SAP

C_THR81_2512

SAP Certified - SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central Core and Position Management

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: 4.0
Subjects

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A consultant is preparing a new-country onboarding test in SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central Core and Position Management. In the public cloud web-based UI, the hire transaction opens correctly, but when recruiters move to the personal information step, one required data section appears read-only for the new country only.
Existing countries in the same tenant can complete the same step normally. The customer confirms the section must stay editable during hiring because downstream workflow and record creation depend on it. The issue started after the rollout team introduced country-specific setup for the new region. The consultant must correct the problem without removing the section from the hire flow or creating a separate manual onboarding process.
What should the consultant investigate first?
Response:

A. Ask recruiters to complete the hire without the section and let HR administrators update it after workflow approval.
B. Grant recruiters broader employee maintenance permissions so they can override the read-only behavior during hiring.
C. Review the new country-specific setup controlling field behavior in the hire process, then correct the configuration making that section read-only.
D. Export a sample of existing records from the new country and reload them so the hire template can refresh its section controls.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
The issue is isolated to one new country and appears during a specific hire step. That strongly indicates a country-specific configuration dependency rather than a generic system defect. Correcting the setup controlling editability in the hire flow restores the intended process while preserving the standard onboarding model.

Question: 2

A consultant is testing a manager-initiated change process in SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central Core and Position Management before a pilot launch. In the public cloud web-based environment, the transaction saves correctly, but one derived employee field remains unchanged after completion for a group of workers in a recently added business unit.
The same process updates that field correctly in other business units. The customer wants the transaction to remain standardized across the tenant and does not want managers or HR users to maintain the field manually after each change. The issue started after the new business unit was added to the organizational structure and made available for transactions.
What is the best next step?
Response:

A. Ask managers to maintain the derived field manually for the new business unit until the next release of the project scope.
B. Reassign the affected employees temporarily to an older business unit where the field derivation already works correctly.
C. Grant HR administrators direct edit access to the derived field so they can correct each record after transaction completion.
D. Review the transaction configuration and derivation dependency for the newly added business unit, then correct the setup controlling how the employee field is populated after save.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
The transaction itself saves, and the issue is limited to one newly added business unit. That means the core process is functioning, but the derivation dependency for that organizational scope is incomplete or misaligned. Reviewing and correcting the transaction setup for the new business unit addresses the root cause and preserves standardized processing.

Question: 3

In a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central tenant, a consultant is validating manager self-service before a customer demo. Managers can open employee profiles and submit workflow requests for job information changes, but they cannot see the position data block that was added for the pilot. The block is visible for HR administrators in the same web-based environment.
A quick review shows that the position-related fields are configured and already used in the tenant. The customer asks for a fix that preserves current data access restrictions because position details include planning-sensitive information. The consultant has limited time and must avoid broadening access beyond what managers need for their own reporting lines.
What is the best action to restore the missing manager view while keeping governance intact?
Response:

A. Grant managers the same role permissions used by HR administrators for position data so the block becomes visible immediately.
B. Review role-based permission target population and position-related permissions for the manager role, then adjust only the manager scope required for supported reporting lines.

C. Reimport the position data so the system refreshes the employee profile and rebuilds the missing block.
D. Disable the position block for HR administrators and rebuild it with a new configuration that is shared across all roles.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
The visible symptom is a missing position block for managers, but the second reasoning layer is authorization scope, not object existence. HR administrators can see the block, which confirms the block and position-related configuration are active. The likely upstream dependency is that the manager role lacks either the required position permissions, the correct target population, or both. Adjusting only the manager scope preserves governance and restores access only where the reporting relationship allows it.

Question: 4

In a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central Core tenant, a consultant is validating a manager-led department transfer process before regional user training. In the web-based UI, managers can select company and location, but for one newly activated operating structure the division list includes valid-looking divisions from an adjacent structure.
The transaction remains usable, but testers repeatedly select incorrect combinations because the intended filtered list is too broad. Other operating structures behave correctly. The customer wants the consultant to fix the issue without broadening organizational visibility across unrelated structures or introducing a special transfer process for that region. Financial reporting and approval routing depend on correct division selection.
What should the consultant investigate first?
Response:

A. Broaden division visibility for all nearby structures so the same larger list appears consistently in every transfer scenario.
B. Review the organizational associations for company, location, and division in the new operating structure, then correct the relationship controlling filtered division availability.
C. Ask managers to keep using the current list and rely on process documentation to choose the correct division during transfer entry.
D. Create duplicate division records for the new operating structure so the intended values appear separately from the adjacent structure.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
The problem is not missing values but over-broad filtered availability. Because only one newly activated structure is affected, the likely root cause is a misaligned corporate data relationship controlling which

divisions should be available after company and location are selected. Correcting that relationship restores controlled selection and supports downstream reporting and routing integrity.

