SAP
P_SAPEA_2601
SAP Certified - SAP Enterprise Architect

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
Post-Merger Pharma Enterprise Architecture and Coexistence Roadmap
Business Context
Lumovera Therapeutics is a multinational pharmaceutical manufacturer formed eight months ago through the merger of two roughly equal mid-cap companies, one headquartered in Switzerland with strong European commercial operations and one in the United States with a large generics and contract-manufacturing footprint across North America and Southeast Asia. The combined group now operates regulated manufacturing sites on three continents, sells into more than forty national markets, and must satisfy overlapping serialization, batch-genealogy, and pharmacovigilance obligations. The board has approved a three-year integration program and has asked the newly appointed enterprise architecture function to set direction before any large build investment is committed.
Engagement Mandate
The enterprise architect has been engaged to lead the early architecture work for the combined group and to produce the artifacts that will anchor the integration: a shared architecture vision, a target operating picture across the business, application, data, and technology layers, and a sequenced set of opportunities that the program can fund in waves. Executive sponsors have asked specifically for a defensible recommendation on how the two enterprise estates should converge, rather than a catalogue of every system in scope.
System Landscape
The two heritage organizations arrive with very different SAP estates. The Swiss heritage runs a long-lived, heavily customized ERP core that has accumulated hundreds of modifications to standard objects over fifteen years, several of which encode market-specific regulatory logic that the business considers indispensable. The US heritage runs a more recently deployed, largely standard ERP environment that was implemented with a fit-to-standard posture and extends through released interfaces rather than core changes. Around both cores sit divergent middleware: the Swiss side relies on a mix of point-to-point file interfaces and an older integration bus, while the US side routes most of its traffic through a managed integration platform.
Commercial Pressures
Commercial leadership wants a single global view of customers, contracts, and rebates within the first year, because the merger rationale rests on cross-selling the combined portfolio and renegotiating distributor agreements at group scale. Supply-chain leadership, by contrast, is anxious that any disruption to the validated manufacturing and quality systems could threaten product release and regulatory standing, and has signalled that it will resist changes to the heritage manufacturing cores until late in the program. These two priorities pull the sequencing in opposite directions.
Data Observations
Early discovery work shows that the two organizations model core business data differently. Material and product master records overlap heavily by molecule but differ in numbering, classification, and unit-of-measure conventions; customer hierarchies are structured around different distributor models; and finance has two incompatible chart-of-accounts designs feeding two separate consolidation routines. Several analytics teams have already begun building reconciliation extracts directly against the heritage transactional systems to answer board questions, and these extracts are multiplying without clear ownership.
Customization Exposure

Visit us at: https://www.examsempire.com/p-sapea-2601

A closer look at the Swiss core reveals that some of the indispensable regulatory logic is implemented as direct modifications to standard objects, which has historically delayed the heritage system's ability to take vendor updates and has on occasion required regression effort measured in months. Business owners describe this logic as non-negotiable, yet the same outcomes appear to be handled on the US side through configuration and released extension points without core modification. The architect must reconcile these claims rather than accept them at face value.

Integration Tension

Because both estates must keep operating through the integration, interfaces between them are being requested faster than any target design exists. Teams have started wiring temporary point-to-point connections between the two ERP cores to satisfy urgent reporting and order-routing needs, and each new connection assumes the heritage data models will persist. Left unmanaged, these connections risk hardening the very divergence the program is meant to remove, and they increase the number of touch-points that any future convergence step would have to unwind.

Governance Context

The combined group has not yet agreed on how architecture decisions will be governed. Two project management offices, inherited from the heritage organizations, continue to approve their own changes, and there is no single body that can adjudicate when a local request conflicts with the emerging group target. Sponsors expect the architect to recommend not only a technical direction but also the decision and governance mechanism that will keep the waves coherent as funding is released incrementally.

