

SAP C_THR81

**SAP Certified - SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central Core
and Position Management (C_THR81_2605)**

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-thr81>

Latest Version: 4.1

Subjects

1. Bratislava Glassworks foundation object records and basic associations
2. Montevideo Meatpacking Co position management enablement and first records
3. Ljubljana Furniture Works self-service changes and approval routing
4. Porto Wine Cellars People Profile and Instance Experience Setup
5. Greenfield Organics Switching On Position Management in EC
6. Lagos FinTrust Bank Employee Central People Profile Setup
7. Brisbane Metro Water Self-Service and Approval Workflow Setup
8. Cedar Ridge Health: Standing Up Employee Central Administration
9. Amman Solar Farms HRIS synchronization and talent alignment
10. Chengdu Home Appliances legacy and MDF foundation objects across plants
11. Quito Hydro Power Business Rules and MDF Automation
12. Athens Ferry Lines Seasonal Bulk Hire Load
13. Dubai Skyline Hospitality Multi-Country Foundation Object Build
14. Rhineland Auto Components Linking Positions to Talent Processes
15. Andes Copper Automating HR Data Logic in Employee Central
16. Kanpur Textiles First Bulk Employee Load in Employee Central
17. Caravel Airways: modeling concurrent employments and international assignments in Employee Central
18. Kuala Lumpur Data Centers: hardening HRIS synchronization to the talent modules
19. Tunis Phosphate Mining: hardening approval workflows end to end
20. Rotterdam Chemicals Group: rolling out Position Management on a live tenant
21. Osaka Robotics Hardening Employee Central Approval Workflows
22. Maple and Birch Retail Hardening Employee Central HRIS Sync
23. Helvetia Precision Instruments Position Management Rollout
24. Nordhavn Maritime Employee Central Data Model Build
25. Employee Data & Lifecycle Management
26. Position Management Configuration
27. Foundation Objects & Associations
28. Platform Administration & Role-Based Permissions
29. Transactions, Workflows & Notifications
30. Data Models & Business Configuration
31. MDF & Business Rules
32. Position Lifecycle & Integration

Topic: 1

Bratislava Glassworks foundation object records and basic associations

Business Context

Bratislava Glassworks manufactures architectural and container glass at a plant in Slovakia, with around 600 people working across the melting furnaces, forming, annealing, cutting and finishing, a quality lab, the warehouse, and a small commercial office. Having recently adopted employee central, the company is now setting up the building blocks that describe its own organisation: the legal entity it operates under, its business units, the departments inside them, and the physical locations where people work.

Until now these details were typed as free text directly onto each worker's record, which produced spelling variants and mismatches that make even simple headcount questions hard to answer.

Implementation Progress

The people records are loaded and stable, and a small hr team with help from an external consultant is now building the foundation objects that these records should point to instead of free text. They are creating the core records first, then connecting them so the structure holds together, and finally checking that the connections actually filter what users can pick. The work needs to be right before the next intake of seasonal furnace staff, when many new records will be created at once.

System Landscape

Foundation objects are shared reference records, such as a legal entity, a business unit, a department, or a location, that many employee records can point to. Each needs its own record with a stable identifier, rather than being retyped per person. Some of these objects can be kept in the older, simpler form, while others may need the more configurable form that allows extra fields and country or region-specific detail. The objects also need to be connected to one another, so that choosing one value sensibly narrows the choices that depend on it.

Operational Context

A few problems have already shown up. The team started entering some organisational values as free text again out of habit, recreating the very inconsistency the foundation objects are meant to remove. When a business unit was chosen on a test record, every department in the whole plant appeared in the next dropdown rather than only the departments that belong to that unit, because the objects had not been connected. And two records were created for the same location under slightly different identifiers, so reports split one place into two.

Governance Context

The company wants its organisational data to be consistent and easy to report on. Every worker's legal entity, business unit, department, and location should come from a shared foundation object record, not from free text. The objects should be connected so that dependent choices filter correctly and users cannot pick a department that does not belong to the chosen unit. And where an object genuinely needs extra fields or country-specific detail, that need, rather than habit, should decide which form of the object is used.

