SAP
C_S4CFI
SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, Financial Accounting (C_S4CFI_2608)

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-s4cfi

Latest Version: 4.0
Subjects

1. Kupa Farmapak Packaging Group Finance Integration Test Cycle
2. Ntemba Forest Products Brings a Second Entity into Cloud Finance
3. Ankasa Ore Stevedoring Prepares Its First Finance Test Run
4. Vipava Mikrotehnika Finance Acceptance Testing in S/4HANA Cloud
5. Sutralaya Textiles India Finance Posting Foundation Build
6. Marrowby Consulting Accounts Payable Down Payments in S/4HANA Cloud
7. Pomarino Foods Financial Statement Reporting Configuration
8. Marenova Fashion Retail S4HANA Cloud Payment Run Build
9. Kotuku Holiday Parks Parallel Accounting Run in S/4HANA Cloud
10. Zovuni Glassworks Group Receivables Follow-Up Remediation Wave
11. Ostrivo Hardmetal Fit-to-Standard Design Validation in S/4HANA
12. Hverafell Varmaorka Second-Wave Finance Rollout in S/4HANA
13. Helmsbach Medical Receivables Readiness in S/4HANA Cloud
14. Yulan Devices Stabilizes Incoming-Payment Clearing in S/4HANA Cloud
15. Benelux Logistics Provider Rehearses Finance Data Migration
16. Northbrae Pharma Distribution Receivables Testing Readiness
17. Sajama Educativa Campus Finance Validation in S/4HANA Cloud
18. Vardheim Seafood Template Remediation Before the Harvest Peak
19. Tuulekivi Isolatsioon Year-End Finance Wave in S/4HANA Cloud
20. Ondera Beneficiation Group Cutover Rehearsal in S/4HANA Cloud
21. Qasr Najd Contracting Accruals Rollout in S/4HANA Cloud
22. Aurellong Utilities Accounts Payable Invoice Testing in S/4HANA
23. Akirano Components Asset Year-End Close Rehearsal in S/4HANA
24. Helvio Chemicals First Close Readiness in S/4HANA Cloud
25. Accounts Receivable - Credit, Collections, Dispute & Dunning Management
26. Accounts Payable, Payment Run & Down Payment Processing
27. Record-to-Report Posting Configuration
28. Asset Accounting Configuration & Valuation Lifecycle
29. S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition Implementation & Fit-to-Standard Configuration
30. Financial Accounting Master Data & General Ledger Configuration
31. Period-End & Year-End Entity Close
32. Financial Statement Reporting & Embedded Analytics

Topic: 1
Kupa Farmapak Packaging Group Finance Integration Test Cycle
Business Context
Kupa Farmapak d.o.o. prints and finishes secondary packaging for generic medicines: folding cartons, patient leaflets, and self-adhesive labels. The plant sits on the edge of Karlovac and employs about three hundred people across printing, die-cutting, and cartoning. Its customers are generics manufacturers, several of them around Zagreb, buying on annual framework agreements with monthly call-offs. A second and much smaller company, Pelagonija Etiketa, converts label stock at Prilep for its own regional

market. The two are separate legal entities under one owner, and finance for both is run by a team of nine in Karlovac.

System Landscape

The group is implementing SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, starting with the Karlovac entity; the label plant joins in a later wave and keeps its local bookkeeping package until then. Business configuration is maintained in SAP Central Business Configuration and moved through the development, test, and production systems, with the implementation project and its test plans in SAP Cloud ALM. The packaging execution and serialization system that drives the cartoning lines stays on premise and outside the finance move, since it is validated for the customers' regulatory audits; finance takes goods issue and batch data from it through an interface. The second integration test cycle is running now, with one delivery of updates falling between this cycle and the cutover weekend.

Order Intake Context

Two contract-packing customers were added for this cycle, both with larger volumes than the plant is used to carrying. Orders for both save and release with no credit decision written to the order, while orders of the same type for long-standing customers are evaluated and, where the exposure is high enough, held. The sales director has asked for a higher ceiling for one of them so the cycle is not delayed, pointing out that the plant already holds printed stock for that customer. Group credit policy derives limits from the customer rating and reserves the approval to the credit controller.

