# SAP
# C_DBADM_2601
## SAP Certified - Database Administrator - SAP HANA

**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 - 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 regional education services provider is rehearsing a move from SAP HANA on-premises to SAP HANA Cloud. The rehearsal export completes, and the target database is reachable. During validation, the administrator finds that the migration checklist confirms data transfer but does not include a verified rollback reference for the source system if post-migration administration checks fail. The project manager wants to proceed because the transfer finished within the allowed window.
The constraint is that the administrator must support phased modernization without approving a migration wave that lacks recoverability evidence. The production decision must include both successful transfer and a validated fallback position.
Which recommendation is most appropriate?

A. Proceed with approval because the rehearsal export completed and the SAP HANA Cloud target is reachable.
B. Repeat the export with a smaller dataset so the transfer can finish faster during the production window.
C. Approve the migration and create the rollback reference only if post-migration checks fail after cutover.
D. Add rollback-reference validation to the rehearsal evidence, then repeat the decision only after transfer, target checks, and fallback readiness are confirmed.

**Answer: D**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:

This resolves the migration readiness gap while preserving phased modernization. Validating transfer, target administration checks, and fallback readiness ensures the migration wave has both execution evidence and recoverability support.

## Question: 2

A regional scientific instruments company is planning an incremental migration rehearsal from SAP HANA on-premises to SAP HANA Cloud. The source system export completes, and the cloud target is reachable in database explorer. Before import approval, the administrator discovers that the migration worksheet records the target connection test but does not record whether the target administration baseline was captured before loading migrated data. The project lead wants to continue because target access is confirmed.
The constraint is that the rehearsal must preserve a clean before-and-after comparison for the cloud target. The team must be able to distinguish pre-import target readiness from post-import migrated-state validation.

A. Continue with import because database explorer confirms the SAP HANA Cloud target is reachable.
B. Repeat the source export because missing target baseline evidence means the source data is unreliable.
C. Capture the target administration baseline before import, then record post-import validation separately for the migrated state.
D. Defer the target baseline until after import because the migrated state is the only state that matters for approval.

**Answer: C**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:
This resolves the migration validation sequencing gap. Capturing the pre-import administration baseline and recording post-import evidence separately aligns target readiness, import execution, migrated-state validation, and repeatable migration controls.

## Question: 3

A regional beverage distributor is preparing an SAP HANA installation acceptance activity for a new on-premises reporting database. The database installation finishes without error, and SAP HANA cockpit shows the system as available. During acceptance review, the administrator notices that the installed database was recorded against the correct host group, but the lifecycle worksheet still lists the previous software package reference from an earlier rehearsal. The deployment lead wants to approve acceptance because the running database is accessible.
The constraint is that the administrator must prove the accepted installation record matches the actual installed lifecycle state. Approval cannot rely only on runtime availability when the lifecycle reference in the worksheet is inconsistent.
Which action best resolves the installation acceptance gap?

A. Approve the installation because SAP HANA cockpit shows the database as available and the installation completed without error.
B. Replace the lifecycle worksheet reference with the actual installed package evidence, validate the acceptance record, and approve only after the worksheet matches the system state.
C. Restart the database so SAP HANA cockpit can refresh the package information shown in the acceptance worksheet.
D. Keep the earlier package reference because it belongs to the same installation rehearsal sequence.

**Answer: B**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:
This corrects the lifecycle evidence layer before acceptance. Updating the worksheet with the actual installed package evidence and validating the record aligns installation completion, lifecycle reference, system state, and approval evidence.

## Question: 4

A regional airport operator maintains SAP HANA for operational analytics while preparing an administration model that covers an on-premises database and an SAP HANA Cloud target. During a readiness review, SAP HANA cockpit confirms the on-premises database is available, while SAP HANA Cloud Central confirms that the cloud target is provisioned. However, the review evidence does not identify which environment owns backup monitoring, daily administration checks, or migration rehearsal validation.
The constraint is that the administrator must prevent unclear operational ownership before the next handover meeting. The team must keep both environments in scope without treating tool visibility as proof that administration responsibilities are correctly assigned.
Which action best addresses the ownership ambiguity?