Decision Horizon

Within the next several weeks the architect must present a vision and an opportunities-and-solutions view to the steering committee, including a recommended convergence posture for the two cores, a sequencing logic for the integration waves, a position on how customer and finance data should be unified, and a stance on whether the heritage customizations should be carried forward, retired, or re-platformed onto released extension mechanisms. The recommendation will frame the entire three-year investment, and the committee has made clear that it wants a direction it can defend to regulators, to the two heritage leadership teams, and to the board.

Your assignment

You are acting as the lead enterprise architect engaged by Lumovera Therapeutics to set architectural direction for the post-merger integration. You will advise the steering committee, the two heritage leadership teams, and the program management offices. Your remit covers the architecture vision and the opportunities-and-solutions view: the convergence posture for the two ERP estates, the sequencing of the integration waves, the clean-core position on inherited customization, and the governance of unified data. Your recommendations must trace to business strategy and capability needs, respect regulatory and validation constraints, and remain defensible to regulators and to both heritage organizations. Frame each response as advisory positioning and trade-off reasoning, not as system configuration steps

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Converging Two Divergent ERP Estates After Merger

• Advise the steering committee on the convergence posture for the two heritage cores, grounding the recommendation in the architecture vision and the combined business-capability target rather than in either heritage system's incumbency.

• Position the convergence decision so that it constrains the later application, integration, and data work, and explain why establishing the vision and capability target must precede committing to a single-core, dual-core, or transition pattern.

• Address how to handle the supply-chain demand to leave validated manufacturing cores untouched while still committing to a defensible long-term target.

Checkpoints

• The recommended posture is justified by business strategy and capability fit, and traceable to the architecture vision.
• The recommendation does not pre-commit downstream integration and data design before the convergence posture is set.
• Validated, revenue-critical operations are protected without abandoning the long-term convergence direction.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Sequencing the Coexistence Roadmap Across Integration Waves

• Derive the wave sequence from a baseline-versus-target gap analysis, ordering opportunities so prerequisite capabilities precede the capabilities that depend on them.
• Reconcile the commercial demand for an early single global customer view against the supply-chain demand for stability, and justify what belongs in the first wave on dependency grounds.
• Define each wave so that it leaves a coherent, operable transition architecture rather than a partially wired intermediate state.

Checkpoints

• Each wave's contents trace to work packages derived from identified gaps, not to stakeholder urgency alone.
• No wave funds a capability before the data or integration foundation it depends on exists.
• Every transition state between waves is operable and regulatorily defensible.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Converging Two Divergent ERP Estates After Merger

The steering committee asks the architect to recommend a convergence posture for the two heritage ERP cores at the first session, before the architecture vision and combined capability target have been agreed.
What is the most defensible advisory response?

A. Standardize now on the more modern US core because it is already fit-to-standard, and direct the Swiss operations to migrate onto it ahead of any agreed vision.
B. Defer committing to a single-core, dual-core, or transition pattern until the vision and capability target are agreed, framing the posture as a decision those artifacts determine.
C. Keep both heritage cores permanently because both are operational today and any convergence step would disturb the validated manufacturing and quality systems the business depends on.
D. Have each heritage organization continue under its own PMO and defer any group-level architecture posture entirely until the integration program has been fully funded by the board.

Answer: B

Explanation:
The convergence posture is a downstream consequence of the architecture vision and the combined capability target; committing to it first inverts the dependency and risks rework once the vision justifies a different direction. Framing the posture as vision-determined keeps the decision traceable to business strategy, which is exactly what the committee must defend.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Converging Two Divergent ERP Estates After Merger

Supply-chain leadership insists the validated manufacturing and quality cores must not be touched until late in the program, while the board wants a committed long-term single-core direction.
How should the architect position these together?

A. Tell supply chain the validated manufacturing systems must change in wave one anyway, to prove convergence momentum to the board and avoid the appearance of program drift.
B. Drop the single-core direction and present only a dual-core steady state, accepting permanent divergence in order to avoid any conflict with the supply-chain stability demand.
C. Commit to the single-core target in the vision but sequence the validated-system convergence into a later wave, so the direction and the stability constraint coexist.
D. Ask the board to choose between convergence and stability, presenting the two as mutually exclusive outcomes that cannot be reconciled within one coherent roadmap.

