

Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP C_ACT

SAP Certified - Project Manager - SAP Activate



For More Information – Visit link below:

<https://www.examsboost.com/>

Product Version

- ✓ **Up to Date products, reliable and verified.**
- ✓ **Questions and Answers in PDF Format.**

Latest Version: 4.0

Subjects

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam - US01
3. Unified Scenario Exam - US02
4. Unified Scenario Exam - US03
5. Unified Scenario Exam - US04
6. Unified Scenario Exam - US05
7. Unified Scenario Exam - US06
8. Unified Scenario Exam - US07
9. Unified Scenario Exam - US08
10. Unified Scenario Exam - US09
11. Unified Scenario Exam - US10

Topic: 1

Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A regional packaged-goods supplier is preparing a first-wave SAP Activate release in a mixed deployment landscape. The sponsor wants the approved go-live date preserved and expects one concise steering recommendation. In the web-based project plan, a country-level operational-readiness review cannot proceed at full depth because the same local business lead is also needed for a parallel validation checkpoint during the same week.

The release manager suggests shortening the country review to a brief status confirmation. The change lead warns that this country is also the only one still carrying a temporary coexistence responsibility with an on-premise process after go-live. The project manager must protect the milestone if possible, but also avoid giving steering a weak readiness signal for the country most exposed to hybrid operational risk.

Which planning response is the best choice?

Response:

- A. Replace the full country review with a short overall confirmation, because preserving the milestone matters more than retaining review depth so late in the release.
- B. Delay the whole steering recommendation until the country can hold a full review, because any partial checkpoint would make the shared release decision unreliable.
- C. Re-scope the country review to cover only release-critical and coexistence-sensitive decisions, and govern lower-impact topics through tracked follow-up actions.
- D. Remove the country's remaining issues from the formal release discussion, because the dependency is local and should not affect the broader first-wave decision.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

Why Re-scope the country review to cover only release-critical and coexistence-sensitive decisions, and govern lower-impact topics through tracked follow-up actions works:

This is the strongest proportional response. It preserves the milestone while ensuring the most decision-relevant evidence remains inside the formal checkpoint. Because this country still carries a coexistence dependency, release-critical and coexistence-sensitive topics must remain governed, while less important matters can be moved to follow-up.

Question: 2

A beverage manufacturer is managing an SAP Activate program in a mixed deployment environment. The first release will move sales reporting to a cloud-centered target, while one connected on-premise settlement activity remains in place for a later transition wave. In the web-based project workspace, the design team has marked its deliverables complete, and the training team has already scheduled business enablement sessions.

However, the data lead has just confirmed that a key reference structure used in reporting examples will be slightly different in the first release than originally assumed. The training lead says the sessions can proceed with the old examples and be corrected later if needed. The sponsor wants no additional steering escalation and expects the release milestone to remain stable. The project manager must decide how to handle the issue without opening a full redesign cycle.

What is the best next action?

Response:

- A. Continue with the current training plan, and ask support teams to explain the updated structure after go-live if users become confused.
- B. Pause all release preparation activities until every downstream artifact is fully revalidated across all workstreams.
- C. Run a targeted cross-workstream impact review, then update only the release-critical enablement content before business sessions begin.
- D. Let the data team publish the new structure separately, because downstream workstreams should adapt locally without central coordination.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

Why Run a targeted cross-workstream impact review, then update only the release-critical enablement content before business sessions begin works:

This is the most proportionate orchestration response. The issue is not broad enough to justify a full redesign, but it is important enough to affect downstream readiness. A targeted impact review aligns design, data, and enablement at the correct coordination layer and protects release-critical training quality.

Question: 3

A specialty medical products distributor is transitioning to a cloud-led operating model using SAP Activate. In the first release, returns authorization moves to the target environment, while one on-premise dispute-escalation step remains active for eight weeks. In SAP Cloud ALM, the project manager can show all transition activities in one board, but business leaders are reading the same board in conflicting ways.

Some leaders interpret every open transition item as a first-wave blocker. Others treat the remaining on-premise step as harmless because it already has a retirement target date. The sponsor wants one steering recommendation and does not want a second board or another governance forum. The project manager must improve interpretation without hiding the coexistence plan or weakening modernization tracking.

What is the best reporting adjustment?