Line Investment Context

A cartoning and serialization line is being installed in stages and carried as an asset under construction, and the equipment supplier requires an advance before the remaining modules ship. The first module was commissioned in the test data and settled to a new asset master; the settled values agree, yet the asset is reported under a different balance sheet position than the rest of the line and carries depreciation terms the plant accountant did not expect. Local requirements allow the commissioned module to be capitalized from its commissioning date, while the second accounting principle the group applies waits for the whole line to pass qualification.

Coexistence Context

Karlovac prints leaflets for the label plant's own customers and recharges it monthly, at figures material for the smaller entity. Because the plant's company code is not created until the later wave, the finance team posts these recharges by hand into a clearing account and matches them against the plant's local records once a quarter. The group controller has asked that the intercompany posting design be configured during this cycle so that nothing has to change when the plant joins.

Payment Cycle Context

Packaging board comes from two mills, whose invoices went through the approval routing without difficulty. In the payment run test, the approved and due invoices from one mill were not selected while other suppliers' invoices in the same run were; the block is removed, the amounts sit well above any minimum, and the supplier's business partner carries the supplier role for the entity. A separate group of material invoices is still with approvers, with a discount deadline falling before the next payment date, and the controller has asked for the approval step to be taken out of the way for those.

Governance Context

The programme rule agreed with the owner is that productive settings change only through the transported route, and that every change made for a test cycle is recorded and closed before the cutover decision. Ines Vukelic, who leads finance in Karlovac, has three weeks of testing left, and Damjan Trajkov, who keeps the label plant's books, follows the cycle from Prilep without a user in the system yet. The cutover decision is taken the week after the cycle closes.

Your Assignment

You are the finance configuration consultant working on the Kupa Farmapak implementation of SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition. You work in the project's test system with the business roles designed for

Visit us at: https://www.examsempire.com/c-s4cfi

the Karlovac entity, and you have access to the implementation workspace, the finance configuration activities, and the receivables, payables, and asset accounting apps. The Karlovac company code is the only one created; the label plant joins in a later wave. Where an entry requires a naming suffix, use the participant number ## issued with your assessment, for example KFP-##. Values you enter must stay consistent across every task on this sheet

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Credit Master Data Setup Before Contract Packing Orders Are Released

• Compare the business partner records of the two contract-packing customers with those of a long-standing customer whose orders are evaluated, and record which entries differ.

• Establish what has to exist for an order to be evaluated at all, and maintain it for one of the two customers using the limit the rating produces.

• Enter one test order for that customer above the maintained limit, and record what the system writes back to the order.

• Set out how the sales director's request for an immediate higher ceiling is to be handled in the test system without changing what will be transported.

CHECKPOINTS

• A test order entered above the maintained limit carries a credit decision that can be read on the order by a reviewer.

• Orders for the second contract-packing customer behave as they did before, so the difference is attributable to the entry you made.

• Any limit entered for the cycle is identifiable as test data and is referred to the credit controller before the cutover decision.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Supplier Advances and Staged Capitalization of the Cartoning Line

• Record the advance required by the equipment supplier so that it is held against the supplier and does not overstate the value carried on the asset under construction.

• Put the steps between the advance and the completed asset in the order the dependencies require, and note the state of the supplier account after each one.

• Examine the asset master created for the first commissioned module and establish why its reporting position and depreciation terms differ from the rest of the line.

• Settle the commissioned module in a way that respects both the local capitalization requirement and the qualification requirement of the second accounting principle.

CHECKPOINTS

• The advance is visible against the supplier and is cleared against the supplier invoice rather than left open once the invoice is posted.

• The completed asset is reported in the position used for production equipment and carries that equipment's depreciation terms.

• The value not yet capitalized under the second accounting principle remains on the asset under construction and is traceable to the qualification that is still outstanding.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Recharging Label Work While the Second Plant Stays on Local Books

• Record one month's leaflet recharge to the label plant in the live entity so that the amount is carried as a trackable item rather than as a manual clearing entry.

