

# SAP C\_TFG61

**SAP Certified - Administrator - SAP Fieldglass Services  
Procurement**

**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-tfg61>**

# Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

**Topic: 1**  
**Micro Skill Drill Exam**

## Question: 1

A regional specialty retail chain is preparing SAP Fieldglass Services Procurement for outsourced store-layout survey services in a public cloud, web-based environment. The administrator is asked to support the first SOW for a newly launched premium store format. Operations has confirmed the supplier and survey scope, but procurement wants the SOW to use the correct service category and business unit so approval routing and later reporting reflect the premium format.

The service category exists, but it is associated only with the standard store business unit. A coordinator suggests creating the SOW under the standard business unit and correcting the reporting classification after the first survey is invoiced. The measurable constraint is that the first SOW must support the premium-format approval and reporting structure from the initial cycle.

Which recommendation best supports accurate administrative setup?

Response:

- A. Create the SOW under the standard business unit and correct the reporting classification after the first invoice.
- B. Create the SOW without service-category assignment because supplier and survey scope are already confirmed.
- C. Validate the service category association with the premium business unit before SOW creation, then confirm inherited values.
- D. Delay all survey SOWs until every future store format and service category has been modeled across the chain.

**Answer: C**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option validates the administrative object relationship before business process execution. Confirming the service category association with the premium business unit supports correct SOW inheritance, approval routing, and reporting evidence from the first cycle.

## Question: 2

A multinational facilities management provider uses SAP Fieldglass Services Procurement to monitor active services engagements. The procurement director wants a dashboard showing SOW status, supplier activity, and invoice exposure for regional managers. The analytics team can build the report

quickly, but the administrator must ensure that managers only see data for their permitted business area.

The measurable constraint is that the dashboard must be available before the monthly review, while access must remain aligned to role and organizational visibility. A proposal is made to grant broad report access temporarily and reduce permissions after the review.

Which recommendation best balances reporting speed with governance control?

Response:

- A. Build the dashboard using the required metrics and validate report access against the managers' assigned visibility before release.
- B. Grant broad report access for the review, because the dashboard can be corrected after stakeholders confirm the metrics.
- C. Publish a dashboard with only invoice totals, because limiting the data avoids the need to validate report access.
- D. Delay all dashboard delivery until a new enterprise analytics model is designed for every procurement process.

**Answer: A**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option satisfies the reporting objective while acting at the access-control layer before release. The dashboard can support the monthly review, and validating visibility against manager assignments provides evidence that operational reporting does not expose data outside the intended scope.

### Question: 3

A hospital network uses SAP Fieldglass Services Procurement to manage outsourced biomedical equipment calibration. A supplier has been approved for urgent calibration work across two clinical sites, and the maintenance director wants worker time and travel expenses opened immediately. The environment is public cloud and web-based.

The administrator notices that the supplier is active, but the selected service role has not been checked against the rate structure that separates on-site calibration time from travel-related expenses. Finance requires the first submitted activity to price correctly and flow into invoice review without manual reclassification. The measurable constraint is that urgent work may begin only after the submission setup can support clean time, expense, and invoice processing.

Which recommendation best supports urgent execution without creating downstream invoice risk?

Response:

- A. Open time and expense submission immediately because supplier approval confirms the supplier can perform the calibration work.
- B. Allow time submission first and ask finance to reclassify travel expenses during invoice review if they appear incorrectly.
- C. Confirm the service role and applicable rate structure for calibration time and travel expenses before enabling worker submission activity.
- D. Hold all calibration SOWs until every hospital site finalizes future biomedical service rates across the network.

**Answer: C**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option validates the administrative layer that controls how submitted activity is priced and classified. Confirming the service role and applicable rate structure before submission supports accurate time, expense, and invoice behavior while still allowing urgent work to begin after the necessary readiness check.

### Question: 4

A medical device distributor uses SAP Fieldglass Services Procurement to manage outsourced installation services. During readiness testing, approved supplier invoice data is expected to flow to an internal finance application through an enabled connector and agreed secure transfer process. The integration monitor shows that the scheduled transfer completed, but the finance team reports that two approved invoices did not appear for downstream processing.

