SAP
C_MDG_2601
SAP Certified - SAP Master Data Governance

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: 4.1

Topic: 1
Unified Scenario Simulation
Aldermoor Freightways: Governing One Trusted Master Record
Business context
Company Background
Aldermoor Freightways coordinates road and rail freight bookings for manufacturers shipping goods between regional hubs. The company relies on customer, vendor, and route data maintained in several departmental systems that were connected over time as the business grew.
Business Context
Each depot keeps its own list of shipping customers, and a company name typed slightly differently in two systems is treated as two separate customers by billing and by dispatch. A finance clerk in Lisbon and a dispatch planner in Porto often see conflicting addresses for the same client.
Current Situation
An invoice was sent to an outdated billing address while the shipment itself was correctly routed to the customer's new warehouse, because the two departments never agreed on which address was current. The customer complained, and the finance director asked why the same fact about one customer could differ between two departments.
Operational Landscape
A data steward was asked to compare customer lists monthly and manually align mismatches, but new discrepancies reappear faster than they can be reconciled by hand. The steward has asked for a longer-term answer rather than a repeating manual fix.
Governance Scope
The chief operating officer wants every department to work from one governed version of customer and vendor data, created and changed through an agreed process rather than typed independently in each system. Aldermoor Freightways has asked an outside consultant to explain what changes are actually needed before any tool is selected.
Your assignment
As the engaged master data governance consultant, you are asked to walk Aldermoor Freightways through why its current approach produces conflicting records, what a single governed version of the truth means in practice, how creation and maintenance should be controlled rather than left to individual departments, and how a trusted record should reach the systems that depend on it. Across four challenges you will address the cost of divergence, the idea of one authoritative record, control over creation and change, and distribution of that trusted data downstream
1. CHALLENGE 1 — Recognizing the Cost of Divergent Records
• Identify at least two concrete consequences of the same customer existing as multiple, inconsistent records.
• Distinguish a data quality symptom, like a misspelled name, from a governance symptom, like no one owning which value is correct.
• Explain why manual monthly reconciliation cannot keep pace with the underlying cause.
• Connect the incident described to a lack of one agreed source of truth.
Checkpoints
• The explanation names a specific business consequence, not just general confusion.
• The candidate distinguishes symptom from root cause.
• The answer avoids blaming a single department instead of the process.
2. CHALLENGE 2 — Establishing a Single Governed Version of the Truth

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

• Define what it means for a record to be the single trusted version across departments.
• Explain why declaring one department's existing list as authoritative is not the same as true governance.
• Describe how ownership of a data object differs from a department merely using that data.
• Show how a governed version reduces, rather than just relocates, the reconciliation burden.

Checkpoints

• The answer defines governance in terms of an agreed, controlled version, not just a chosen file.
• The candidate separates data ownership from data usage.
• The response avoids suggesting governance is solved by picking a favorite existing list.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Recognizing the Cost of Divergent Records

Why did Aldermoor Freightways' invoice go to an outdated address even though dispatch used the correct one?

A. The two departments were maintaining separate, unsynchronized versions of the same customer record.
B. The finance clerk in Lisbon made a one-time typing mistake that has since been corrected.
C. The dispatch planner in Porto used an unauthorized personal spreadsheet instead of the actual company system.
D. The customer themselves supplied two different addresses to the company on separate occasions without saying so.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Each department held its own copy of the customer, so an update in one did not reach the other.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Recognizing the Cost of Divergent Records

The data steward's monthly manual reconciliation keeps falling behind. What does this best indicate about the underlying problem?

A. The data steward is not experienced enough to keep up with the reconciliation workload.
B. New conflicting records keep being created because nothing controls data entry at the source.
C. The company simply needs to hire two additional data stewards to share the reconciliation workload.
D. The monthly reconciliation schedule should instead be changed to a weekly schedule to catch issues sooner.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Without control at the point of creation, new conflicts will always outpace after-the-fact cleanup.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 2 — Establishing a Single Governed Version of the Truth

The finance director suggests just telling every department to copy finance's customer list going forward. Why is this not the same as governing the data?

