SAP
C_TS422_2601
SAP Certified - SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition, Production Planning and Manufacturing

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.



Latest Version: 4.0

Topic: 1
Unified Scenario Simulation
Tamesford Appliances: First Manufacturing Planning Cycle on S/4HANA
Business Context
Tamesford Appliances is a mid-sized discrete manufacturer of domestic appliances supplying retail and wholesale customers across two regions. The company is implementing SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition for manufacturing and is approaching its first live planning cycle for a new product line. A small manufacturing project team — a consultant and two business users — is preparing master data, running planning, and rehearsing the production order lifecycle before go-live, so that the first MRP run and the first production orders behave as expected.
Master Data Context
The new appliance is assembled from purchased and in-house components. The team has created the bill of material and the routing, and has set up the work centers that the routing operations refer to. During the first walkthrough, most assemblies plan correctly, but one in-house component does not generate the expected planned orders, even though demand exists for it. The team has confirmed the component's demand and that it is flagged for in-house production.
Planning Context
The project plans to use MRP Live for the regular planning run and is evaluating advanced methods for a constrained, high-variability subassembly. The business expects the planning run to create planned orders for in-house items and purchase requisitions for externally procured items, and to surface exception messages where coverage cannot be met. A category manager has asked whether make-to-stock or make-to-order is the right strategy for the configurable variant the company sells to wholesale customers.
Capacity Context
Two work centers are shared between the new line and existing production. After the first planning run, the team wants to see whether the planned load exceeds available capacity at those work centers before committing to dates. The expectation is that capacity evaluation shows the load against available capacity so the team can decide whether any levelling is needed, rather than discovering an overload only when orders are executed.
Advanced Planning Context
The constrained subassembly has sequence-dependent setup and limited resource availability, so the team is weighing the embedded advanced planning and detailed scheduling capability against the standard run for that item. The goal is finite, resource-aware scheduling for the bottleneck without over-engineering planning for the rest of the catalogue, which the standard run handles well.
Execution Context
For shopfloor execution the team is rehearsing the production order lifecycle: creating and releasing orders, confirming operations, and completing them. During the rehearsal, one released order cannot be confirmed at a particular operation, and the team needs to determine whether the cause sits in the order, the master data the order copied, or the confirmation step itself, before they repeat the rehearsal.
Process Manufacturing Context
A separate liquid-detergent area runs as process manufacturing rather than discrete, with its own master data and shopfloor process. The team must keep the two streams distinct, because the same

Visit us at: https://www.examsempire.com/c-ts422-2601

business intent is modelled with different objects across discrete and process manufacturing, and reusing a discrete assumption in the process area has already caused confusion once.

Go-Live Readiness Context

Before go-live, the team wants confidence that master data is complete enough for planning to resolve, that the planning run and capacity evaluation produce a readable result, that the chosen strategy and method fit each item, and that the production order lifecycle can be executed end to end. Management wants the first cycle to validate the setup rather than expose gaps to the shopfloor.

Your assignment

You are the manufacturing consultant on the Tamesford S/4HANA project. Working in the project system before go-live, you must prepare master data, run and interpret planning, choose fit-for-purpose strategies and methods, and execute the production order lifecycle. Validate each result against observable system evidence; do not assume a re-run will fix a master-data or strategy gap

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Completing Manufacturing Master Data Before Planning

• Review the new product's bill of material, routing, work centers, and in-house production settings.

• For an in-house item that planning skips, identify which master-data prerequisite is missing rather than re-running planning blindly.

• Correct the prerequisite and confirm the item becomes eligible for planning.

Checkpoints

• The previously skipped item generates the expected planned order after correction.

• No item is left planning-ineligible due to an incomplete master-data prerequisite.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Running MRP and Reading the Planning Result

• Execute the planning run and review planned orders, purchase requisitions, and exception messages.

• Distinguish an exception that signals a real coverage problem from one that is informational.

• Use capacity evaluation to see planned load against available capacity at the shared work centers.

Checkpoints

• Procurement proposals match each item's procurement type.

