

SAP C_MDG

**SAP Certified - SAP Master Data Governance
(C_MDG_2601)**

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-mdg>

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A regional public broadcasting network is introducing SAP Master Data Governance for advertiser, production partner, and sponsor account records used by sales, programming, and finance. Sales wants quick updates to campaign contacts, programming requires controlled approval of content-rights partner eligibility, and finance requires validated billing responsibility before invoices are issued. The commercial director wants faster campaign setup, but the governance sponsor requires evidence of who approved rights-sensitive and billing-relevant changes. One proposal gives sales broad ownership because it initiates most records. Another proposal assigns ownership based on field sensitivity and downstream business impact. The measurable constraint is to reduce campaign setup delay without weakening rights or billing traceability.

Which advisory response best defines governance ownership for this SAP MDG rollout?

Response:

- A. Assign sales as the owner for all advertiser, sponsor, and production partner fields because it initiates most campaign setup records.
- B. Define ownership by data sensitivity and business use, with sales maintaining campaign contacts, programming approving rights-sensitive eligibility, and finance validating billing responsibility.
- C. Route every advertiser and production partner change through programming because content-rights eligibility creates the highest approval exposure.
- D. Allow sales, programming, and finance to maintain separate approved partner records, then reconcile differences during monthly governance review.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation aligns ownership with field sensitivity, business purpose, and downstream impact. It supports faster setup for low-risk contact updates while preserving traceable approval for content-rights eligibility and billing responsibility before operational use.

Question: 2

A precision packaging machinery company is using SAP Master Data Governance to improve service module and spare-kit master data

- a. Engineering wants to create early module records quickly for customer pilot installations, procurement requires approved sourcing attributes before supplier negotiation, and service planning

requires validated replacement indicators before modules are released for field support. The innovation lead wants fewer pilot setup delays, while the service manager warns that premature release of incomplete records can cause incorrect spare-kit recommendations. One proposal applies full sourcing and service approval at initial module creation. Another proposal uses lifecycle status to restrict early records until required procurement and service attributes are validated. The measurable constraint is to speed pilot installations while preventing unvalidated field-support use.

Which recommendation best balances lifecycle control and master data quality?

Response:

- A. Require complete procurement and service approval for every service module record at initial creation so later lifecycle checks are unnecessary.
- B. Allow engineering to create service module records freely and ask procurement or service planning to correct missing attributes if field-support use begins.
- C. Maintain separate module records for pilot installations and field-support use so engineering can avoid dependency on procurement or service validation.
- D. Use lifecycle-based module governance so pilot records can exist with restricted use, then require sourcing and replacement validation before procurement or field-support release.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation aligns governance effort with lifecycle state and business risk. It permits early pilot activity while preventing incomplete module records from supporting procurement or field-service processes before required attributes are validated.

Question: 3

An automotive parts supplier is defining SAP Master Data Governance controls for supplier master changes during a phased modernization program. Engineering teams want to qualify prototype suppliers quickly for limited sourcing trials, procurement requires approved purchasing terms before production orders, and finance requires validated tax and payment details before invoice processing. The program lead wants to avoid delaying innovation trials, but the finance controller warns that premature release of unvalidated suppliers creates payment blocks and audit cleanup. The measurable constraint is to enable limited trial use while preventing unvalidated suppliers from being used in production purchasing or payment processing.

Which recommendation best supports lifecycle control and quality improvement for supplier master data?

Response:

- A. Require full production-level approval for every prototype supplier before any trial sourcing can begin.
- B. Use lifecycle-based supplier governance so trial qualification allows restricted use, while production purchasing and payment processing require completed procurement and finance validations.
- C. Allow engineering to create trial suppliers freely, then ask procurement and finance to enrich the records if the supplier becomes production-relevant.
- D. Maintain separate supplier records for trial and production use so prototype activity remains independent from governed purchasing and finance processes.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation aligns governance with supplier lifecycle state and business risk. It permits restricted trial use while preventing production purchasing or invoice processing until procurement terms, tax details, and payment validations are complete.

