

SAP

C_TS452_2601

SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition, Sourcing and Procurement

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-ts452-2601>

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A procurement implementation team is running a final controlled regression cycle in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition after moving configuration from a project test tenant into the pre-production environment. Business users can manually execute requisitioning, purchasing, and invoice entry in SAP Fiori. However, one regression package for procurement release processing fails during the initial environment check. The validation log shows that the required business-role-dependent app target is not available in the assigned catalog for that package, although another release-processing package succeeds for the same user group.

The release manager wants the issue corrected without copying broad pilot roles into pre-production. Access must stay audit-ready, and the role model has to remain reusable for production cutover under lifecycle governance.

Which action should the consultant take first?

Response:

- A. Copy the full pilot role collection into pre-production so the missing target mapping is guaranteed to exist before cutover.
- B. Mark the failed regression package as non-blocking because the same users can still execute related steps manually.
- C. Rebuild the release workflow because missing app targets during validation usually indicate approval-step design changes.
- D. Compare the deployed business role, catalog, and target mapping for the affected package in pre-production against the approved release design.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

The observable artifact is an access scope discrepancy during the environment check: one package lacks the required app target while another similar package works for the same user group. That strongly suggests a mismatch in the deployed role-to-catalog-to-target mapping for the affected package. The reasoning chain is: role deployment and catalog assignment → app target mapping → package environment validation → release-process execution.

Question: 2

A procurement implementation team is running final regression validation in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition after importing a controlled transport set into pre-production. Business users can still complete requisitioning and purchase-order creation manually in SAP Fiori. However, one regression package that validates approval execution fails because the expected approval task is no longer routed to the target test users, even though the workflow itself appears active and a similar approval package still works for a comparable business role.

The issue started after a transport that included workflow-related configuration and role-scope adjustments. The release manager wants a targeted correction before sign-off. Broadly reopening access is not allowed, and the production role model must remain audit-ready under lifecycle governance.

Which action should the consultant take first?

Response:

- A. Restore the previous broader approval role temporarily so the missing tasks reappear for all affected users before sign-off.
- B. Compare the transported workflow recipient determination and the deployed role-scope assignments for the affected approval package.
- C. Mark the failed package as low priority because other approval scenarios are still working in the same environment.
- D. Recreate the test requisitions because approval-routing issues usually start with incorrect business-user input during document creation.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The task-routing issue began after a transport that changed both workflow-related configuration and role scope. The workflow appears active, so the defect is likely in the intersection of recipient determination and authorization scope, not in general workflow existence. The dependency chain is: transported workflow/role configuration → recipient determination and role eligibility → approval task routing → regression validation outcome. Comparing those two layers is the most precise and governance-aligned first step.

Question: 3

A consumer products company is validating a new purchasing group structure in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition to support regional procurement ownership. Material masters, supplier records, and purchasing info records have been migrated for the pilot region. Requisition creation works, and buyers can open the conversion app in the web UI. However, when one regional buyer group tries to convert requisitions into purchase orders, the documents are blocked because the system cannot complete the organizational determination for the purchasing step.

Another regional buyer group using the same document type can convert successfully. The rollout lead wants a scalable correction that supports the future regional waves. The team must avoid temporary cross-region processing and cannot introduce exceptions that would weaken the target operating model.

Which action is the best first step?

Response:

- A. Verify whether the affected regional purchasing structure and related master-data assignments are consistently maintained for the tested requisition scope.
- B. Allow the successful regional buyer group to process all requisitions temporarily so the pilot timeline remains intact.
- C. Recreate the requisitions with a different document type because purchasing conversion blocks typically originate in requisition formatting.
- D. Build a custom routing rule that sends blocked requisitions to a default purchasing region until all rollout waves are complete.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The failure is isolated to one regional buyer group while a comparable group succeeds. That points to an inconsistency in organizational or master-data assignment, not a universal requisition-processing defect. The likely chain is: regional organizational setup and assignments → eligibility for PO conversion → execution of the purchasing step → successful process validation. Checking those structural assignments is the correct first action.

Question: 4

A household-goods manufacturer is validating pipeline-material procurement in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition after moving the process from a manual finance-controlled approach into the shared procurement template. Buyers can create the required procurement documents, and warehouse users can post the associated material movements without interruption. However, when the project team validates the downstream consumption-related financial impact for one plant, the posting logic fails for a specific material class, while the same scenario works correctly in another plant using the same process design. A recent transport included plant-dependent settings related to procurement valuation and posting control.

