

SAP C_SIGBT_2601

SAP Certified - Business Transformation Consultant

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-sigt-2601>

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A food export cooperative is reviewing export documentation and cold-chain release approvals. You are advising the process transformation lead. SAP Signavio analysis shows repeated waiting time between quality certificate confirmation and shipment release, but the compliance manager states that certificate checks are required for market-entry documentation.

The sales director wants faster release for priority shipments to reduce spoilage risk. The transformation lead asks for a recommendation that improves cycle time without weakening required export evidence. The constraint is that process optimization must distinguish mandatory control evidence from avoidable waiting before any change is moved into the implementation roadmap.

Which advisory response best reflects the process analysis requirement?

Response:

- A. Remove certificate confirmation for priority shipments and rely on post-shipment review to protect release speed.
- B. Keep the full release process unchanged because export documentation controls should not be challenged during transformation.
- C. Use SAP Signavio findings to separate required certificate-control activity from avoidable waiting time, then propose targeted release-flow improvements.
- D. Shift shipment-release ownership to sales so priority shipments can bypass quality approval delays during high-risk spoilage windows.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This response uses process analysis at the correct transformation layer. It protects mandatory certificate evidence while targeting avoidable waiting time, allowing cycle-time improvement without weakening governance-sensitive shipment release controls.

Question: 2

A regional municipal parking authority is preparing a modernization proposal for permit applications, violation appeals, and payment-plan management. You are advising the architecture sponsor. SAP LeanIX shows that several legacy applications support overlapping customer-account capabilities, but only one system is the authoritative source for payment-plan status used in appeal decisions.

The finance lead wants to consolidate quickly around the newest customer portal to reduce support cost. The operations lead wants appeal processing improved before the next permit renewal cycle. The constraint is that modernization must reduce capability overlap while preserving authoritative payment-plan data during coexistence.

Which recommendation best balances modernization and data governance?

Response:

- A. Move all customer-account processing to the newest portal first because it offers the best user experience and lowers support cost.
- B. Use SAP LeanIX to map customer-account capabilities, authoritative payment-plan ownership, and appeal-processing dependencies before defining the phased modernization path.
- C. Freeze all customer-account applications until payment-plan data can be redesigned into a single future-state model.
- D. Improve appeal processing in the current landscape and postpone application rationalization until after the permit renewal cycle.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation uses enterprise architecture transparency at the correct decision layer. It connects overlapping capabilities, authoritative data ownership, and process dependency so modernization can proceed without breaking payment-plan evidence during coexistence.

Question: 3

A packaging manufacturer is preparing a modernization proposal for artwork approval, customer proofing, and production-release coordination. You are advising the architecture sponsor. SAP LeanIX shows overlapping proofing applications across business units, while SAP Signavio analysis indicates that release delays occur mainly when artwork changes require customer reapproval.

The production lead wants to retire duplicate proofing tools quickly to reduce support cost. The quality lead warns that approved artwork records must remain auditable during the first modernization wave.

The constraint is that the recommendation must reduce application duplication without disrupting governed approval evidence or forcing replacement decisions before process impact is validated.

Which recommendation best balances modernization and approval traceability?

Response:

- A. Retire all duplicate proofing applications immediately because overlapping capability coverage creates avoidable support cost.
- B. Freeze the proofing application landscape until every artwork approval workflow has been redesigned and formally approved.
- C. Optimize only the customer reapproval handover and postpone application rationalization until production-release delays improve.
- D. Map proofing applications to business capabilities, approval-evidence dependencies, and process-delay impact before phasing modernization decisions.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation applies SAP LeanIX landscape evidence at the correct decision layer. It connects duplicate applications, business capabilities, governed approval evidence, and process impact so modernization can proceed without premature retirement of traceability-relevant systems.