Question: 4

A regional hearing-aid manufacturer is using SAP Master Data Governance to improve accessory and fitting-profile master data.

a. Product engineering wants to create early accessory records quickly for clinic trials, procurement requires approved sourcing attributes before supplier negotiation, and service teams require validated compatibility indicators before accessories are released for patient fitting support. The product lead wants fewer trial setup delays, while service operations warns that premature release of incomplete records can cause incorrect accessory recommendations. One proposal applies full sourcing and service approval at initial creation. Another proposal uses lifecycle status to restrict early records until sourcing and compatibility attributes are validated. The measurable constraint is to speed clinic trials while preventing unvalidated fitting-support use.

Which recommendation best balances lifecycle control and master data quality?

Response:

A. Use lifecycle-based accessory governance so clinic-trial records can exist with restricted use, then require sourcing and compatibility validation before procurement or fitting-support release.

B. Require complete procurement and service approval for every accessory record at initial creation so later lifecycle checks are unnecessary.

C. Allow product engineering to create accessory records freely and ask procurement or service teams to correct missing attributes if fitting use begins.

D. Maintain separate accessory records for clinic trials and fitting-support use so engineering can avoid dependency on procurement or service validation.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation aligns governance effort with lifecycle state and business risk. It permits early trial activity while preventing incomplete accessory records from supporting procurement or fitting-support processes before required attributes are validated.

Question: 5

A regional electric vehicle charging operator is adopting SAP Master Data Governance for charging-site, customer account, and billing partner data shared across field operations, mobile support, and finance systems. Finance requires centrally approved billing classifications before monthly settlement, while

field operations needs quick local updates to temporary charger-access notes during grid maintenance events. The integration manager recommends distributing every approved charging-site change to all connected systems for consistency. The field operations lead warns that maintenance-specific access notes should not trigger unnecessary downstream updates. The measurable constraint is to prevent incorrect settlement classification while keeping grid-maintenance response updates fast. The long-term goal is governed cross-landscape consistency without replicating nonessential local information.

Which recommendation best addresses the distribution and consistency requirement?

Response:

- A. Distribute every charging-site, customer account, and billing partner attribute to all connected systems so each environment always holds identical records.
- B. Keep all field-maintained charging-site details outside SAP MDG so grid-maintenance updates can proceed without governance dependency.
- C. Delay distribution until all connected systems share one data model so interim differences do not require governance rules.
- D. Govern billing classifications centrally for distribution, while allowing controlled local responsibility for temporary charger-access notes.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation separates centrally governed settlement-relevant attributes from controlled local operational notes. It protects downstream settlement classification while preserving responsive maintenance for temporary charger-access information that does not need broad replication.

Question: 6

A clinical research network is adopting SAP Master Data Governance for investigator, study-site, and sponsor account data shared across study operations, grant accounting, and participant services. Grant accounting requires centrally approved sponsor account classifications before funding allocations are processed, while study teams need fast local updates to temporary site-access instructions during active trials. The integration lead recommends distributing every approved study-site change to all connected systems to maximize consistency. The study operations manager warns that temporary access notes should not create unnecessary updates outside trial execution. The measurable constraint is to prevent incorrect sponsor funding allocation while keeping trial-site coordination responsive. The long-term goal is governed cross-landscape consistency without replicating nonessential local information.

Which recommendation best addresses the distribution and consistency requirement?

Response:

- A. Distribute every investigator, study-site, and sponsor account attribute to all connected systems so each environment always holds identical records.
- B. Keep all study-site operational details outside SAP MDG so trial teams can maintain temporary access information without governance dependency.
- C. Govern sponsor account classifications centrally for distribution, while allowing controlled local responsibility for temporary study-site access instructions.

D. Delay distribution until all connected systems use the same data model so interim differences do not require governance rules.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation separates centrally governed funding-relevant attributes from controlled local operational notes. It protects downstream funding allocation while preserving responsive maintenance for temporary site-access information that does not need broad replication.

Question: 7

You are advising a regional consumer products company that runs SAP S/4HANA for finance and procurement but still maintains customer reference data in several local sales systems. The data governance lead wants a first SAP Master Data Governance rollout that improves customer data quality within six months without forcing all sales teams onto one operational system immediately. The CIO favors a single centralized design from day one, while the sales director argues for keeping local flexibility because market-specific attributes change frequently. The measurable constraint is to reduce duplicate customer records by 35% in the first phase while preserving regional operating continuity. The environment is mixed, web-based, and governed by a hybrid lifecycle.

