

SAP C_IEE2E

**SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - End-to-End
Business Processes for SAP Business Suite**

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-ieee2e>

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Unified Scenario Simulation
2. Micro Skill Drill Exam

Topic: 1

Unified Scenario Simulation

Hydronova Pumps Multi-Plant Production Cutover Rehearsal

Business Context

Hydronova Fluid Systems is an industrial manufacturer of centrifugal pumps and control valves supplying water-treatment, chemical, and energy customers. The group runs a single company code and operates three manufacturing plants — a cast-and-machine plant, an assembly-and-test plant, and a spares-and-refurbishment plant — that share products, engineering data, and demand. The board has committed to running its core business processes on the cloud ERP edition adopted under a fit-to-standard program, and the production and finance streams are the last to move.

Program Setup

The program is in its cutover rehearsal window — a full dress rehearsal executed against a copy of the target productive tenant before the real go-live. The intent is to prove that a demand signal can flow all the way through planning, production, and period-end settlement without manual intervention, and that the numbers land correctly in Finance. Master data has been loaded from the legacy system, best-practice production processes have been activated, and the rehearsal team is executing a scripted week of business days compressed into the rehearsal calendar.

System Landscape

Products are modeled once and used across all three plants, with plant-specific extensions where a material behaves differently at a given location. Bills of material and routings were migrated for the cast-and-machine and assembly plants; the spares plant reuses several of the same finished products but assembles from a narrower component set. Overhead is planned and actual through cost centers aligned to the work centers, and the finished-pump cost estimates were run so that standard prices exist before the rehearsal transactions begin.

Planning Context

The rehearsal opens with the demand plan being handed to operational planning, after which the planning run is expected to net requirements against stock and open receipts and propose supply. On the first rehearsal day the planners at the assembly plant observe that several finished pumps generate procurement proposals for components rather than production proposals for the pumps themselves, while the same products at the cast-and-machine plant plan as expected. The planners note the difference and continue converting whatever proposals the run produces so the downstream steps can be exercised.

Order Handoff

As converted orders reach the shop floor, the assembly team reports that a batch of production orders cannot be released. The material availability check flags missing components that the warehouse insists are physically on hand and were counted during the load. A second cluster of orders releases cleanly but, once confirmations are posted, the goods receipt for the finished pump does not update inventory value the way the finance observer expected. The team records both observations and keeps executing the script to preserve the rehearsal timeline.

Costing Observations

At the assembly plant, several finished pumps were given a manually keyed standard price during the load because their cost estimates had not finished running when the price list was frozen. Those pumps

now carry a standard that does not match the summed cost of their components and operations. The controlling observer notices that confirmations on these products are posting activity quantities but the values look thin, and asks whether the rehearsal should pause to rerun costing or continue and settle whatever accumulates.

Close Preparation

The rehearsal calendar reaches its compressed period-end. The controlling team begins the closing sequence for production: overhead is to be applied to the orders, work in process is to be calculated for orders still open, variances are to be computed for orders that finished, and the results are to be settled. The finance observer wants confirmation that once settlement runs, the postings reconcile to the general ledger and that no order is left carrying a balance that should have cleared. The team is unsure which orders are eligible for which step given the mixed release and confirmation states across the three plants.

Governance Context

Program governance has set two firm expectations for sign-off. First, the rehearsal must demonstrate the end-to-end chain on standard configuration — the sponsors will not accept a green result achieved by manually forcing prices, forcing availability, or hand-posting to the ledger, because those manual acts cannot be repeated at productive scale. Second, the close must be defensible: every value that lands in Finance must trace back to a production event, and the three plants must close on a consistent basis even though they were loaded and are executing at slightly different maturity levels. The cutover lead has to decide which anomalies are true configuration or data defects to fix before go-live and which are merely rehearsal-sequencing artifacts, and record that judgment for the go/no-go review.

Your assignment

You are working in the rehearsal tenant of an industrial pump and valve manufacturer that runs one company code across three manufacturing plants. Best-practice production processes are active and finished-product cost estimates have been run. You are executing a scripted end-to-end run — demand to planning to production to period-end settlement — and validating that each step produces the expected system evidence and that production values reconcile to Finance. Use only standard configuration; do not force prices, availability, or manual ledger postings. Work per plant where behavior differs, and record observable completion evidence at each checkpoint

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Planning Run Handoff Across Multiple Plants

- Hand the demand plan to operational planning and execute the planning run for the affected finished pumps at each plant.
- For a finished pump that generates a procurement proposal at the assembly plant but a production proposal at the cast-and-machine plant, inspect the plant-level product master and the supply-steering settings that determine whether the run proposes in-house production or external procurement.
- Confirm the requirement is netted against existing stock and open receipts before any proposal is accepted, and convert proposals to the appropriate supply element only after the proposal type is correct.