Question: 4

A coastal port authority is preparing a modernization proposal for vessel slot booking, berth coordination, and hazardous-cargo documentation. You are advising the architecture sponsor. SAP LeanIX shows overlapping berth-request applications across terminals, while SAP Signavio analysis indicates that delays mainly occur when hazardous-cargo evidence is missing during berth approval. The terminal operations lead wants to retire duplicate berth-request tools quickly to reduce support cost. The safety governance lead warns that hazardous-cargo documentation must remain auditable during the first modernization wave. The constraint is that the recommendation must reduce application duplication without disrupting governed safety evidence or forcing replacement decisions before process impact is validated.

Which recommendation best balances modernization and safety traceability?

Response:

- A. Retire all duplicate berth-request applications immediately because overlapping capability coverage creates avoidable support cost.
- B. Freeze the berth-coordination landscape until every hazardous-cargo workflow has been redesigned and approved.
- C. Map berth-request applications to business capabilities, hazardous-cargo evidence dependencies, and process-delay impact before phasing modernization decisions.
- D. Optimize only the hazardous-documentation handover and postpone application rationalization until berth approval time improves.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation applies SAP LeanIX landscape evidence at the correct decision layer. It connects duplicate applications, business capabilities, governed safety evidence, and process impact so modernization can proceed without premature retirement of traceability-relevant systems.

Question: 5

A regional dental laboratory network is preparing a transformation wave for case remake requests, technician reassignment, and customer credit handling. You are advising the implementation review group. SAP Signavio contains the agreed remake process, and SAP LeanIX identifies the case-management and billing applications affected by the new reassignment behavior.

SAP Cloud ALM shows that delivery tasks are complete, but the release package does not include the agreed operational monitoring threshold for remake-credit disputes. The customer-service lead wants approval because remake cycle-time KPIs are worsening. The constraint is that release readiness must include implementation completion and operational monitoring criteria for the changed process. Which recommendation best supports the release decision?

Response:

- A. Approve the release because implementation tasks are complete and remake cycle-time improvement is the highest business priority.
- B. Require SAP Cloud ALM readiness evidence that links completed delivery tasks, affected applications, and operational monitoring thresholds before approval.
- C. Ask customer service to define monitoring thresholds during hypercare while the release proceeds under close observation.
- D. Delay the release until all dental case-management and billing improvements are added to the long-term transformation roadmap.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation uses SAP Cloud ALM to connect implementation completion with operational readiness. It ensures the changed process, affected applications, and monitoring criteria are aligned before the release decision is made.

Question: 6

A regional professional membership association is preparing a change to membership upgrade handling and prorated dues adjustment. You are advising the validation sponsor. SAP Signavio confirms that the change affects only upgrades submitted after the monthly billing cutoff, while SAP LeanIX identifies the membership-management and billing applications involved.

The service lead wants focused validation because upgrade volume is increasing before the annual conference. The finance governance lead agrees that full regression is unnecessary but requires evidence that realistic test data covers billing-cutoff timing and downstream dues posting. The constraint is that validation must prove the changed rule using representative timing scenarios, not only confirm ordinary membership upgrades.

Which recommendation best balances validation effort and rule-change risk?

Response:

- A. Reuse the previous membership-upgrade test scope because ordinary upgrade processing has not changed.
- B. Run full regression across all membership, renewal, cancellation, and billing scenarios before approving the change.
- C. Test only one upgrade after the billing cutoff because it confirms that prorated dues logic is active.
- D. Align Tricentis validation to billing-cutoff timing scenarios, prorated dues calculation, and downstream posting behavior identified by the approved process and application impact.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation applies risk-based validation at the correct layer. It focuses Tricentis coverage on the changed cutoff condition, prorated dues rule, and billing impact so the rule change is proven without unnecessary full regression.

Question: 7

A regional language-training institute is preparing a controlled transformation wave for corporate course enrollment, invoice adjustment, and access activation. You are advising the program sponsor. SAP Signavio contains the agreed enrollment-adjustment process, SAP LeanIX identifies the learning-access and billing-support applications affected by the new adjustment path, and SAP Cloud ALM is used to manage implementation activities and readiness gates.

The operations director wants the change released before a new corporate training cycle because enrollment-adjustment KPIs are worsening. The finance governance lead requires evidence that process scope, implementation work, and affected application dependencies are aligned before release approval. The constraint is that the release must improve turnaround quickly, but it cannot depend on separate status updates that do not prove lifecycle alignment.

