

SAP C_BRU2C

**SAP Certified - SAP Billing and Revenue Innovation
Management - Usage to Cash**

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-bru2c>

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A subscription-based document automation provider is piloting BRIM Usage-to-Cash for metered document generation while keeping a legacy renewal process active during transition. Separate tests confirm rating, billable item creation, invoice simulation, and FI-CA follow-up. In the integrated pilot, some current usage charges are invoiced together with renewal-related test data from the legacy cycle. The invoice amount is mathematically correct, but the transaction set does not represent one clean pilot flow. The sponsor wants to continue the transition without redesigning validated component configuration.

The constraint is that the next test must isolate the pilot Usage-to-Cash flow from legacy-cycle data while preserving existing component settings.

Which action best supports the transition objective?

Response:

- A. Simplify all metered document-generation prices so legacy and pilot charges produce identical amounts.
- B. Continue testing because the invoice total is correct even if the transaction sources are mixed.
- C. Validate a controlled pilot data set across rating, billable item processing, invoicing, and FI-CA follow-up.
- D. Move financial follow-up to a later phase so the pilot can focus only on rating and invoice creation.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the artifact shows that current usage charges and legacy renewal data are combined in one integrated test. Validating a controlled pilot data set confirms that rating, billable item processing, invoicing, and FI-CA follow-up are based on the same transition flow.

Question: 2

A subscription-based facility robotics provider is validating FI-CA follow-up for usage-based autonomous floor-cleaning hours in a mixed BRIM Usage-to-Cash cycle. Cleaning-hour events are rated correctly, billable items are selected, and the invoice document shows the expected charges. During receivable review, the open item is created, but it is assigned to the customer's standard equipment-service contract account instead of the robotics-service accounting structure required for reconciliation. Invoice selection, document grouping, and pricing have already been confirmed as correct.

The constraint is that the correction must focus only on the financial assignment of the receivable after invoice creation.

What should the consultant validate first?

Response:

- A. The robotics-service fee condition used during Convergent Charging price determination.
- B. The FI-CA contract account assignment and accounting structure used for robotics-service receivables.
- C. The invoice selection control used to include cleaning-hour items in the customer document.
- D. The allowance relationship used to determine whether cleaning-hour usage becomes chargeable.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the mismatch appears during receivable review after successful rating, billable item selection, and invoice creation. Validating the FI-CA contract account assignment and accounting structure targets the layer responsible for placing the open item in the intended reconciliation structure.

Question: 3

A utilities company is testing its first monthly BRIM Usage-to-Cash cycle after enabling a new invoicing setup. Usage events from Convergent Charging are rated successfully, and billable items are visible for the customer. However, the test invoice run excludes several rated items that belong to the current billing period. The operations analyst notes that the excluded items have no rating errors and are assigned to the expected customer contract account. The project team wants to avoid unnecessary changes to pricing because the rated amounts match the expected test results.

The constraint is that the correction must focus on why valid rated items are not selected during invoicing execution.

Which action best addresses the likely system-layer issue?

Response:

- A. Modify the charge plan so the excluded usage events create different rated amounts before billable item transfer.
- B. Validate the invoicing selection criteria and billable item processing status for the affected billing period.
- C. Change the customer contract account so all open items are posted before the invoice run starts.
- D. Rebuild the allowance plan so the rated usage events are grouped into a separate entitlement bucket.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the issue occurs at the invoicing execution layer, where billable item status and selection criteria determine whether rated items enter the invoice run. Validating those settings targets the layer that controls inclusion of already-rated items for the current billing period.

Question: 4

A laboratory diagnostics network is testing a usage-based offer for outsourced test analysis in a mixed BRIM Usage-to-Cash landscape. The pricing model should apply one fee for routine analysis and a higher fee for priority analysis. During a controlled rating test, priority analysis events are accepted, and the event detail contains the priority indicator. The rated result is created successfully, but the routine fee is applied. No billable item processing or invoicing validation has started. The pricing analyst confirms that the priority fee condition exists, but the test result suggests the condition is not being selected during rating.

The constraint is that the team must correct the source rated amount before downstream billing artifacts are created.

Which action should be performed first?

Response:

- A. Adjust invoice simulation so priority analysis receives the higher fee when the customer document is created.
- B. Assign priority analysis customers to a separate FI-CA contract account group before continuing the test.
- C. Transfer the rated result into billable item processing to confirm whether the higher fee appears later.
- D. Validate the priority fee condition selection and its binding within the active charge plan used for the subscription.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the event contains the priority indicator, but the rating result still uses the routine fee. Validating condition selection and binding within the active charge plan targets the configuration layer that determines the source rated amount.