Deployment Readiness

Before the seasonal intake, the team needs the core foundation object records created with stable identifiers, business units correctly associated with the legal entity they belong to, the dependent department dropdown filtering by the chosen business unit, and a clear, defensible choice about which objects stay in the simpler form and which need the more configurable one. Getting these foundations right now will keep every record created later clean and consistent.

Your assignment

You are working as an Employee Central configuration specialist in the small hr team at Bratislava Glassworks, in an instance where employee records are loaded and the organisation is being described through Foundation Objects for the first time. Your assigned area is the foundation data layer: creating the core Foundation Object records for the legal entity, business units, departments, and locations; associating business units with their legal entity; making the dependent department dropdown filter by the chosen business unit; and choosing between the legacy and the MDF form of an object based on its requirements. Work to the structure, identifier, and association decisions already agreed with hr; where an exact value is not provided, follow the documented conventions rather than inventing one. Each task ends with an observable check confirming the configured behaviour before the seasonal intake creates many records at once

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Creating the Core Foundation Object Records

- Create a foundation object record for each core organisational value, such as the legal entity, the business units, the departments, and the locations.
- Give each record its own stable, unique identifier so no two real things collide into one and one thing is not split into two.
- Point employee records at the shared foundation object records rather than letting users type the values as free text.

CHECKPOINTS

- Each core organisational value exists as a shared foundation object record rather than as free text.
- No two records share an identifier, and no single real place or unit is split across two records.
- An employee record can select these values from the shared records instead of typing them.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Linking Business Units to Their Legal Entity

- Configure an association between the legal entity and its business units so the system knows which units belong to the entity.
- Shape the association as one-to-many from the legal entity to its units, since one entity has several units and each unit belongs to one entity.
- Confirm the relationship is a configured association rather than a naming convention or a free-text note.

CHECKPOINTS

- An association exists between the legal entity and its business units.
- The association reflects that one entity has several units while each unit belongs to a single entity.
- Choosing the legal entity on a record offers only that entity's business units.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Making a Dependent Dropdown Filter Correctly

- Configure the association so the department dropdown depends on the chosen business unit and offers only that unit's departments.
- Make sure a department that does not belong to the chosen unit is not offered as a choice.
- Confirm the dependency filters on a real record rather than relying on users to avoid wrong combinations.

CHECKPOINTS

- Choosing a business unit narrows the department dropdown to only that unit's departments.
- A department from a different unit is not selectable once a unit is chosen.
- Changing the chosen unit changes the department list accordingly.

4. CHALLENGE 4 — Deciding Where Foundation Data Should Live

- Choose the more configurable form for an object that needs extra fields or country and region-specific detail.
- Keep the simpler form for objects whose needs it already meets rather than rebuilding them without a reason.
- Let the object's actual requirement, not habit or caution, decide which form is used.

CHECKPOINTS

- An object needing extra fields or country-specific detail is placed in the more configurable form.
- An object with no such need is left in the simpler form rather than rebuilt without cause.
- The choice of form for each object can be justified by that object's requirements.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Creating the Core Foundation Object Records

Out of habit, the team has slipped back into typing the business unit and department as free text on each new record, recreating the spelling variants the project set out to remove.

Why should these organisational values come from foundation object records instead of free text, and what should the team do?

- A. Keep typing the values as free text on each record, since free text is faster to enter and any spelling differences between records can simply be tidied up by hand later on when there is time.
- B. Enter these values by pointing each record at a shared foundation object record, so the same consistent value is reused everywhere and reporting is not broken by spelling variants.
- C. Keep the values as free text but write a style guide asking everyone to spell each unit and department in exactly the same way, relying on that written guidance rather than shared records to stay consistent.
- D. Remove the organisational fields from the records altogether, on the basis that if the values are hard to keep consistent it is better not to record a worker's unit or department at all.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Pointing each record at a shared foundation object record means every worker in the same unit carries the identical value, so reporting groups them correctly. This is exactly what foundation objects are for and it removes the inconsistency at its source.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Creating the Core Foundation Object Records

Creating a second location record, the team reuses an identifier already given to another location, and the system will not keep both as distinct places.