Response:

- A. Keep the current board unchanged, and rely on the transition lead to explain verbally which items are blockers and which are planned coexistence conditions.
- B. Reclassify board items within the same view as immediate blockers, approved temporary coexistence conditions, and future retirement obligations.
- C. Remove all future retirement obligations from the main board so leaders can focus only on the current release decision.
- D. Promote the remaining on-premise step to automatic blocker status, because a cloud-led first release should never proceed with residual coexistence.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

Why Reclassify board items within the same view as immediate blockers, approved temporary coexistence conditions, and future retirement obligations works:

This improves steering clarity without increasing governance overhead. It keeps one reporting path, preserves visibility into temporary coexistence and later retirement, and makes the weighting of immediate versus managed transition items explicit. That is the most sustainable choice for a phased modernization program.

Question: 4

A household chemicals supplier is coordinating an SAP Activate release across design, testing, business enablement, integration, and cutover planning in a mixed deployment landscape. In the web-based project environment, the integration workstream confirms that a release-approved sequence change will alter when one operational confirmation step occurs during the first-wave process. The testing workstream has already prepared execution packs, and the enablement workstream has already scheduled super-user briefings based on the earlier sequence.

The sponsor does not want a milestone shift and does not want a broad design reset. The enablement lead says the difference can be explained during workshops. The cutover lead warns that if test evidence, workshop guidance, and handover timing reflect different sequences, early support decisions may become inconsistent. The project manager must act before validation workshops begin.

What is the best next action?

Response:

- A. Keep all current artifacts unchanged, and rely on workshop facilitators to explain the approved sequence change verbally during training.
- B. Reopen the complete release baseline, because any approved sequence change requires total cross-workstream reapproval before go-live.
- C. Launch a focused cross-workstream impact review and align only the release-critical testing, enablement, and handover artifacts affected by the approved change.
- D. Ask each workstream to handle the effect locally, because the integration change was already approved and should not require central coordination.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

Why Launch a focused cross-workstream impact review and align only the release-critical testing, enablement, and handover artifacts affected by the approved change works:

This addresses the issue at the correct orchestration layer. The problem is not the approval of the change itself, but the downstream inconsistency it creates across multiple release-critical artifacts. A focused review is proportionate, protects the milestone, and realigns the dependent workstreams before validation and briefings proceed.

Question: 5

A regional healthcare packaging company is preparing a first-wave SAP Activate release in a mixed deployment environment. During final preparation in the web-based project workspace, several local coordinators want temporary authority to attach country-specific decision notes directly to release tasks instead of routing them through the governed decision log. They argue that this will speed up issue handling during the first two weeks after go-live.

The sponsor supports faster stabilization, but only if the project still has one authoritative view of approved operational decisions. The enterprise lead warns that if task-level notes become the real source of truth, later rollout waves may inherit inconsistent decision history and unclear ownership. Clean core discipline remains part of the operating model, but the sponsor does not want a solution that slows local response unnecessarily.

What is the best recommendation for the project manager?

Response:

- A. Allow country-specific decision notes directly on tasks, provided each coordinator adds an expiry date and weekly summary for central visibility.
- B. Prohibit all local decision notes until after stabilization, because governance control should outweigh first-wave operational speed.
- C. Let each country manage local notes independently, and consolidate them into the central project record after the first month of production use.
- D. Keep task-level visibility, but require that approved operational decisions be created and owned in the governed decision path before they can be referenced in local release tasks.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

Why Keep task-level visibility, but require that approved operational decisions be created and owned in the governed decision path before they can be referenced in local release tasks works:

This supports fast local visibility without fragmenting governance. Teams can still see relevant decisions in their task context, but approval, ownership, and lifecycle control remain in one governed record. That aligns with clean core-oriented discipline and protects later-wave maintainability.

Question: 6

A packaging company is using SAP Activate for a mixed deployment rollout. The first release will move finance reporting to a cloud-centered target, but one on-premise inventory reconciliation step will remain active for one additional quarter. In the web-based project workspace, executive dashboards show overall project progress as healthy. However, the operations lead points out that several open tasks are tied to the temporary coexistence process, while others are tied to the first release itself. The sponsor wants one steering message: either the release is ready or it is not. The transition lead argues that treating all open items equally could delay the release unnecessarily. The quality lead warns that if coexistence controls are underweighted, the release may be approved with hidden operational risk. The project manager must prepare the next status view without adding a new reporting tool or creating a second governance forum.

