

SAP

C_III2E_2602

**SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - End-to-End
Business Processes for SAP Business Suite**

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-iec2e-2602>

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

An implementation consultant is validating an integrated production-to-accounting flow for a regional food ingredients producer using SAP Business Suite with SAP S/4HANA Cloud in a mixed cloud environment. The assigned user INT_E2E_64 confirms completion of a production activity that should update the operational production view and create related financial visibility for the same business event. The production completion is visible, but financial analysis shows no corresponding operational cost impact.

The observable artifact is completed production evidence with missing accounting impact in financial analysis. The constraint is that the consultant must not post a separate finance-only cost entry, because the exercise must validate that production completion carries the correct accounting-relevant relationship into financial visibility. The same production completion record must remain traceable.

Which action best resolves the production-to-accounting integration failure?

Response:

- A. Post a separate finance-only cost entry so financial analysis contains the expected production impact.
- B. Accept the validation because the production activity completion is visible in the operational process view.
- C. Review the accounting-relevant production assignment and cost-impact linkage that determine whether completion updates financial analysis.
- D. Recreate the production completion under a different reference so accounting receives a fresh operational event.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option targets the dependency that controls whether a completed production activity is interpreted as financially relevant. Correcting the production assignment and cost-impact linkage preserves the original completion record and validates the integrated production-to-accounting flow.

Question: 2

An implementation consultant is validating an integrated service-to-sales follow-up for a regional industrial pump maintenance provider using SAP Business Suite with SAP S/4HANA Cloud in a mixed cloud environment. The assigned user INT_E2E_80 completes a service inspection that should create a

sales follow-up opportunity for a replacement package. The service inspection is complete, but the sales follow-up view does not show the expected customer opportunity.

The observable artifact is a completed service inspection with missing sales follow-up evidence. The constraint is that the consultant must not create a standalone sales opportunity, because the exercise must prove that the service event drives the commercial follow-up through the integrated process. The same service inspection and customer reference must remain traceable.

Which action best resolves the service-to-sales integration failure?

Response:

- A. Create a standalone sales opportunity with the same customer reference so the sales follow-up view contains the expected item.
- B. Accept the validation because the service inspection was completed successfully in the operational process.
- C. Review the customer follow-up relevance and process linkage that determine whether the completed inspection creates sales evidence.
- D. Repeat the service inspection completion so the sales follow-up view receives another update attempt.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option targets the dependency that controls whether a completed service inspection is interpreted as relevant for sales follow-up. Correcting the customer follow-up relevance and process linkage preserves the original inspection and validates the integrated service-to-sales flow.

Question: 3

A procurement consultant is validating a source-to-pay exercise for a marine equipment repair company using SAP Business Suite with SAP S/4HANA Cloud. The assigned user STP_E2E_46 creates a purchase order for a subcontracted repair service and records service acceptance. Invoice entry retrieves the purchase order, but the accepted service quantity is not available as expected for invoice validation. The observable artifact is an invoice entry result with correct purchase order retrieval but missing service-acceptance quantity evidence. The constraint is that the consultant must not enter the invoice quantity manually to complete the checklist, because the exercise must prove that purchasing, service acceptance, and invoice validation remain connected through the standard document chain. The original purchase order and acceptance record must remain traceable.

Which action best makes the invoice validation result complete?

Response:

- A. Enter the invoice quantity manually because the purchase order was retrieved successfully.
- B. Cancel the service acceptance and create a new purchase order before checking why quantity evidence was missing.
- C. Attach the service acceptance record to the invoice as documentation and continue with posting.
- D. Review the service acceptance reference and purchase order item relationship that determine whether accepted quantity is retrieved.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option addresses the dependency that controls whether invoice entry can retrieve the accepted service quantity from the referenced purchasing item. Correcting that relationship preserves the original document chain and makes the source-to-pay validation evaluable.

