SAP

C_THR81

SAP Certified - SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central Core and Position Management

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/

Latest Version: 4.0
Subjects

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A consultant is validating position maintenance in a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central and Position Management environment before a reorganization freeze ends. In the web-based UI, managers can create new positions, but some newly created positions remain in a draft-like state and cannot be used in downstream planning activities even though the save action completes without error. Older positions created earlier in the project are available as expected. The customer confirms that the affected positions are all created under a newly introduced position category. The business wants a fix that keeps the category structure intact and avoids asking users to recreate positions manually across multiple departments.
What should the consultant investigate first?
Response:

A. Review the configuration dependency tied to the new position category and correct the setting that controls whether saved positions become usable for downstream planning.
B. Ask managers to keep using the older position categories until the new category can be removed from the design.
C. Grant managers broader access to planning activities so the newly created positions become selectable despite their current state.
D. Export the affected positions, change their identifiers externally, and reload them under a different category structure.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
The save action completes, so basic position creation is functioning. The issue is selective and limited to positions under a newly introduced category, which points to a category-specific dependency controlling downstream usability. Reviewing and correcting that configuration is the most direct way to restore expected behavior without disrupting the category design.

Question: 2

In a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central Core and Position Management project, a consultant is testing a workflow for manager-submitted temporary supervisory changes. In the web-based environment, requests save and enter workflow for all tested populations, but for one newly added operating population the request routes directly to the standard approval path instead of the intended review queue whenever both a temporary end date and a position-linked organizational impact are present.
Existing populations with the same combination still use the intended review path. The customer wants to preserve the shared workflow framework because separate population-specific workflows would increase post-go-live maintenance. The consultant must correct the routing behavior without redesigning the overall business process.
What is the best corrective action?
Response:

A. Add the intended review queue members to the standard approval path so affected requests still receive additional oversight.
B. Create a separate workflow for the new operating population so the intended review path is always used for those requests.
C. Review the routing condition or rule precedence for the new population, then correct the logic for requests combining temporary end date with position-linked organizational impact.
D. Ask managers in the new population to submit those requests through HR administrators until the routing design can be simplified later.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
The workflow engine is active because requests save and route. The defect appears only when two conditions interact and only for one newly added population, which indicates a rule-precedence or condition-resolution problem rather than missing workflow activation. Correcting that logic addresses the upstream cause while preserving the shared workflow model.

Question: 3

In a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central and Position Management tenant, a consultant is validating a position reclassification process in the web-based UI before a quarterly workforce planning cycle. HR specialists can update a position’s category and save successfully, but for a subset of records the vacancy planning indicator remains locked in the prior state after save.

The same process works for older positions in the tenant. The customer confirms that the affected positions were created under a newly introduced lifecycle status sequence and must remain in that sequence because reporting depends on it. The consultant must restore correct downstream position behavior without asking HR specialists to maintain planning indicators manually for each reclassified position.
What is the best first action?
Response:

A. Ask HR specialists to update the vacancy planning indicator manually after each position reclassification until the quarter closes.
B. Review the dependency between the new lifecycle status sequence and position reclassification behavior, then correct the configuration controlling how the planning indicator is updated after save.
C. Give workforce planners broader edit access so they can override the locked indicator directly during planning preparation.
D. Recreate the affected positions under the older status sequence so the existing reclassification behavior applies again.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
The position change itself saves, so the basic update path is functioning. The breakdown appears only for records using the newly introduced lifecycle status sequence, which points to a second-order dependency between lifecycle status handling and post-save position behavior. Correcting that configuration restores automatic planning-indicator updates without abandoning the new reporting design.

Question: 4

In a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central and Position Management project, a consultant is validating a controlled process where approved vacant positions should become available for staffing preparation. In the web-based environment, position approval completes successfully and the status appears updated, but a subset of approved positions still does not appear in the next staffing-related step.
Positions created earlier in the project behave correctly. The affected records were all loaded during a recent hierarchy expansion and share the same new parent structure. The customer wants the consultant to preserve the position-driven operating model and avoid recreating large numbers of positions before the next test cycle.
What is the best action to take first?
Response:

A. Review the dependency between approved position status and downstream staffing availability for the newly expanded hierarchy, then correct the configuration or binding that is not resolving for those positions.
B. Allow staffing users to create requests without selecting positions until the expanded hierarchy can be rebuilt after testing.

C. Give staffing users broader search visibility so the approved positions appear even if the downstream readiness state is not fully aligned.
D. Recreate the newly expanded hierarchy with simplified parent structures so future positions inherit a cleaner setup automatically.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
The key artifact is a state mismatch: approval is complete, yet downstream staffing availability does not follow. Because only positions in the new parent structure are affected, the likely second-order cause is not the approval itself but the binding between hierarchy setup and the next process step. Correcting that dependency repairs the upstream cause without abandoning the position-driven design.