Question: 5

A consultant is validating position maintenance in a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central and Position Management environment before a reorganization freeze ends. In the web-based UI, managers can create new positions, but some newly created positions remain in a draft-like state and cannot be used in downstream planning activities even though the save action completes without error. Older positions created earlier in the project are available as expected. The customer confirms that the affected positions are all created under a newly introduced position category. The business wants a fix that keeps the category structure intact and avoids asking users to recreate positions manually across multiple departments.
What should the consultant investigate first?
Response:

A. Review the configuration dependency tied to the new position category and correct the setting that controls whether saved positions become usable for downstream planning.
B. Ask managers to keep using the older position categories until the new category can be removed from the design.
C. Grant managers broader access to planning activities so the newly created positions become selectable despite their current state.
D. Export the affected positions, change their identifiers externally, and reload them under a different category structure.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
The save action completes, so basic position creation is functioning. The issue is selective and limited to positions under a newly introduced category, which points to a category-specific dependency controlling downstream usability. Reviewing and correcting that configuration is the most direct way to restore expected behavior without disrupting the category design.

Question: 6

A consultant is validating a controlled monthly correction process in a web-based SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central tenant before a compliance review cycle. HR operations users can search records, open the correction page, and prepare updates for all approved populations. For one sensitive regional population, the preview step works and the changed values are visible, but the final process completes without committing those rows and returns an access-scope message.
HR administrators can process the same rows successfully. The customer wants the approved operations team to handle this population only for the defined monthly correction process, without broad administrator rights and without weakening the stricter regional governance boundary. The solution must remain repeatable for future month-end cycles.
What is the best corrective action?

Response:

A. Ask HR administrators to process the sensitive regional population separately every month while operations users continue with the rest of the workforce.
B. Copy the administrator permissions to the operations team during the monthly cycle so the final processing step can complete for the restricted rows.
C. Review the operations role and target-population authorization for the final correction-processing step, then adjust only the approved execution scope for that regional population.
D. Temporarily move the sensitive regional population into the general operations scope during each monthly cycle and restore the current restriction afterward.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
The users can search, open, and preview the target records, which confirms that visibility and preliminary process access already exist. The failure occurs only at the final execution layer for one protected regional population, indicating a process-level authorization or target-population scope dependency rather than a complete access failure. Adjusting only the approved execution scope restores the required recurring process while preserving the governance boundary.

Question: 7

A consultant is supporting a scheduled import of future-dated employee pay-group corrections in a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central tenant before a monthly reconciliation cycle. The file processes correctly for most employees, but a subset completes with warnings and leaves those records unchanged. The affected employees already have approved future workflow requests for employment-status changes in the same effective period.
The customer wants the pay-group corrections preserved without deleting the already approved status changes, because those requests were validated as part of the monthly operating plan. They also do not want a permanent manual exception process for employees who have approved future changes. The consultant must restore a repeatable and governance-aligned administrative load.
What is the best next step?
Response:

A. Retry the warning rows under a broader administrative role so the import can override the approved future workflow state during this cycle.
B. Adjust the import handling for employees with overlapping approved future changes so the pay-group correction fits into the effective-dated timeline without replacing later records.
C. Delete the approved future employment-status workflow requests, then rerun the warning rows so the pay-group correction can load without conflict.
D. Exclude employees with approved future workflow requests from all future pay-group imports and require HR administrators to maintain those cases manually.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
The warning pattern is selective and tied to employees with approved future workflow changes in the same effective period. That indicates an effective-dating and lifecycle dependency rather than a broad import or authorization issue. Adjusting the import handling so the current correction coexists with the approved future timeline addresses the root cause while preserving validated future records and keeping the process repeatable.

Question: 8

A consultant is loading position updates into a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central tenant before a scheduled workforce planning review. The import completes with mixed results: some records update, but many fail because parent position references are invalid. The customer wants the upload corrected quickly, yet they also want to avoid breaking existing reporting relationships or manually editing large volumes in the web UI.
A review shows that the failed records are mostly new child positions whose parent positions were included in the same file but appear later in the sequence. The consultant must choose a fix that restores consistency with the least operational risk.
Which action is the best next step?
Response:

A. Split the load so parent positions are created or updated first, then load dependent child positions after the hierarchy references are valid.
B. Remove the parent position column from the file so all records load, then rebuild the hierarchy manually after the planning review.
C. Retry the same file with administrator access because import failures involving hierarchy fields are often permission-related.
D. Disable hierarchy validation for the import cycle so the system accepts all position updates in one pass.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
The failure pattern points to sequencing, not missing authorization or defective position design. Child positions depend on valid existing parent references at load time. When parent records appear later in the same file, the import can partially process the file yet still reject dependent rows. Splitting the load by dependency order fixes the upstream prerequisite and protects reporting structure integrity.

Question: 9

A consultant is validating a position-based readiness process before a succession planning checkpoint in a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central and Position Management tenant. In the web-based UI, HR specialists update selected positions to an approved-for-readiness state and save successfully. The new state is visible on the position records, but for positions in one newly introduced regional segment the linked employee-side planning eligibility flag does not update during follow-up validation.

