fast adoption without creating incomplete workspaces that later fail review or reporting validation.

Which recommendation should the consultant provide?

Response:

- A. Require the key workspace creation fields before approval tasks start so routing, ownership, and reporting are based on complete contract data.
- B. Allow contract owners to create workspaces with only supplier and title fields, then ask approvers to correct missing values during review.
- C. Create a separate workspace after approval to capture finance-required values so the initial contract creation process remains lightweight.
- D. Let contract owners enter placeholder values during creation and replace them after the contract document is finalized.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation places required data at the correct point in the workspace lifecycle. Complete creation inputs allow ownership, approval routing, and reporting visibility to operate from reliable workspace data before downstream tasks begin.

Question: 2

You are advising a regional laboratory services cooperative using SAP Ariba Contracts to manage supplier agreements for testing materials and calibration services. Procurement leadership needs a monthly visibility report showing only currently active contracts with renewal action due within 120

days, the responsible owner, and whether the last internal review task was completed before publication. During pilot reporting, the report includes several closed or superseded workspaces because users have been relying on agreement titles and manual notes to identify active records. A reporting lead proposes asking contract owners to clean up titles and add a standard note to closed workspaces. Legal wants historical records preserved, while operations wants renewal follow-up to focus only on valid active agreements. The project cannot introduce custom development and must rely on functional configuration and administration practices. The consultant must recommend how to make the report dependable without hiding historical contract records.

Which recommendation best supports reliable visibility while preserving lifecycle traceability?

Response:

- A. Ask contract owners to rename closed workspaces and add standard notes so report users can manually exclude inactive agreements.
- B. Remove closed and superseded workspaces from search visibility so monthly reports show only agreements requiring operational attention.
- C. Create a separate external renewal tracker and leave SAP Ariba Contracts reporting focused on historical agreement storage.
- D. Base the report on governed workspace lifecycle status, renewal action data, owner assignment, and task completion evidence.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation uses governed contract data at the correct reporting layer. Lifecycle status, renewal action data, owner assignment, and task completion evidence allow operational reports to target active agreements while preserving historical workspace traceability.

Question: 3

A global office supplies distributor is preparing SAP Ariba Contracts for regional supplier agreement rollout in a public cloud, web-based environment. During access validation, a legal reviewer assigned to the North region can view contract workspaces for two other regions, while a second reviewer in the North region cannot access one workspace requiring legal review. The workspace template and approval task design have already been approved.

A project manager suggests giving all legal reviewers the same broad visibility for testing and narrowing access after go-live. The regional compliance lead rejects this because contract workspaces may contain sensitive supplier terms. The consultant identifies that reviewer group membership and organization assignments are inconsistent across regions. The team must preserve the approved process while proving that legal access matches responsibility before go-live.

Which recommendation should the consultant provide?

Response:

- A. Standardize legal reviewer group membership and organization assignments, then validate that each reviewer sees only the workspaces aligned to the review responsibility.
- B. Give all legal reviewers broad workspace visibility during testing so missing access does not block validation of approval task completion.

- C. Remove regional ownership from the affected workspaces so legal reviewers use one shared access model for all contract review tasks.
- D. Redesign the approved workspace template because inconsistent legal visibility indicates that the approval process cannot support regional governance.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation addresses the administrative setup that controls workspace visibility and legal participation. Correct group membership and organization assignments allow reviewers to access the right contract workspaces while preventing unnecessary exposure to unrelated regional supplier terms.

Question: 4

A regional event venue operator is configuring SAP Ariba Contracts for supplier agreements covering ticketing support, catering coordination, and venue maintenance. The customer has one approved workspace template for service suppliers, including review tasks, template questions, and reportable agreement attributes. One week before user acceptance testing, compliance approves a revised supplier-screening question that changes when an additional internal review task should appear. The template owner wants to update the approved template immediately and let testers identify any issues during execution. The testing lead is concerned that the new question affects task visibility, document assembly guidance, and reporting fields used in the acceptance criteria. Operations does not want to split the template because portfolio reporting must stay consistent across supplier service agreements. The sponsor accepts a short validation checkpoint but does not want a separate redesign cycle unless the dependency impact proves material.