Question: 5

In a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central tenant, a consultant is validating manager self-service before a customer demo. Managers can open employee profiles and submit workflow requests for job information changes, but they cannot see the position data block that was added for the pilot. The block is visible for HR administrators in the same web-based environment.
A quick review shows that the position-related fields are configured and already used in the tenant. The customer asks for a fix that preserves current data access restrictions because position details include planning-sensitive information. The consultant has limited time and must avoid broadening access beyond what managers need for their own reporting lines.
What is the best action to restore the missing manager view while keeping governance intact?
Response:

A. Grant managers the same role permissions used by HR administrators for position data so the block becomes visible immediately.
B. Review role-based permission target population and position-related permissions for the manager role, then adjust only the manager scope required for supported reporting lines.
C. Reimport the position data so the system refreshes the employee profile and rebuilds the missing block.
D. Disable the position block for HR administrators and rebuild it with a new configuration that is shared across all roles.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
The visible symptom is a missing position block for managers, but the second reasoning layer is authorization scope, not object existence. HR administrators can see the block, which confirms the block and position-related configuration are active. The likely upstream dependency is that the manager role lacks either the required position permissions, the correct target population, or both. Adjusting only the manager scope preserves governance and restores access only where the reporting relationship allows it.

Topic: 2
Unified Scenario Exam - US01

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 1 — Foundation Data Sequence for Field Workforce Setup
During validation, several position records can be selected during employee assignment, but the regional context shown later in review does not match the expected operating area. The team confirms that some corporate data values were created after the initial position import.
Which action best supports a controlled correction before the next manager test cycle?
Response:

A. Reload all employee and position records so that every imported object is rebuilt using the newest corporate data values.
B. Validate the active foundation data referenced by affected records, then selectively correct or reload only dependent records with confirmed mismatches.
C. Expand HR specialist permissions temporarily so that users can correct affected employee and position records during testing.
D. Continue manager validation and document the behavior as a known limitation until the next rollout wave.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option addresses the dependency between foundation data timing and downstream position behavior without assuming every record is invalid. It preserves validation time while still requiring evidence before a selective correction or reload is made.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 1 — Foundation Data Sequence for Field Workforce Setup
The import logs do not show a single rejected file, yet position assignments behave differently depending on which regional values are referenced. The project lead wants to avoid a broad reload unless the second-order cause is clear.
What should the consultant determine first?
Response:

A. Whether workflow approvers can manually reroute affected position changes during the next validation cycle.
B. Whether all regional managers have the same permission role before reviewing imported positions.
C. Whether affected position records reference foundation values that were inactive, missing, or created after the import sequence.
D. Whether HR specialists can edit the employee records directly from the employee profile screen.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
The scenario points to a second-order dependency where imported records may save but later behave inconsistently because referenced foundation values were not stable at import time. Confirming that dependency is necessary before choosing a reload, permission change, or workflow adjustment.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 2 — Position Assignment Visibility Across Regional Teams
A regional manager can see some position records outside their operating area, while another valid position in their own division is not visible during review. HR specialists report that the same position can still be used during assignment.
Which validation path best distinguishes position setup behavior from a general permission complaint?
Response:

A. Compare position attributes, employee assignment context, and manager-view visibility using representative users from multiple regions.
B. Grant the regional manager broader access to all position records so that visibility can be tested without regional restrictions.
C. Reassign the hidden position to a different supervisor and repeat the review from the original manager account.
D. Ask HR specialists to complete all position assignments centrally until manager visibility is reviewed after rollout.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option checks the relationship between position data, assignment behavior, and manager visibility across realistic users. It separates a configuration or data-alignment cause from a broad access complaint.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 2 — Position Assignment Visibility Across Regional Teams
The team can make position assignments successfully, but manager review does not consistently reflect the regional operating model. The business sponsor asks whether the next test cycle can proceed if HR completes assignments on behalf of managers.
Which response best reflects the performance-versus-governance trade-off?
Response:

A. Proceed with HR-only assignment because it keeps the test cycle on schedule and avoids manager support delays.
B. Allow managers to view all positions during testing, then restore regional filtering before production preparation.

C. Proceed only after manager-facing visibility is validated for representative regional contexts, even if some test activities are narrowed.
D. Delay all testing until every employee and position record across the full company is reloaded and reviewed.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option preserves governance boundaries while still allowing controlled progress through representative validation. It recognizes that schedule pressure cannot justify bypassing manager-facing visibility behavior that is central to the rollout.

