SAP
C_LIXEA_2601
SAP Certified - Enterprise Architecture Consultant - SAP LeanIX

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: 6.0
Subjects

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam - US01
3. Unified Scenario Exam - US02
4. Unified Scenario Exam - US03
5. Unified Scenario Exam - US04
6. Unified Scenario Exam - US05
7. Unified Scenario Exam - US06
8. Unified Scenario Exam - US07
9. Unified Scenario Exam - US08
10. Unified Scenario Exam - US09
11 Unified Scenario Exam - US10

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A transportation authority is using SAP LeanIX to visualize a modernization road map for ticketing, passenger information, asset maintenance, and finance applications. The modernization office wants to show a faster move toward platform services, but operations leadership requires that systems supporting safety-related maintenance scheduling remain stable until coexistence dependencies are validated.
The measurable constraint is that the first road map review must support investment sequencing without implying that safety-dependent applications can be replaced before operational transition evidence exists. Several legacy systems are costly, but they remain connected to regional maintenance processes during the rollout period.
Which road map representation should the consultant recommend?
Response:

A. Show all costly legacy systems in the earliest retirement wave so investment leaders can clearly see the intended modernization acceleration.
B. Display only target platform services and planned business outcomes so the review remains focused on the future-state architecture.
C. Keep safety-related maintenance applications outside the road map until operations leadership approves final retirement dates.
D. Represent applications by rollout wave and transition status, marking safety-dependent systems as controlled-coexistence items until dependency evidence supports replacement timing.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:
This option works at the correct transformation-visibility layer. Rollout waves and transition status show modernization direction while controlled-coexistence labeling protects safety-dependent applications from premature replacement assumptions.

Question: 2

A regional building materials distributor is introducing SAP LeanIX to create a shared architecture view across quote management, depot fulfillment, contractor portals, fleet coordination, and finance applications. The architecture sponsor wants the first workspace review within five weeks. The measurable constraint is that depot managers must validate application purpose, ownership, and capability alignment without being asked to complete every future portfolio assessment field immediately.
One onboarding option imports the full inventory and leaves relationship validation for later. Another option establishes a controlled baseline for application identity, accountable ownership, capability relationships, and lifecycle intent before expanding workspace detail.
Which onboarding approach should the consultant recommend?
Response:

A. Import the full inventory first so depot managers can see every application before modeling rules are finalized.
B. Delay onboarding until every future portfolio assessment field is approved by operations, sales, finance, and architecture stakeholders.
C. Establish a controlled baseline for application identity, accountable ownership, capability relationships, and lifecycle intent before expanding workspace detail.
D. Let each depot define its own fact sheet structure so local managers can validate application purpose faster.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option works at the correct onboarding layer. A controlled baseline gives depot managers enough structure to validate purpose and ownership while preserving a reliable foundation for later assessment and workspace expansion.

Question: 3

A university medical center is expanding SAP LeanIX participation to business architecture leads from clinical administration, research operations, facilities, and finance. The sponsor wants these leads to maintain application relevance and lifecycle observations before a modernization planning workshop. The measurable constraint is that contribution must be broad, but assessment categories used for investment ranking must remain stable across all functions.
Several leads request local values for priority and risk because their operating areas use different language. The architecture team must decide how to configure collaboration so local insight improves the assessment without fragmenting the governed scoring structure.

Which approach best supports the collaboration and governance requirements?
Response:

A. Allow each function to create local priority and risk values so modernization scoring reflects the language of each operating area.
B. Keep all assessment categories centrally governed and allow business architecture leads to maintain agreed relevance and lifecycle fields.
C. Require all business architecture leads to send comments to the architecture team, which then decides whether to update SAP LeanIX.
D. Remove priority and risk values from the assessment until every function has agreed to identical terminology and scoring definitions.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option works at the correct collaboration-governance layer. Business leads maintain operationally informed fields, while centrally governed assessment categories preserve stable inputs for investment ranking.

Question: 4

A regional home energy retrofit provider is using SAP LeanIX to visualize a transformation road map for customer intake, installer scheduling, grant eligibility tracking, inspection records, and finance applications. The modernization sponsor wants to replace aging scheduling tools before the next incentive-program window. The measurable constraint is that applications supporting grant eligibility evidence must not appear ready for replacement until evidence coverage, fallback readiness, and transition timing are validated.
Two road map views are proposed. One places all aging scheduling tools in the earliest retirement wave to show progress. The other separates near-term modernization candidates from controlled-coexistence applications and links timing to capability coverage, grant-evidence dependency, and transition readiness.
Which road map view should the consultant recommend?
Response:

A. Place all aging scheduling tools in the earliest retirement wave so stakeholders see clear modernization progress before the incentive window.
B. Show only the target customer intake and installer scheduling capabilities so the review focuses on the desired future operating model.
C. Separate near-term modernization candidates from controlled-coexistence applications using timing, capability coverage, grant-evidence dependency, and transition readiness.
D. Keep grant-eligibility applications outside the road map until every final replacement date is formally approved.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option works at the correct road map planning layer. It supports acceleration where evidence permits while preventing premature replacement assumptions for applications that require controlled coexistence.