• Capacity load is visible against available capacity before dates are committed.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Choosing the Strategy and Planning Method per Item

• Decide make-to-stock or make-to-order per item from its demand pattern and configuration needs.

• Decide standard planning versus the embedded advanced method for constrained, sequence-dependent items.

• Record the choice and the reason it fits that item.

Checkpoints

• The configurable wholesale variant uses a strategy consistent with its demand and variant nature.

• The constrained subassembly uses finite, resource-aware scheduling without over-engineering the rest.

4. CHALLENGE 4 — Executing the Production Order Lifecycle

• Create and release a production order, confirm its operations, and complete it.

• For an operation that cannot be confirmed, locate the cause in the order, its copied master data, or the confirmation step.

• Keep discrete and process execution distinct, using each stream's own objects.

Checkpoints

• A released order is confirmed at every operation and completed.

• A confirmation failure is traced to the responsible layer, not worked around by retrying.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Completing Manufacturing Master Data Before Planning

An in-house component has clear demand and is flagged for in-house production, yet the planning run creates no planned order for it, while other in-house items on the same bill of material plan correctly. Which check most directly explains why this one item is skipped?

A. Confirm the item has the master data needed to be produced in-house, since the working items prove the run itself is fine
B. Re-run the planning job for the whole plant and assume the planned order appears on the second pass, since the configuration looks correct and the first pass was probably incomplete
C. Change the item to external procurement so a purchase requisition is created instead
D. Raise the planning horizon for the plant so more periods are included

Answer: A

Explanation:
Other in-house items plan correctly, so the planning run works; the fault is specific to this item's readiness to be produced in-house. Checking that it has the master data required for in-house production (so planning can build a make proposal) targets the actual gap rather than the run.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Completing Manufacturing Master Data Before Planning

The routing for the new appliance refers to a work center, but one operation cannot find valid capacity or scheduling basis when the order is later scheduled. The bill of material is complete and the routing exists.
What is the most likely cause to correct?

A. The bill of material is missing a component and must be extended before scheduling, on the assumption the scheduling basis comes from the component list rather than the work center
B. The work center the operation refers to is not set up with the data scheduling needs, so it must be completed
C. The order quantity is too large and should be reduced to schedule the operation
D. The item should be switched to make-to-order so scheduling is skipped

Answer: B

Explanation:
The bill of material is complete and the routing exists, so the gap is the work center the operation depends on: if it lacks the data scheduling relies on, the operation cannot be scheduled. Completing the work center setup it references resolves the scheduling basis at the right layer.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 2 — Running MRP and Reading the Planning Result

After the planning run, an externally procured component shows a procurement proposal, and the team must confirm the proposal type matches how the component is obtained.
Which result is correct for an externally procured component?

A. A planned order for in-house production is created for the component, on the assumption the planning run makes every component regardless of its procurement type
B. A purchase requisition is created for the component, matching external procurement
C. No proposal is created because external items are excluded from planning
D. A process order is created for the component regardless of its type

Answer: B

Explanation:
A planned order represents in-house production, which contradicts an externally procured component and would propose making something meant to be bought.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 2 — Running MRP and Reading the Planning Result

The planning result shows an exception message on a finished product indicating its coverage cannot be met within the requested dates. A business user wants to ignore all exception messages as noise.
How should the team treat this exception?

A. Investigate it as a real coverage signal, because it indicates demand that cannot be met as requested
B. Treat the message as low priority and release the plan now, intending to revisit coverage only if the shopfloor later reports that the product has run short
C. Delete the finished product's demand so the exception disappears
D. Switch the plant to a different planning method to remove all exceptions

Answer: A

Explanation:
An exception that says coverage cannot be met within the requested dates is an actionable signal about unmet demand, not noise; investigating it lets the team address the shortfall (timing, capacity, or supply) before it reaches the shopfloor.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 3 — Choosing the Strategy and Planning Method per Item

The configurable variant sold to wholesale customers is ordered to specific customer configurations with limited predictability. The team must choose make-to-stock or make-to-order for it.
Which choice fits this item, and why?