The project lead suggests resending the full invoice batch immediately. The integration analyst recommends checking connector scope, generated file contents, and downstream acceptance evidence before any resend. The measurable constraint is to restore invoice processing without creating duplicate records or changing the secure transfer method.

Which recommendation best addresses the integration issue?

Response:

- A. Change the secure transfer method immediately because missing invoices prove that the current transport approach is unreliable.
- B. Ask finance to enter the missing invoices manually and continue integration testing during the next scheduled cycle.
- C. Resend the full invoice batch because the missing records indicate that the original transfer was incomplete.
- D. Review connector scope, generated file contents, and downstream acceptance evidence before deciding whether a targeted corrected resend is required.

**Answer: D**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option investigates the correct integration layers before recovery. Reviewing connector scope, generated file contents, and downstream acceptance evidence separates scheduled transfer completion from successful processing and supports a controlled targeted correction if needed.

### Question: 5

A railway maintenance contractor uses SAP Fieldglass Services Procurement for signal inspection SOWs. During testing, approved SOW data is expected to flow to an internal finance application through an enabled connector and secure transfer process. The integration monitor shows that the scheduled

transfer ran, but the finance team reports that one approved SOW was not available for downstream commitment tracking.

The project lead suggests resending all SOW updates from the test cycle. The integration analyst wants to compare connector scope, generated payload evidence, and downstream acceptance before any resend. The measurable constraint is to restore commitment tracking without creating duplicate or mismatched SOW records.

Which recommendation best addresses the integration concern?

Response:

- A. Review connector scope, generated SOW payload evidence, and downstream acceptance before deciding whether a targeted correction is required.
- B. Resend all SOW updates from the test cycle because the missing commitment proves the first transfer was incomplete.
- C. Ask finance to create the commitment manually and continue integration testing with the next approved SOW.
- D. Replace the secure transfer method before checking connector evidence because downstream absence indicates transport failure.

**Answer: A**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option investigates the correct integration layers before recovery is attempted. Reviewing connector scope, payload evidence, and downstream acceptance separates scheduled transfer execution from successful commitment processing and supports a controlled correction without duplicate SOW records.

## Question: 6

A pharmaceutical research organization uses SAP Fieldglass Services Procurement to manage laboratory validation services in a public cloud, web-based environment. As the administrator, you are advising the sourcing lead before a new SOW template is used for regulated facility work. Legal requires approved clause language, procurement wants reusable milestone events, and finance needs the fee structure to support staged supplier billing.

A project manager proposes creating a basic SOW first and adding library clauses, milestone events, and fees after the supplier confirms availability. The measurable constraint is that the first supplier-facing SOW must contain the approved contractual structure and must not require revision before internal approval.

Which recommendation best supports controlled supplier-facing SOW creation?

Response:

- A. Create the basic SOW first and add clauses, events, and fees after the supplier confirms that resources are available.
- B. Configure the template with approved library clauses, milestone events, fee structure, and approval readiness before generating the first SOW.
- C. Configure only the clause library first, because legal language is the primary control needed before supplier review.

D. Ask finance to approve staged billing manually for the first SOW and standardize the template after the pilot engagement.

**Answer: B**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option establishes the reusable template dependencies before the SOW is generated. Approved clauses, milestone events, fees, and approval readiness are available at the point of document creation, which supports controlled supplier review and avoids preventable rework.

### Question: 7

A beverage manufacturing group uses SAP Fieldglass Services Procurement to manage outsourced production-line sanitation services. A supplier has accepted a short-term SOW for weekend plant cleaning, and the operations manager wants SOW workers to begin logging activity as soon as the shift starts. The environment is public cloud and web-based.

The SOW is approved, but the administrator sees that one cleaning crew is still pending worker lifecycle confirmation. Operations proposes allowing all workers to submit activity and correcting any unmatched records after the first cycle. The measurable constraint is that every first-cycle submission must be traceable to a confirmed SOW worker state for later time, expense, and invoice validation.