Answer: C

Explanation:
The target architecture and the sequencing are separate decisions: the vision can commit to a single-core direction while the roadmap defers validated-system convergence to a wave where it can be done safely. This satisfies the board's direction and supply chain's stability constraint without treating them as a binary choice.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 1 — Converging Two Divergent ERP Estates After Merger

Two heritage leadership teams each argue their own core should be the convergence target, citing operational familiarity and sunk investment.
What advisory basis should determine the target core?

A. The combined group's target business capabilities and strategy, against which each estate's fit and its gap-closure cost are assessed before the target is chosen.
B. The larger heritage organization's core, because its bigger existing user base reduces the change-management effort needed to move everyone onto a single estate quickly.
C. The core carrying fewer modifications, on the basis that technical cleanliness alone is a sufficient determinant of convergence suitability for the group.
D. Whichever heritage team commits first to fund the convergence work from its own divisional budget, settling the target on funding readiness.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Visit us at: https://www.examsempire.com/p-sapea-2601

Convergence-target selection is an architecture-vision decision anchored to the combined capability target and strategy; each estate is evaluated by capability fit and gap-closure cost, not by incumbency or sunk cost. This keeps the recommendation defensible to both heritage organizations.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 2 — Sequencing the Coexistence Roadmap Across Integration Waves

Commercial leadership wants the single global customer, contract, and rebate view delivered in wave one, but discovery shows customer hierarchies and finance data are modeled incompatibly across the two estates.
What sequencing recommendation is most defensible?

A. Fund the global customer view in wave one as requested, then reconcile the underlying data divergence afterward through extracts built against the heritage transactional systems.
B. Split the program into two fully independent tracks so the commercial and data workstreams never interact, letting each proceed at its own pace without coordination.
C. Cancel the global customer view objective outright, on the grounds that the customer and finance data are currently modeled too incompatibly to support it.
D. Sequence the customer and finance data-foundation work ahead of the global view, so the later view rests on a governed model rather than reconciliation extracts.

Answer: D

Explanation:
The single global view depends on a unified, governed data foundation; funding the view before that foundation exists inverts the dependency and forces reconciliation extracts that the engagement is trying to eliminate. Sequencing the data foundation first lets the later view rest on governed data.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 2 — Sequencing the Coexistence Roadmap Across Integration Waves

The program office proposes ordering the waves by which stakeholder is most vocal, starting with the requests that have the loudest executive sponsors.
How should the architect respond on sequencing method?

A. Endorse the urgency-based order, on the reasoning that visibly responsive delivery to the loudest sponsors will build program credibility and sustain executive support for the integration.
B. Order the waves from a baseline-versus-target gap analysis, so each wave's work packages and their prerequisites set the sequence rather than stakeholder volume.
C. Sequence the capabilities alphabetically by name to remove all stakeholder influence from the decision, treating neutrality of ordering as the primary objective for fairness.
D. Let each PMO sequence its own heritage organization's waves independently and merge the two plans later, preserving each side's autonomy over its own delivery order.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Wave sequencing in opportunities-and-solutions work derives from gap analysis: work packages come from baseline-versus-target gaps, and their dependencies set the order. Stakeholder urgency may influence priority within dependency constraints but cannot override them, or prerequisites get funded after the capabilities that need them.
Topic: 2
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 6

Mauna Lani Hospitality operates a chain of resort hotels across the Hawaiian islands and is modernizing its central reservation and guest-services platform. You are the enterprise architect advising the program. The operations team has a genuine business need for a specialized loyalty-tier calculation that standard configuration does not cover, and they have asked for it to be added. A senior manager, having heard that the program must follow a clean-core strategy, insists that this means no custom logic of any kind may be built, and wants the requirement dropped entirely so future upgrades are never put at risk. The architecture goal is a maintainable, upgrade-stable platform that can still consume new releases with low effort, while genuinely meeting differentiated business needs. Released extension points and platform-side extension options are available. The program has a tight modernization timeline, and the sponsor wants a direction that protects upgrade stability without abandoning a valid business requirement. You must advise how the loyalty-tier requirement should be handled under the clean-core objective.
Which advisory direction best satisfies both the clean-core objective and the business need?