Which reporting decision is the best choice?

Response:

- A. Present one overall completion percentage and explain any coexistence concerns only if executives raise questions during the review.
- B. Separate open items by first-release criticality and temporary coexistence risk in the current workspace, then keep one steering decision path with visible weighting.
- C. Remove coexistence items from executive reporting until after go-live so first-release readiness can be judged more clearly.
- D. Escalate every coexistence item as a release blocker because transition-related risk should always outweigh schedule pressure.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

Why Separate open items by first-release criticality and temporary coexistence risk in the current workspace, then keep one steering decision path with visible weighting works:

It improves decision quality without changing the governance structure. The sponsor still gets one steering path, but the underlying visibility distinguishes immediate release blockers from managed coexistence obligations. That supports phased modernization while protecting operational control.

Topic: 1

Unified Scenario Exam - US01

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 1 — Cutover Governance Across Shared and Local Task Lists

During cutover rehearsal preparation, the project manager finds that local country leads have added approval steps in their own tracker files, but the central plan in SAP Cloud ALM still drives the official readiness review. What is the best next action?

Response:

- A. Allow local teams to retain their own approval steps outside SAP Cloud ALM as long as they complete them before go-live
- B. Consolidate approval-dependent local steps into the shared cutover plan and recheck ownership and sequencing before rehearsal approval
- C. Freeze the current central plan and instruct local teams to resolve any approval differences during hypercare
- D. Move all approval activities out of the rehearsal so the team can validate only technical execution timing

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The central risk is not the existence of local review steps by itself, but that they influence timing and sign-off without being governed in the shared execution structure. Bringing approval-dependent steps into the shared plan preserves SAP Activate delivery discipline and allows the rehearsal to reflect real ownership and sequencing.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 1 — Cutover Governance Across Shared and Local Task Lists

A local lead argues that maintaining a separate country approval tracker improves speed because the local team can adjust steps quickly without waiting for updates to the central plan. Which response best aligns with the program's delivery model?

Response:

- A. Accept the local tracker for this rollout only, because flexibility is more valuable than governance during rehearsal
- B. Keep the local tracker as the primary source for local timing, but use SAP Cloud ALM only for milestone reporting
- C. Use the local tracker as reference input, but require any approval step affecting sequence or ownership to be reflected in the shared plan
- D. Ask each country lead to sign off separately so the central plan does not need to reflect detailed local differences

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This answer balances local operational knowledge with program governance. The shared plan remains authoritative, while local input is still considered where it changes actual execution order, ownership, or transition approval logic.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 2 — Transition Reporting During Mixed-Landscape Coexistence

Business users request manual comparison sheets so they can review open commitments across the new cloud division and the retained legacy service administration scope during the coexistence period. What is the best project response?

Response:

- A. Approve the manual comparison sheets as the default transition method because they provide the fastest visibility
- B. Reject all interim comparison requests because coexistence always requires a single reporting source from day one
- C. Determine whether planned transition monitoring already covers the required visibility and allow only controlled interim support that does not become the decision baseline
- D. Delay all reporting comparisons until the legacy division is fully migrated so governance remains simpler

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The project needs to separate legitimate transition visibility from unmanaged operating workarounds. Controlled interim support may be reasonable during coexistence, but readiness decisions should still rely on governed transition controls rather than ad hoc manual reporting.

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 2 — Transition Reporting During Mixed-Landscape Coexistence

The steering committee wants the second rollout wave to reuse the same delivery model with fewer local deviations. Which approach to transition-period reporting best supports that goal?

Response:

- A. Let each division design its own temporary comparison method during rollout, then standardize later
- B. Base coexistence monitoring on controlled transition practices and keep manual extracts limited, explicit, and temporary
- C. Encourage broad spreadsheet-based reporting during coexistence so user adoption improves before standardization
- D. Shift all reporting responsibility to local managers because they understand the retained legacy landscape better

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This preserves a reusable program model while still recognizing the reality of coexistence. Temporary extracts may still exist, but they remain secondary and governed rather than becoming the operating design for the transition.