A. Assign each administration activity to the correct SAP HANA environment and validate the evidence source for each responsibility.
B. Approve the handover because both environments are visible in their respective SAP administration tools.
C. Use the on-premises database as the single administration reference until the migration project is fully completed.
D. Remove the cloud target from the readiness review because it is not yet supporting the active workload.

**Answer: A**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:
This resolves the ambiguity at the operational ownership layer. Mapping each administration activity to the correct environment and validating the evidence source ensures that availability, backup monitoring, daily checks, and migration validation are not mixed across SAP HANA targets.

## Question: 5

A media analytics provider is documenting the administration model for SAP HANA across an on-premises system and an SAP HANA Cloud environment. During validation, an administrator records that monitoring, backup review, and database explorer checks are being performed from different tools without a clear statement of which environment each evidence item represents. The cloud instance is available, and the on-premises system is also active for the current reporting workload.
The constraint is that the administration handover must distinguish environment-specific evidence before operational ownership changes. The team must avoid accepting mixed proof that combines cloud availability with on-premises operational checks.
Which action best supports a reliable handover?

A. Create a validation record that maps each tool output to the specific SAP HANA environment before accepting the handover.
B. Use the cloud availability status as the primary handover evidence because the modernization target is available.
C. Combine all successful checks into one operations summary because both environments belong to the SAP HANA landscape.
D. Delay all validation until the on-premises workload is migrated so only one environment remains active.

**Answer: A**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:
This resolves the evidence classification problem at the landscape validation layer. Mapping each tool output to its environment ensures that availability, monitoring, and administrative checks prove the correct SAP HANA system state before ownership changes.

## Question: 6

A medical device supplier is moving a reporting database from on-premises SAP HANA to SAP HANA Cloud in phases. The first migration rehearsal finishes technically, but the operations team finds that existing administration routines no longer map cleanly to the target environment. Backup scheduling assumptions, daily monitoring habits, and some lifecycle procedures were copied from the on-premises runbook without adjustment.
The migration manager wants the next rehearsal to stay on schedule and avoid rework after go-live. The constraint is that the team must reduce operational risk during transition without expanding the scope into a full process redesign.
What is the best next step for the next rehearsal cycle?

A. Freeze the migrated target configuration and postpone all administration process updates until after productive cutover.
B. Rebuild the entire administration model from scratch so the target landscape is treated as a completely independent platform.

C. Add focused validation of backup, monitoring, and operational procedures in the cloud target and adjust only the runbook elements that no longer fit the new environment.
D. Keep the existing on-premises administration routines unchanged because the successful technical migration proves operational readiness.

**Answer: C**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:
This is the required modernization-style drill. The migration rehearsal succeeded technically, but the artifact is operational misfit between inherited on-premises routines and the cloud target. The best answer is incremental adaptation: validate the cloud-target administration model for backup, monitoring, and lifecycle operations, then adjust only the procedures that no longer align. That directly addresses transition risk while respecting the constraint not to expand into full redesign.

## Question: 7

A financial services operations team notices that one SAP HANA database appears healthy in routine availability checks, yet a scheduled administration task fails each morning for only one administrator group. Database monitoring shows normal runtime status, and no general service interruption is visible. Another team member proposes reactivating the failed task definition because the symptom appears limited to that operation.
The lead administrator is concerned that the issue may sit upstream of the task itself and wants the first corrective action to restore execution without masking the actual dependency failure. The environment supports both cockpit-style checks and detailed administration review.
What is the best first action?

A. Recreate the scheduled task because a failed execution usually indicates the task object is no longer valid.
B. Validate whether the affected administrator group still has the required access scope for the task and correct that dependency before changing the task definition.
C. Restart the database services used by the task because healthy monitoring does not rule out a short-lived runtime inconsistency.
D. Increase the task retry interval so the operation has more time to complete under the current runtime state.