Which recommendation best supports a controlled weekend launch?

Response:

A. Allow all workers to submit activity because SOW approval confirms that the supplier engagement is ready.

B. Permit the pending crew to submit activity and ask finance to reconcile unmatched records before invoice review.

C. Replace the weekend cleaning SOW with a broader annual sanitation SOW to avoid worker confirmation issues.

D. Enable submission only after the pending crew is confirmed, then validate first-cycle activity against the confirmed SOW worker structure.

**Answer: D**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option addresses the lifecycle dependency before activity submission begins. Confirming the pending crew and validating first-cycle activity against the SOW worker structure supports traceable execution without relying on later correction.

### Question: 8

A logistics company is standardizing services procurement for depot maintenance through SAP Fieldglass Services Procurement. The procurement director wants a simple workflow that lets local managers

initiate SOW activity quickly, while corporate finance requires approval evidence before supplier work can create payable activity. The environment is public cloud and web-based.

Two recommendations are being considered. One would let managers submit SOWs directly to suppliers and collect approval notes outside the system. The other would keep approval inside the services procurement workflow before supplier execution. The timing constraint is that the first depot must go live this month, but the process must remain reusable for later depots.

Which recommendation best supports the workflow objective and long-term rollout?

Response:

- A. Let local managers send SOWs directly to suppliers and attach approval notes later to preserve go-live timing.
- B. Require corporate finance to approve every supplier time entry manually, because it gives the strongest control after work begins.
- C. Build a separate manual approval tracker for the first depot and revisit SAP Fieldglass workflow setup during later rollout waves.
- D. Configure the services procurement workflow so approval evidence is captured before supplier execution, then reuse the pattern for later depots.

**Answer: D**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option aligns approval capture with the correct workflow stage before supplier execution. It supports the immediate go-live constraint while creating a repeatable administration pattern for later depots without relying on external approval tracking.

### Question: 9

A fisheries cooperative uses SAP Fieldglass Services Procurement to manage outsourced vessel inspection services. Supplier administration data is received from an internal vendor governance system through an enabled connector and agreed secure transfer process. The integration monitor shows that the latest supplier update completed, but the approved supplier appears under the wrong service region and cannot be used for the intended inspection SOW.

The procurement lead suggests creating a second supplier record under the correct region so the SOW can proceed. The integration owner recommends reviewing connector mapping, regional code values, transferred supplier data, and processing evidence before any manual action. The measurable constraint is to make the supplier usable without duplicate records or weakening the secure transfer process.

Which recommendation best addresses the supplier integration issue?

Response:

- A. Review connector mapping, regional code values, transferred supplier data, and processing evidence before deciding whether a corrected supplier update is required.
- B. Create a second supplier record under the correct service region and merge the records after the inspection SOW is complete.
- C. Change the secure transfer method because successful transfer with the wrong region proves that the transport design is unsuitable.

D. Ask procurement to use a similar approved supplier temporarily and replace the supplier reference after invoice review.

**Answer: A**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option investigates the correct integration and data-processing layers before recovery is attempted. Reviewing mapping, regional codes, transferred data, and processing evidence supports a controlled correction that preserves supplier identity and avoids duplicate records.

## Question: 10

A regional disaster recovery services company uses SAP Fieldglass Services Procurement to manage outsourced building-damage assessment services in a public cloud, web-based environment. A reusable SOW template is being prepared for rapid-response assessments after severe weather events. Operations needs standard assessment events, legal requires the current approved clause library, and finance requires fee elements for fixed site assessments and reimbursable emergency travel. The administrator sees that a previously used template is still available, but it references an older clause library and does not include the current emergency travel fee element. The response lead wants the first supplier-facing SOW issued immediately using the available template. The measurable constraint is that rapid deployment must not use obsolete template content or incomplete fee coverage. Which recommendation best supports controlled template use?

