

SAP E_S4CPE

**SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - SAP S/4HANA
Cloud Private Edition (E_S4CPE_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/e-s4cpe>

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A commercial printing company is validating a clean-core extension in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. The team added a governed extension value for a production priority indicator. The value appears on the Fiori document and is saved correctly. During downstream validation, the connected process receives the value only when the document is created manually, but not when the same document type is created through a migrated test dataset.

The observable artifact is a context-binding mismatch: the extension works for manual creation but not for migration-originated records in the same validation scope. The project requires the extension to support the intended end-to-end process without modifying standard objects. The consultant must decide the next validation correction.

Which action best resolves the extension validation gap?

Response:

- A. Accept the extension as complete because manually created documents pass the production priority value downstream.
- B. Confirm that the extension field is populated and mapped for migration-originated document context as well as manual creation context.
- C. Modify the standard downstream process so it assigns the priority value whenever migrated records are processed.
- D. Ask testers to recreate all migrated documents manually so the extension follows the already successful creation path.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option addresses the context-specific extension dependency. The extension must be populated and mapped for the migration-originated document path so downstream validation proves the full intended end-to-end behavior.

Question: 2

An engineering services company is preparing a second validation cycle in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. The setup environment contains an approved configuration update for a service billing process. The validation environment shows the prior approved configuration version, and the test script still

references the old expected result. A business lead asks the team to run the test anyway and update the evidence afterward if the result differs.

The observable artifact is a version conflict between the approved setup change, the validation environment state, and the test script expectation. The project constraint requires that the tested configuration version and expected result must match before execution. The team must protect traceability while keeping the validation cycle usable.

Which action best prepares the validation cycle correctly?

Response:

- A. Execute the test with the old expectation and adjust the evidence afterward if the new configuration behavior appears.
- B. Move and confirm the approved configuration version in validation, then align the test script expectation before execution.
- C. Manually change the expected result in the evidence file after testing so the final record matches the approved setup update.
- D. Keep the validation environment unchanged because the previous configuration version was already approved in an earlier cycle.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option corrects the lifecycle dependency before validation. The approved configuration must be present in the validation environment, and the expected result must reflect that same version so execution evidence can be trusted.

Question: 3

A medical packaging company is validating a configured batch-release process in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. User BATCH_VAL_27 opens the Fiori launchpad task, creates release document BR-527, and enters the configured test values. The document saves successfully, but the expected release indicator is not set because the process still evaluates an older threshold value from a prior configuration cycle.

The observable artifact is a parameter-value dependency mismatch: the user task executes, but the completion behavior follows an outdated configured threshold. The configuration owner confirms that the current process variant is active, and the validation rule requires evidence that the approved threshold drives the release decision. The team must correct the system behavior before accepting the validation result.

Which corrective action best targets the missing validation dependency?

Response:

- A. Ask BATCH_VAL_27 to create a new release document because the first identifier may be linked to the previous threshold.
- B. Accept the validation because the document was saved successfully with the configured test values.
- C. Confirm that the approved threshold value is active for the specific release decision used by the current process variant.

D. Assign additional launchpad content to BATCH_VAL_27 so the release indicator can be updated from another task.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option resolves the issue at the configuration-parameter layer. The current process variant must use the approved threshold during execution so the release decision and validation evidence reflect the intended configured behavior.

Question: 4

A cold-chain logistics company is preparing a controlled validation cycle in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. The setup environment contains an approved configuration change for a delivery confirmation process. The change was moved to the validation environment, and the movement record shows successful completion. However, when user DEL_VAL_12 executes the validation script, the system still applies the previous confirmation tolerance.

The observable artifact is a parameter-value dependency mismatch: the movement record is successful, but the executable validation behavior does not reflect the approved tolerance value. The project rule requires evidence from the validation environment using the approved current configuration. The consultant must identify the corrective action before the validation cycle can be accepted as ready.

Which action best resolves the validation readiness issue?

Response:

- A. Confirm that the approved tolerance value is active in the validation environment and rerun the script using the same validation identifier.
- B. Accept the movement record as sufficient evidence because it confirms that the configuration change reached the validation environment.
- C. Ask DEL_VAL_12 to execute the script in the setup environment where the approved tolerance was originally configured.
- D. Change the expected result in the validation script to match the previous tolerance so testing can continue without delay.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option addresses the active configuration value that controls execution behavior. A successful movement record confirms transport or movement completion, but validation readiness depends on the approved tolerance being active and reflected during execution in the validation environment.

Question: 5

A regional textile finishing company is validating a configured quality-release process in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. User QUAL_VAL_88 opens the Fiori launchpad task and creates quality release

document QR-188. The document saves and the release action is logged. However, the validation result shows that the release action used the default review path instead of the configured accelerated path assigned to the document category.