Checkpoints

- The same finished pump proposes in-house production consistently across plants where it is manufactured, not procurement of its components.
- Requirements reconcile to demand net of stock and open receipts at each plant.
- No proposal is converted while its supply type is still wrong.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Production Order Release And Component Availability

- Attempt release of the blocked assembly orders and read the material availability result rather than overriding it.
- Reconcile the components the check reports as missing against the storage location, plant assignment, and stock type of the physically counted inventory.

- Establish why on-hand stock is not evaluated by the check before deciding on any release action, and re-run the check after the underlying data is corrected.

Checkpoints

- The availability check confirms components once the stock is visible in the correct plant, storage location, and unrestricted stock type.
- Release proceeds without a manual override of the availability result.
- Goods issue subsequently consumes the intended components against the order.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Finished-Product Cost Estimate And Standard Price Integrity

- Identify finished pumps whose standard price was keyed manually during the load rather than set by a released cost estimate.
- Rerun the finished-product cost estimate so the standard reflects the rolled-up component and activity cost, and release it before further confirmations post value.
- Verify that goods receipts value the finished pump at the released standard and that resulting variances measure real deviation, not a difference caused by the manual price.

Checkpoints

- The released standard equals the summed component and operation cost for the finished pump.
- Goods receipt for the finished pump posts inventory value at the released standard.
- Confirmation values reflect actual activity consumption, not a thin manual baseline.

4. CHALLENGE 4 — Period-End Settlement And Reconciliation To Finance

- Run the production closing steps in sequence: apply overhead to orders, calculate work in process for orders still open, calculate variances for orders that are technically complete, then settle.
- Determine each order's eligibility for work-in-process versus variance treatment from its status, and settle so results post to the correct receivers in Finance.
- After settlement, reconcile the postings to the general ledger and confirm no order retains a balance that should have cleared.

Checkpoints

- Open orders carry work in process; finished orders carry variances; each posts to the correct Finance receiver.
- After settlement every settled order shows a cleared balance with no residual left on the order.
- Every value in the ledger traces to an originating production event, consistently across all three plants.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Planning Run Handoff Across Multiple Plants

The same finished pump proposes in-house production at the cast-and-machine plant but procurement of its components at the assembly plant after the planning run.

What is the most likely root cause of the difference in proposal type between the two plants?

- The demand plan was released only to the cast-and-machine plant, so the assembly plant received no requirement of its own and simply defaulted to a procurement proposal for the components
- The finished pump has no bill of material at either plant, so the run cannot resolve a production path and therefore procures the pump everywhere
- The planning run was executed before any stock and open receipts existed, so every plant temporarily proposed procurement until fresh inventory posted against it
- The plant-level supply-steering setting on the assembly plant's product master is set to external procurement, so the run proposes procurement there instead of production

Answer: D

Explanation:

Whether the run proposes in-house production or external procurement is steered by the plant-level settings on the product master, so a difference in behavior for the same product across two plants points to a plant-specific procurement-type setting. Correcting that setting at the assembly plant makes the pump plan for production consistently.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Planning Run Handoff Across Multiple Plants

Planners continue converting whatever proposals the run produced to keep the rehearsal script moving, including the procurement proposals at the assembly plant.

What is the most appropriate action before converting the assembly plant's proposals?

- A. Convert the procurement proposals now and raise a change request to fix the supply type after go-live, since keeping to the rehearsal timeline is the immediate priority here
- B. Correct the plant-level supply-steering setting so the pump proposes in-house production, then re-run and convert the corrected production proposals
- C. Manually create production orders for the pumps and delete the procurement proposals, leaving the plant-level product master unchanged
- D. Convert the proposals as they are but tag them clearly so Finance can reclassify the resulting postings later during period-end settlement

Answer: B

Explanation:

The defect is in the plant-level master data steering supply, and the rehearsal must prove the chain on standard configuration; correcting the setting and re-running produces the right proposal type so the downstream production and costing steps execute as they will at go-live.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 1 — Planning Run Handoff Across Multiple Plants

Before accepting any proposal, the planner must confirm the run netted requirements correctly at the plant.