The implementation lead wants the issue resolved before template rollout to two more plants. Manual finance corrections are not allowed, and the team must remain within standard configuration and clean-core governance.

What should the consultant do first?

Response:

- A. Review whether the plant-dependent valuation and account-determination settings are correctly aligned for the affected pipeline-material class and usage.
- B. Recreate the procurement documents because downstream posting failures usually originate from buyer entry differences in the original transaction.
- C. Ask finance to post the affected consumption impacts manually until all plants adopt the shared template.
- D. Broaden warehouse and finance roles so the failed downstream posting can complete during the next validation cycle.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The logistics-side execution is working, but the downstream financial effect fails only for one plant and one material class. That strongly indicates a plant-dependent customizing and account-determination issue rather than a document-entry or access problem. The reasoning chain is: plant-specific valuation/posting control → account-determination binding for the material class → execution of downstream financial impact → validation outcome.

Question: 5

A spare-parts business is introducing standard replenishment planning in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition while gradually retiring a legacy planning spreadsheet used by regional planners. Initial planning runs now generate proposals for most stock items, and downstream purchasing tests are progressing. However, one regional planner reports that materials transferred from the legacy spreadsheet process into the new planning scope are still excluded from replenishment proposals, even though current stock levels and recent consumption would normally justify planning output.

Other materials created directly in the new model are processed correctly. The program manager wants the issue fixed before the spreadsheet is formally retired. No custom planning logic may be introduced, and the correction must support a controlled modernization path for later regional adoption.

What should the consultant check first?

Response:

- A. Increase the overall planning run frequency so transferred materials are recalculated more often than newly created materials.
- B. Ask planners to continue entering manual replenishment requests for transferred materials until all regions abandon the spreadsheet.
- C. Verify whether the transferred materials carry the planning-relevant master-data settings and scope assignments required for standard proposal generation.
- D. Rebuild the purchasing source assignments because replenishment gaps usually originate in supplier-selection logic.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The problem is selective to materials coming from the retiring spreadsheet-based process, while materials created directly in the new model work correctly. That indicates a modernization transition gap in planning-relevant master data or scope assignment rather than a general failure of the planning run. The dependency chain is: transferred master data and planning scope alignment → inclusion in standard replenishment logic → proposal generation → downstream procurement readiness.

Question: 6

A consumer electronics company is validating subcontracting procurement in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition during a rollout from a template that previously handled the process outside the core system. Purchase requisitions and purchase orders for subcontracting materials can be created

successfully, and component visibility appears correct in the buyer-facing apps. However, when the team posts goods receipt for finished items from one subcontractor group, the follow-on accounting validation fails only for those receipts. The same subcontracting flow works for another subcontractor group in the same company code.

The project lead wants the process fixed within standard configuration because the next rollout wave will reuse the same template. Manual finance corrections are not allowed, and clean core governance prevents any custom posting logic.

What should the consultant check first?

Response:

- A. Ask the warehouse team to continue receiving the finished items and let finance post manual corrections after cutover rehearsal.
- B. Rebuild the subcontracting purchase orders because accounting validation failures after receipt usually originate in buyer document entry.
- C. Verify whether the affected subcontracting valuation and account-determination settings are consistently aligned for the supplier group and material usage.
- D. Grant broader invoice-processing access because follow-on financial validation errors often indicate restricted finance roles.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The key signal is that procurement execution reaches goods receipt, but accounting validation fails only for one subcontractor group. That points to an upstream configuration and account-determination dependency, not a general receiving problem. The reasoning chain is: subcontracting-related customizing and valuation setup → account-determination binding → goods receipt execution → financial validation outcome. Checking those aligned settings is the correct first step and supports reuse of the standard template.

Question: 7

A manufacturing group is validating release-controlled sourcing agreements in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition before handing the process to regional buyers. Contract records can be created, and category managers can submit them for approval in SAP Fiori. For one purchasing organization, the contracts move into approval and release correctly. For another purchasing organization, the same contract type remains in preparation status even though users report that required fields are complete. A recent role cleanup and workflow adjustment were both transported together during the latest release cycle.

The project sponsor wants a controlled fix that preserves the differentiated approval design and avoids excessive access expansion. Audit readiness is part of the go-live criteria, so the team must resolve the issue without weakening the governance model.

