SAP
P_SAPEA_2601
SAP Certified - SAP Enterprise Architect

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

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

You are advising a private education group that is expanding from classroom programs into blended learning and corporate training. Academic leadership wants faster course-launch capability, finance wants clearer profitability by program type, and operations wants minimal disruption during the current admissions cycle. The current transformation portfolio contains separate initiatives for enrollment, content delivery, billing, and reporting, each owned by different departments.
One proposal prioritizes the initiative with the strongest executive sponsor. Another proposal maps business capabilities across course launch, learner enrollment, delivery operations, billing visibility, and reporting, then sequences roadmap items by business value, dependency risk, and clean-core maintainability. The board asks which recommendation best aligns modernization with strategy.
Which recommendation should the enterprise architect make?
Response:

A. Prioritize the course-launch initiative first, because new program growth is the most visible strategic change.
B. Let each department deliver its own highest-priority initiative, because local ownership will reduce governance delays.
C. Sequence the roadmap by capability impact, dependency risk, and lifecycle maintainability across launch, enrollment, delivery, billing, and reporting.
D. Focus first on profitability reporting, because executive financial visibility should determine the modernization sequence.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option places the decision at the enterprise architecture layer. It connects strategic capability impact, dependency risk, and lifecycle maintainability so modernization can support blended learning growth without creating disconnected departmental outcomes.

Question: 2

You are advising a utilities services company preparing a modernization release for customer hardship adjustments across residential billing, small-business accounts, and regulated assistance programs. Several legacy adjustment checks exist inside core billing processing, and only some are still required by

current policy. Customer operations wants the first release before the next billing cycle, while the architecture board wants to reduce upgrade risk and avoid carrying obsolete logic forward.
One proposal moves all existing adjustment checks into separated extensions to preserve behavior quickly. Another proposal evaluates each check against current policy, business ownership, integration impact, and lifecycle risk, then retires obsolete checks and externalizes only approved variations needed for the first release.
Which recommendation is most appropriate?
Response:

A. Move all existing adjustment checks into separated extensions, because this protects the core while preserving current billing behavior.
B. Remove all adjustment checks immediately, because clean-core governance requires eliminating legacy billing logic.
C. Keep the adjustment checks in core billing processing until after the billing cycle, because timing is more important than modernization discipline.
D. Assess each check against policy need, ownership, integration impact, and lifecycle risk, then retire obsolete logic and externalize approved variations.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option balances billing-cycle timing with lifecycle governance. It validates each adjustment check at the policy and ownership layer, removes obsolete logic, preserves required controls, and externalizes only approved variations needed for a maintainable first release.

Question: 3

You are advising a mining company modernizing maintenance planning across remote sites. Site managers want locally optimized work-priority rules because equipment conditions differ by region. Operations wants the first release before the next shutdown planning cycle. The technical team suggests embedding site-specific priority logic into core maintenance processing to reduce delivery effort. The architecture board is concerned about upgrade effort, future rule changes, and integration stability across the hybrid landscape.
A second proposal uses a common maintenance planning foundation with separated rule logic for approved site variations. It narrows the first release to the highest-value equipment groups but preserves lifecycle adaptability. The COO asks which recommendation best balances operational timing and clean-core governance.
Which recommendation is most appropriate?
Response:

A. Embed site-specific priority logic into core processing for the first release, because shutdown planning timing is the most urgent constraint.
B. Standardize all maintenance priority rules globally before rollout, because local variation creates avoidable governance complexity.
C. Build separate maintenance planning processes for each site, because equipment differences make shared architecture impractical.

D. Use a common planning foundation with separated rule logic and prioritize first-release scope for the highest-value equipment groups.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option balances operational delivery with clean-core governance. It preserves a common foundation, separates variable rule logic, limits first-release scope, and supports future adaptation without destabilizing the core landscape.

Question: 4

You are advising a construction services enterprise introducing a unified project-mobilization process for large infrastructure contracts. Sales wants faster contract handoff, project operations need consistent resource planning, and finance requires reliable margin visibility before work begins. Existing processes vary by region, and several custom handoffs connect contract approval, resource assignment, and cost forecasting.
A delivery team proposes a region-specific mobilization solution for the largest market first and plans to reconcile differences later. The architecture board recommends defining solution boundaries for contract handoff, resource-planning responsibility, finance control points, and integration ownership, then delivering a limited first release for the highest-value contract types. The COO asks which direction best avoids long-term fragmentation.
Which recommendation best supports the solution architecture objective?
Response:

A. Build the largest-region solution first, because regional volume provides the strongest evidence for later enterprise rollout decisions.
B. Standardize every regional mobilization process before release, because consistent resource planning must precede any phased delivery.
C. Define solution boundaries for handoff, planning, finance controls, and integration ownership, then deliver a limited first release.
D. Focus only on contract handoff speed, because earlier handoff will naturally improve resource planning and margin visibility.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option addresses the solution architecture at the correct separation layer. It clarifies business handoff, resource-planning responsibility, financial controls, and integration ownership while limiting first-release scope to manage risk.