Which evidence best confirms the planning run handoff behaved correctly at a plant?

- A. Every finished pump ends up with at least one converted order at the plant regardless of what its current on-hand stock position happens to be
- B. The proposal quantity generated at the plant equals the full gross demand with no reduction at all for existing stock or open receipts

- C. The requirement is netted against on-hand stock and open receipts, and the resulting proposal is of the correct supply type for that plant
- D. Procurement proposals and production proposals turn out to appear in roughly equal numbers across all three of the plants once the planning run has fully completed

Answer: C

Explanation:

A correct handoff both nets demand against existing stock and open receipts and generates the appropriate supply element, so the netted quantity and the correct proposal type together are the evidence that planning behaved as designed.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 1 — Planning Run Handoff Across Multiple Plants

The spares plant reuses several of the same finished pumps but assembles them from a narrower component set than the assembly plant.

How should the planning run resolve requirements for a shared pump that is built differently at the spares plant?

- A. The run should resolve each plant's requirement against that plant's own production master data, so the spares plant plans its narrower component set independently
- B. The run should apply the assembly plant's full component set to the spares plant as well, on the basis that the pump is the same central product across every plant
- C. The run should simply procure the finished pump for the spares plant in order to avoid maintaining two separate component sets for a single product
- D. The run should merge both plants' requirements together into one single proposal at whichever plant happens to have available capacity first

Answer: A

Explanation:

A shared product carries plant-specific production master data where it is built differently, so the run must net and resolve each plant's requirement against that plant's own bill of material and routing; the spares plant then plans its narrower component set correctly and independently.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 2 — Production Order Release And Component Availability

Assembly orders fail release because the material availability check reports components missing, yet the warehouse counted those components as physically on hand during the load.

What is the most likely reason the check does not see the stock?

- A. The physical stock exists but sits in a plant, storage location, or stock type that the availability check does not evaluate for that order
- B. The availability check is disabled entirely in standard configuration, so it reports every component as missing on every single order
- C. The finished pump has no released standard price yet, so the check cannot value the components and therefore reports them as missing
- D. The components were already fully consumed by an earlier confirmation posting, so no unrestricted stock now remains for any of the blocked orders

Answer: A

Explanation:

When a physical count shows stock but the check reports it missing, the stock almost always exists in a location, plant, or stock type the check does not include — for example the wrong storage location or a non-unrestricted stock type — so the visibility, not the quantity, is the defect. Placing the stock where the check evaluates it lets release proceed.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 2 — Production Order Release And Component Availability

The rehearsal script is under time pressure and the team is tempted to override the availability result to release the blocked orders.

Which action best satisfies both the timeline and the sponsors' standard-configuration expectation?

- A. Override the availability check so as to release the blocked orders right now, and then reconcile the underlying stock records only after the rehearsal window has fully ended
- B. Reduce the component quantities keyed on each of the blocked orders so that the check passes against the limited stock it currently evaluates
- C. Move or correct the stock into the plant, storage location, and unrestricted stock type the check evaluates, then re-run the check and release without an override
- D. Release the blocked orders without running the availability check at all and rely on the later confirmation step to flag any real component shortage

Answer: C

Explanation:

Correcting the stock visibility so the check confirms components addresses the actual defect and lets release proceed on standard configuration without a manual override, which is exactly what the sponsors require and what will be repeatable at go-live.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 2 — Production Order Release And Component Availability

After the underlying data is corrected, the team must confirm the order handoff to the shop floor is sound.

Which observable evidence confirms the release and consumption step is now correct?

- A. The order still releases only once a manual availability override is applied afresh on each and every occasion that release is attempted
- B. The availability check confirms components, the order releases without an override, and goods issue consumes the intended components against the order
- C. The order releases and then immediately posts a goods receipt for the finished pump even before any component goods issue has been recorded against it at all
- D. The order releases and the missing components are then backflushed automatically from a different plant's unrestricted stock

Answer: B

Explanation:

A correct handoff is evidenced by the check confirming components, release occurring without a manual override, and goods issue consuming the intended components against the order — the full sequence that proves stock visibility and consumption work on standard configuration.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 3 — Finished-Product Cost Estimate And Standard Price Integrity

Several finished pumps at the assembly plant carry a manually keyed standard price that does not equal the summed cost of their components and operations.