Which action is the most appropriate first step?

Response:

- A. Compare the workflow triggering conditions and purchasing-organization-specific approval assignments before changing user access.

- B. Grant broader approval authorizations to all category managers so every contract can enter release processing immediately.
- C. Ask users to create the affected agreements under the working purchasing organization and transfer responsibility later.
- D. Remove the differentiated approval design until after go-live so all contracts follow one release path.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The failure is selective by purchasing organization after a transport that changed both workflow and roles. The correct first step is to distinguish whether the break sits in workflow-trigger configuration and organizational assignment before widening access. The chain is: workflow conditions and approval assignment → release-state transition → execution of contract approval → governance-ready validation. Because one organization works and another does not, organization-specific trigger or assignment logic is the most likely starting point.

Question: 8

A retail company is validating external procurement in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition after moving a previously manual invoice process into the standard system flow. Purchase orders for consumable materials can be created and goods receipts post successfully. However, when the accounts payable specialist enters supplier invoices for the same documents, several invoices are automatically blocked and the test log shows account assignment inconsistencies for only one company code. The same purchasing group and material groups work correctly in another company code used during template testing.

The implementation manager wants the team to fix the issue in the current release cycle without redesigning the purchasing process. The correction must support standard invoice verification and remain transportable for future rollout waves.

What is the best next step to resolve the second-order cause of the invoice issue?

Response:

- A. Check whether valuation and account determination settings are consistently maintained for the affected company code and procurement-relevant material usage.
- B. Retrain the accounts payable specialist to enter the invoice with a different reference method so the block is avoided.
- C. Recreate the purchase orders with a different purchasing group because invoice blocks usually originate in buyer-specific settings.
- D. Disable invoice blocking temporarily so test execution can continue and analyze configuration after go-live.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario shows that purchasing and goods receipt work, but invoice verification fails only in one company code. That points away from a global process issue and toward company-code-dependent valuation or account determination configuration. The correct dependency chain is: organizational configuration → valuation/account determination binding → invoice posting execution → block or error validation. Because the issue is selective by company code, configuration consistency is the most likely upstream cause.

Question: 9

A sourcing and procurement workstream is preparing a cutover rehearsal in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition after moving approved configuration from a project environment into pre-production. Business users can execute the main procurement flow manually in SAP Fiori. However, one validation package that checks role-based task execution for procurement approvals now fails because the required app tile opens but cannot reach the target task, while other approval-related tiles for the same users function correctly. The issue was first observed after the latest lifecycle sequence that included role deployment and catalog updates.

The release coordinator wants a targeted correction before mock cutover. No broad role-copy from project systems is allowed, because access must remain controlled, production-aligned, and auditable under governance rules.

Which action should the consultant take first?

Response:

- A. Copy the complete project role design into pre-production so the failing task path matches the earlier environment exactly.
- B. Mark the failing package as informational because users can still perform other approval actions successfully.
- C. Compare the deployed catalog target mapping and task-binding configuration for the affected approval tile in pre-production.
- D. Rebuild the approval-step sequence because missing task navigation usually indicates workflow logic inconsistency.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The app tile opens, so the user can access the shell layer, but it cannot reach the intended task. That indicates a more specific tile-to-target/task binding problem than a broad access failure. Because similar approval tiles work for the same users, the likely dependency chain is: role/catalog deployment → target mapping/task binding → task execution navigation → validation result. Comparing the deployed mapping for the affected tile is the most precise first step.

Question: 10

A medical-supplies distributor is validating replenishment planning in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition while retiring a legacy spreadsheet-based reorder process in two branches. Standard planning runs generate proposals correctly for most materials, and downstream purchasing tests are already

underway. However, a group of branch-managed consumables transferred from the legacy process shows no proposal output after the latest planning cycle, even though demand history and stock levels would normally trigger replenishment. Materials created directly in the new model behave correctly. The program manager wants the legacy spreadsheet retired on time. No custom planning logic may be added, and the correction must support controlled branch-by-branch modernization without extending manual replenishment longer than necessary.

Which action is most appropriate?