Question: 5

You are advising a healthcare network formed through the acquisition of three regional clinic groups. Each group has its own application inventory, reporting ownership, and local improvement initiatives. The CEO wants a unified architecture direction within four months to support patient-service expansion, but the CIO warns that the current portfolio view is incomplete. The compliance office also requires that architecture decisions preserve auditability of sensitive process and data ownership.
One proposal is to start by consolidating applications with overlapping functions. Another proposal is to establish an enterprise architecture method first: define architecture principles, map business capabilities, identify decision rights, and use these outputs to prioritize the transition roadmap. Leadership asks which response best creates architecture value without becoming an academic exercise.
Which recommendation should the enterprise architect make?
Response:

A. Begin by consolidating overlapping applications, because duplicated functionality is the clearest measurable evidence of architecture inefficiency.
B. Ask each acquired clinic group to complete its own target architecture first, because local ownership reduces resistance during integration.
C. Delay roadmap decisions until the application inventory is fully complete, because any early architectural prioritization could miss hidden dependencies.
D. Establish architecture principles, capability mapping, decision rights, and prioritization criteria before selecting consolidation initiatives.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option creates a practical enterprise architecture foundation before solution selection. It links principles, capabilities, governance ownership, and prioritization criteria so consolidation decisions can be evaluated against business value, compliance visibility, and transition feasibility.

Question: 6

You are supporting an enterprise architecture review for a global circular-economy marketplace introducing material-recovery analytics across collection partners, refurbishers, resale channels, and finance teams. Collection partners classify returned materials differently, refurbishers report recovery outcomes using local conventions, and finance requires consistent evidence for margin and recovery-value analysis. The board wants the first recovery scorecard within eight months, while regional agreements restrict how partner-identifiable activity data may be shared.
One proposal loads all collection, refurbishment, and resale activity into a central analytical structure immediately. Another proposal defines a governed material-recovery information model with common condition and recovery attributes, controlled regional extensions, and phased source alignment for the highest-volume markets.
Which recommendation best supports reliable analytics and governance?
Response:

A. Preserve local material classifications and add a comparison dashboard, because partners should not be disrupted during scorecard delivery.

B. Centralize all partner and resale activity immediately, because recovery analytics requires complete data volume before model governance is finalized.
C. Let finance define the model independently, because margin evidence is the most important executive reporting requirement.
D. Define a governed material-recovery information model with common attributes, regional controls, and phased alignment of high-volume sources.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option addresses the information architecture at the correct layer. It establishes common material-recovery meaning, preserves controlled regional variation, supports data-sharing constraints, and enables phased delivery for high-volume markets.

Question: 7

You are advising a battery leasing company introducing a unified return-and-refurbishment capability across customer collection points, logistics partners, inspection centers, recycling contractors, warranty teams, and finance operations. Operations wants the first release before a new fleet-customer contract begins, warranty teams need consistent reuse-or-recycle decisions, and finance requires controlled triggers for deposit release and refurbishment cost capture. Existing processes vary by battery type and rely on local handoffs between return intake, condition inspection, logistics assignment, contractor confirmation, and settlement approval.
A delivery team proposes building a battery-type-specific solution for the largest fleet segment first and reconciling differences later. The architecture board recommends defining solution boundaries for return intake, inspection ownership, contractor coordination, warranty evidence, deposit controls, and integration responsibility.
Which recommendation best supports the solution architecture objective?
Response:

A. Define solution boundaries for return intake, inspection ownership, contractor coordination, warranty evidence, deposit controls, and integration responsibility.
B. Build the largest fleet-segment solution first, because transaction volume provides the strongest basis for later rollout decisions.
C. Standardize all battery-type return processes before release, because consistent inspection handling must precede phased delivery.
D. Focus only on faster return registration, because earlier intake capture will naturally resolve inspection and settlement-control issues.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:

This option addresses the solution architecture at the correct separation layer. It clarifies return intake, inspection decision ownership, contractor coordination, warranty evidence, financial control points, and integration responsibility while supporting a controlled first release.

Question: 8

You are advising a regional healthcare insurer introducing a unified prior-authorization intake capability across employer plans, provider portals, clinical review teams, and member-service operations. Provider relations wants faster submission handling before a new network launch, clinical teams need consistent review routing, and finance requires controlled tracking of approval-related cost exposure. Existing processes vary by plan type and rely on local handoffs between request intake, clinical review assignment, status communication, and cost tracking.
A delivery team proposes building an employer-plan-specific solution for the largest customer segment first and reconciling differences later. The architecture board recommends defining solution boundaries for request intake, review-routing ownership, member communication, cost-control evidence, and integration responsibility, then delivering a limited first release for the highest-volume request types.
Which recommendation best supports the solution architecture objective?
Response:

A. Build the largest employer-plan solution first, because high request volume provides the strongest basis for later rollout decisions.
B. Standardize all plan-type authorization processes before release, because consistent clinical handling must precede phased delivery.
C. Define solution boundaries for intake, review routing, communication, cost controls, and integration responsibility before the first release.
D. Focus only on provider submission speed, because faster intake will naturally resolve review routing and cost-tracking issues.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option addresses the solution architecture at the correct separation layer. It clarifies intake responsibility, clinical review routing, communication ownership, cost-control evidence, and integration responsibility while supporting a controlled first release.