Response:

- A. Use the available template now and replace obsolete clauses and missing travel fees after supplier acceptance.
- B. Remove emergency travel fees from the first SOW and let finance manage those costs outside the reusable template.
- C. Update the template with the current approved clause library and emergency travel fee element before generating the first supplier-facing SOW.
- D. Create a one-time manually reviewed SOW for the first event and update the reusable template after supplier assessment work begins.

**Answer: C**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option resolves the template content dependency before document generation. Updating the approved clause library and emergency travel fee element supports a supplier-facing SOW that is reusable, approvable, and complete for the rapid deployment scenario.

**Topic: 2**

**Unified Scenario Exam**

## Question: 11

### CHALLENGE 1 — Transit Service Template and Fee Readiness

An elevator inspection SOW shows an inspection surcharge in the internal draft, but the supplier-facing response does not display the surcharge. The supplier can still submit the response successfully. Which recommendation best supports UAT readiness?

Response:

- A. Accept the response because successful supplier submission proves the SOW request is usable.
- B. Correct and validate supplier-facing surcharge visibility before using the response as UAT evidence.
- C. Ask the supplier to confirm the surcharge by email and attach the email after award.
- D. Remove the surcharge from the SOW and let finance add it during invoice review.

**Answer: B**

Explanation:

Feedback:

Supplier submission is not enough because the supplier must see the commercial detail needed to price the response. Correcting and validating supplier-facing surcharge visibility protects both supplier response quality and downstream invoice evidence.

## Question: 12

### CHALLENGE 1 — Transit Service Template and Fee Readiness

The project team wants to reuse the depot cleaning template for station signage work because both services use supplier coordination and scheduled work. Signage work also includes installation milestones and restricted safety notes.

What is the best response?

Response:

- A. Reuse the depot cleaning template because scheduled supplier work is the main setup requirement.
- B. Validate or adjust the signage template so milestones, supplier coordination, approvals, and safety-note visibility work for that service type.
- C. Ask the supplier to identify signage-specific requirements after the SOW response is submitted.
- D. Use one generic scheduled-services template and let reviewers correct differences during invoice approval.

**Answer: B**

Explanation:

Feedback:

Scheduled work is only one part of template readiness. Signage work has different milestone and visibility requirements, so the template must be validated or adjusted before UAT evidence is accepted.

## Question: 13

### CHALLENGE 2 — Depot Crew Activity and Reviewer Ownership

A depot cleaning worker is assigned to the correct supplier project, but the depot reviewer cannot see the shift activity needed to confirm completion. The SOW and supplier response are otherwise complete.

What should the administrator check first?

Response:

- A. Worker activity setup, depot reviewer role visibility, shift attribution, and depot cost-center context.
- B. Supplier onboarding status, because activity visibility is controlled only by supplier activation.
- C. Safety-note access, because public-safety note visibility determines all depot cleaning activity views.
- D. Invoice extract status, because downstream transfer acceptance controls activity visibility in the web UI.

**Answer: A**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The symptom is about reviewer visibility into activity evidence for depot cleaning completion. The likely dependency is activity setup, reviewer role visibility, shift attribution, and depot cost-center context.

## Question: 14

### **CHALLENGE 2 — Depot Crew Activity and Reviewer Ownership**

Depot cleaning must continue to support service readiness, but finance says overtime must be visible by depot before invoice approval.

Which recommendation best balances speed and governance?

Response:

- A. Continue depot cleaning activity validation while holding invoice readiness signoff for affected records until depot-level overtime evidence is corrected.
- B. Stop all depot cleaning SOWs until every supplier and depot cost center is reloaded.
- C. Approve overtime invoices now and reconcile depot ownership after the next UAT pass.
- D. Move all depot cleaning overtime to one regional cost center until reporting stabilizes.

**Answer: A**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This separates operational continuity from invoice readiness. It allows depot cleaning validation to continue while protecting depot-level overtime evidence before payment review.

**Thank You for Trying Our Product**  
**Special 16 USD Discount Coupon: NSZUBG3X**  
**Email: [support@examsempire.com](mailto:support@examsempire.com)**

**Check our Customer Testimonials and ratings  
available on every product page.**

**Visit our website.**

**<https://examsempire.com/>**