What is the primary risk of confirming and receiving these pumps against the manual standard?

- A. Confirmations on these pumps will be rejected outright because a manually keyed standard price cannot value the activity consumption posted on the order
- B. The planning run will regenerate procurement proposals for these pumps on the grounds that their manual standard price is internally inconsistent
- C. The pumps will be excluded from period-end settlement automatically until a fresh cost estimate has been released for each of them
- D. Goods receipt will value inventory at a wrong standard and settlement will report variances that reflect the price error rather than real production deviation

Answer: D

Explanation:

When the standard does not equal the rolled-up cost, goods receipt values inventory at that wrong standard and the variance at settlement measures the gap between the wrong standard and actuals, so the reported variance reflects the price error rather than genuine production deviation. That undermines both valuation and the defensibility of the close.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 3 — Finished-Product Cost Estimate And Standard Price Integrity

The controlling observer asks whether to pause and correct the standard or continue and settle whatever accumulates.

What is the most appropriate action to protect valuation integrity?

- A. Continue and settle against the manual standard for the time being, then post a manual Finance adjustment afterward to correct the resulting inventory value
- B. Rerun the finished-product cost estimate and release it so the standard reflects rolled-up cost, before further confirmations and receipts post value
- C. Keep the manual standard in place for now but exclude these pumps from the variance calculation so the close still appears to balance
- D. Lower the confirmation quantities posted on these pumps so the accumulated value matches the manual standard price they currently carry

Answer: B

Explanation:

Rerunning and releasing the cost estimate restores a standard equal to the rolled-up component and activity cost, so subsequent receipts value inventory correctly and variances measure real deviation — the standard-configuration fix that keeps the close defensible.

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 3 — Finished-Product Cost Estimate And Standard Price Integrity

After the estimate is rerun and released, the team validates the correction.

Which evidence confirms the standard-price integrity is restored?

- A. The released standard equals the summed component and operation cost, and goods receipt values the finished pump at that released standard
- B. The manual standard remains completely unchanged, but the variances on these pumps are now suppressed at settlement so that the close still balances
- C. The pumps no longer appear in the planning run at the assembly plant simply because their standard cost has now been corrected
- D. The standard price is now set to the arithmetic average of the old manual value and the newly estimated value for each pump

Answer: A

Explanation:

Integrity is restored when the released standard equals the rolled-up component and operation cost and goods receipt values the finished pump at that released standard, which is the observable evidence that valuation and downstream variance are now based on a correct baseline.

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 3 — Finished-Product Cost Estimate And Standard Price Integrity

The controlling observer notes that confirmations on the affected pumps post activity quantities but the resulting values look thin.

Which explanation is most consistent with the thin confirmation values?

- A. The activity confirmations were apparently never posted, so no production cost at all has accumulated on the affected orders
- B. The overhead step has evidently already run on these orders, so the low values are simply the expected residual left after settlement
- C. The activity quantities are valued against a manual standard baseline that is below the rolled-up cost, so accumulated value understates real consumption
- D. The pumps are already being received at the correct standard, so the thin confirmation values are simply normal rounding differences well within tolerance

Answer: C

Explanation:

The confirmations do post activity quantities, but those quantities are being valued against a manual standard set below the rolled-up cost, so the accumulated value understates the real activity consumption — the thin values are a direct symptom of the wrong baseline, resolved by rerunning and releasing the estimate.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 4 — Period-End Settlement And Reconciliation To Finance

The team begins the production close across all three plants with orders in mixed release and confirmation states.

Which sequencing of the closing steps is correct before settlement?

- A. Settle all orders first, then apply overhead and calculate work in process only for those orders that still show a residual balance
- B. Apply overhead to the orders, calculate work in process for orders still open, calculate variances for orders that are technically complete, then settle
- C. Calculate variances for every order regardless of its status first, then apply overhead, then settle both the open and the complete orders together in a single run
- D. Calculate work in process for all orders including the finished ones, then settle those orders before applying any overhead at all to them

Answer: B

Explanation:

The close must apply overhead so orders carry full cost, then calculate work in process for orders still open and variances for orders that are technically complete, and only then settle; this order ensures each order carries the right value and posts to the correct receiver before results reach Finance.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 4 — Period-End Settlement And Reconciliation To Finance

An order that finished production must be treated differently from one still open at period-end. How should each be treated so settlement posts correctly to Finance?