• Identify what the plant must be in the live entity for that treatment to be possible, and create or complete it for the current cycle.

• Establish what the intercompany posting design requires that the system does not yet contain, and state when it can be configured.

• Prepare the evidence a reviewer would use to follow one recharge from the posting to its settlement.

CHECKPOINTS

• The recharge produces an item that can be selected and cleared in the live entity without reference to a file held outside the system.

Visit us at: https://www.examsempire.com/c-s4cfi

• The route chosen for the coexistence period does not create entries that have to be reversed when the plant's company code is created.
• The intercompany design is recorded against the wave that creates the counterpart entity, with the dependency stated.

4. CHALLENGE 4 — Getting Held Packaging Material Invoices Into the Payment Proposal

• Run the payment proposal for the Karlovac company code and record which of the board supplier's due items it selects.
• Compare the entries on the unselected items with those on items the proposal did select, and identify the entry that decides selection.
• Correct that entry for the current cycle and re-run the proposal, recording the difference in the selected items.
• Set out how the invoices whose discount deadline falls before the next payment date are to be handled while the approval step stays in place.

CHECKPOINTS

• The board supplier's due items appear in the proposal after the correction, and the items left behind are only those not yet released by approvers.
• No change is made to the approval design in order to meet a discount deadline within the cycle.
• The handling agreed for invoices at risk of losing the discount is recorded and can be shown at the cutover decision.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Credit Master Data Setup Before Contract Packing Orders Are Released

Orders for the two contract-packing customers save and release with no credit decision written to the order, while orders of the same type for long-standing customers are evaluated and, where the exposure is high enough, held.

What is the most likely reason the two new customers' orders are not being evaluated?

A. The order type used for contract packing was left out of credit evaluation when the sales scope was set, so no check runs for orders created under it.
B. The two customers were created with payment terms copied from a template, so their exposure is only assessed once the resulting receivable becomes overdue.
C. The two customers hold no credit master data in the relevant segment, so an order has no limit or score to be evaluated against.
D. The two customers were not assigned to a collection segment and specialist, so nothing tracks their exposure and the order is released unevaluated.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Credit evaluation reads the customer's credit master data for the segment the order belongs to, and a customer without that data has nothing for the check to work with, so the order passes through unevaluated. The behaviour is customer-specific rather than order-type-specific, which is exactly what the comparison with long-standing customers shows. Maintaining the credit master data with the limit the rating produces restores the evaluation for these two customers alone.

Visit us at: https://www.examsempire.com/c-s4cfi

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Credit Master Data Setup Before Contract Packing Orders Are Released
Before the next test run, the finance lead wants evidence that credit evaluation now works for one of the contract-packing customers, and asks the team to plan the check.
Which action produces the most reliable evidence?

A. Maintain the credit limit on the customer's credit master data, enter a test order above that limit, and read the credit decision recorded on the order.
B. Post a test invoice for the customer and confirm the open item appears in receivables analysis, taking that visibility as evidence the exposure is evaluated.
C. Run a dunning proposal that selects the customer's overdue item, taking that selection as confirmation that the credit limit is now effective on orders.
D. Ask sales to enter an order below the expected limit and confirm it saves without a hold, taking the clean save as proof of correct evaluation.

Answer: A

Explanation:
The evidence a reviewer can use is the decision the system writes on the order, and it is only produced when a limit exists and an order is entered against it. Deliberately exceeding the limit forces the evaluation to reach a visible outcome rather than passing silently. This is also the checkpoint stated for the challenge, so it is the evidence the cycle is expected to produce.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 1 — Credit Master Data Setup Before Contract Packing Orders Are Released
The sales director asks for a higher ceiling for one contract-packing customer so the cycle is not delayed. Group credit policy derives limits from the customer rating and reserves approval to the credit controller, and the programme rule is that productive settings change only through the transported route.
How should the request be handled?