Question: 4

An implementation consultant is validating an integrated service-to-accounting process for a regional security systems provider using SAP Business Suite with SAP S/4HANA Cloud in a mixed cloud environment. The assigned user INT_E2E_76 completes a customer service activity that should update the service process view and create financial visibility for the assigned service contract. The service process is complete, but financial analysis shows the transaction without the service-contract reference. The observable artifact is a completed service process with missing contract-level financial binding. The constraint is that the consultant must not post a separate finance-only reference, because the exercise must prove that the service completion carries the correct contract relationship into accounting visibility. The same service activity and contract reference must remain traceable.

Which action best resolves the service-to-accounting validation failure?

Response:

- A. Review the service-contract assignment and accounting-relevant linkage that determine whether service completion updates financial analysis with the contract reference.
- B. Accept the validation because the service activity is complete in the operational process view.
- C. Post a finance-only contract reference so financial analysis contains the expected service contract.
- D. Recreate the service activity under a different contract and use the new financial analysis result as evidence.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option targets the dependency that controls whether completed service activity is interpreted with the correct contract relationship in financial analysis. Correcting the service-contract assignment and accounting linkage preserves the original activity and validates the integrated service-to-accounting flow.

Question: 5

A finance consultant is completing a record-to-report validation task for a regional distribution company using SAP Business Suite with SAP S/4HANA Cloud in a mixed cloud environment. The assigned test user FIN_E2E_01 posts a supplier-related expense that should flow into financial accounting and management accounting reporting. The accounting document is created successfully, but the management reporting view shows the value under an unexpected cost area after refresh.

The visible artifact is a posted accounting document with valid financial postings, while the analytical output does not match the expected management accounting view. The constraint is that the posting must remain traceable to the same business transaction; reversing and reposting without identifying the upstream cause would not satisfy the validation task. The consultant must determine the best corrective action before confirming the process output.

Which action best addresses the validation failure while preserving the end-to-end process evidence?

Response:

- A. Manually adjust the management reporting output so that the displayed cost area matches the expected validation result.
- B. Review the accounting assignment used during posting and correct the controlling-relevant assignment before retesting the process.
- C. Repost the same expense with a different document reference so the financial document can be separated from the original result.
- D. Refresh the analytical report again after confirming that the financial accounting document has posted successfully.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option addresses the upstream dependency that determines how the posted business transaction is interpreted in management accounting. The financial posting is already successful, so the correct layer of action is the controlling-relevant assignment used during execution. Retesting after correction validates both document creation and analytical output.

Question: 6

A production consultant is validating a design-to-operate exercise for a regional commercial refrigeration manufacturer using SAP Business Suite with SAP S/4HANA Cloud. The assigned user DTO_E2E_110 creates a planned requirement for a finished cooling unit and expects the planning output to show component demand with the correct assembly work center group. Component demand is generated, but the planning result assigns the demand to an unspecified work center group.

The observable artifact is generated component demand with missing work-center-group classification in planning output. The constraint is that the consultant must not manually enter the group in the validation notes, because the exercise must validate that planning derives the work center group from maintained production and material data.

a. The original planned requirement and generated component demand must remain traceable.

Which action best corrects the missing work-center-group evidence?

Response:

- A. Accept the validation because component demand was generated from the finished cooling unit requirement.
- B. Add the expected work center group manually to the validation notes so the planning evidence can be considered complete.
- C. Create another planned requirement and use the new output if it receives the expected work center group.

D. Review the work-center-group assignment and planning-relevant production data that determine how component demand is classified.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option addresses the dependency that determines how work-center-group classification is derived for generated component demand. Correcting the assignment and planning-relevant production data preserves the original planning evidence and validates the intended design-to-operate behavior.

Question: 7

A finance consultant is validating a record-to-report exercise for a logistics services company using SAP Business Suite with SAP S/4HANA Cloud. The assigned user FIN_E2E_30 posts an operational cost that should appear in the period review for the current reporting cycle. The financial document posts successfully, and the line item is visible in document display, but the period review excludes the value from the expected cycle total.

The observable artifact is a posted financial document that is not included in the reporting-cycle output. The constraint is that the consultant must not add a manual period adjustment, because the task must validate that the posted transaction is selected by the reporting process through its maintained attributes. The original document must remain the evidence object for correction and retesting.