- A. Both the open and the finished orders should carry work in process into the next period, then settle together once complete
- B. The finished order should instead carry work in process; the open order should carry variances, on the basis that open orders have not deviated yet
- C. Both orders should simply be settled directly to a single cost center in order to keep the multi-plant close easy to reconcile
- D. The open order carries work in process; the technically complete order carries variances; each settles to its correct Finance receiver

Answer: D

Explanation:

An order still open at period-end carries its accumulated cost as work in process, while a technically complete order has its deviation captured as variance; settling each to its correct Finance receiver is what lets production values reconcile to the ledger.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 4 — Period-End Settlement And Reconciliation To Finance

After settlement, the finance observer checks that the close is defensible across the three plants. Which result demonstrates that settlement reconciled correctly to Finance?

- A. Every settled order shows a cleared balance and each posted value traces to an originating production event, consistently across all three plants
- B. The three plants each show a different residual order balance, but together they happen to net to exactly zero at the company-code level after settlement
- C. Settlement posted only a single summary value to Finance for the whole period, with no order-level detail retained behind it
- D. Orders deliberately retain their accumulated balances after settlement so the values can be reviewed once more during the next period

Answer: A

Explanation:

A defensible close shows every settled order with a cleared balance and every ledger value traceable to a production event, applied consistently across all three plants — the evidence the sponsors require for sign-off.

Question: 15

CHALLENGE 4 — Period-End Settlement And Reconciliation To Finance

During reconciliation the team finds a ledger value at the assembly plant that does not correspond to any production event.

What is the most likely explanation and the correct response?

- A. It is simply a normal rounding difference at the plant and should therefore be written off directly with a manual Finance posting
- B. It proves that settlement double-posted at the plant, so the settlement run should be reversed across all three of the plants and then re-run from scratch
- C. It originates from settling an order built on a manually keyed standard or a forced release; correct the upstream data and re-run the affected close steps
- D. It reflects overhead having been applied twice over, so overhead should be removed from the closing sequence for these orders entirely

Answer: C

Explanation:

A ledger value with no originating production event typically traces to an order settled on corrupted upstream data — a manual standard or a forced release that produced value without a valid production basis; correcting that upstream data and re-running the affected steps restores traceability without hand-posting to the ledger.

Question: 16

CHALLENGE 4 — Period-End Settlement And Reconciliation To Finance

Governance requires all three plants to close on a consistent basis even though they were loaded at slightly different maturity levels.

Which approach best satisfies the consistency expectation for sign-off?

- A. Close the most mature plant first on the standard steps and defer the other two plants' close entirely until after the go-live date
- B. Let each individual plant choose its own closing steps and its own sequence so that the overall rehearsal run finishes in the fastest possible time
- C. Force all three plants onto the same settled totals by adjusting the least mature plant's order values to match the other two
- D. Apply the same closing sequence and eligibility rules to all three plants and remediate any plant-specific data defect before settling that plant

Answer: D

Explanation:

Consistency comes from applying the identical closing sequence and eligibility rules to every plant and fixing any plant-specific data defect before settling that plant, so all three close on the same defensible basis regardless of load maturity.

Topic: 2

Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 17

Voltahaus Drivetrains, an EV powertrain manufacturer, runs two legal entities in SAP Business Suite cloud ERP: one German entity and one newly incorporated Spanish entity that must report in euros but file statutory results separately. During go-live, a consultant creates a single production plant and assigns it under the German entity, intending both entities to draw finished inverters from it. When the Spanish sales team posts its first goods issues for local deliveries, the resulting accounting documents settle into the German entity's books, and the Spanish statutory ledger shows no cost of goods sold. The team confirms master data for the material and business partners is correct and reused across both entities, and that deliveries themselves complete without error. The consultant is asked to correct the structure so that inventory movements for Spanish deliveries post to the Spanish entity's books, without duplicating the material master or the plant's operational setup, and while keeping the shared warehouse footprint. The correction must address which enterprise-structure element determines the entity a plant's postings belong to, rather than adjusting individual delivery documents after the fact. Which action makes goods issues for Spanish deliveries post to the correct entity's books?