Which recommendation best supports release readiness?

Response:

- A. Release the invoice adjustment path immediately and use the next enrollment-adjustment KPI report to confirm whether turnaround improved.
- B. Use SAP Cloud ALM readiness gates to confirm alignment between the agreed process scope, implementation activities, and affected application dependencies before release approval.
- C. Ask each tool owner to provide a separate readiness statement and allow the sponsor to approve release based on combined expert judgment.
- D. Delay the release until all future course-enrollment enhancements are planned across the transformation roadmap.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation uses SAP Cloud ALM at the correct lifecycle governance layer. It supports timely release by requiring structured readiness evidence that process scope, implementation work, and affected application dependencies are aligned before approval.

Question: 8

A regional building-safety inspection agency is starting a transformation initiative for permit review, field inspection scheduling, and compliance-result publication. You are advising the steering committee. The agency director wants to begin by deploying new workflow tools, while the public-service lead wants the first wave tied to measurable reduction in delayed inspection outcomes.

SAP Signavio shows that permit-review completion does not consistently translate into scheduled inspections, and SAP LeanIX identifies several applications involved in review, scheduling, and publication. SAP Cloud ALM will be used once the first wave is approved. The constraint is that the initiative must first establish a value-framed transformation scope before committing delivery milestones or tool-specific rollout activities.

What is the best advisory recommendation for initiating the transformation?

Response:

- A. Start SAP Cloud ALM milestone planning immediately because delivery governance should begin before the value case is finalized.
- B. Prioritize deployment of the newest workflow tool because tool adoption will create a visible transformation signal for stakeholders.
- C. Define the transformation value frame around inspection-outcome delay, affected process dependencies, and measurable public-service impact before approving delivery milestones.
- D. Delay the initiative until all permit, inspection, and publication applications can be replaced in a single modernization program.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation applies business transformation methodology at the correct advisory layer. It anchors the first wave in a measurable outcome, connects the process and application dependencies, and creates a defensible basis for later SAP Cloud ALM milestone governance.

Question: 9

A regional hospital network is reviewing referral authorization and outpatient appointment scheduling. You are advising the process transformation lead. SAP Signavio analysis shows repeated waiting time after insurance eligibility confirmation, but the patient-access manager argues that the eligibility check itself is required to avoid rejected appointments.

The operations director wants faster scheduling for priority referrals before the next reporting cycle. The transformation sponsor requires that process optimization protect authorization evidence while reducing avoidable delay. The constraint is that the recommendation must separate mandatory control activity from non-value-added waiting before any improvement is added to the transformation roadmap.

Which advisory response best uses the process analysis findings?

Response:

- A. Remove eligibility confirmation for priority referrals and rely on downstream billing review to catch authorization problems.
- B. Keep the scheduling process unchanged because authorization-sensitive workflows should not be modified during transformation.
- C. Transfer scheduling ownership to the operations director so priority referrals can bypass the patient-access queue.
- D. Use SAP Signavio evidence to distinguish required eligibility checks from avoidable waiting time, then propose targeted scheduling-flow improvements.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This response applies process analysis at the correct advisory layer. It preserves mandatory authorization evidence while targeting avoidable waiting, allowing cycle-time improvement without weakening governance-sensitive referral handling.

Question: 10

A regional equipment safety certification body is preparing a modernization proposal for inspection booking, certificate issuance, and renewal reminders. You are advising the architecture sponsor. SAP LeanIX shows that the renewal-reminder application has low technical debt, but SAP Signavio shows renewal delays mostly occur because certificate status from the issuance application is not trusted by reminder users.

The technology lead wants to modernize the older booking application first because it is more expensive to maintain. The certification director wants renewal delays reduced before the next audit cycle. The constraint is that modernization sequencing must prioritize the dependency that affects certified-status trust, not only visible age or maintenance cost.

Which recommendation best supports modernization sequencing?