What should the consultant recommend?

Response:

- A. Update the governed template and validate the dependent task, document, and reporting behavior before using it for user acceptance testing.
- B. Add the new supplier-screening question directly to the approved template and allow user acceptance testing to reveal any downstream issues.
- C. Create a temporary template for suppliers requiring the additional review so the approved service-supplier template can proceed unchanged.
- D. Defer the supplier-screening question until after go-live and ask compliance reviewers to handle affected agreements manually during testing.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation handles the late change through controlled template governance before acceptance evidence is produced. Validating the question, review task behavior, document guidance, and reportable values ensures testing measures the intended go-live configuration.

Question: 5

You are advising a precision tooling manufacturer using SAP Ariba Contracts in a public cloud, web-based environment. The procurement team creates contract requests for supplier tooling agreements, and approved requests should become the source for the related contract workspace. The business tracks request category, approved requester, supplier, and intended workspace owner as part of the request-to-workspace lifecycle. These values are needed later for ownership visibility, request traceability, and contract portfolio reporting.

During pilot execution, one contract owner manually creates a new workspace after a request is approved because it appears faster than using the accepted request as the workspace starting point. The workspace can be drafted, but the implementation team cannot prove that the workspace is tied to the approved request record. One manager suggests keeping the manual workspace and attaching a screenshot of the request approval. The governance lead wants the creation process to preserve the request-to-contract relationship without adding unnecessary manual reconciliation.

Which recommendation best supports lifecycle traceability and controlled workspace creation?

Response:

- A. Keep the manually created workspace and attach the approved request as supporting evidence before drafting continues.
- B. Create a second reporting-only workspace from the accepted request so the manual workspace can remain focused on document drafting.
- C. Allow manual workspace creation for urgent contracts if the contract owner enters the approved request number in the workspace title.
- D. Create the contract workspace from the accepted request so request data, approval evidence, ownership, and reporting linkage remain connected.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation uses the accepted request at the correct lifecycle layer. Creating the workspace from the approved request keeps request attributes, approval evidence, ownership context, and reporting continuity tied to one controlled contract record.

Question: 6

A regional electronics retailer is implementing SAP Ariba Contracts for supplier display agreements. Marketing wants standard display agreements to move quickly after request approval. However, legal must review requests when exclusivity language is requested, and finance must review requests when supplier funding exceeds the approved threshold.

During design discussion, marketing proposes a single optional reviewer task so contract owners can decide whether legal or finance should participate. Legal and finance agree that standard agreements should not be delayed, but both require clear task evidence when their specific trigger applies. The

implementation sponsor wants a design that avoids unnecessary reviews while preventing missed approvals for defined exception conditions.

What is the best recommendation?

Response:

- A. Use an optional exception reviewer task so contract owners can add legal or finance when the agreement appears unusual.
- B. Make legal and finance approval mandatory for all display agreements so exception review evidence is consistently available.
- C. Configure separate condition-driven tasks for exclusivity language and supplier funding threshold exceptions.
- D. Keep exception review outside SAP Ariba Contracts and require approvers to document any legal or finance concerns in comments.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation aligns task participation with the condition that creates the review requirement. Separate condition-driven tasks preserve accountability for legal and finance while allowing standard requests to proceed through a lighter path.

Question: 7

You are advising a consumer packaged goods company implementing SAP Ariba Contracts in a public cloud, web-based environment. The legal team wants one global contract workspace template for supply agreements, but regional procurement leads require different approval steps and additional questions for regulated product categories. The project timeline allows only one template design cycle before user acceptance testing.

Two recommendations are being considered. One approach creates separate regional templates immediately to reflect every local variation. Another keeps a common template structure but uses template questions and conditions to drive regional task visibility, approval routing, and document inclusion. The customer also wants reporting consistency across contract workspaces after go-live. The implementation lead asks which recommendation best balances regional flexibility, governance, and long-term maintainability without creating avoidable template administration overhead.

