Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP
C_ACT
SAP Certified - Project Manager - SAP Activate (C_ACT_2604)

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.

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

Latest Version: 4.1
Subjects

1. Velderhof Brewing S/4HANA Cloud Activate Delivery
2. Halvern Outdoor Cloud SAP S/4HANA Go-Live Preparation
3. Marenta Frozen Foods Prepares Its SAP S/4HANA Project
4. Kessmark Footwear Plans a Cloud SAP S/4HANA Programme
5. Brindlemoor Dairy Cooperative S/4HANA Implementation
6. Riverstone Credit Union Begins Its SAP S/4HANA Cloud Finance Journey
7. Lakemont University Cloud S/4HANA Explore-Phase Backlog Build
8. Brightreel Media Greenfield Cloud S/4HANA Agile Project Setup
9. Lumen Stay Hotels Cloud ERP Greenfield Implementation Start
10. Fjordrein Seafood Agile S/4HANA Delivery Governance
11. Drovane Logistics First Move to Cloud SAP S/4HANA Build
12. Velbruk Metals S/4HANA Realize-Phase Build and Migration
13. Verdano Coffee Export Cooperative SAP S/4HANA Programme
14. Fenngrove Specialty Chemicals Cloud SAP S/4HANA Programme
15. Camber Construction Group On-Premise S/4HANA System Conversion
16. Mercy Health Network SAP S/4HANA Conversion Test Program
17. Northgate City Authority Public Cloud SAP S/4HANA Programme
18. Aegura Insurance Group Selective Move to SAP S/4HANA Finance
19. Northvane Aerostructures S/4HANA Brownfield Modernization Roadmap
20. Pharventis Pharmaceutical Distribution S/4HANA Programme
21. Vorsa Automotive SAP S/4HANA System Conversion Cutover Readiness
22. Crestmark Bank S/4HANA Finance Hypercare and Clean-Core Run
23. Tidewell Water Utilities SAP S/4HANA Upgrade and Clean-Core Program
24. Althea Communications SAP S/4HANA Multi-Market Delivery Program
25. SAP Activate Methodology Foundation & Phase Execution
26. Agile & Scrum Project Delivery
27. Iterative Build, Release Planning, Testing & Deploy
28. Stakeholder, Change & Quality Management
29. Workstreams Across Cloud, On-Premise & Upgrades
30. Three Pillars & Clean Core Adoption
31. Transition Paths & RISE with SAP
32. SAP Integrated Toolchain & Cloud ALM Across Phases

Topic: 1
Velderhof Brewing S/4HANA Cloud Activate Delivery
Business Context
Velderhof Brewing is an independent craft brewery in Belgium, running a single brewhouse and a small packaging line that supplies bottled and kegged beer to regional bars, supermarkets, and a growing export trade. The owners approved a first move to SAP S/4HANA Cloud to bring finance, purchasing, production, and sales onto one platform, retiring a mix of spreadsheets and an ageing accounting tool. Delivery follows the SAP Activate methodology, with a small implementation partner working alongside a handful of Velderhof staff who know the brewery well but have never run a software project.