What does a foundation object record need so that each one is distinct and usable?

- A. Nothing in particular is needed, because two separate locations can safely share the very same identifier as long as their names on the screen are spelled at least slightly differently from each other.
- B. Only a colour or an icon to tell them apart visually, since a distinct appearance on screen is really all that is needed for the system to treat two records as genuinely different places.
- C. A longer description on one of them, on the basis that adding more descriptive text to a record is what makes it count as separate and distinct from another record.
- D. Its own stable, unique identifier, so that each location is a distinct record that employees and reports can point to without two places being merged into one.

Answer: D

Explanation:

A stable, unique identifier makes each location its own record that employees and reports can reliably reference, which is what stops two places from merging. Uniqueness of the identifier is the requirement that was missed.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 1 — Creating the Core Foundation Object Records

After creating the core records, the team wants to confirm they can actually be used on an employee record.

Which check best confirms the foundation object records are set up correctly?

- A. Open an employee record and confirm that the legal entity, business unit, department, and location can each be picked from the shared records rather than typed as free text.
- B. Confirm that the records saved without any error message, and treat that clean save on its own as proof that they are all selectable and correctly usable on employee records.
- C. Count how many foundation object records now exist in total and confirm that the number is large, on the assumption that a higher count must mean the setup is complete and correct.
- D. Confirm that the consultant says the records were created, and take that verbal assurance on its own as sufficient evidence that they will be selectable when staff create employee records later.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Selecting each value from the shared records on a real employee record directly confirms the objects exist and are usable in place of free text, which is the whole point. This tests the actual outcome staff will experience.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 2 — Linking Business Units to Their Legal Entity

The business unit records and the legal entity record all exist, but nothing connects them, so the system does not know which units belong to the entity.

What is the right way to establish that relationship?

- A. Rename each business unit so that its name begins with the legal entity's name, on the basis that a shared prefix in the text is enough for the system to treat them as related to each other.
- B. Type the legal entity's identifier into a free-text note on each business unit record, relying on that written note rather than a real link for the system to understand the relationship.
- C. Configure an association between the legal entity and its business units, so the system knows which units belong to that entity and can use the relationship.
- D. Leave the objects unconnected and rely on staff to remember which business units belong to which legal entity, treating that shared knowledge as a substitute for a configured relationship.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Configuring an association between the legal entity and its business units gives the system the actual relationship, so it knows which units belong to the entity and can filter and roll up correctly. This is the supported way to connect the objects.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 2 — Linking Business Units to Their Legal Entity

The team is unsure how the association should be shaped, since one legal entity has several business units but each business unit belongs to just one entity.
How is this relationship best represented?

- A. As many-to-many, so that every business unit can belong to every legal entity at once, even though in reality each unit sits under only one entity within the company.
- B. As a one-to-many association from the legal entity to its business units, reflecting that one entity has several units while each unit belongs to a single entity.
- C. As no association at all, treating the fact that one entity has several units as a reason to keep the objects entirely separate rather than related in any way.
- D. As a link that points only from each business unit outward to several legal entities at once, so a single unit is recorded as belonging to many entities simultaneously.

Answer: B

Explanation:

A one-to-many association from the legal entity to its business units captures that one entity has several units while each unit belongs to a single entity, which matches reality and lets choices filter correctly. This is the shape the relationship should take.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 2 — Linking Business Units to Their Legal Entity

The team wants to confirm the association actually works before loading more records.
Which check best confirms the association is set up correctly?