A. Finance's customer list is historically less accurate than the list used by dispatch.
B. Departments outside finance will refuse to use a list that they did not create themselves.
C. It picks an existing list as default without establishing who owns changes or how updates are agreed.
D. Copying a list between systems always introduces formatting errors that no governance process could ever realistically prevent.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Without agreed ownership and a change process, the copied list will diverge again as soon as anyone edits it independently.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 2 — Establishing a Single Governed Version of the Truth

What best distinguishes a department that owns a master data object from a department that merely uses it?

A. The owning department is the one that originally typed the record into the very first system the company ever used.
B. The owning department has the largest number of daily transactions involving that data.
C. The owning department is whichever team complains most often about data quality problems.
D. The owning department is accountable for approving what values are correct and how changes are made.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Ownership means accountability for correctness and the change process, not just having access to the data.
Topic: 2
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 5

Halberd Components needs to update the responsible person field on about six hundred cost centers after a management restructuring, all pointing to the same three new managers depending on department. A finance operations clerk begins opening cost centers one at a time to update the field, but after a full day only a small fraction are done and the deadline for the new budgeting cycle is close. The team lead proposes using a mass change so the update applies to all affected cost centers at once, while still keeping the standard governance validation and approval so the bulk update itself is checked before it takes effect.
How should Halberd Components apply the responsible person update across six hundred cost centers?

A. Use governed mass processing to update the responsible person field on all affected cost centers in one validated run.
B. Write a direct update against the underlying cost center table so all records change in a single overnight batch.
C. Continue having the finance operations clerk update each of the six hundred cost centers individually, and bring in extra clerks to work through the remaining records in parallel before the deadline.
D. Update only the cost centers used in the next budgeting cycle and leave the rest for a later date.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Mass processing changes many cost centers together while still passing through governance validation, meeting the deadline without sacrificing control.

Question: 6

Vantorix Holdings operates finance shared services out of Dublin and Chicago, and its controller has asked for a change to the account type and description on a set of G/L accounts used for intercompany settlements. A junior accountant proposes making the edits directly in each system's finance master data table over the weekend, since the change seems simple and time is short before month-end close. The finance data steward objects, noting the accounts feed consolidated reporting and any inconsistency between systems could break intercompany eliminations. She wants the update captured, validated, and approved through the proper governance workflow before it reaches any productive system, even though that adds an extra day to the timeline.
What should Vantorix Holdings do to update the G/L accounts safely?

A. Have the junior accountant make the same manual edits in each connected system over the weekend and cross-check the totals afterward against a spreadsheet the team maintains separately.
B. Ask the consolidation team to manually adjust the intercompany eliminations to compensate for the inconsistent account data.
C. Postpone the account type change until after month-end close and make no update now.
D. Route the account changes through a governed finance change request so validation and approval happen before the update is applied.

Answer: D

Explanation:

A change request captures the edit centrally, runs validation, and requires approval, keeping the accounts consistent across systems before anything goes productive.

Question: 7

Nordreach Distribution merged with two smaller regional distributors last year, and the combined operation in Manchester now runs on three separate customer master files. The same retail chain shows up under three different customer numbers, three slightly different names, and three billing addresses, so the finance team cannot tell how much credit exposure the chain actually represents across all three legacy systems. A recent audit found dozens of similar overlaps among wholesale customers, though a handful of the near-identical names really do belong to separate independent franchise owners who happen to share a common shopping-center address. The governance lead wants a single trusted customer record per real business, without erasing the franchise owners who are genuinely distinct. She is deciding how to bring the three files together into one.
Which approach should the governance lead take to unify Nordreach's three customer master files?