What is the best advisory recommendation for the implementation consultant to provide?

Response:

- A. Create separate regional templates so each procurement team can maintain its own approval steps, questions, and contract documents independently after go-live.
- B. Use one governed template structure with conditions and questions to control regional tasks, approvals, and document inclusion while preserving consistent workspace metadata.
- C. Allow users to manually add regional approval tasks and documents during workspace creation so the template remains simple and implementation speed is maximized.
- D. Start with a minimal global template and defer regional rules until after go-live so reporting can be stabilized before governance complexity is introduced.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation satisfies the need for controlled regional variation without multiplying template structures. Conditions and questions allow the template to drive task visibility, approval participation, and document inclusion while maintaining consistent workspace metadata for downstream reporting and governance.

Question: 8

A national food distribution company is preparing SAP Ariba Contracts for supplier agreement rollout in a public cloud, web-based environment. The implementation team has loaded contract administrators, legal reviewers, and category buyers. During validation, one category buyer can create contract workspaces for the correct supplier category but cannot select the expected internal owner group. A project coordinator suggests giving the buyer a broader administrative role so testing can continue. The procurement governance lead objects because the buyer should not gain template or site administration access. The team must correct the issue without changing the approved contract workspace template or expanding access beyond the user's business responsibility. The consultant reviews the setup and sees that the buyer's role is correct, but the organizational assignment used for owner group visibility is incomplete.

Which recommendation should the consultant provide?

Response:

- A. Give the category buyer temporary contract administrator access until workspace creation testing is complete.
- B. Correct the buyer's organizational assignment so the expected owner group becomes available without expanding administrative permissions.
- C. Modify the workspace template so owner group selection is no longer required during contract workspace creation.
- D. Ask contract administrators to create workspaces for the buyer whenever the expected owner group is unavailable.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation addresses the administrative data layer causing the visibility issue. Correct organizational assignment allows the buyer to create workspaces with the proper owner group while preserving role boundaries and avoiding unnecessary administrator access.

Question: 9

You are advising a regional museum consortium using SAP Ariba Contracts in a public cloud, web-based environment. The consortium manages supplier agreements for exhibition logistics, insurance coordination, and artifact handling. A contract request for a standard exhibition transport supplier has

already entered approval review. Mid-review, the business owner updates the request because the supplier will now handle high-value artifact movement, which requires curator review before legal approval can be considered complete.

The legal approver has already approved the earlier version of the request, and procurement wants to avoid restarting the full contract process because the exhibition opening date is fixed. One stakeholder suggests adding a comment that curator review was added after legal approval and continuing to workspace creation. Another suggests cancelling all approvals and starting over. The governance lead wants the review evidence to reflect the revised handling scope without discarding valid work that is not affected by the change. The consultant must recommend the best approval-control direction.

Which recommendation best preserves approval integrity while avoiding unnecessary process restart?

Response:

- A. Add a comment explaining the high-value artifact handling change and proceed to workspace creation because legal already approved the request.
- B. Cancel the full request and restart all approvals so every participant reviews the request again from the beginning.
- C. Reopen or route the affected approval activity so curator input and any dependent legal review reflect the revised handling scope before workspace creation.
- D. Create the workspace from the current request and ask the contract owner to invite the curator after drafting begins.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation acts at the correct approval-control layer. Reopening or routing the affected approval activity ensures curator input and any dependent legal approval reflect the revised request scope while preserving unrelated valid review history.

Question: 10

You are advising a regional rail component distributor using SAP Ariba Contracts to manage supplier quality agreements. Procurement leadership needs a weekly report showing workspaces where the supplier acceptance task was completed after the planned acceptance date, because late acceptance changes when internal quality review should begin. The report must show the agreement owner, supplier category, planned acceptance date, actual task completion status, and whether quality review started afterward.