A. Drop the loyalty-tier requirement entirely, so that no custom logic exists and the platform's upgrade stability is guaranteed by avoiding all extension.
B. Build the loyalty-tier logic through released extension points off the core, so the requirement is met while the digital core stays standard and upgrade-stable.
C. Modify the core reservation tables directly to embed the loyalty-tier logic, so the calculation runs in one place and no extension framework is needed.
D. Defer the loyalty-tier requirement to a separate standalone legacy system, so the modern core is left untouched and the calculation runs well outside the upgrade path entirely.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Implementing the loyalty-tier logic through released extension points keeps the digital core standard while still delivering the differentiated requirement. This is the intent of a clean-core strategy: extensions live off the core using sanctioned, released mechanisms so the platform stays upgrade-stable and can consume new releases with low modification cost. It meets the business need without compromising maintainability.

Question: 7

Meridian State University, a large public institution in Australia, is planning a major modernization of its student-lifecycle and research-administration systems. You are the enterprise architect engaged to shape the architecture vision. The infrastructure group has arrived with a strong preference: they want the target architecture organized around a specific bundle of modern platform technologies they are keen to adopt, and they have drafted a technology blueprint to anchor the program. The university's executive, however, has framed the modernization around concrete strategic outcomes — improving student retention, shortening research-grant administration cycles, and consolidating fragmented student data. The vice-chancellor is wary of a program that leads with technology choices before those outcomes are reflected in the architecture. Budget and a multi-year horizon are approved, but the executive wants assurance the architecture will trace to strategy. You must advise how the architecture vision should be anchored so the modernization stays aligned to the institution's goals.
Which advisory direction should anchor the architecture vision?

A. Anchor the vision on the infrastructure group's technology blueprint, so the modern platform bundle defines the target and outcomes are mapped onto it later.
B. Anchor the vision on the university's strategic outcomes and capabilities, so the target architecture traces to retention and data goals before technology is chosen.
C. Anchor the vision on the current system inventory, so the target is defined by consolidating what already exists before new strategic goals are introduced.
D. Anchor the vision on a vendor reference architecture adopted as-is, so a proven external pattern sets the target without lengthy internal strategy debate.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Anchoring the vision on the university's strategic outcomes and the capabilities that deliver them keeps the architecture traceable to strategy — retention, grant-cycle, and data-consolidation goals drive the target, and technology is selected to serve those capabilities. This is the business-outcome pull the executive asked for and the correct ordering for an architecture vision.

Question: 8

Sahel Harvest, a mid-sized agribusiness cooperative operating across several regions of Kenya, has completed a target architecture for its produce-traceability and grower-payment systems. You are the enterprise architect advising the transformation lead. Sponsors are impatient to publish a transformation roadmap and begin funding projects, and one director proposes turning the approved target architecture directly into a sequenced roadmap of initiatives so delivery can start next quarter. The current landscape, however, is only partially documented: some regional cooperatives still run manual payment ledgers, and the existing traceability data quality varies widely. The transformation lead is uneasy that moving straight from target to roadmap could produce work packages that assume capabilities the cooperative does not yet have. Funding is constrained, so initiatives must be scoped accurately the first time. You must advise on what should happen before a credible roadmap can be assembled, given the partially understood starting point.
Which advisory direction should you recommend before the roadmap is assembled?

A. Publish the roadmap directly from the target architecture, so funding can begin next quarter and the sequence is set before momentum is lost.