System Landscape
The team is early in the work. The partner has set up a starter system and walked the owners through a first look at how the standard processes behave. A short series of working sessions has been planned, in which the standard processes will be demonstrated and the brewery will confirm where it can adopt them as they are. Most of the Velderhof people taking part still spend their days on the floor of the brewery and join the sessions between brewing and packaging runs, so their time on the project is uneven from one week to the next.
Implementation Progress
As the demonstrations have begun, a pattern in how the work is being recorded has drawn comment. Decisions reached in the sessions are mentioned in passing and remembered differently a week later, with no single place that holds what was agreed. Concerns the owners raise about whether a standard process will suit a small brewery are noted on whiteboards and then lost. When a question comes back, no one can point to where it was settled, and the same discussion is reopened more than once.
Process Flow
The partner has started to assemble a backlog of the work the build will cover. Items are being added quickly and in mixed shape, some written as a clear piece of brewery work and others as vague headings that mean different things to different people. There is no shared understanding of what an item must contain before the team agrees to build it, and no agreed test for when a built item can be called finished. The owners assume the partner will simply know, while the partner assumes the owners will say.
Release Decision
A first go-live has been pencilled in to land before the busy summer season, when demand for the brewery's beer is highest and the owners least want disruption. The date was set at the outset on the season alone, before any building had been done, and nothing about how much the small team can actually complete in a working cycle has fed into it. As the sessions proceed, quiet doubts have begun to surface about whether everything sketched into the backlog can be ready in time.
Governance Context
With the season approaching, some on the team have pressed to skip ahead and start configuring the brewery's own way of working straight into the system, reasoning that the owners already know what they want. Others have pointed out that the working sessions intended to confirm fit against the standard are not yet finished, and that building before that confirmation risks committing the brewery to bespoke work it may not need. The owners want to keep things simple and are unsure which voice to follow.
Operational Readiness
The project manager has been asked to put the delivery on a steadier footing as the first build approaches. The questions before the small team are how to keep a reliable record of what has been decided and what risks are open, how to bring the backlog into a shape where everyone agrees what each item means and when it is done, whether to keep confirming fit against the standard or jump to building, and how to judge what can realistically be ready for a date that the season has fixed. The choices made now will shape whether Velderhof reaches a first go-live it can stand behind.
Your Assignment
You are acting as the project manager assigned to steady the SAP Activate delivery at Velderhof Brewing as it approaches its first build and a season-fixed go-live. The brewery is small, its staff are new to SAP projects and stretched across operational duties, and the partner is leading the method. You are expected to advise the owners and the partner on how to run the early work soundly, keep governance hygiene in place, shape the backlog, judge fit against the standard, and set a credible release expectation. Reason from the situation to the most appropriate SAP Activate recommendation; do not assume tools, transaction details, or release-specific behaviour beyond what the situation supports

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

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Keeping a Reliable Record of Decisions and Risks

• Advise the team on how decisions reached in the working sessions should be captured so they are not remembered differently later.

• Recommend how open concerns and risks raised by the owners should be handled rather than left on whiteboards.

• Position the record-keeping in a way the small, informal team can realistically sustain.

CHECKPOINTS

• A single decision log and a single risk log exist and are kept current as the work proceeds.

• The team consults the logs to answer "why was this decided" rather than reconstructing it from memory.

• Open risks have an owner and are reviewed, not forgotten until they surface.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Bringing the Backlog Into a Workable Shape

• Recommend how backlog items of mixed clarity should be brought to a shared, build-ready shape.

• Advise on agreeing what an item must satisfy before the team commits to building it.

• Advise on agreeing how the team will judge a built item to be finished.

CHECKPOINTS

• Items meet an agreed readiness standard before they are taken into the build.

• A built item is judged complete against an agreed completion standard, not by individual opinion.

• The backlog is ordered and understood consistently by partner and owners.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Confirming Fit to Standard Before Committing to Build

• Advise whether to begin configuring the brewery's own way of working now or to finish confirming fit against the standard first.

• Recommend how the team should decide where to adopt the standard process and where a real need justifies more.

• Position the choice in terms of keeping the solution close to the standard and easy to maintain.

CHECKPOINTS

• Fit against the standard is confirmed before bespoke build is committed.

• Departures from the standard are deliberate decisions tied to a genuine brewery need, not defaults.

• The resulting scope keeps the solution maintainable and upgrade-friendly.

4. CHALLENGE 4 — Setting a Release Expectation the Evidence Supports

• Advise how the first go-live expectation should be set given a date fixed on the season alone.

• Recommend what evidence the team should gather before committing to what will be ready.

• Advise how to handle the conversation if the evidence and the fixed date do not agree.

CHECKPOINTS

• The release expectation is grounded in what the team has actually delivered across early cycles.

• A trade-off between date and scope is put honestly to the owners where the evidence requires it.

• The release the team commits to is one the observed pace can credibly support.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Keeping a Reliable Record of Decisions and Risks

Decisions from the working sessions are recalled differently a week later and the same points are reopened more than once.

What should you advise the team to put in place to address this?