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 3 — Rehearsal Timing for Finance and Partner Data Readiness

The finance lead wants the rehearsal schedule frozen early so close-related activities can be timed against the first reporting cycle. However, several upstream partner confirmations affecting warehouse readiness are still incomplete. What should the project manager do?

Response:

- A. Freeze the full rehearsal schedule now so finance can prepare, and let warehouse teams adjust within the fixed window later
- B. Delay all rehearsal planning until every partner confirmation is complete, even if the overall program loses momentum
- C. Keep close-related planning visible, but condition final timing commitments on upstream dependency completion evidence
- D. Remove warehouse readiness tasks from the rehearsal so finance activities can be validated independently

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This preserves planning progress without treating uncertain upstream inputs as settled facts. It also addresses the second-order dependency that warehouse and procurement readiness affect the credibility of finance-aligned rehearsal timing.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 3 — Rehearsal Timing for Finance and Partner Data Readiness

Which indicator best shows that schedule compression is becoming a readiness risk rather than just an efficiency choice?

Response:

- A. The sponsor asks for a production date that aligns with a distributor agreement
- B. The team wants to reduce time between rehearsal steps to make the cutover plan shorter
- C. Time-sensitive rehearsal commitments are being fixed before prerequisite confirmations are mature enough to support them
- D. Finance wants a stable timetable for first-cycle reporting activities

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The real concern is not faster timing by itself, but locking downstream commitments before upstream dependencies are stable. That is the point where schedule pressure becomes a credibility risk for the rehearsal outcome.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 4 — Access Scope for Transition Validation and Sign-Off

Several local managers request broad temporary access across both environments so they can compare outputs quickly during transition validation. What is the best response from the project manager?

Response:

- A. Approve the access broadly for the rehearsal period because speed of comparison is the main objective
- B. Deny all temporary access requests because any cross-environment visibility is inconsistent with controlled rollout practice
- C. Approve temporary access only where it directly supports named validation or sign-off responsibilities and keep ownership documented
- D. Allow broad read-only access to all managers because read-only access does not affect governance

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This preserves accountability while still enabling necessary transition validation. The key is that access must support defined responsibilities, not general convenience or informal review habits.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 4 — Access Scope for Transition Validation and Sign-Off

The team can complete sign-off faster if validation evidence is gathered through broad manager access, but the governance office wants approval accountability to remain tied to defined roles. Which option is best?

Response:

- A. Keep sign-off tied to role-based accountability, even if comparison activity takes longer, and refine evidence collection within that structure
- B. Prioritize faster sign-off now and tighten role discipline only after the first rollout wave
- C. Let local managers validate across both environments while central roles complete the formal approval afterward
- D. Split sign-off into a local operational approval and a separate program approval so both models can run in parallel

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is the strongest governance-aligned choice because it protects accountability without stopping transition work. It accepts some operational effort in exchange for a reusable and controlled approval model.

Topic:

Unified Scenario Exam - US02

Question: 15

CHALLENGE 1 — Local Exception Routing Within the Standard Rollout Template

During rollout-wave planning, regional leads continue to maintain offline exception records for assortment and returns variations because they believe these can be settled after wave release. What is the best project response?

Response:

- A. Allow regional leads to carry the exception records offline for this wave, as long as no country escalates them during execution
- B. Require all exception requests that affect scope, ownership, or entry criteria to pass through the governed template review path before release
- C. Freeze the rollout baseline immediately and ask each region to manage its own exceptions during hypercare
- D. Accept only assortment-related exceptions centrally and leave returns variations to local process owners

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

Exception decisions in this scenario influence rollout entry criteria and reusable template behavior, so they cannot remain outside the governed release path. Routing them through the standard review structure preserves accountability and prevents local accommodations from silently redefining the wave baseline.

Thank You for Trying Our Product

For More Information – **Visit link below:**

<https://www.examsboost.com/>

15 USD Discount Coupon Code:

G74JA8UF

FEATURES

- ✓ **90 Days Free Updates**
- ✓ **Money Back Pass Guarantee**
- ✓ **Instant Download or Email Attachment**
- ✓ **24/7 Live Chat Support**
- ✓ **PDF file could be used at any Platform**
- ✓ **50,000 Happy Customer**



Visit us at: <https://www.examsboost.com/test/c-act>