Question: 5

A packaging manufacturer wants SAP LeanIX architecture views to include selected maintenance-planning context from an existing operations tool. Enterprise architects need this context to understand which production-support applications influence plant modernization decisions. The measurable constraint is that planning reviews must improve within the current quarter, but SAP LeanIX must not become the operational owner of maintenance schedules.
A standard integration can expose selected maintenance references to application fact sheets. Operations stakeholders want all maintenance-plan fields synchronized to reduce follow-up questions. The architecture team prefers a narrower integration scope tied to decision relevance and source ownership validation.
Which integration recommendation best satisfies the constraint?
Response:

A. Synchronize every maintenance-plan field into SAP LeanIX so architecture reviews have complete operational context.
B. Avoid integration until operations agrees to maintain maintenance schedules directly in SAP LeanIX.
C. Use periodic manual extracts during quarterly planning so the team avoids defining synchronization ownership.
D. Use the standard integration for architecture-relevant maintenance references, validate field ownership, and expand scope only where decision value is clear.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option works at the correct integration-fit layer. It uses the available integration to support architecture decisions while preserving source ownership and limiting synchronization to fields with validated planning value.

Question: 6

A regional blood services organization is using SAP LeanIX to visualize a transformation road map for donor scheduling, collection-site operations, inventory coordination, hospital communications, and finance applications. The modernization sponsor wants to replace aging donor scheduling tools before the next campaign cycle. The measurable constraint is that applications supporting collection continuity must not appear ready for replacement until site coverage, fallback readiness, and transition timing are validated.

Two road map views are proposed. One places all aging scheduling tools in the earliest retirement wave to show speed. The other separates near-term modernization candidates from controlled-coexistence applications and links timing to capability coverage, continuity evidence, and dependency readiness.
Which road map view should the consultant recommend?
Response:

A. Place all aging donor scheduling tools in the earliest retirement wave so stakeholders see clear modernization progress before the campaign cycle.
B. Show only the target donor scheduling and collection-site capabilities so the review focuses on the future operating model.
C. Separate near-term modernization candidates from controlled-coexistence applications using timing, capability coverage, continuity evidence, and dependency readiness.
D. Keep collection-continuity applications outside the road map until every final replacement date is formally approved.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option works at the correct road map planning layer. It supports modernization where evidence permits while preventing premature replacement assumptions for applications that require controlled coexistence.

Question: 7

A mining company is using SAP LeanIX to visualize a transformation road map for exploration planning, equipment maintenance, environmental reporting, and finance applications. The modernization sponsor wants to accelerate retirement of aging regional applications. The environmental compliance lead requires that applications supporting statutory reporting remain traceable until replacement timing and reporting coverage are validated.
The measurable constraint is that the first road map review must support phased modernization funding without implying that compliance-linked applications are ready for early retirement. Some legacy systems are costly and unpopular, but they remain connected to regional reporting obligations during the transition period.
Which road map planning decision should the consultant recommend?
Response:

A. Place the most expensive regional applications in the first retirement wave to make the modernization business case easier to fund.
B. Remove compliance-linked applications from the road map until replacement dates are formally approved by the environmental compliance lead.
C. Show only the desired target platform architecture so funding stakeholders can focus on the end-state benefits.
D. Use phased road map groupings that distinguish modernization candidates from compliance-linked controlled-transition applications until dependency and reporting coverage are validated.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option works at the correct transformation road map layer. It supports modernization funding while separating retirement candidates from controlled-transition applications based on validated dependency and reporting-coverage evidence.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 1— Supplier Rollout Coverage Across Regional Applications
The portfolio view shows several quality inspection tools as mature lifecycle candidates for consolidation. However, some are still tied to region-specific supplier approval flows that are not represented in the global capability structure.
Which interpretation is most appropriate?
Response:

A. The tools should move directly into consolidation planning because mature lifecycle status indicates low modernization priority.
B. The tools should remain provisional until regional approval-flow relationships are aligned with the global capability model.
C. The tools should be retained permanently because any regional approval flow prevents future consolidation.
D. The tools should be excluded from supplier rollout views because quality inspection is separate from sourcing modernization.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
The mature lifecycle status is not enough to support consolidation when regional approval-flow context is not aligned. Provisional handling prevents a partial assessment from becoming a rollout decision.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 1 — Supplier Rollout Coverage Across Regional Applications
A sourcing hub lead updates rollout wave relevance for several regional applications, but the applications still reference older regional capability labels. The global readiness view then shows them as aligned with the first rollout wave.
What is the best validation action?
Response:

A. Confirm that rollout wave relevance is supported by normalized capability mapping before the applications appear as confirmed wave candidates.