A. Raise the limit in the test system to the requested value and enter the same value in the productive settings, so both environments agree at the cutover decision.
B. Leave the limit as it is and log the held orders as a test defect, so the disagreement between sales and credit is settled before the cycle can close.
C. Raise the limit in the test system and adjust the derivation so ratings no longer drive limits, which prevents the same request arising in later test cycles.
D. Raise the limit as test data in the test system, leave the rating-based derivation untouched, and refer the request to the credit controller before cutover.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Two rules are in play, and both can be honoured: the cycle needs a limit high enough to keep testing, and the policy owner keeps the decision on the real ceiling. Entering the value as test data keeps the transported settings and the derivation rule intact while the controller decides on the commercial question. The request is then closed through the route the programme agreed rather than through the test system.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 2 — Supplier Advances and Staged Capitalization of the Cartoning Line
The first commissioned module of the cartoning line was settled from the asset under construction to a new asset master. The settled values agree, yet the asset is reported under a different balance sheet position than the rest of the line and carries depreciation terms the plant accountant did not expect. What is the most likely cause of what the plant accountant is seeing?

A. The field status group on the settlement account suppresses the asset fields, so the posting could not carry the attributes on which the reporting position depends.
B. The asset master was created in an asset class other than the one used for production equipment, so account determination and depreciation defaults came from that class.
C. The financial statement version node for production equipment carries no semantic tag, so the module's values are reported outside the position intended for them.
D. The depreciation run was executed before the settlement was posted, so the terms shown on the asset reflect the master record as it stood at that earlier time.

Answer: B

Explanation:
The asset class controls account determination, the number range, and the default depreciation data a new asset master takes on, so a module created in the wrong class posts correct values into the wrong reporting position with the wrong terms. That matches a symptom where the amounts are right and only the presentation and depreciation differ. Correcting the class assignment is what brings the module back in line with the rest of the line.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 2 — Supplier Advances and Staged Capitalization of the Cartoning Line
The equipment supplier requires an advance before the remaining modules ship, and the line is carried as an asset under construction until commissioning.
Which sequence records the advance and completes the capitalization correctly?

A. Post the down payment request, post the down payment against the supplier, clear it when the supplier invoice arrives, then settle the asset under construction.
B. Post the down payment request, post the down payment against the supplier, settle the asset under construction, then clear the advance at year-end closing.
C. Post the down payment against the supplier, settle the asset under construction, clear the advance against the supplier invoice, then post the down payment request.

D. Post the down payment request, post the advance as an acquisition on the asset under construction, clear it against the supplier invoice, then settle that asset.

Answer: A

Explanation:
The request records the commitment, the down payment is posted as a special general ledger transaction so account determination keeps it off the ordinary reconciliation account, and it is cleared against the supplier invoice when that invoice arrives. Only then does the asset under construction carry the value that belongs on it, so settlement to the completed asset comes last. Each step depends on the one before it, and nothing is left open against the supplier.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 2 — Supplier Advances and Staged Capitalization of the Cartoning Line
Local requirements allow the commissioned module to be capitalized from its commissioning date, while the second accounting principle applied by the group waits until the complete line has passed qualification.
How should the settlement be handled?

A. Settle the module for both accounting principles now and reverse the settlement for the stricter principle once the qualification date for the line becomes known.
B. Leave the whole value in the asset under construction until both criteria are met and record the earlier capitalization as an adjustment in an extension ledger.
C. Settle the commissioned module for the accounting principle whose criteria are met and leave the remaining value in the asset under construction for the other principle.
D. Settle the module for both accounting principles now and set the depreciation terms so that no depreciation arises under the stricter principle until qualification.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Settlement can be posted for a single accounting principle, which is precisely the situation where one principle's criteria are met and another's are not. The commissioned module is capitalized and starts depreciating where the local requirement allows it, while the value stays on the asset under construction under the principle still waiting for qualification. Both sets of books then show a position that can be substantiated on its own terms.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 3 — Recharging Label Work While the Second Plant Stays on Local Books
Karlovac prints and finishes leaflets for the label plant's own customers and recharges the plant monthly. The plant keeps its local bookkeeping package until its company code is created in the later wave.
How should the recharges be recorded in the live entity during that period?