Question: 5

A regional telecom operator is validating customer account behavior during a BRIM Usage-to-Cash test cycle. Rated items are converted into billable items, and the invoice document is created with the expected usage and recurring charges. During financial follow-up, the receivable does not appear under the expected contract account structure for the customer. The invoice output is correct, but the finance tester cannot reconcile the open item against the account grouping defined for the test customer. The project team asks for a focused correction without changing charging or invoicing rules.

The constraint is that the invoice calculation must remain unchanged because the issue appears only after invoicing, during financial account assignment validation.

What is the best next step?

Response:

- A. Reconfigure the recurring charge so the invoice creates a separate billable item for financial reconciliation.

- B. Change the invoicing layout so the finance tester can identify the receivable more clearly during validation.
- C. Review the FI-CA contract accounting structure and customer account assignment used for the invoiced item.
- D. Adjust the usage allowance model so rated usage items inherit a different customer-facing charge category.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the mismatch appears after invoicing when the receivable should be represented in the expected contract accounting structure. Reviewing the FI-CA structure and account assignment targets the layer responsible for financial placement of the invoiced item.

Question: 6

A mobility services provider is testing usage rating for a new distance-based subscription offer. The configured price model should apply a different usage fee once a customer crosses a defined distance band. During testing, the event is accepted and produces a rated result, but the amount remains in the first distance band even when the test usage quantity exceeds the threshold. The subscription assignment is correct, and there is no billable item transfer error. The pricing analyst asks whether the team should adjust invoicing because the invoice would otherwise show an undercharged amount. The constraint is that the correction must address the source of the incorrect rated amount before downstream processing continues.

Which action should be taken first?

Response:

- A. Review the threshold logic in the active price model and confirm it is bound to the relevant charge plan.
- B. Change the invoice run so the higher distance band is applied when customer documents are created.
- C. Modify the customer contract account so high-distance usage is separated during financial posting.
- D. Continue with invoicing and correct the amount manually during financial reconciliation.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the incorrect amount is created during rating when the distance threshold should influence price determination. Reviewing the threshold logic and confirming its binding to the relevant charge plan addresses the source configuration that controls the rated result.

Question: 7

A subscription-based marine weather intelligence provider is testing a usage-based offer for route-risk forecasts in a mixed BRIM Usage-to-Cash landscape. The pricing model should apply a base fee for daily

forecasts and a higher fee when a storm-risk enrichment is requested. During rating validation, enriched forecast events are accepted, and the event detail contains the storm-risk enrichment indicator. The rated result is created successfully, but the base forecast fee is applied. No billable item transfer or invoice simulation has started. The pricing analyst confirms that the storm-risk enrichment fee condition exists in the prepared configuration.

The constraint is that the source rated amount must be corrected before downstream billing validation begins.

Which action should be performed first?

Response:

- A. Transfer the rated result into billable item processing to verify whether the enrichment fee appears later.
- B. Validate the storm-risk enrichment pricing condition and its assignment within the active charge plan.
- C. Adjust invoice simulation so enriched forecasts receive the higher amount on the customer document.
- D. Assign enriched-forecast customers to a separate FI-CA contract account group for reconciliation.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the event carries the storm-risk enrichment indicator, but the rating result still applies the base fee. Validating the pricing condition and its assignment within the active charge plan targets the configuration layer that determines the source rated amount.

Question: 8

A subscription insurance services provider is validating financial follow-up for a BRIM Usage-to-Cash pilot. The rating result is correct, billable items are selected, and the invoice document contains the expected usage fees. When the receivable is reviewed, it is assigned to a contract account grouping that does not match the customer's configured business relationship. The finance team can see the open item, but it appears under the wrong accounting structure for reconciliation. The implementation consultant is asked to correct the root cause without disturbing the validated rating and invoicing setup. The constraint is that pricing and invoice selection must remain unchanged because the mismatch appears only after invoice creation.

What should the consultant validate first?

Response:

- A. The charge plan fee condition used to produce the rated amount for the customer's usage event.
- B. The invoice selection variant used to decide which billable items enter the invoice run.
- C. The FI-CA contract account assignment and related accounting structure used for the customer.
- D. The allowance consumption rule used to determine whether usage is chargeable or entitlement-based.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the observable mismatch is in financial account grouping during receivable review. Validating the FI-CA contract account assignment and accounting structure targets the layer responsible for where the open item is represented for reconciliation.

Question: 9

A subscription-based telemedicine provider is testing a BRIM Usage-to-Cash offer for virtual consultation minutes in a mixed landscape. The package includes a recurring access fee and a night-time consultation allowance. During testing, night-time consultations consume the allowance correctly, but daytime consultations also reduce the same allowance even though they should be rated as standard chargeable usage. The rating trace shows accepted events for both time categories and the correct subscription assignment. No billable item transfer or invoice simulation has started.