**Answer: B**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:
This is the required second-order diagnosis drill. The visible symptom is task failure, but the pattern is narrow: the database is healthy, and only one administrator group is affected. That points upstream to an access-scope dependency rather than a broken task object or platform outage. Validating and correcting the required access scope addresses the real execution blocker.

## Question: 8

A regional facilities management company runs SAP HANA for service request analytics. After a planned restart, SAP HANA cockpit shows the database as available, but a scheduled administrative validation script fails because it references a configuration profile that was renamed during the maintenance window. Manual checks from the cockpit succeed, so the service coordinator wants to close the restart activity.
The constraint is that the administrator must prove scheduled administration will execute correctly after the restart. The validation must address the renamed configuration reference rather than relying only on manual tool access.
What should the administrator do before closing the restart activity?

A. Close the restart activity because manual SAP HANA cockpit checks show that the database is available.
B. Reboot the database again so the scheduled script can rediscover the renamed configuration profile automatically.
C. Replace the scheduled script with manual cockpit checks until the next maintenance window.
D. Update and verify the scheduled validation reference to the renamed configuration profile, then rerun the administrative script.

**Answer: D**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:
This resolves the issue at the configuration binding layer used by scheduled execution. Updating the renamed profile reference and rerunning the script confirms that restart completion, configuration reference, scheduled execution, and validation evidence are aligned.

## Question: 9

A regional public transit operator maintains SAP HANA for ridership analytics while preparing an SAP HANA Cloud environment for a later modernization wave. During an administration review, the architecture register lists both environments under one “database platform” entry. SAP HANA cockpit confirms the on-premises database is available, and SAP HANA Cloud Central confirms the cloud database is running, but the register does not identify which administration tasks belong to the active workload and which belong to the cloud rehearsal path.
The constraint is that the administrator must make the architecture register usable for operational decisions without changing the landscape. The handover must clearly distinguish current administration scope from future migration readiness.
Which action best improves the architecture register?

A. Keep one platform entry because both systems are SAP HANA databases and both are reachable through SAP administration tools.
B. Separate the register entries by SAP HANA environment, administration purpose, and evidence source before approving handover.
C. Remove the SAP HANA Cloud entry until the cloud environment hosts the active ridership analytics workload.

D. Use the on-premises entry as the controlling architecture record because it supports the current production analytics workload.

**Answer: B**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:
This resolves the landscape classification gap at the architecture evidence layer. Separating entries by environment, purpose, and evidence source confirms that current administration and migration readiness are validated against the correct SAP HANA target.

## Question: 10

A consumer lending firm runs an on-premises SAP HANA database for core transaction support and uses SAP HANA Cloud for selected analytical workloads. During the morning review, administrators see that the database remains available and background jobs finished, but one monitoring dashboard now shows repeated alert bursts for a short interval after each monitoring cycle.
The alert pattern clears on its own and does not affect general user processing. A team member recommends disabling the noisy alert because it looks self-correcting. The operations lead wants to keep monitoring reliable without hiding a genuine issue, and the first action must stay within current operating scope.
What is the best first action?

A. Review whether the alert bursts are caused by a specific monitoring threshold or collection sequence before changing the alert design.
B. Disable the alert temporarily because self-clearing alerts do not represent a meaningful operational problem.
C. Restart the monitored database so the alert pattern can be cleared before the next review cycle begins.
D. Increase system capacity immediately because repeated alerts prove the current environment is under-sized.

**Answer: A**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:
The key artifact is a repeating, short-lived alert burst that clears without user impact. That pattern suggests the need to distinguish between an actual platform issue and a monitoring threshold or collection-sequence problem. The best first action is to validate whether the alert design or collection behavior is producing the burst pattern before making disruptive system changes.

**Topic**
**Unified Scenario Exam - US02**

## Question: 11

**CHALLENGE 1 — Supplier Allocation Readiness for Shared Material Demand**
During cutover rehearsal, two plants generate recurring demand for the same packaging material family. Both plants have approved suppliers available, but only one plant follows the expected supplier distribution pattern once purchase documents are created. The sourcing lead wants to preserve a shared support model after go-live rather than rely on local buyer judgment.
What is the best first validation action?