Which action best resolves the period review exclusion?

Response:

- A. Review the posting date, reporting-cycle selection data, and assignment attributes that determine whether the document is included in the period review.
- B. Add a manual period adjustment so the reporting-cycle total matches the expected validation value.
- C. Accept the result because the financial document posted and the line item is visible in document display.
- D. Repost the cost with a new document number before checking why the original transaction was excluded.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option addresses the reporting-selection dependency that determines whether a posted document is included in the period review. The correct validation layer is the relationship among posting date, assignment attributes, reporting selection, and cycle output.

Question: 8

An implementation consultant is validating a SAP Business Suite fundamentals exercise for a regional civic asset management office using SAP S/4HANA Cloud. The assigned user BAS_E2E_113 records a basic asset-service event that should appear in the process overview with the expected business role

context and validation status. The transaction saves successfully, but the overview shows the event under a neutral role context with validation status still incomplete.

The observable artifact is a saved transaction with role-context mismatch in the process overview. The constraint is that the consultant must not close the task based only on transaction visibility, because the exercise must validate that the event is interpreted in the correct process role context. The same transaction must remain traceable during correction.

Which action best makes the fundamentals validation result complete?

Response:

- A. Accept the validation because the transaction appears in the process overview after saving.
- B. Add the expected business role context manually to the validation notes so the evidence is complete.
- C. Review the business role context assignment and validation-status dependency that determine how the saved event is interpreted.
- D. Recreate the event under a different user role before reviewing why the original transaction was classified neutrally.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option targets the dependency that controls whether the saved business event is classified in the correct role context and reaches the expected validation state. Correcting the assignment and status relationship preserves the original transaction and validates the intended process behavior.

Question: 9

A sales consultant is validating a lead-to-cash exercise for a commercial kitchen equipment service provider using SAP Business Suite with SAP S/4HANA Cloud. The assigned user LTC_E2E_71 creates a customer order for an urgent repair visit and completes the service activity. The process monitor shows completion, but the billing preparation view excludes the item because the urgency surcharge is not recognized as commercially complete.

The observable artifact is a completed service item with blocked billing-preparation evidence tied to missing commercial surcharge recognition. The constraint is that the consultant must not add a separate surcharge billing line, because the exercise must validate that the original service item carries all required commercial data into billing preparation. The same customer order and service activity must remain traceable.

Which action best resolves the billing preparation blockage?

Response:

- A. Create a separate surcharge billing line so the customer can be billed for the urgent repair visit.
- B. Accept the validation because the service activity is complete and visible in the process monitor.
- C. Repeat service completion so billing preparation receives another update from the same customer order.
- D. Review the surcharge-relevant commercial data and billing-selection dependency that determine whether the completed item is billing-ready.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option targets the dependency that controls whether the completed service item is commercially complete and eligible for billing preparation. Correcting the surcharge-relevant commercial data preserves the original order and validates the intended lead-to-cash flow.

Question: 10

A sales consultant is validating a lead-to-cash exercise for a wholesale equipment company using SAP Business Suite with SAP S/4HANA Cloud. The assigned user OTC_E2E_09 creates a customer order for a service part, confirms availability, and expects the follow-up billing evidence to appear after the fulfillment step. The delivery-related process status is completed, but the billing due evidence does not include the order.

The observable artifact is a completed fulfillment step with missing billing readiness in the process monitor. The constraint is that the consultant must preserve the same customer order and fulfillment evidence, because the validation task requires one traceable order-to-billing chain. Creating a separate billing request manually would not prove that the lead-to-cash process generated the expected downstream billing state.

Which action best makes the lead-to-cash validation result complete?

Response:

- A. Create a manual billing request with the same customer reference so the expected billing evidence appears.
- B. Repeat fulfillment for the same order so the billing due monitor refreshes with a second completion event.
- C. Accept the validation because the customer order and fulfillment step were completed successfully.
- D. Review the billing-relevance and document-flow dependency that determines whether completed fulfillment can generate billing due evidence.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option addresses the correct dependency layer because billing due evidence depends on document flow and billing-relevance conditions after fulfillment. Preserving the same order and fulfillment evidence allows the consultant to validate the complete lead-to-cash chain.