The observable artifact is a process-path mismatch: execution is recorded, but the wrong configured path is selected for the document category. The configuration owner confirms that both paths are active. The validation rule requires evidence that the correct path is selected from the document category during execution.

Which corrective action best targets the missing configuration dependency?

Response:

- A. Accept the validation because the release action was logged and both review paths are active.
- B. Ask QUAL_VAL_88 to create a new document because the first identifier may have been assigned to the default path.
- C. Assign broader launchpad content so QUAL_VAL_88 can manually choose the accelerated review path from another task.
- D. Verify that the document category is bound to the accelerated review path and rerun the release validation.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option resolves the configuration-to-execution dependency. The document category must be bound to the accelerated review path so execution produces evidence for the intended configured behavior.

Question: 6

A regional medical device repair company is validating task ownership in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. User TASK_VAL_192 can open the assigned Fiori launchpad task, create repair decision document RD-692, and submit it. The workflow item reaches the user's inbox for follow-up, but the completion action is hidden because the role includes inbox visibility without the required task-completion authorization for that responsibility context.

The observable artifact is an inbox-action scope discrepancy: workflow retrieval works, but the assigned user cannot complete the controlled follow-up step. The governance rule requires least-privilege execution evidence using TASK_VAL_192. The team must not complete the task with an implementation administrator or remove the follow-up step from validation.

Which corrective action best preserves valid authorization evidence?

Response:

- A. Accept the validation because the workflow item reached TASK_VAL_192's inbox.
- B. Use an implementation administrator to complete the inbox item and attach the workflow log to the evidence.
- C. Remove the follow-up completion step because the user already submitted the repair decision document.
- D. Add the required task-completion authorization for the responsibility context and rerun the workflow validation.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option resolves the issue at the task-action authorization layer. The user already has launchpad access and inbox visibility, so valid evidence requires the completion authorization for the same controlled responsibility context.

Question: 7

A professional services firm is validating role assignments in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. User BILL_VAL_13 was created for a billing validation task and assigned the required Fiori launchpad content. The user can open the billing document, review the configured values, and start the release action. The system blocks the final release because the user lacks authorization for the assigned company-level responsibility.

The observable artifact is an access scope discrepancy: document access and action initiation work, but release execution fails at the responsibility assignment layer. The governance rule requires least-privilege validation evidence and prohibits using a broad implementation role. The team must preserve the original validation document and assigned user.

What should the consultant do to correct the validation failure?

Response:

- A. Change the validation document to a company responsibility already covered by BILL_VAL_13's current access.
- B. Assign a broad implementation role temporarily so BILL_VAL_13 can complete the release action.
- C. Remove the release action from the validation script because display and review access are enough to prove the process is available.
- D. Extend BILL_VAL_13's validation role to include the required company-level responsibility for the release action.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option corrects the failure at the responsibility authorization layer. The user already has launchpad access and can initiate the action, so the missing dependency is authorization for the company-level responsibility needed to complete the release.

Question: 8

A regional cold-storage operator is validating a clean-core extension in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. The team introduced a governed extension artifact for a temperature-handling indicator on an outbound delivery document. User TEMP_VAL_47 can enter the value in the Fiori document, and the value is saved correctly. During downstream validation, the connected process receives two

temperature indicators: one from the approved extension path and one from an older temporary extension binding used during early testing.

The observable artifact is a duplicate integration value: source persistence works, but downstream evidence contains both current and obsolete extension outputs. The governance rule prohibits changing standard process objects. The validation evidence must prove that only the approved governed extension path is active.

Which corrective action best resolves the downstream validation issue?

Response:

- A. Accept the validation because the approved temperature-handling value is present in the downstream process.
- B. Modify the standard downstream process so it ignores all duplicate temperature-handling values during validation.
- C. Ask TEMP_VAL_47 to re-enter the value so the approved extension output overwrites the temporary output.
- D. Deactivate the obsolete temporary extension binding and rerun validation through the approved governed extension path.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option resolves the issue at the extension-binding layer. Removing the obsolete temporary binding ensures the downstream process receives the value only from the approved clean-core extension path during validation.

Question: 9

A marine services company is setting up its SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition implementation governance before configuration execution begins. The project plan lists separate workstreams for configuration, extensibility, migration, integration, and automated testing. During readiness review, the implementation lead finds that no owner is assigned to approve cross-workstream dependencies before test scripts are locked.

The observable artifact is a planning control gap: each workstream has an owner, but no accountability exists for confirming that configuration, extension behavior, migrated data, and integration evidence align in the validation plan. The customer wants to keep the current workstream structure and avoid adding unnecessary hierarchy. The consultant must recommend a setup correction that supports traceable validation.