Response:

- A. Increase branch planners' authorization scope so transferred consumables are included in the next proposal cycle.
- B. Verify whether the transferred consumables are missing planning-relevant parameters or branch-scope assignments required for standard proposal generation.
- C. Tell branch planners to keep creating manual replenishment requests until every branch completes the spreadsheet retirement.
- D. Rebuild supplier source assignments because missing replenishment output usually starts with purchasing-source configuration.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The planning run works for materials created directly in the new model, but not for a transferred subset from the legacy process. That pattern points to a modernization transition issue in planning master data or scope assignment, not a broken planning engine. The reasoning chain is: transferred planning-relevant data and branch assignment → eligibility for standard proposal generation → replenishment output → downstream procurement execution.

Topic: 2

Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

Unified Scenario: HarborFoods SAP S/4HANA Cutover Planning for Procurement

CHALLENGE 3 — Quota and Source Coordination for Multi-Vendor Materials

During isolated testing, a seasoning blend behaves acceptably with more than one approved supplier. During cross-plant cutover rehearsal, however, purchasing activity begins concentrating around one operationally convenient vendor even though the intended design expects shared supplier usage. What is the best interpretation?

Response:

- A. The multi-vendor design is working because at least one approved supplier is being used successfully
- B. The team should validate whether quota-related sourcing setup and source coordination remain aligned once cross-plant operational demand is introduced
- C. The project should remove multi-vendor materials from the first live week to simplify supplier communication
- D. The concentration on one vendor proves that the original sourcing design was unnecessarily complex

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario shows acceptable behavior in isolated testing but divergence under cross-plant operational demand, which points to a coordination dependency rather than a simple supplier-performance question. Validating quota-related setup and source coordination under realistic demand is the correct next step.

Question: 12

Unified Scenario: HarborFoods SAP S/4HANA Cutover Planning for Procurement

CHALLENGE 3 — Quota and Source Coordination for Multi-Vendor Materials

The sourcing lead wants to preserve vendor-sharing for priority materials so the first live week has more resilient coverage. A plant buyer wants to simplify those same materials to a single vendor during cutover because the order path looks more stable. Which option is most appropriate?

Response:

- A. Preserve the intended multi-vendor pattern and verify whether source coordination can remain stable under representative cross-plant demand
- B. Switch all priority materials to a single vendor because cutover stability always outweighs sourcing resilience
- C. Let each plant decide which materials will use multi-vendor behavior during the first live week
- D. Postpone supplier-sharing validation until invoice continuity testing is complete

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario requires a performance-versus-governance and resilience-versus-simplicity decision. The planned multi-vendor pattern should be preserved and validated under realistic demand unless the coordination model itself cannot sustain operational execution.

Question: 13

Unified Scenario: HarborFoods SAP S/4HANA Cutover Planning for Procurement

CHALLENGE 4 — Receipt-to-Invoice Continuity During Transition Weekend

During overlap-period rehearsal, one plant shows clean invoice continuity for goods received near the transition weekend, while another plant shows less stable invoice results for comparable procurement cases. Reviewers find that the weaker cases were prepared under different upstream source, purchasing, and receipt assumptions. What is the best next action?

Response:

- A. Increase invoice-processing speed targets so both plants complete more transactions before comparison

- B. Align upstream sequence assumptions and repeat receipt-to-invoice rehearsal for representative overlap-period cases
- C. Ignore plant differences and validate only the aggregate invoice completion count for the weekend
- D. Move all overlap-period invoice handling to local finance teams so cases can be resolved faster

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario identifies invoice instability as a downstream effect of earlier sequence differences. Repeating representative cases after aligning source, purchasing, and receipt assumptions addresses the second-order dependency and tests whether continuity is truly stable.

Question: 14

Unified Scenario: HarborFoods SAP S/4HANA Cutover Planning for Procurement

CHALLENGE 4 — Receipt-to-Invoice Continuity During Transition Weekend

The finance team proposes a quicker overlap approach: allow local exception handling during the transition weekend so invoices can be settled faster, even if the route differs slightly by plant. The transition office wants a result that remains supportable after go-live. Which action is best aligned with the scenario?

Response:

- A. Accept local exception handling because transition weekends should prioritize speed over continuity
- B. Retain the stricter receipt-to-invoice sequence and validate whether finance traceability remains intact under overlap-period conditions
- C. Suspend invoice validation during the weekend and rely on post-go-live cleanup for any unsettled cases
- D. Validate only goods receipt completion and assume invoice continuity will normalize once the legacy system closes

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario places finance traceability and overlap-period stability at the center of go-live readiness. Retaining the stricter end-to-end sequence preserves the evidence needed to confirm that invoice handling remains supportable during transition.

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/>