A. A single decision log, kept current and visible, that records each agreed decision and where it was made

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

B. A weekly email from the partner summarising progress, with decisions mentioned in the body where relevant
C. A rule that any reopened topic is settled by whoever spoke most recently in the latest session
D. A detailed meeting transcript stored by the partner and shared only when a dispute is raised

Answer: A

Explanation:
A single, current decision log gives the team one trusted place to see what was agreed and why, so settled points are not reopened. It is the lightweight governance hygiene SAP Activate expects even on a small project. It directly removes the "remembered differently" failure.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Keeping a Reliable Record of Decisions and Risks
The owners keep raising concerns about whether standard processes suit a small brewery, and these concerns are noted on whiteboards and then lost.
How should these concerns best be handled?

A. Asked again at go-live, when it will be clear which concerns actually turned into problems
B. Left with the owners to raise again if they still matter once building has started
C. Recorded as risks in a single log, each with an owner, and reviewed as the work proceeds
D. Passed to the partner to resolve quietly so the owners are not worried unnecessarily

Answer: C

Explanation:
Capturing each concern as a risk with an owner and reviewing it keeps it visible and actionable before it becomes a problem. This is the basic risk-management hygiene SAP Activate expects throughout delivery. It stops valid concerns from being lost on whiteboards.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 2 — Bringing the Backlog Into a Workable Shape
The backlog is filling with items of mixed clarity, and there is no shared agreement on what an item must contain before the team agrees to build it.
What should you recommend the team establish?

A. A rule that the partner alone decides which items are clear enough, to keep things moving quickly
B. A backlog frozen now, so that no further items can be added before the first build begins
C. A target number of backlog items per cycle, so the team always has enough work queued
D. A shared, agreed standard for what an item must contain before it is ready to be built

Answer: D

Explanation:
An agreed readiness standard gives partner and owners one shared test for whether an item is fit to enter the build, so vague items are clarified first. This is the readiness discipline SAP Activate's agile delivery relies on. It directly fixes the mixed-clarity backlog.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 2 — Bringing the Backlog Into a Workable Shape
The team has no agreed test for when a built item can be called finished, and the owners and partner each assume the other will judge it.
What should you advise the team to agree?

A. A shared definition of when a built item is complete, applied to every item on acceptance
B. That an item is finished once the partner has demonstrated it working in the starter system
C. That completion is judged item by item in the moment, since brewery items differ from one another
D. That items are marked finished at the end of each cycle so the backlog stays visibly moving

Answer: A

Explanation:
A shared completion standard applied to every item gives both sides one agreed test for "done," removing the gap where each assumes the other will judge. This is the completion discipline SAP Activate's agile delivery depends on. It makes acceptance consistent and disputes rare.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 3 — Confirming Fit to Standard Before Committing to Build
Some on the team want to start configuring the brewery's own way of working now, before the sessions confirming fit against the standard solution are finished.
What should you advise?

A. Begin building the brewery's known preferences now, since finishing the fit sessions will only slow a small project
B. Finish confirming fit against the standard first, then build only where a real need justifies departing from it
C. Build the brewery's preferences now but keep notes, so any standard processes missed can be retrofitted later
D. Split the team so one half confirms fit while the other configures the brewery's preferences in parallel

Answer: B

Explanation:
Confirming fit against the standard before bespoke build lets the team adopt the standard where it serves and reserve custom work for genuine need, keeping the solution lean and maintainable. This is the fit-to-standard and clean-core discipline SAP Activate expects. It prevents building bespoke work the standard could have met.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 3 — Confirming Fit to Standard Before Committing to Build
During the fit sessions, the brewery finds that most standard processes suit it well, but one genuine brewery-specific need is not met by the standard.
How should the team decide what to do about that one need?

A. Adopt the standard for it anyway, since keeping everything standard is always the right choice
B. Build a bespoke solution for every process, so the whole system reflects how the brewery works
C. Treat it as a deliberate departure from the standard, scoped only to that genuine need
D. Defer the need entirely to a later release, regardless of how important it is to the brewery

Answer: C

Explanation:
A deliberate, justified departure scoped only to the genuine need keeps the rest of the solution standard while meeting the real requirement. This is the considered fit-to-standard judgment SAP Activate expects, not a blanket rule either way. It balances clean core against actual business need.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 4 — Setting a Release Expectation the Evidence Supports
The go-live date was fixed on the busy season alone, before any building, with nothing about the small team's real delivery pace behind it.
What should you advise as the basis for the release expectation?