Topic: 2

Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Inbound Receipt Context for Packing Materials

The warehouse supervisor sees tray insert quantity in a general stock review, but the assigned pack preparation activity does not consistently show the material as available. The supervisor suggests a fast transfer into the packing staging area so the clinic replenishment rehearsal can continue.

What is the best next action?

Response:

- A. Post the transfer immediately so the pack preparation activity can continue within the timed rehearsal window.
- B. Validate the original receipt against the intended material, plant, storage location, and usable stock state used by the pack preparation review.
- C. Ask sales coordination to reduce the clinic replenishment order quantity so packing can be confirmed with available stock.
- D. Begin billing-readiness checks and document that material availability will be corrected after the hypercare review.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The material may be visible in general inventory while not supporting the pack preparation review if the receipt context differs from the process requirement. Validating the receipt first preserves system evidence before creating an additional inventory movement.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 1 — Inbound Receipt Context for Packing Materials

The purchase order history shows a goods receipt for sterile wrap materials. The packing planner still cannot include the expected quantity in the procedure-pack preparation review.

Which evidence best confirms that the purchasing step supports the packing task?

Response:

- A. The supplier delivery reference appears in the purchase order history.
- B. The received sterile wrap quantity is visible in the same material, plant, storage location, and stock-status context used by the pack preparation review.
- C. The warehouse team confirms that the sterile wraps were physically placed near the packing tables.
- D. The customer order already contains the finished procedure pack and requested delivery date.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

Packing depends on material availability in the same context used by the pack preparation review. Purchase history or physical placement does not prove system availability for the next process step.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 2 — Packing Confirmation and Finished Pack Evidence

The procedure-pack activity shows a completed status after confirmation. Logistics cannot see enough finished pack stock for outbound processing, and accounting cannot find the expected cost evidence. What should the consultant verify first?

Response:

- A. Whether the customer order can be marked ready and corrected later during accounting review.
- B. Whether the packing confirmation produced material consumption, finished pack stock, and cost-relevant evidence.
- C. Whether procurement can duplicate the tray insert receipt to increase material quantity.
- D. Whether logistics can substitute a similar finished pack from another rehearsal order.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The completed status is not sufficient if the required outputs are missing. The consultant should validate the confirmation results that logistics and accounting depend on.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 2 — Packing Confirmation and Finished Pack Evidence

The packing confirmation reflects the planned finished pack quantity, but finished stock is not available for the assigned delivery step. Accounting also cannot connect the activity to expected cost review evidence.

Which interpretation best fits the rehearsal requirement?

Response:

- A. The packing activity is complete because the planned quantity appears confirmed.
- B. The packing activity may be incomplete for downstream use if finished stock and cost evidence are not visible.
- C. The customer order should proceed because the replenishment delivery date is already maintained.
- D. Accounting should wait for billing because cost evidence is not needed before delivery completion.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The rehearsal requires validation of the system outputs created by confirmation. If finished stock and cost evidence are missing, the confirmation may not fully support delivery or accounting review.

Question: 15

CHALLENGE 2 — Packing Confirmation and Finished Pack Evidence

Packing operations wants to treat the activity as complete because the status changed. Logistics needs finished pack availability, and accounting wants cost evidence before invoice-related checks.

Which decision best balances rehearsal progress with process integrity?

Response:

- A. Allow logistics to continue from the visible packing status and ask accounting to review costs after billing validation.
- B. Validate finished pack stock and cost evidence before treating the pack as available for the customer order.
- C. Create an RML-E2E note stating that packing was performed and continue with delivery review.
- D. Substitute a finished pack from another exercise so logistics can complete its step.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This decision protects the dependency between packing output, delivery readiness, and accounting review. It allows progress only after the system evidence required by downstream users is available.

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/>