- A. Reassign each Spanish delivery document to the Spanish entity at goods issue so the accounting document is redirected per transaction as deliveries are processed
- B. Create a duplicate material master under the Spanish entity so its deliveries draw from a separately valued copy and post independently to Spanish books
- C. Create a plant for the Spanish entity and assign it to that company code, then have Spanish deliveries draw stock from that plant so movements post to Spanish books
- D. Change the shared plant's valuation so it revalues stock into the Spanish entity whenever a Spanish sales organization triggers the delivery, redirecting the posting after the movement is recorded

Answer: C

Explanation:

The company code assigned to a plant determines the entity whose books receive that plant's inventory postings. Creating a plant for the Spanish entity and assigning it to the Spanish company code makes Spanish deliveries draw from that plant, so goods issues post cost of goods sold into the Spanish statutory ledger by construction, with material and business-partner master data still reused.

Question: 18

Kettwig Brake Systems, a mid-size automotive brake supplier operating from a single plant in the Ruhr region, runs SAP Business Suite cloud ERP with two ledgers configured for parallel accounting: a leading

ledger for group reporting and a second ledger for local statutory valuation of assets. During month-end, an accountant posts a depreciation run and confirms the leading ledger shows the expected depreciation expense. The local statutory reviewer then reports that the second ledger shows a different net book value for several production machines, and asks whether the run failed. Investigation shows the assets were capitalized with one useful life in the leading ledger and a shorter statutory useful life in the second ledger, and both ledgers depreciated on their own basis as configured. Transaction data, cost centers, and the run itself all completed without error. The accountant must explain the correct end state and confirm no corrective posting is needed, distinguishing a genuine defect from expected parallel-accounting behavior before closing the period. How should the accountant interpret the differing net book values across the two ledgers?

- A. The differing net book values are expected: each ledger depreciates on its own useful life for parallel accounting, so both figures are correct and no corrective posting is required
- B. The second ledger is wrong because depreciation must be identical across every ledger in the company code; rerun depreciation so both ledgers converge on the leading ledger's net book value at close
- C. The leading ledger is wrong because the statutory useful life is authoritative; adjust the leading ledger down so it matches the second ledger's net book value
- D. Both ledgers are inconsistent; post a manual adjustment to a suspense account so the two net book values reconcile to a single blended figure at close

Answer: A

Explanation:

Parallel accounting exists precisely so that group and statutory views can value the same asset on different bases. Each ledger applying its own useful life produces a different net book value by design, so both figures are correct and closing proceeds without any corrective posting.

Question: 19

Aurelia Seating Group, a global supplier of automotive seat frames with a purchasing organization serving three assembly plants across Mexico, sources steel tube against a long-term quantity contract in SAP Business Suite cloud ERP. A buyer creates a purchase order for a plant referencing the contract, the supplier ships, and the warehouse posts the goods receipt. When the supplier's invoice arrives, the accounts-payable clerk attempts to post it and the system blocks release for payment, flagging a quantity mismatch even though the invoiced quantity equals the ordered quantity on the purchase order. The clerk confirms the purchase order, the contract reference, and the supplier business partner are all correct, and that payment terms are maintained. Investigation shows the warehouse recorded a partial goods receipt for the first truckload and the remaining quantity is still in transit; the invoice covers the full ordered quantity. The clerk must determine why the three-way match holds the invoice and what condition must be true before the full invoice can be released, without overriding controls or splitting the supplier's document.

Why is the invoice blocked, and what must be true before the full invoice can be released?

- A. The contract reference expired between order and invoice; renew the contract and re-reference it on the purchase order so the three-way match can complete for the full quantity

- B. The supplier business partner is flagged for review; clear the partner block so accounts payable can release the full invoice against the received quantity
- C. Payment terms were missing at invoice entry; maintain the terms on the invoice so the three-way match resolves and the full quantity is released for payment
- D. The goods receipt is only partial, so the received quantity is below the invoiced quantity; the remaining goods must be received before the full invoice matches and releases

Answer: D

Explanation:

The three-way match compares ordered, received, and invoiced quantities; here the goods receipt is partial while the invoice covers the full order, so received is below invoiced and the invoice is correctly blocked. Once the remaining in-transit goods are received, received equals invoiced and the full invoice releases without overriding any control.

Question: 20

Northmark Motor Retail, a regional automotive dealer network in the United States, uses SAP Business Suite cloud ERP to sell spare parts to independent workshops. A sales representative creates a sales order for a workshop customer, and the order is saved successfully. When the shipping team tries to bill the customer, the billing step is not available for that order, although other orders from the same day bill normally. The representative confirms the customer business partner, the material, pricing, and the sales organization on the order are all correct, and that the order shows no incompleteness messages. Checking the document flow reveals the order was entered and priced, but no delivery has been created or goods issued for it, whereas the orders that billed normally each show a completed delivery and goods issue. The representative must identify the missing prerequisite in the sales process and the correct next step so customer billing becomes available, without altering the order's pricing or bypassing shipping.