B. Freeze the target architecture and re-run a full visioning workshop, so stakeholder priorities are reconfirmed before any roadmap work proceeds.
C. Run a baseline-versus-target gap analysis first, so work packages are derived from real gaps and the roadmap is scoped to what the cooperative actually lacks.
D. Commission a broad market scan of traceability vendors first, so the roadmap initiatives can be named after specific commercial products before any sequencing work is done.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Running a baseline-versus-target gap analysis is the step that derives credible work packages: comparing the approved target to the actual, uneven baseline exposes exactly which capabilities are missing and where. Those gaps become the roadmap's initiatives, so each is scoped to a real need — essential when funding is constrained and initiatives must be sized accurately the first time.

Question: 9

FreshVale Grocers, a mid-sized regional supermarket chain in the United Kingdom, has decided to stand up an enterprise architecture capability for the first time after years of uncoordinated, store-by-store IT decisions. You are advising the newly appointed head of architecture. Leadership is eager to begin a high-profile loyalty-platform engagement and wants the team to jump straight into scoping that specific initiative and securing sponsor buy-in. However, the organization has no agreed architecture principles, no defined governance for how architecture decisions are made, and no shared repository for reuse across the brand. The head of architecture worries that diving into the loyalty engagement without first establishing how architecture work will be run could leave every later decision contested. Budget exists for a short foundational effort before the loyalty work begins. You must advise leadership on which activity should come first so the capability is set up to function, given that this is the organization's very first architecture undertaking.
Which advisory direction should you recommend as the appropriate first step?

A. Begin the loyalty-platform engagement right away and scope its vision first, so a visible early win builds clear momentum before any foundational work is attempted.
B. Stand up a procurement process for the loyalty vendor first, so commercial terms are locked before any architecture principles constrain the choice.
C. Establish the architecture capability first — principles, governance, and a repository — so later engagements run on an agreed foundation across the brand.
D. Draft the detailed loyalty data model first, so the technical design is ready and the foundational governance can be fitted around it afterward.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Establishing the architecture capability first — the principles, the governance for how decisions are made, and the repository for reuse — is the foundational step for a first-time practice. It puts the agreed basis in place so the loyalty engagement and every later one are scoped and decided consistently across the brand, which is exactly the gap the head of architecture identified.

Question: 10

Nordkamp Automotive, a large vehicle manufacturer in southern Germany, is launching its first formal enterprise architecture engagement to modernize plant-floor and supply systems. You are the lead enterprise architect engaged to apply the SAP Enterprise Architecture Framework, which tailors the TOGAF Architecture Development Method. The sponsoring board wants the engagement to move quickly and asks the architecture team to take the reference architecture content and methodology exactly as published, on the assumption that an out-of-the-box approach will save weeks of planning. The plant network spans three sites with different production maturity levels, a recent merger that introduced a second supplier portal, and several regulatory reporting obligations unique to the German market. The CIO is concerned that an unadjusted method will not account for the merger context or the uneven site readiness. The board has set a fixed first-phase deadline and limited the initial budget, so the team cannot run an open-ended discovery. You must advise the board on how the framework's methodology should be applied to this specific engagement.
Which advisory direction best fits how the SAP Enterprise Architecture Framework methodology should be applied here?

A. Adopt the published reference architecture content unchanged for every site, on the basis that standard content delivers the fastest defensible path to the first-phase deadline.
B. Tailor the method and reference content to Nordkamp's merger context and uneven site readiness, so the engagement stays both standards-based and fit to this company.
C. Replace the framework with a custom in-house method built around the German reporting rules, on the basis that local regulation should drive the overall approach.
D. Defer all method decisions until every plant site reaches equal production maturity, on the basis that consistent inputs are required before any tailoring begins.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Tailoring the method and the reference content to Nordkamp's specific context is exactly how the framework is intended to be used: it tailors a recognized method and provides reusable content as a starting point, not a fixed template. This keeps the engagement standards-based while accounting for the merger, the dual portals, and differing site maturity, and it fits the fixed deadline because tailoring narrows scope rather than expanding it.

Visit us at: https://www.examsempire.com/p-sapea-2601

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/