The constraint is that night-time allowance consumption must remain unchanged while daytime consultations must stop consuming the allowance.

What should the consultant validate first?

Response:

- A. The allowance applicability condition and time-category usage binding within the active charge plan relationship.
- B. The invoice selection rule so daytime consultation items are excluded from the customer document.
- C. The FI-CA contract account assignment used to post daytime consultation receivables after invoicing.
- D. The recurring access fee setup so night-time and daytime consultations use separate subscriptions.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the artifact shows that accepted usage is being bound to the wrong allowance condition during rating. Validating the allowance applicability condition and time-category binding targets the configuration relationship that determines whether consultation usage consumes entitlement or becomes chargeable.

Question: 10

A municipal waste-management provider is testing BRIM Usage-to-Cash for commercial pickup services. The usage events are rated correctly, billable items are included in invoicing, and the invoice document shows the expected pickup charges. During financial validation, the open item appears under the customer account but not under the contract account structure expected for commercial service reconciliation. The finance tester reports that the invoice total is correct, yet the receivable cannot be matched to the intended accounting grouping. The project lead wants a correction without changing pickup pricing or invoice selection.

The constraint is that the issue must be resolved at the financial assignment layer because all upstream billing artifacts are validated.

Which action best addresses the observed mismatch?

Response:

- A. Reconfigure the pickup usage price so the invoiced charge creates a new rated result category.
- B. Change invoice selection so commercial pickup items are processed in a separate invoice run.
- C. Review the FI-CA contract account assignment and accounting structure used for commercial service items.
- D. Modify the allowance model so commercial pickups consume entitlement before receivables are created.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the artifact appears during financial validation after rating and invoicing have succeeded. Reviewing the FI-CA contract account assignment and accounting structure targets the layer responsible for representing the receivable in the intended reconciliation grouping.

Topic: 2

Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 3 — Legacy Credit Balance Separation for Cooperatives

A migrated cooperative account shows a legacy credit balance in the same review context as current platform fees and scan overage charges. Which validation approach is most appropriate?

Response:

- A. Clear the legacy credit balance before validating current automated charges.
- B. Combine the legacy credit with current scan overage charges to simplify customer communication.
- C. Replace the migrated cooperative account with a new account for close preparation.
- D. Validate current-cycle automated charges separately while keeping the legacy credit visible for finance review.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

The instruction requires current-cycle billing behavior to remain distinguishable from migrated credit context. Keeping the credit visible supports finance review without masking new usage billing behavior.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 3 — Legacy Credit Balance Separation for Cooperatives

Finance asks whether legacy credits should be reclassified into the new automated billing model before close approval. What is the best response for the current preparation run?

Response:

- A. First determine whether legacy credits affect current invoice calculation or only remain visible for finance review.
- B. Hide legacy credits from the evidence pack because they are outside current automated billing.
- C. Reclassify all legacy credits immediately so cooperative accounts show only one credit model.
- D. Use manual invoice edits for migrated cooperatives and validate automated billing after close.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The best response isolates the role of legacy credits before changing them. This preserves migration context while supporting evidence for current automated billing behavior.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 4 — Close Evidence Control for Usage Billing Approval

Billing testers manually edit several invoice previews, and the corrected results appear acceptable. Field usage rating performance also meets the close preparation target. What should the close lead require before approving the run?

Response:

- A. Approval to proceed because corrected previews and acceptable rating performance are sufficient for the first close.
- B. Traceable evidence from usage rating through allowance consumption, cooperative consolidation, invoice preview, and FI-CA posting checks.
- C. A customer success note confirming that account managers can explain the corrected invoices.
- D. A full redesign of all subscription and allowance charge models before any close activity continues.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The close decision must rely on repeatable evidence across the integrated flow. A manually corrected preview and acceptable rating performance do not prove allowance, consolidation, and FI-CA readiness.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 4 — Close Evidence Control for Usage Billing Approval

The close lead wants to protect the monthly close schedule, while finance requires evidence-based approval for affected cooperative accounts. Which decision best balances these priorities?

Response:

- A. Move affected cooperatives out of the evidence pack and approve the remaining close package.
- B. Approve the close if manual invoice edits are documented and rating throughput remains within target.
- C. Stop the full close cycle because any correction means the SAP BRIM setup is unusable.

D. Rerun the affected cooperative group after controlled correction and use the repeatable result as the close approval basis.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This decision balances close schedule protection with evidence-based approval. It allows the close plan to continue, but only after controlled correction proves repeatable behavior for the affected cooperative group.

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/>