Which recommendation best aligns SAP Master Data Governance capabilities with the stakeholder priorities and rollout constraint?

Response:

- A. Start with governed customer creation and quality controls around shared customer attributes, then phase distribution and regional harmonization based on agreed ownership rules.
- B. Replace the local sales systems immediately with one centralized master data application so duplicate prevention becomes enforceable across all regions at once.
- C. Allow each regional sales team to continue maintaining customers independently, then use periodic reporting to identify duplicate records after they occur.
- D. Prioritize a broad enterprise data architecture redesign before configuring governance processes, because long-term landscape consistency must be resolved first.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation satisfies the phased business objective by applying SAP Master Data Governance first to controlled creation, shared attribute quality, and ownership discipline. It addresses duplicate reduction within the six-month constraint while allowing regional continuity and later distribution expansion.

Question: 8

A logistics services company is evaluating SAP Master Data Governance after customer service teams reported recurring shipment delays caused by inconsistent ship-to party and carrier reference data. The COO wants evidence that governance will improve operational reliability before funding a broader data program. The transportation lead wants immediate correction of high-volume shipping records, while the enterprise data owner wants a sustainable governance model that prevents the same issues from returning. The measurable constraint is to reduce shipment exceptions by 12% in the first phase without launching a company-wide master data redesign. The environment is mixed and web-based, with advisory emphasis and moderate modernization pressure.

Which recommendation best demonstrates SAP Master Data Governance value while respecting the first-phase constraint?

Response:

- A. Begin with governed control over ship-to party and carrier attributes linked to shipment exceptions, assign clear ownership, and use exception reduction as the first value measure.
- B. Launch an enterprise-wide master data governance redesign across customer, supplier, material, and logistics domains before measuring shipment exception reduction.
- C. Let transportation teams correct inconsistent shipping data directly during exception handling, then use those corrections to justify a later governance initiative.
- D. Focus first on improving exception reporting dashboards so operational teams can identify shipment issues faster before changing master data processes.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation links SAP Master Data Governance to the specific operational outcome required by the sponsor. It focuses governance on the attributes causing shipment exceptions, establishes ownership discipline, and creates a measurable first-phase benefit without expanding beyond the approved scope.

Question: 9

A food safety inspection agency is defining SAP Master Data Governance processes for facility, vendor, and inspection partner records. Field inspectors want rapid creation of temporary facility records during emergency inspections, finance requires validated vendor payment data before reimbursement, and compliance requires restricted visibility for sensitive facility ownership details. The field operations lead suggests creating minimal records first and completing missing information after inspection reports are submitted. The governance lead suggests one strict approval route for every facility and vendor record. The measurable target is to reduce incomplete reimbursement records while allowing emergency inspection activity to continue. The environment is web-based, functionally configured, and subject to strong governance expectations.

Which recommendation best supports controlled creation and maintenance under the stated constraints?

Response:

- A. Apply one strict approval route to every facility and vendor record so all emergency and standard cases follow the same governance sequence.

- B. Create minimal facility and vendor records for emergency inspections, then complete payment and sensitive ownership details only after reimbursement is requested.
- C. Maintain separate local records for emergency inspections so field teams can proceed without dependency on governed master data release.
- D. Define purpose-based creation paths with required payment validation before reimbursement eligibility and role-appropriate visibility for sensitive ownership data.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation matches creation control to business purpose, reimbursement readiness, and data sensitivity. It supports emergency inspection work while ensuring payment-related records are validated before reimbursement and sensitive ownership information is visible only to appropriate reviewers.

Question: 10

A regional sports league is evaluating SAP Master Data Governance after clubs reported duplicate sponsor records, inconsistent contract billing preferences, and delayed revenue reconciliation across ticketing, merchandising, and finance systems. The league CFO wants fewer reconciliation corrections before the next season, while club operations wants sponsor onboarding to remain responsive during campaign planning. The enterprise data lead proposes a broad governance initiative across sponsors, teams, venues, suppliers, and finance. The commercial director proposes starting with sponsor identifiers, billing preference attributes, and ownership rules that directly affect duplicate detection and reconciliation accuracy. The measurable constraint is to reduce duplicate sponsor records by 15% before season launch without delaying commercial campaigns.