Other regional segments behave correctly. The customer wants to preserve position-driven administration and avoid separate employee-side correction after each position update. The affected records all belong to a segment added during the latest configuration cycle, and the consultant must correct the issue without redesigning the broader readiness process.
What is the best first action?
Response:

A. Ask HR specialists to update the employee planning eligibility flag manually for the new regional segment until the checkpoint is completed.
B. Give planning users broader edit access to the employee eligibility field so they can repair missing updates directly after each position save.
C. Recreate the affected positions under an older regional segment so the downstream update behavior matches earlier records.
D. Review the dependency between the new regional segment and downstream planning-eligibility propagation, then correct the configuration or binding controlling the linked employee update.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
The position update itself succeeds and the new readiness state is stored. The failure occurs only in the downstream employee-side update and only for the newly introduced regional segment. That indicates a second-order integration dependency between segment-specific setup and the propagation logic that updates planning eligibility. Correcting that dependency restores the intended end-to-end behavior while preserving the position-driven model.

Question: 10

In a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central tenant, a consultant is validating a new hiring setup in the web-based UI before regional onboarding begins. Recruiters can start the hire process, but when they reach the organizational assignment step, one required field appears as blank and unavailable for selection for a single country rollout.
The same field works correctly in other countries in the tenant. The customer confirms that the field is part of the planned core setup and must remain required because downstream employee records depend on it. The project manager wants the issue corrected without introducing country-specific manual workarounds or weakening the standardized hire design.
What should the consultant do first to resolve the issue correctly?
Response:

A. Remove the field from the country-specific hiring flow so recruiters can complete hiring and update the missing value later.
B. Give recruiters broader edit permissions to organizational data so they can populate the value after the employee is hired.
C. Review the country-specific setup dependency for the required organizational field and correct the configuration that controls its availability during hire creation.
D. Reimport existing employee data for that country so the system rebuilds the organizational assignment options for new hires.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
The failure is limited to one country and occurs during the hire process, while the same field works in other countries. That indicates a setup dependency specific to that country configuration rather than a system-wide problem. Correcting the country-specific configuration controlling the field's availability addresses the upstream cause and preserves the standardized design.
Topic: 2
Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Foundation Data Sequence for Field Workforce Setup
During validation, several position records can be selected during employee assignment, but the regional context shown later in review does not match the expected operating area. The team confirms that some corporate data values were created after the initial position import.
Which action best supports a controlled correction before the next manager test cycle?
Response:

A. Reload all employee and position records so that every imported object is rebuilt using the newest corporate data values.
B. Validate the active foundation data referenced by affected records, then selectively correct or reload only dependent records with confirmed mismatches.
C. Expand HR specialist permissions temporarily so that users can correct affected employee and position records during testing.
D. Continue manager validation and document the behavior as a known limitation until the next rollout wave.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option addresses the dependency between foundation data timing and downstream position behavior without assuming every record is invalid. It preserves validation time while still requiring evidence before a selective correction or reload is made.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 1 — Foundation Data Sequence for Field Workforce Setup
The import logs do not show a single rejected file, yet position assignments behave differently depending on which regional values are referenced. The project lead wants to avoid a broad reload unless the second-order cause is clear.
What should the consultant determine first?
Response:

A. Whether workflow approvers can manually reroute affected position changes during the next validation cycle.
B. Whether all regional managers have the same permission role before reviewing imported positions.
C. Whether affected position records reference foundation values that were inactive, missing, or created after the import sequence.
D. Whether HR specialists can edit the employee records directly from the employee profile screen.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
The scenario points to a second-order dependency where imported records may save but later behave inconsistently because referenced foundation values were not stable at import time. Confirming that dependency is necessary before choosing a reload, permission change, or workflow adjustment.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 2 — Position Assignment Visibility Across Regional Teams
A regional manager can see some position records outside their operating area, while another valid position in their own division is not visible during review. HR specialists report that the same position can still be used during assignment.
Which validation path best distinguishes position setup behavior from a general permission complaint?
Response:

A. Compare position attributes, employee assignment context, and manager-view visibility using representative users from multiple regions.
B. Grant the regional manager broader access to all position records so that visibility can be tested without regional restrictions.
C. Reassign the hidden position to a different supervisor and repeat the review from the original manager account.
D. Ask HR specialists to complete all position assignments centrally until manager visibility is reviewed after rollout.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option checks the relationship between position data, assignment behavior, and manager visibility across realistic users. It separates a configuration or data-alignment cause from a broad access complaint.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 2 — Position Assignment Visibility Across Regional Teams

The team can make position assignments successfully, but manager review does not consistently reflect the regional operating model. The business sponsor asks whether the next test cycle can proceed if HR completes assignments on behalf of managers.
Which response best reflects the performance-versus-governance trade-off?
Response:

A. Proceed with HR-only assignment because it keeps the test cycle on schedule and avoids manager support delays.
B. Allow managers to view all positions during testing, then restore regional filtering before production preparation.
C. Proceed only after manager-facing visibility is validated for representative regional contexts, even if some test activities are narrowed.
D. Delay all testing until every employee and position record across the full company is reloaded and reviewed.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option preserves governance boundaries while still allowing controlled progress through representative validation. It recognizes that schedule pressure cannot justify bypassing manager-facing visibility behavior that is central to the rollout.

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/