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 3 — Role-Based Access Boundaries for HR Operations
Support tickets increase because some HR specialists cannot view records they believe they need for validation. A project coordinator suggests temporarily assigning a broader HR role to all regional HR users until testing is complete.
What is the best configuration decision?
Response:

A. Use broad temporary access because the environment is still preproduction and validation speed is the immediate priority.
B. Adjust target populations and role assignments based on the intended regional responsibilities, then retest with representative HR users.
C. Remove regional restrictions from employee records and rely on workflow approvals to control inappropriate changes.
D. Defer permission validation until after position and workflow testing are fully complete.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option keeps access aligned with the regional operating model while allowing valid HR testing to continue. It addresses the governance-sensitive permission structure directly rather than masking it with broad access.

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 3 — Role-Based Access Boundaries for HR Operations
Two governance goals compete during testing: HR specialists need enough access to complete assigned validation tasks, while regional employee and position data should remain restricted to the correct operating area.
Which option best handles this governance-versus-governance prioritization?
Response:

A. Prioritize data restriction by removing HR specialist access until regional managers complete their own validation.
B. Prioritize validation speed by giving HR specialists cross-region access and tracking any inappropriate use manually.
C. Configure access around intended regional responsibility and use representative users to confirm both task completion and boundary enforcement.
D. Keep current permissions unchanged and treat any blocked HR activity as evidence that the configuration is secure.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option balances both governance goals: enabling assigned work and enforcing regional boundaries. It validates the intended model rather than choosing one governance objective to the exclusion of the other.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 4 — Workflow Routing for Cross-Regional Position Changes
A position-change request can be initiated successfully, but approver assignment varies when the position belongs to a region whose corporate data was adjusted after the original import. The team is considering a workflow rule change.
What should be validated before changing workflow routing?
Response:

A. Whether the position and organizational context used by the workflow is stable and correctly reflected in affected records.
B. Whether all regional managers can be added as approvers to every position-change workflow.
C. Whether HR specialists can bypass the approval step for test records until routing is stabilized.
D. Whether the workflow notification text clearly explains that approver assignment may vary during testing.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
The workflow behavior may depend on position and organizational data that was affected by earlier sequencing. Validating that context first prevents changing workflow rules to compensate for unstable source data.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 4 — Workflow Routing for Cross-Regional Position Changes

After selected data corrections, one regional position-change workflow routes correctly, but another comparable request still reaches an unexpected approver. The team wants to close the readiness review with minimal additional testing.
Which next step best confirms whether the correction is sufficient?
Response:

A. Approve the corrected workflow case and treat the remaining variation as a user-training item.
B. Apply the same correction to all regions and close workflow validation after one successful retest.
C. Execute representative position-change transactions across affected regional contexts and compare approver results against the expected responsibility model.
D. Disable workflow routing for position changes until all regional managers complete access validation.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
One successful retest is not enough when comparable requests still route differently. Representative cross-region workflow execution confirms whether the correction consistently aligns position context with approver responsibility.
Topic: 3
Unified Scenario Exam - US02

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 1 — Location Data Readiness for Clinic Employee Records
During template validation, HR analysts can create employee records for clinic locations, but rehabilitation-center records show different required-field behavior. Recent configuration notes show that some location-related values were refreshed after employee and position validation began.
Which action best supports a controlled readiness decision?
Response:

A. Pause all validation and rebuild every location, department, employee, and position record from the beginning.
B. Compare affected records against active location and department values, then correct only records with confirmed dependent-data impact.
C. Give HR analysts broader edit access so they can manually complete the missing fields during validation.
D. Continue testing because the records save successfully and required-field behavior can be reviewed after rollout.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:

This option tests the dependency between refreshed location values and employee record behavior before selecting a correction scope. It supports a bounded readiness decision without assuming that every template record is affected.

Question: 15

CHALLENGE 1 — Location Data Readiness for Clinic Employee Records
The implementation lead notices that some rehabilitation-center employee records behave differently from comparable clinic records even though both use the same core employee template. The location values were refreshed shortly before the validation cycle.
What should the consultant determine first?
Response:

A. Whether the affected employee records reference location and department values that were active and aligned when validation began.
B. Whether HR shared services can complete all rehabilitation-center records without manager participation.
C. Whether the workflow notification for rehabilitation-center employees uses the correct message text.
D. Whether department managers should be removed from validation until the template is finalized.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
The first step is to test whether the different behavior is caused by the data context used by affected records. The scenario suggests a second-order dependency between refreshed location values and later employee-record behavior.

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/