A. Let the slower plant choose suppliers manually until the first live week is complete
B. Compare source-maintenance setup and purchasing conditions for the material across both plants before changing execution behavior
C. Reduce approval involvement for packaging purchases so supplier selection can move faster
D. Assign one preferred supplier to both plants temporarily so cutover rehearsal can finish on time

**Answer: B**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:
The visible difference appears during purchasing execution, but the scenario points to earlier sourcing preparation as the likely cause. Comparing source-maintenance setup and purchasing conditions addresses the upstream dependency before changing live-operating behavior.

## Question: 12

**CHALLENGE 1 — Supplier Allocation Readiness for Shared Material Demand**
A plant buyer argues that urgent materials should allow local supplier substitution whenever the expected allocation pattern does not appear quickly enough during rehearsal. The cutover office is concerned that this approach will create unpredictable post-go-live support demands. Which decision is most appropriate?

A. Permit local supplier substitution for all urgent materials because speed is more important during rehearsal
B. Preserve centrally governed allocation behavior and confirm whether shared-demand materials enter purchasing execution with aligned sourcing assumptions
C. Pause all supplier-allocation validation until the legacy system is fully shut down
D. Remove shared-demand materials from rehearsal scope and validate only plant-specific items

**Answer: B**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:
The scenario is testing whether shared-demand materials can follow the intended sourcing model under cutover pressure. Preserving centrally governed allocation behavior while validating aligned sourcing assumptions protects both go-live supportability and template reuse.

## Question: 13

**CHALLENGE 2 — Release Control Timing for Urgent Replenishment Orders**
Timed execution runs show that urgent replenishment orders for short-shelf-life ingredients move fast enough in one plant only when approval handling is lighter than the common cutover model. The central support team wants early live operations to remain interpretable across all sites. What should the validation team do next?

A. Keep the lighter local approval route because urgent food materials require the fastest possible progression
B. Compare whether urgent-order timing remains acceptable under restored common approval handling before approving any local variation
C. Allow each plant to define its own urgent-order release behavior for the first operating week
D. Remove urgent replenishment orders from cutover rehearsal and validate them after go-live stabilization

**Answer: B**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:
The decision space is between operational speed and a repeatable approval structure that central support can govern. The team should first test whether the common release model can still meet cutover timing before accepting local deviations.

## Question: 14

**CHALLENGE 4 — Receipt-to-Invoice Continuity During Transition Weekend**
During overlap-period rehearsal, one plant shows clean invoice continuity for goods received near the transition weekend, while another plant shows less stable invoice results for comparable procurement cases. Reviewers find that the weaker cases were prepared under different upstream source, purchasing, and receipt assumptions. What is the best next action?

A. Increase invoice-processing speed targets so both plants complete more transactions before comparison
B. Align upstream sequence assumptions and repeat receipt-to-invoice rehearsal for representative overlap-period cases
C. Ignore plant differences and validate only the aggregate invoice completion count for the weekend
D. Move all overlap-period invoice handling to local finance teams so cases can be resolved faster

**Answer: B**

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

**Topic**
**Unified Scenario Exam - US03**

## Question: 15

**CHALLENGE 1 — SIT Configuration State Comparison**
During SIT, integration users can connect to both SAP HANA reporting systems, but the upgraded on-premises system does not show one configuration entry in its final administration record. The newly installed database has the entry documented correctly. What should the administrator do before accepting the reporting comparison results?

A. Accept the comparison because user connectivity confirms both systems are ready for SIT reporting.
B. Reconcile the configuration records so both systems are evaluated against documented states.
C. Remove the configuration entry from the installed system record to simplify the comparison.
D. Continue testing and document the configuration difference only if report results become unusable.

**Answer: B**

**Explanation:**
Feedback:
The administrator should reconcile the configuration records before accepting the comparison. The reporting results may be reachable, but the two SAP HANA systems are not being evaluated against comparable documented states.

# 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/**