B. Accept the wave assignment because local sourcing teams understand which applications should be included in their rollout.
C. Replace capability mapping with rollout wave relevance because the wave field is more directly tied to the deployment calendar.
D. Hide regional capability labels in the portfolio view so the readiness dashboard remains easy for business users to read.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
Rollout wave relevance should be interpreted together with capability mapping. Without normalized capability evidence, the wave assignment may create a misleading readiness signal.

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 2 — Provider Dependency Visibility in Supplier Processes
A simplified business diagram for supplier onboarding shows the main application and global capability relationship clearly. It excludes several provider relationships used for regional document validation and inspection scheduling.
Which action best balances business readability and dependency governance?
Response:

A. Use the simplified diagram alone because business stakeholders need an uncluttered view for rollout readiness.
B. Add a governed indicator or companion view for excluded provider dependencies while keeping the main diagram readable.
C. Replace the simplified diagram with a full provider and interface view showing every technical relationship.
D. Defer provider relationship review until after the rollout wave is approved to avoid slowing the readiness discussion.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This preserves a readable business view while exposing provider dependencies that may affect rollout sequencing. It avoids hiding decision-relevant dependency evidence.

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 2 — Provider Dependency Visibility in Supplier Processes
A provider fact sheet is recorded by platform name in one region and by supplier process step in another. Both records appear to refer to the same shipment coordination dependency.
What should the team validate first?
Response:

A. Whether the two records represent the same provider dependency and should be reconciled for readiness interpretation.
B. Whether both records should remain separate because regional teams used different names during their inventory import.
C. Whether shipment coordination dependencies can be ignored because they are outside supplier onboarding scope.
D. Whether the provider records should be deleted and recreated only after the first rollout wave is complete.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
The first validation point is whether the records represent the same dependency. Reconciliation prevents duplicate or fragmented dependency evidence from distorting rollout readiness.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 3— Local Enrichment Under Enterprise Review Rules
A local owner updates lifecycle comments and ownership notes accurately, but also changes rollout dependency scoring without review. The team wants to preserve useful enrichment while protecting the readiness baseline.
What should be done?
Response:

A. Retain the factual updates and route the scoring change through review before it affects readiness views.
B. Revert all updates from the local owner because mixed changes cannot be trusted.
C. Accept all updates because accurate ownership notes indicate that the scoring change is likely reliable.
D. Disable the custom scoring fields until all local owners complete their enrichment work.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
This separates factual enrichment from decision-critical scoring. It preserves useful local contributions while ensuring the readiness baseline remains governed.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 4— Synchronization Timing Before Rollout Readiness Review
The IT service management integration can refresh application ownership and lifecycle values before the readiness review. Rollout wave relevance, supplier criticality, quality dependency, capability links, and provider relationships would remain manually governed.

What is the best decision?
Response:

A. Activate synchronization only if portfolio views clearly distinguish synchronized standard fields from manually governed rollout evidence.
B. Activate synchronization immediately because refreshed ownership and lifecycle fields make the fact sheets reliable overall.
C. Delay synchronization until every LeanIX field used in rollout planning can be automatically synchronized.
D. Reject synchronization because rollout readiness should rely only on manually governed application architecture data.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
This captures data freshness benefits while controlling false confidence in fields outside the integration scope. Readiness users need clear boundaries between synchronized values and manually governed rollout evidence.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 4— Synchronization Timing Before Rollout Readiness Review
After a pilot synchronization, reviewers see updated lifecycle values and assume supplier criticality and provider relationships are also current. Those fields were not included in the integration scope.
Which validation control is most important?
Response:

A. Add visible synchronization scope and validation status indicators for fields that remain manually governed.
B. Remove lifecycle values from readiness views because they create confusion when other fields are manual.
C. Treat all fields on synchronized fact sheets as current because the integration has updated the application record.
D. Pause the readiness review until supplier criticality and provider relationships can be synchronized automatically.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
Visible scope and validation status prevent synchronized fields from implying full fact sheet completeness. This supports continued readiness work while protecting manually governed dependency and scoring fields.

Question: 15

CHALLENGE 4— Synchronization Timing Before Rollout Readiness Review
The sponsor favors early synchronization because it will reduce manual updates and improve user confidence. The governance lead wants relationship mapping and collaboration rules stabilized before synchronized fields appear in portfolio views.
Which resolution best supports both adoption and governance?
Response:

A. Run synchronization as a bounded pilot with reporting exclusions until relationship and collaboration governance are validated.
B. Activate synchronization broadly and rely on users to identify any remaining incomplete rollout fields during review.
C. Postpone all synchronization planning until after the supplier collaboration rollout has completed.
D. Synchronize lifecycle values and automatically derive rollout wave relevance from the lifecycle stage.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
A bounded pilot preserves adoption momentum while preventing partially governed records from driving final readiness outputs. It also allows relationship and collaboration rules to be validated before broad portfolio use.

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/