- A. On a test record, choose the legal entity and confirm that only the business units belonging to that entity are offered, not units from other entities.
- B. Confirm that the association saved without any error at all, and then treat that clean save on its own as proof that the units now filter correctly under each legal entity everywhere.
- C. Confirm that the total number of business units in the system is unchanged from before, and take that steady count as sufficient evidence that the association must now be working as intended.
- D. Confirm that the association simply appears in the configuration list, and take its mere presence in that list as proof that it filters the business units correctly on real records.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Choosing the entity on a test record and seeing only its own units offered directly proves the association filters correctly, which is what it was configured to do. This tests the actual runtime behaviour.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 3 — Making a Dependent Dropdown Filter Correctly

On a test record, after a business unit is chosen, the department dropdown still lists every department in the plant, so a user can pick a department that does not belong to that unit.

What is the correct way to make the department dropdown show only the relevant departments?

- A. Tell users to be careful and only pick a department they already know belongs to the chosen unit, relying on their care rather than any configuration to keep invalid combinations out of the data.
- B. Sort the full department list alphabetically so the right one is easier to find, accepting that departments from every other unit still appear in it and can still be chosen by mistake.
- C. Remove the department field entirely so that no one can ever pick a wrong department, accepting that the plant then records no department at all against any of its workers.
- D. Configure the association so the department dropdown depends on the chosen business unit, offering only the departments that belong to that unit.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Configuring the dependency so the department dropdown filters by the chosen business unit offers only that unit's departments, which prevents invalid combinations at the point of entry. This fixes the cause rather than coaching around it.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 3 — Making a Dependent Dropdown Filter Correctly

After configuring the dependency, the team wants to confirm it filters correctly.

Which check best confirms the dependent dropdown now works?

- A. Confirm that the dependency configuration saved without any error at all, and then treat that clean save as proof that the department list now filters correctly for every business unit.
- B. On a test record, choose a business unit and confirm the department dropdown offers only that unit's departments, then choose a different unit and confirm the list changes.
- C. Confirm that the department dropdown still contains every department somewhere within its underlying data, and take the continued presence of all departments as evidence that the filtering is working.
- D. Ask a user whether the dropdown feels shorter than it did before, and take their general impression that it seems shorter as sufficient confirmation that it filters to the right departments.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Choosing one unit and seeing only its departments, then choosing another and seeing the list change, directly proves the dropdown filters by the selected unit. This tests the real behaviour across more than one case.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 4 — Deciding Where Foundation Data Should Live

One object needs extra configurable fields and some country or region-specific detail, which the older simpler form does not readily support.

How should the team decide which form of the object to use?

- A. Always use the older, simpler form for every object regardless of what it needs, on the basis that the simplest option is best even when an object clearly requires extra fields it cannot possibly hold.
- B. Choose the form at random for each object, on the basis that the two forms are effectively interchangeable and the choice makes no practical difference to what an object can actually do.
- C. Choose the more configurable form for the object that needs the extra fields and country-specific detail, and keep the simpler form for objects whose needs it already meets.
- D. Put all the extra fields as free text into the object's name, so that the simpler form can carry the additional detail simply by cramming it into the record's title field.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Matching the form to the requirement, the configurable form where extra fields and country-specific detail are needed and the simpler form where they are not, gives each object the capability it needs without needless complexity. The requirement drives the choice.

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 4 — Deciding Where Foundation Data Should Live

A team member suggests rebuilding all the existing simple objects into the configurable form just in case, even the ones with no extra requirements.

What is the most sensible approach to the objects that already meet their needs in the simpler form?

- A. Leave the objects that already meet their needs in the simpler form as they are, and use the configurable form only where an actual requirement calls for it.
- B. Rebuild every object in the configurable form regardless of need, accepting the extra work and complexity this adds to objects that were already doing everything required of them.
- C. Delete the simpler objects and re-enter all of their data by hand in the configurable form, even where nothing about those objects actually needed to change at all.
- D. Convert objects back and forth between the two forms periodically, on the basis that regularly switching form keeps the configuration fresh whether or not any requirement has changed.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Leaving well-functioning objects in the simpler form and reserving the configurable form for real requirements avoids needless work and complexity while still meeting every need. The requirement, not caution, should trigger a change.

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/>