A. Hold the season date as fixed and ask the team to commit to delivering the full backlog by it
B. Observe what the team completes across early cycles and base the expectation on that pace
C. Assume the small team will speed up once building starts and plan the release on that improvement
D. Add developers to the partner team so the full backlog can be promised by the fixed date

Answer: B

Explanation:
Basing the expectation on the team's observed delivery across early cycles grounds the release in evidence rather than the calendar alone. This is the evidence-based release-planning discipline SAP Activate's agile delivery expects. It produces a commitment the team can credibly meet.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 4 — Setting a Release Expectation the Evidence Supports
The early cycles show the team's real pace cannot deliver the full backlog by the season-fixed date.
What is the most appropriate response?

A. Report that the release is on track and quietly hope the later cycles make up the shortfall
B. Record partly built items as finished so the reported progress matches the fixed date
C. Keep the date and the full scope, and ask the team to work longer hours to close the gap
D. Put an honest date-versus-scope choice to the owners to decide the release scope

Answer: D

Explanation:
Putting an honest date-versus-scope trade-off to the owners lets them make an informed choice with the evidence in front of them, which is the project manager's responsibility. This is the transparent stakeholder and release-planning conduct SAP Activate expects. It keeps the release credible and trust intact.

Topic: 2

Halvern Outdoor Cloud SAP S/4HANA Go-Live Preparation

Business Context

Halvern Outdoor is a retailer and wholesale distributor of camping and outdoor equipment based in Chile, selling through a dozen of its own stores and to independent retailers across the country. The business has grown steadily as demand for outdoor gear has risen, and it has run its purchasing, inventory, and finance on a long-serving local system supplemented by spreadsheets. Its board approved a first move to SAP S/4HANA in the cloud to bring these processes onto one platform, and the programme has followed the SAP Activate methodology with an implementation partner supplying consultants alongside Halvern's own staff.

Build Progress

The programme has moved well beyond its opening phases. The solution has been built in short iterations, and the team has worked from a single ordered backlog, demonstrating new capability to the business at the end of each iteration. The stock, purchasing, and finance flows now exist in the build system, and the partner reports that most of the planned backlog has been delivered. Attention has turned to the steps that stand between the current build and a working system the stores can actually use.

Release Context

A go-live date was announced to the board early in the programme and has been quoted widely since. With that date approaching, several leads are keen to declare the build complete and switch the stores onto the new platform on the chosen weekend. Each iteration was shown and accepted in its own demonstration, and the prevailing view is that, because every piece was approved as it was built, the whole should work together once it is turned on. No end-to-end run across the full order-to-cash and procure-to-pay flows has yet been carried out with business users.

Operational Readiness

The plan for moving onto the new platform is, at present, a single weekend in which the legacy data is copied across and the stores begin trading on SAP S/4HANA the following Monday. The data to be carried over, including open purchase orders, stock balances, and supplier and customer records, still sits in the old system in varied condition, and no trial of the move has been scheduled. Some on the team assume the load can be done in one pass; others have begun to wonder, quietly, what would happen if the figures did not reconcile once they arrived.

Governance Context

The programme sponsor wants the announced date honoured but has started to ask what evidence the team will have that the system is fit to take live, beyond the individual iteration demonstrations. There is, as yet, no agreed view of what must be proven before the switch, who confirms it, and what would

justify holding the date. The partner has referred to the methodology's later phases, but the business has not translated those into a concrete set of checks of its own.

Decision Context

Beyond the switch itself, little thought has been given to the first weeks of live running. The current assumption across much of the team is that the project closes at go-live and the consultants leave, with day-to-day questions handled by whoever is available. No support arrangement, ownership of fixes, or path for problems found in the first live days has been set out. The project manager has been asked to recommend how Halvern should bring the build to a safe go-live and what should be in place around it, and the choices made now will shape how steady those first live weeks turn out to be.