A. Compare every customer name pair for similarity and automatically delete whichever of the two records was created most recently, since the newer entry is normally the redundant one introduced during the merger and can safely be dropped without further review.
B. Flag each suspected duplicate with a comment for finance to read but leave every record exactly as it is today.
C. Run a matching pass across the three files and merge each confirmed duplicate set into a single best record, leaving the distinct franchise owners as separate records.
D. Choose the largest of the three legacy files as authoritative and discard the other two files completely.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Matching and merging into one best record collapses genuine duplicates into a trusted customer view while the standalone matching step keeps distinct franchise owners intact.

Question: 8

Aventmark Cosmetics runs its master data quality checks informally today: whenever someone in the Zurich office notices a missing tax classification or an oddly formatted phone number, they email the data team to fix it. There is no defined list of what good data means for a customer record, so two reviewers checking the same batch of records often disagree about what counts as a problem. Leadership wants to move away from these one-off emails toward a defined set of quality dimensions such as completeness and accuracy, evaluated against explicit rules, with a score calculated the same way every time so results can be tracked release over release. The data quality lead is presenting options for how to get there.
Which approach should the data quality lead recommend to replace the current informal checks?

A. Ask every department to keep emailing the data team whenever they personally notice something wrong, but require them to copy their manager on each email so there is a written record of every individual issue that was ever reported by any employee.
B. Wait until the next system upgrade and assume the new software will catch data problems automatically.
C. Define quality dimensions and rules, then evaluate records against them to produce a repeatable score that can be tracked over time.
D. Hire one additional reviewer to double-check the existing ad hoc emails faster.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Defined dimensions and rule-based evaluation produce a consistent, repeatable score, replacing subjective one-off judgments with something trackable release over release.

Question: 9

Larchmont Systems runs central governance for material master data and is expanding into several new cloud-based consuming systems used by its logistics partners. Today, once a material master change is approved, a regional administrator manually exports a spreadsheet and emails it to each consuming system's owner, who then re-enters the values by hand. This has already caused at least one mismatch where a partner's system held an outdated unit of measure after a correction was approved centrally.
The governance architect is designing how central governance should operate going forward so that every approved change reaches every consuming cloud system consistently, without depending on a person remembering to export and forward a file each time.
How should the governance architect ensure approved material master changes reach every consuming system consistently?

A. Configure central governance in cloud-ready mode so approved changes are replicated automatically and consistently to consuming systems.
B. Store all approved changes in a shared folder and let each consuming system's owner copy values across whenever it happens to be convenient.
C. Have the regional administrator export the spreadsheet more frequently so partners receive updates sooner after approval.
D. Ask each logistics partner to periodically check in and re-key any material master values they suspect may have changed.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Cloud-ready mode with automated replication removes the manual export step and guarantees every consuming system receives the same approved data.

Question: 10

At Ravensworth Airlines, supplier change requests are meant to close within three business days, yet buyers keep reporting that some drag on for weeks while others clear almost immediately, and nobody can say with certainty where the delay actually sits. The governance lead has only secondhand impressions to go on: one team blames the approval step, another blames incomplete supplier submissions, and a third suspects the data quality check. Leadership has committed to a formal service level for change-request turnaround and now wants proof, not opinion, of which step is breaching it and how often, so that any fix targets the real cause rather than a hunch. The lead must decide how to get an objective view of throughput and locate exactly where requests stall against the agreed target.
What should the governance lead do to identify where change requests are breaching the agreed service level?

A. Relax the three-day service level to two weeks so that fewer requests are counted as breaches going forward.
B. Add another layer of approval to every change request so that more reviewers can catch problems before they escalate further up the chain.
C. Poll each team informally and record whichever step they personally believe is the slowest based on recent memory.
D. Run MDG process analytics to measure change-request throughput and isolate the specific step breaching the service level.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Process analytics reports actual step-by-step throughput against the service level, replacing guesswork with evidence of exactly where requests stall.

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/