Which action best resolves the implementation setup gap?

Response:

- A. Let each workstream approve its own deliverables independently and reconcile mismatches after the validation run.
- B. Replace all workstream owners with one central lead who signs off every configuration and testing artifact.
- C. Start validation with current ownership because named workstream owners are sufficient for controlled execution.

D. Assign a dependency review responsibility to confirm cross-workstream alignment before scripts and evidence checkpoints are locked.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option resolves the gap at the governance-design layer while preserving the existing workstream model. A dependency review responsibility creates a traceable checkpoint that confirms cross-workstream alignment before validation materials are locked.

Question: 10

A precision tools company is validating a configured repair process in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. User REPAIR_VAL_20 opens the Fiori launchpad task and creates repair document REP-620. The document saves, and the first action is recorded. When the tester selects the configured completion action, the validation result shows that the document remains in an intermediate process state. The observable artifact is an activation inconsistency: the action is available to the user, but the configured completion behavior is not triggered for the repair process variant. The configuration owner confirms that the general process variant is active. The test rule requires evidence that the exact configured completion action moves the document to the final state.

Which action best corrects the process validation issue?

Response:

- A. Ask REPAIR_VAL_20 to create a new repair document because an intermediate state usually means the first identifier was not valid.
- B. Accept the validation because the completion action was visible and selectable in the Fiori task.
- C. Assign additional launchpad content to REPAIR_VAL_20 so the completion action can be displayed in another process tile.
- D. Verify that the completion action is activated and assigned to the final-state transition for the specific repair process variant.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option targets the correct configuration binding. The action must be active and assigned to the final-state transition for the exact process variant before execution can produce valid completion evidence.

Topic: 2

Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Plant Configuration Bundle and Rehearsal Release Control

The release coordinator wants to move the full configuration bundle into the cutover-rehearsal tenant to complete the checklist quickly. Some plant-specific staging entries still need plant-level sign-off. Which decision best supports valid cutover evidence?

Response:

- A. Release the full bundle because the rehearsal window is short and business users need complete coverage.
- B. Release only approved configuration entries and hold unapproved plant-specific staging behavior outside measured evidence.
- C. Release the full bundle but mark unapproved entries as pending after the checklist is completed.
- D. Ask planners to validate the unapproved entries manually and approve the bundle after production start.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This decision preserves traceability between approved configuration, rehearsal execution, and production start evidence. It prevents unapproved plant behavior from becoming part of measured cutover readiness.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 1 — Plant Configuration Bundle and Rehearsal Release Control

Approved staging configuration can be rehearsed while one high-value component staging entry remains unsigned. The change lead wants the rehearsal to continue without mixing evidence.

Which sequencing approach is most appropriate?

Response:

- A. Execute approved rehearsal cases and pause only the unsigned staging-dependent cases until sign-off is complete.
- B. Execute all cases and remove any failed results related to the unsigned staging entry later.
- C. Delay every cutover rehearsal task until all plant-specific entries are fully signed off.
- D. Move the unsigned entry into production scope because the plant needs a full rehearsal.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This approach keeps rehearsal progress moving while protecting evidence boundaries. It separates approved checklist execution from staging behavior that still requires sign-off.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 2 — Component Staging Role and Inventory Review Separation

Line supervisors can confirm component staging requests but cannot see inventory posting review items after supplier-managed component consumption. The plant manager asks to add inventory reviewer access to supervisors during rehearsal.

What is the best action?

Response:

- A. Add inventory reviewer access temporarily and remove it after the daily readiness report is produced.
- B. Confirm the intended review responsibility and validate role assignment or posting review routing before expanding supervisor access.
- C. Ask inventory reviewers to share their access with supervisors so readiness cases can be completed.
- D. Remove posting review items from the rehearsal evidence because staging confirmation has already succeeded.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This action checks whether visibility belongs to the supervisor or inventory reviewer role before changing authorization. It preserves role-separated cutover evidence and production access design.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 2 — Component Staging Role and Inventory Review Separation

A line supervisor can open the SAP Fiori launchpad space for staging and complete staging confirmation, but the related inventory posting review item does not appear. User accounts are active.

Which interpretation best fits the rehearsal instruction?

Response:

- A. Active accounts and staging access are enough to confirm supervisor readiness.
- B. The next validation should check whether the intended role and posting review routing expose the review item correctly.
- C. All supervisors should receive inventory reviewer access because they already confirm component staging.
- D. The component migration should be repeated because missing review items always indicate bad component records.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario separates basic task access from follow-on review visibility. The next validation should focus on role responsibility and posting review routing.

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/>