Your Assignment

You are the project manager advising Halvern Outdoor, a Chilean retailer and wholesale distributor of camping and outdoor equipment, on a first SAP S/4HANA Cloud programme run under the SAP Activate methodology. The solution has been built iteratively and a go-live date has been announced. Leadership is keen to switch the stores onto the new platform, but the team has not yet agreed how it will prove the solution is ready, how it will move data and switch over safely, or how it will support the business once live. Your role is to recommend the right course at each decision, balancing the announced date against the evidence and controls a safe go-live depends on. Reason as an advisor to the sponsor and steering board; recommend the SAP-aligned course rather than the most convenient one

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Proving the Solution Through Integration and Acceptance Testing

• Advise how the team should confirm the assembled solution is ready, given that each iteration was accepted separately but the flows have not been run together.

• Recommend how to weigh the announced go-live date against test results when critical flows do not pass.

• Position the right response when a defect is found that produces wrong results across connected processes.

• Frame readiness as evidence the sponsor can rely on, not as the sum of past iteration demonstrations.

CHECKPOINTS

• The recommendation rests on an end-to-end integration and acceptance test against agreed criteria, not on prior sign-offs alone.

• The go/no-go logic keeps the acceptance criteria as the condition for going live.

• Defects are resolved at root cause rather than masked by a workaround carried into live operations.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Planning a Rehearsed Cutover to the New Platform

• Recommend how to reduce the risk of a cutover currently planned as a single untested weekend.

• Advise on a data-carry approach for legacy records held in varied condition, balancing speed against trust in the opening figures.

• Position what must be agreed in advance so the switch can proceed, or step back, on a clear basis.

• Keep the recommendations consistent with a controlled, evidence-based move rather than an improvised one.

CHECKPOINTS

• A full cutover rehearsal on a copy is planned before the live weekend.

• The data load is controlled and reconciled against the source before trading opens.

• Go/no-go CHECKPOINTS and a defined fallback are agreed before the cutover weekend.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Establishing Support for the Transition to Operations

• Address the assumption that the project ends at go-live and that later problems will be handled informally.

• Recommend how early-life issues of mixed severity should be managed in the first live weeks.

• Advise what must be confirmed about the business's own capability before the partner's involvement reduces.

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

• Frame the transition to operations as a planned handover, not an event that simply happens at go-live.

CHECKPOINTS

• A transition to operations with early-life support and named ownership of fixes is planned before go-live.
• Early-life issues are triaged by business impact within an agreed support arrangement.
• Knowledge transfer is verified so Halvern's staff can operate and support the core processes.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 1 — Proving the Solution Through Integration and Acceptance Testing

The team believes that because each iteration was demonstrated and accepted, the assembled solution will work once it is switched on. The sponsor asks what evidence will show the system is ready.
What should the project manager recommend as the most appropriate way to confirm the solution is ready before the switch?

A. Rely on the sign-offs already gathered at each iteration demonstration, since every delivered increment was reviewed and accepted by the business as it was built.
B. Re-run the individual iteration demonstrations once more, so the same accepted features are confirmed a second time before the date.
C. Run an end-to-end integration and user-acceptance test across the full business flows, so the parts are proven to work together before go-live.
D. Add the remaining backlog items first, on the assumption that a more complete build is what readiness mainly depends on.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Iteration demonstrations confirm individual increments, but they do not prove that the flows work together; an end-to-end integration and acceptance test with real users is the evidence the methodology's testing and deploy work expects before a switch. It surfaces breaks between processes that single-feature demos cannot.

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 1 — Proving the Solution Through Integration and Acceptance Testing

The end-to-end test finds that several critical business flows fail, and the announced go-live date is now close. Two leads disagree on whether to hold the date or proceed regardless.
How should the project manager advise the steering board to handle the failing flows against the announced go-live date?

A. Treat passing the agreed acceptance criteria as the condition for go-live, and hold the date if the critical flows cannot be made to pass in time.
B. Keep the announced date and go live with the failing flows, planning to correct them in the first live weeks so the commitment to the board is not broken.
C. Keep the date but narrow the acceptance criteria so the flows that are failing no longer count, allowing the switch to proceed as planned.

D. Hand the go/no-go decision to the partner to make on the weekend itself, since they hold the technical detail of which flows are passing.

Answer: A

Explanation:
The acceptance criteria are the agreed definition of fit-to-go; honouring them, and holding the date only if critical flows cannot pass, keeps the go/no-go decision evidence-based rather than date-driven, which is the discipline the deploy gate exists to enforce.

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

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