A. Make-to-stock, because keeping the configurable variant in finished stock gives wholesale customers the fastest possible response whenever they place an order for it
B. Make-to-stock, because the variant should be built to a forecast and stored ahead of orders
C. Make-to-order, because the configurable, customer-specific variant should be produced against actual orders
D. Either is equally valid, so pick whichever is faster to configure

Answer: C

Explanation:
A configurable, customer-specific variant with limited predictability is best produced against actual sales orders, which is make-to-order; it avoids stocking configurations that may never be ordered and ties production to real demand.
Topic: 2
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 6

A food and beverage manufacturer runs a liquid-products area as process manufacturing on SAP S/4HANA, alongside a discrete packaging line. A team member who set up the discrete line tries to execute the liquid area the same way, using the discrete production order approach that worked for packaging. The liquid area, however, does not behave correctly under the discrete approach, and the team is unsure whether to push the discrete objects onto it, convert the area to discrete, or run it in some other way. The packaging line continues to run normally through its discrete path, so the issue is specific to how the liquid area is being executed. The consultant must decide how to execute the liquid area correctly while keeping it distinct from the discrete packaging line, and stop reusing a discrete assumption where it does not apply. The correction must let both areas run validly side by side, with the liquid area executed in the way that suits how it actually works rather than by the discrete assumption that does not fit it.
Which approach correctly executes the liquid area while keeping both streams valid?

A. Convert the liquid area to discrete manufacturing so it can reuse the packaging line's order approach directly
B. Execute the liquid area with its own process manufacturing objects, since process and discrete model the work with different objects
C. Force the liquid area onto the discrete production order so the whole plant executes through one consistent path, reusing the packaging line's setup even though the liquid area is process manufacturing
D. Run the packaging line's discrete order for the liquid area and adjust the quantities and components afterward

Answer: B

Explanation:

Process and discrete manufacturing represent the same intent with different objects, so the liquid area must execute through its own process manufacturing path. That keeps both streams valid and removes the confusion caused by reusing the discrete approach.

Question: 7

An electronics manufacturer on SAP S/4HANA plans most of its catalogue successfully with the standard planning run. One subassembly, however, is a genuine bottleneck: it has sequence-dependent setup, limited availability on a specialised resource, and tight delivery commitments, so its scheduling must respect finite capacity and setup sequence rather than assume unlimited capacity. The standard run keeps proposing dates that the bottleneck resource cannot actually meet during execution, and the planner must decide how to plan this item so its schedule reflects the real resource and setup limits. The consultant must decide how to plan the bottleneck without disturbing the rest of the catalogue, which the standard run handles well. The bottleneck's specialised resource is available only in limited windows, and its setup time depends on the sequence in which items are produced. Moving everything to advanced planning would over-engineer the unconstrained majority, while leaving the bottleneck on the standard run keeps producing unrealistic dates. The correction must give this constrained item a schedule that respects its finite resource and setup limits, while the unconstrained items remain on the standard run that already serves them well.
Which planning approach fits the bottleneck subassembly without over-engineering the rest?

A. Keep the bottleneck on the standard run like the rest of the catalogue, since that run already plans most items well
B. Move the entire catalogue to advanced planning so every item is scheduled in exactly the same consistent way, including the many items the standard run already plans well without constraints
C. Stop planning the bottleneck in the system and expedite it manually each time its delivery date approaches
D. Apply the embedded advanced planning and detailed scheduling capability to the bottleneck for finite, resource-aware scheduling

Answer: D

Explanation:
A bottleneck with sequence-dependent setup and limited resource availability needs finite, resource-aware detailed scheduling, which the embedded advanced planning capability provides. Applying it only to the constrained item fixes the unrealistic dates without disturbing the rest.