Which recommendation best demonstrates SAP MDG value under the first-phase business constraint?

Response:

- A. Launch a full enterprise governance program across all league data before selecting a specific sponsor-related improvement target.
- B. Allow clubs to correct sponsor and billing preference data manually during campaign planning, then use corrected records for a future governance phase.
- C. Focus first on improving reconciliation dashboards so duplicate sponsor records can be monitored before master data controls are introduced.
- D. Start with governed control of sponsor identifiers and billing preference attributes, assign clear ownership, and use duplicate reduction and reconciliation improvement as first-phase value measures.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation connects SAP Master Data Governance to a measurable business outcome by controlling the attributes that affect sponsor duplication and reconciliation accuracy. It keeps the first phase focused while establishing ownership and preventive data quality control.

Topic: 2
Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Deployment Path for Regional Governance Readiness

Marula Ingredients Group is preparing a readiness recommendation for the next subsidiary rollout wave. The subsidiaries are at different maturity levels, but the steering committee wants the rollout approach to remain compatible with the future SAP S/4HANA-centered governance model.

Which recommendation best fits the deployment decision expected from the consultant?

Response:

- A. Let each subsidiary define its own local governance model first, then consolidate the differences after all subsidiaries have completed onboarding.
- B. Select the fastest subsidiary as the design reference and allow slower subsidiaries to adopt the model later without additional governance review.
- C. Recommend a phased deployment path that allows subsidiary sequencing while preserving common governance responsibilities, validation expectations, and future SAP S/4HANA alignment.
- D. Delay all MDG rollout activity until every acquired subsidiary has fully retired its legacy ERP system.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

A phased deployment path supports modernization pacing while keeping the target governance model coherent. It addresses regional readiness differences without creating disconnected local governance designs that later require major rework.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 1 — Deployment Path for Regional Governance Readiness

During the advisory discussion, a regional director proposes a temporary regional approval model because it would shorten the pilot timeline. The central governance lead accepts the speed benefit but is concerned that the design may become difficult to standardize later.

Which response best balances the competing priorities?

Response:

- A. Approve the regional model if it reduces approval cycle time, then revisit governance standardization after the second wave.
- B. Reject regional participation entirely and require every subsidiary to use a fully centralized flow from the first pilot.
- C. Allow regional participation only where role ownership, validation checkpoints, and target-model alignment remain consistent across the rollout.
- D. Move deployment selection to the analytics team because approval cycle metrics will show which model is correct.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation preserves regional flexibility while preventing each region from creating a separate governance model. It recognizes the speed benefit but keeps role ownership and validation aligned with the governed target state.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 2 — Stewardship Controls for Supplier Release Decisions

Procurement wants newly requested supplier records to become usable as soon as the data steward creates them. Finance argues that tax, payment, and bank-data checks should be completed before release.

Which governance decision is most appropriate?

Response:

- A. Permit supplier use immediately after request creation because procurement owns sourcing urgency.
- B. Release suppliers only after role-appropriate stewardship, procurement enrichment, and finance-controlled validation are complete for downstream use.
- C. Allow finance to create all supplier records directly so that procurement does not need to participate in the approval flow.
- D. Block all supplier creation until the global template has been expanded to every subsidiary.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

Supplier release should depend on the required enrichment and approval responsibilities, not merely on request creation. This protects downstream procurement and finance processes while still allowing a controlled onboarding path.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 2 — Stewardship Controls for Supplier Release Decisions

A supplier record created in the pilot has procurement category information, but payment terms and bank details are still awaiting controller review. The supplier is requested for an urgent purchase order.

What is the best advisory response?

Response:

- A. Approve use for purchasing because the missing fields are finance-specific and can be corrected before invoice payment.
- B. Create a duplicate temporary supplier record for urgent purchasing and merge it into the governed record after finance review.
- C. Keep the record from downstream release until required finance-controlled fields are validated, while using the governance process to prioritize urgent review.

D. Allow local procurement to maintain the missing finance fields because the business need is urgent.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The best response protects release readiness while still acknowledging procurement urgency through prioritization. It avoids treating incomplete finance validation as a minor post-processing step.

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/>