Question: 9

You are advising a regional space-research agency aligning architecture planning across mission planning, satellite operations, ground-station scheduling, scientific data services, and finance oversight. Each division has submitted modernization proposals with different benefit measures, ownership assumptions, and delivery urgency. The director wants a roadmap before the next government funding review, while mission leaders require decisions to remain traceable to mission continuity, scientific value, and long-term operating sustainability.
One proposal ranks initiatives by mission visibility because public-facing missions are easiest to justify. Another proposal establishes architecture principles, maps mission, operations, data, scheduling, and

finance capabilities, defines governance participation, and applies shared value-risk criteria before selecting roadmap items.
Which advisory response best fits the enterprise architecture objective?
Response:

A. Rank initiatives by mission visibility, because public-facing outcomes provide the clearest basis for funding justification.
B. Establish principles, capability mapping, governance participation, and shared value-risk criteria before roadmap selection.
C. Allow each division to maintain its own roadmap, because mission planning, satellite operations, and data services have different ownership assumptions.
D. Delay roadmap creation until every proposal has a finalized cost estimate, because incomplete estimates create investment risk.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option creates a structured enterprise architecture method before initiative selection. It connects principles, capability context, governance participation, value-risk evaluation, and traceable mission outcomes into a decision process suitable for roadmap planning.
Topic: 2
Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 1 — Enterprise Data Meaning Across Regional Reporting
Veyra's reporting team proposes using a single cross-reference table to align regional asset categories for executive dashboards. During review, the SAP enterprise architect notices that the same category mapping will also influence investment classification, procurement grouping, and regulatory explanations.
Which recommendation best addresses the architecture decision?
Response:

A. Approve the mapping table for dashboard use and defer semantic alignment until each region completes its reporting rollout.
B. Establish shared enterprise data definitions with accountable stewardship, while allowing controlled regional attributes where regulatory interpretation differs.
C. Require every region to adopt the same asset category labels immediately before any dashboard or regulatory reporting work continues.
D. Let each acquired company maintain its current asset category model and consolidate only financial totals at group level.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:
B is correct because the dashboard mapping affects downstream business meaning, not only visual reporting. Shared definitions with stewardship protect enterprise consistency while controlled regional attributes preserve regulatory interpretation.

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Enterprise Data Meaning Across Regional Reporting
The steering committee asks whether dashboard speed or data governance should take priority for the first roadmap wave. Regional leaders argue that executives need consolidated views quickly, while the architecture review board wants definitions that can support regulatory narratives and future analytics.
What is the best advisory response?
Response:

A. Prioritize the fastest dashboard delivery because executive visibility is the strongest business value in the first wave.
B. Prioritize data governance only after regulators challenge the reporting definitions, because early governance may slow adoption.
C. Deliver a phased reporting model that starts with governed minimum common definitions and expands regional interpretation rules as adoption progresses.
D. Allow each region to define dashboard semantics independently, then compare results manually during steering committee reporting.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
C is correct because it balances performance and governance rather than treating them as mutually exclusive. A governed minimum common model supports early visibility while preserving a path for regional interpretation and future analytics.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 2 — Clean-Core Roadmap for Local Maintenance Extensions
A regional operations team requests a local reporting enhancement for monthly maintenance evidence. The team proposes changing core SAP reporting logic because the requirement is urgent and applies only to one market in the first roadmap wave.
Which recommendation best aligns with Veyra's architecture principles?
Response:

A. Permit the core change for the region because regulatory deadlines justify a temporary exception.
B. Reject the regional requirement until the full enterprise maintenance model is completed.
C. Use a clean-core extension approach with defined ownership, reuse assessment, and a retirement or convergence condition.
D. Build the enhancement outside SAP without architecture review so the region can satisfy the regulator independently.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
C is correct because it addresses local compliance urgency while protecting lifecycle maintainability. Ownership, reuse assessment, and retirement conditions make the interim extension governable.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 2 — Clean-Core Roadmap for Local Maintenance Extensions
Two options are presented for the maintenance reporting requirement. Option 1 uses a local extension separated from core SAP objects but requires architecture board approval. Option 2 modifies existing central reporting logic and can be delivered faster.
Which factor should carry the greatest weight in the enterprise architect's recommendation?
Response:

A. The option that delivers the local report fastest should be preferred because regulatory reporting has a fixed monthly deadline.
B. The option that protects core maintainability while meeting the local requirement through governed extension should be preferred.
C. The option that centralizes all maintenance reporting logic immediately should be preferred even if the region misses the first reporting cycle.
D. The option with the least documentation should be preferred because interim patterns should remain lightweight.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
B is correct because Veyra's roadmap requires both local responsiveness and clean-core lifecycle control. A governed extension can meet near-term needs without embedding region-specific logic into the core.

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/