A. Post each month's recharge as a journal entry to a clearing account and reconcile it against the plant's local records in a spreadsheet once a quarter, as now.
B. Record the plant as a business partner with the customer role and invoice the recharge, so the amount carries an open item that can be tracked and cleared.
C. Build an interface from the plant's local package so that both sides of the recharge post automatically while the two systems continue to run alongside each other.
D. Hold the recharges outside the ledger and post the accumulated amount once the plant's company code exists, so that the entries are made only once and stay aligned.

Answer: B

Explanation:
With only one side of the relationship in the system, the plant can still be carried as a business partner in the customer role, and an invoice then produces an open item that behaves like any other receivable. The amount is visible in follow-up, can be cleared when the plant settles, and needs no file kept beside the system. Nothing posted this way has to be reversed when the plant's own company code is created later.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 3 — Recharging Label Work While the Second Plant Stays on Local Books
The group controller asks for the intercompany posting design to be configured during the current cycle so that nothing has to change when the plant joins.
What is the most appropriate response to that request?

A. Configure the intercompany rules now against a placeholder company code and repoint them to the plant once its company code exists, so the design is proven early.
B. Configure the intercompany rules now and post the recharges through them from the live entity, leaving the counterpart side to be added at the later wave.
C. Ask the plant to record its side in the local package using the live entity's document numbers, so that both sides can be matched automatically after the wave.
D. Keep the recharges on the interim customer route and schedule the intercompany design for the wave that creates the plant's company code.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Intercompany posting rules are defined between company codes, and the counterpart the controller wants to post to does not exist in the system until the later wave. The interim customer route carries the recharge properly in the meantime, and the design is booked into the wave that supplies its missing dependency. The controller's aim is met at the point where it can actually be met, rather than simulated now.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 4 — Getting Held Packaging Material Invoices Into the Payment Proposal

In the payment run test, approved and due invoices from one board mill are not selected while invoices from other suppliers in the same run are. The approval record shows the block removed, the amounts sit well above any minimum, and the supplier's business partner carries the supplier role for the entity. What is the most likely reason those invoices are not selected?

A. The payment method carried on those invoices is not among the methods defined for the paying company code, so the run has no permitted way to pay them.
B. The document type used for those invoices has exhausted its number range, so the run cannot assign a payment document to the items it would otherwise select.
C. The invoices were entered against a house bank whose ranking places it below the others, so the run defers them until the higher-ranked bank has been used.
D. The invoices carry a posting date in a period that has since been closed, so the run treats them as not yet due and holds them for a later proposal.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Selection requires a payment method that the paying company code permits, and an item carrying a method defined only elsewhere is passed over however complete its approval is. That explains why other suppliers in the same run were paid and why nothing in the approval record points to a reason. Aligning the method on the item with those the company code allows brings the items into the next proposal.

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 4 — Getting Held Packaging Material Invoices Into the Payment Proposal
A group of packaging material invoices is still with approvers, and the discount deadline on them falls before the next payment date. The controller asks for the approval step to be taken out of the way so the discounts are not lost.
What is the most appropriate way to proceed?

A. Remove the approval step for invoices below an agreed value so that discount deadlines are met without waiting, and record the change as a process improvement.
B. Release the invoices without approval for this run, note the discounts captured as evidence, and restore the approval requirement before the next test cycle begins.
C. Let the notification for invoices at risk of losing the discount prompt the approvers, keep the approval step, and pay only the invoices released in time.
D. Bring the payment run forward and change the payment terms on the open invoices so that the discount is shown as taken when the proposal is created.

Answer: C

Explanation:
The situation notification exists for exactly this pressure: it puts the deadline in front of the people who can act on it while leaving the approval design untouched. Whatever is released in time is paid with the

discount, and whatever is not is visible as an approval delay rather than as a configuration decision. The programme rules the owner's auditor was shown remain intact through the cycle.

Visit us at: https://www.examsempire.com/c-s4cfi

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/