Why is billing unavailable for this order, and what is the correct next step?

- A. Pricing was not finalized on the order; recalculate and release pricing on the order so the billing document can draw the correct amounts and then become available for the customer
- B. The delivery and goods issue are missing; create the delivery and post goods issue so the sales process reaches the point where customer billing becomes available
- C. The customer business partner lacks a billing block release; remove the billing block on the partner so billing becomes available for this and future orders
- D. The sales organization is not enabled for billing; assign the sales organization to the billing scope so orders it creates can be billed to the customer

Answer: B

Explanation:

In the standard sales process, customer billing follows delivery and goods issue; the document flow shows this order has neither, which is exactly why billing is unavailable while the completed orders billed normally. Creating the delivery and posting goods issue moves the order to the point where billing becomes available, without touching pricing or bypassing shipping.

Question: 21

Sanko Automotive Fasteners, a Japanese supplier expanding into a second sales region, runs SAP Business Suite cloud ERP and has committed to fit-to-standard adoption with a clean core. A workshop is called to model a new distribution flow: the same finished fasteners will be sold to existing customers through the current channel and to a new set of distributors through a separate channel with different pricing and output. A junior consultant proposes creating a second copy of each customer and material master so the new channel has its own independent data, arguing it is simpler than reworking existing records. A senior consultant objects that this duplicates central objects that should be reused, and that the enterprise structure already provides a way to represent the same product and customer selling through different channels. The team must choose the fit-to-standard modeling approach that supports the new channel while keeping master data reused as single central objects, avoiding duplicate records that would drift apart across processes.

Which approach models the new channel while keeping master data as reused central objects?

- A. Duplicate the customer and material masters for the new channel so each channel owns its independent records and can be maintained without affecting the other channel
- B. Build a custom extension that clones master data into a parallel table maintained for the new channel, so the standard records stay untouched while the new channel reads and updates its own copy
- C. Represent the new channel through the sales-area enterprise structure so the same customer and material central objects sell through both channels with channel-specific pricing and output
- D. Create a separate company code for the new channel so its transactions and master data are fully isolated from the existing channel across every process

Answer: C

Explanation:

The sales-area enterprise structure lets the same customer and material central objects be extended to an additional distribution channel, carrying channel-specific pricing and output while the underlying master data stays single and reused. This is the fit-to-standard, clean-core way to add a channel without duplicating central objects.

Question: 22

Pfalzwerk Castings, a supplier of aluminium engine housings running SAP Business Suite cloud ERP, closes its period in management accounting. A controller confirms that production orders for the month were confirmed and that goods movements posted, and expects each order to carry its actual overhead so variances can be settled to the relevant cost objects. During the close, the controller runs order settlement and finds that several production orders still show large balances that did not settle, while orders in another production line settled cleanly. Master data for the cost centers and the materials is confirmed correct, and the failed orders processed their confirmations without error. Investigation shows the overhead surcharge that applies actual overhead to those orders had not yet been run for the period, so the orders held only their direct costs when settlement executed. The controller must correct the close sequence so the affected orders settle with their full actual cost, identifying the prerequisite step that was skipped rather than forcing a manual balance write-off.

Why did the affected production orders fail to settle cleanly, and what corrects it?

- A. The overhead surcharge that applies actual overhead was not run before settlement, so the orders held only direct costs; run overhead calculation first, then re-run settlement
- B. The production confirmations were incomplete, so actual costs never reached the orders; re-enter the confirmations and settlement will then clear the balances at close
- C. The cost centers were assigned to the wrong controlling scope, so overhead posted elsewhere; reassign the cost centers and the existing settlement run will clear the balances
- D. The settlement rule pointed at the wrong receiver, so balances stayed on the affected orders; redirect the settlement receiver and the orders will then settle with the costs already present on them

Answer: A

Explanation:

Actual overhead reaches a production order only after the overhead surcharge is calculated for the period; settlement then distributes the order's full actual cost. Because the surcharge had not run, the orders held only direct costs at settlement, leaving balances. Running overhead calculation first and then re-running settlement supplies the missing prerequisite and clears the balances with full actual cost.

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/>