Response:

- A. Replace the older booking application first because application age and maintenance cost should drive modernization priority.
- B. Improve renewal reminders manually and postpone application modernization until renewal delays are reduced.
- C. Freeze modernization until the certification body defines a complete future-state architecture for all inspection and renewal capabilities.
- D. Use SAP LeanIX to map booking, issuance, and reminder capabilities against trusted certificate-status ownership and renewal-delay impact before sequencing modernization.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation applies enterprise architecture transparency at the correct decision layer. It links capability impact, trusted data ownership, and renewal-delay evidence so modernization sequencing targets the dependency that affects certification outcomes.

Topic: 2

Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Steering Evidence Across Process and Capability Sources

HarborWest wants to present an executive dashboard showing transformation readiness for the next wave. The dashboard already contains process modeling progress from SAP Signavio, but several process models do not yet show a named owner or approval status, and the related capability context in SAP LeanIX is still being reviewed.

What is the best advisory recommendation?

Response:

- A. Publish the dashboard using the available process progress and add the missing ownership and capability context after the steering committee confirms the next wave.
- B. Delay all steering committee reporting until every regional process model and every application inventory item has reached final approval.
- C. Present the dashboard with maturity indicators that distinguish approved process evidence from incomplete ownership or capability linkage.
- D. Move the capability context into the process modeling environment so executives can review one consolidated reporting source.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The best recommendation is to provide useful executive reporting while clearly showing evidence maturity. This preserves decision momentum but prevents dashboard completion from being mistaken for fully validated process and architecture evidence.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 1 — Steering Evidence Across Process and Capability Sources

The enterprise architecture group notices that process excellence has started adding application notes directly into process models to make the steering dashboard easier to read. The notes help executives understand process impact, but they are not synchronized with the SAP LeanIX application inventory.

Which response best addresses the second-order misalignment?

Response:

- A. Keep the notes in the process models because business users need a readable executive view more than architecture-level accuracy.
- B. Treat the notes as temporary context and establish traceable linkage to the SAP LeanIX application and capability view before using them for decisions.
- C. Ask enterprise architecture to stop updating SAP LeanIX until process excellence finishes the steering committee dashboard.
- D. Replace the process dashboard with an application inventory report because architecture data is the more reliable decision source.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The second-order issue is not simply that application notes exist; it is that decision evidence could become disconnected from the authoritative architecture source. Temporary context can help readability, but steering decisions need traceable linkage to the SAP LeanIX view.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 2 — Regional Process Variants and Approval Boundaries

A regional operations lead asks the transformation office to reuse a local customer-claim process map in the standardization baseline because the site has used it successfully for years. The map contains useful local detail, but it was created before the group-wide ownership and approval rules were introduced. What should the consultant recommend?

Response:

- A. Include the map in the baseline immediately because proven local use demonstrates operational validity.
- B. Exclude the map from all transformation planning because it was created outside the current governance model.
- C. Review the map, assign accountable ownership, confirm approval status, and decide whether it becomes baseline content or a documented exception.
- D. Convert the local map into an executive summary and avoid variant-level review until rollout execution begins.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The local map may contain valuable process knowledge, but it cannot automatically become approved baseline evidence. The correct approach evaluates ownership, approval, and whether the variant belongs in the standard or should remain an exception.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 2 — Regional Process Variants and Approval Boundaries

HarborWest's compliance team and regional business leaders disagree about how to handle a region-specific process variant linked to local customer return documentation. The process owner says the variant is required locally, while the standardization team wants one group-wide process for reporting simplicity.

Which recommendation best balances the governance priorities?

Response:

- A. Accept the regional variant as a documented exception if ownership, approval status, and the reason for local retention are visible in the baseline decision.
- B. Remove the variant from the baseline because standardized reporting should take priority over regional process differences.
- C. Retain every regional variant until all regions agree voluntarily on one future-state process.

D. Ask the steering committee to choose between compliance documentation and standardization speed without further process review.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option recognizes a governance-vs-governance collision: regional compliance discipline and standardization control both matter. A documented exception with ownership and approval allows the transformation baseline to remain controlled while respecting valid local requirements.

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/>