Question: 8

A discrete automotive-components manufacturer is preparing master data on SAP S/4HANA before its first planning cycle. A subassembly is meant to be produced in-house, and demand for it clearly exists from the finished products that consume it. After the planning run, however, the subassembly receives a purchase requisition rather than a planned order for in-house production, while comparable in-house items on the same bill of material correctly receive planned orders. The consultant confirms the bill of material is complete, the routing exists, and the work centers are set up. Its peers on the same bill of material plan correctly and its routing and work centers are complete, so the team must determine why

this one item is not being planned for in-house production. The team needs the first cycle to reflect the real sourcing intent and must avoid simply accepting the purchase requisition, because the part is genuinely manufactured in-house and no supplier is set up for it. The correction must make planning propose in-house production for the subassembly while leaving the correctly-planned peers untouched, and the result must be reproducible into later systems.
Which correction makes planning propose in-house production for the subassembly?

A. Extend the bill of material with more components so planning recognises the part as in-house
B. Increase the planning horizon so the subassembly is included on a later planning pass
C. Correct the subassembly's procurement type so the system treats it as produced in-house, then re-run planning for it
D. Accept the purchase requisition and quickly create a supplier so the part can be procured externally instead, even though no supplier exists and the part is genuinely manufactured in-house

Answer: C

Explanation:
Peers on the same bill of material plan correctly, so the run is sound; the subassembly's procurement type is what makes the system buy rather than make it. Correcting that procurement type makes planning propose in-house production, and re-running confirms it at the right layer.

Question: 9

A pharmaceutical manufacturer on SAP S/4HANA produces two kinds of output: a standard over-the-counter product with steady, forecastable demand sold through retail, and a specialised preparation made to specific clinic orders with low predictability and order-specific characteristics. The planning team initially set both to the same strategy for simplicity, but the specialised preparation has been accumulating finished stock that clinics do not order in that exact form, while the standard product occasionally runs short. Demand for the standard product is steady across the retail calendar, whereas clinic orders for the specialised preparation arrive irregularly and in specific forms. The consultant must assign each product the planning strategy that fits its demand. The standard product's steady, forecastable demand suits building to a forecast and holding stock, while the specialised preparation's order-specific, low-predictability nature suits producing against actual clinic orders rather than to forecast. The correction must stop the specialised preparation being built to stock it cannot sell as-is, and keep the standard product available for its predictable retail demand, by matching strategy to each product's pattern rather than applying one uniform approach.
Which strategy assignment fits the two products' demand patterns?

A. Keep both on one identical strategy, because a uniform approach is simpler to configure and maintain over time
B. Make both products to stock, since holding finished inventory keeps everything available for customers at all times
C. Make the standard product to stock and the specialised, order-specific preparation to order, matching each pattern
D. Make both products to order, so nothing is ever built before a confirmed order exists for it

Answer: C

Explanation:
The standard product's predictable demand suits make-to-stock, and the specialised, order-specific preparation suits make-to-order; matching each product to its pattern stops the unsellable stock and keeps the standard product available.

Question: 10

A building-materials manufacturer on SAP S/4HANA reviews the result of its latest planning run. A finished product carries an exception message indicating that its demand cannot be covered within the requested dates. A junior planner suggests treating all exception messages as background noise and ignoring them, so the team can release what is already planned and move on. The exception names a specific finished product whose demand cannot be covered within the requested dates, and nothing about the planning run itself has been shown to be faulty. Other team members are unsure how to respond: some would delete the product's demand so the message simply disappears, others would switch the plant to a different planning method in the hope of removing such messages, and others suspect the exception points to a genuine shortfall that needs looking into. The consultant must decide how to treat this exception before the plan is committed, weighing whether dismissing or suppressing it could let a real coverage problem reach the shopfloor against the effort of investigating its cause in timing, supply, or capacity.
How should the team treat the coverage exception on the finished product?

A. Investigate it as a real coverage signal, since it flags demand that cannot be met within the requested dates
B. Switch the plant to a different planning method on the assumption it will stop generating exception messages
C. Ignore all exception messages as background noise and release whatever is already planned without investigating them
D. Delete the finished product's demand so the exception message disappears from the planning result entirely

Answer: A

Explanation:
An exception that says coverage cannot be met within the requested dates is actionable, so investigating its cause — timing, supply, or capacity — lets the team resolve the shortfall before it reaches execution.

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/