During pilot reporting, contract owners usually mark the task complete, but late completion is only explained in free-text comments. Some workspaces show a completed task with no reliable way to compare completion timing against the planned date. A reporting analyst suggests asking owners to write "late acceptance" in comments. Quality management wants repeatable evidence without reading each workspace, while legal wants the task history preserved. The project must rely on functional configuration, task evidence, and reportable workspace values rather than custom development.

Which recommendation best meets the reporting requirement?

Response:

- A. Require owners to add a standard “late acceptance” comment whenever the supplier acceptance task completes after the planned date.
- B. Capture planned acceptance date as governed workspace data and report against task completion evidence, owner, supplier category, and quality review start status.
- C. Ask quality managers to review completed supplier acceptance tasks manually each week and maintain a separate list of late acceptances.
- D. Create a duplicate supplier acceptance task whenever the first task is completed late so reporting can count duplicate tasks as delay evidence.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation places the reporting logic in governed workspace data and task evidence. Planned date, completion status, owner, supplier category, and quality review start status provide repeatable visibility without losing the underlying task history.

Topic: 2

Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 3 — Safety Clause Variants for Contractor Documents

Construction teams want quick access to alternative safety clauses during contractor negotiation, while legal operations wants evidence of the approved variant selected. Which recommendation best supports both priorities?

Response:

- A. Permit authors to edit safety wording directly in Microsoft Word and rely on the final legal review before publication.
- B. Provide approved safety clause variants with clear applicability guidance for construction, maintenance, and site-access work, and retain selection evidence.
- C. Remove all alternative safety clauses during hypercare so every contractor receives the same safety wording.
- D. Let each project team upload its preferred safety wording as an attachment to the contract workspace.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

Approved variants provide negotiation flexibility while keeping authoring within controlled clause selection. Applicability guidance and selection evidence support legal review before publication.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 3 — Safety Clause Variants for Contractor Documents

Early hypercare reporting shows similar safety clauses appearing in different document packages without consistent author selection evidence. What is the best validation action?

Response:

- A. Confirm clause variant naming, applicability guidance, and document package rules before expanding authoring to additional project teams.
- B. Ask legal operations to review every published contract manually after hypercare to identify inconsistent safety wording.
- C. Remove safety clause reporting from steering because clause selection is a legal activity rather than a rollout readiness topic.
- D. Allow each buyer to decide which safety clause fits the supplier relationship and document the decision in a comment field.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The inconsistent evidence points to clause library and document package dependencies. Validating naming, applicability, and package rules addresses the source of author selection behavior.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 4 — Hypercare Reporting for Expansion Readiness

The PMO wants to judge expansion readiness using open workspace counts, pending approvals, and contracts ready for publication. Legal and procurement operations want subproject and clause usage detail. Which reporting approach is best?

Response:

- A. Use only the PMO indicators because expansion decisions should be based on simple metrics that are easy to refresh.
- B. Provide PMO summary indicators with supporting exception views for site subprojects, task reassignment patterns, and clause usage.
- C. Replace reporting with daily meetings where each buyer explains workspace progress and clause selections.
- D. Delay expansion reporting until the next region is live so there is more production data to compare.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This balances reporting performance with governance depth. Summary indicators support steering, while exception views expose the control patterns needed for expansion readiness.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 4 — Hypercare Reporting for Expansion Readiness

A steering sponsor says expansion should continue because daily hypercare reports show most workspaces are moving toward publication. What is the best response?

Response:

- A. Agree because workspace movement toward publication is the strongest indicator that the process is stable.
- B. Recommend expansion only after confirming that publication progress is not hiding unresolved subproject, ownership, or clause-usage patterns.
- C. Stop all expansion planning until every hypercare observation has been fully eliminated.
- D. Approve expansion if project buyers confirm they can manually correct subproject and task ownership concerns.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

Publication progress alone does not prove that contract evidence and governance controls are stable. Expansion should consider whether subproject relationships, task ownership, and clause usage patterns are under control.

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/>