

Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP C_ARP2P

**SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - SAP Ariba
Procurement**



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-arp2p>

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

You are advising a regional waste management company moving municipal purchasing requests into SAP Ariba Procurement. Operations supervisors need fast access to routine safety supplies, while procurement leadership wants approved sources, consistent approvals, and spend categories captured before purchase orders are created.

One operations lead recommends keeping depot-level purchasing outside the new process for the first release because route disruptions are costly. The procurement transformation lead recommends moving routine safety supplies into the guided procurement flow while defining a controlled urgent-supply exception path with justification. Leadership wants early modernization benefit, but it cannot slow safety-critical field operations during the transition.

Which recommendation best supports procurement modernization while preserving operational continuity?

Response:

- A. Keep all depot-level safety supply requests outside SAP Ariba Procurement and upload summarized spend after month-end close.
- B. Require every depot request to wait for central procurement approval so supplier selection and category coding are standardized immediately.
- C. Delay the safety-supply process until routine and urgent depot purchases can follow one identical approval and sourcing model.
- D. Move routine safety supplies into SAP Ariba Procurement and define a governed urgent-supply exception path with justification.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation supports incremental modernization while protecting safety-critical operations. Routine safety supplies gain structured sourcing, approval, and reporting control, while urgent cases remain possible through an exception path that preserves governance evidence.

Question: 2

You are advising a regional clinical research organization configuring SAP Ariba Procurement for participant logistics and study support services. Study managers need fast approval for standard courier and room-booking requests, but procurement governance requires additional review when a request

involves a new supplier, a higher study-budget impact, or service terms that differ from the approved study plan.

The operations lead proposes one short study-support form with optional comments to keep submissions fast. The procurement policy owner recommends guided inputs for supplier status, study-budget impact, and service-term variance so routine requests move quickly while exceptions route for review. The launch date is fixed, and approval evidence must exist before supplier commitments are made.

Which configuration direction best satisfies speed and controlled exception routing?

Response:

- A. Use one short study-support form and depend on approvers to identify supplier, budget, or term risks from optional comments.
- B. Route every study-support request through full procurement review so no supplier or budget exception can be missed.
- C. Keep study-support requests outside SAP Ariba Procurement until every study service supplier and term variation is standardized.
- D. Use guided inputs and approval rules so routine requests proceed quickly while supplier, budget, or term exceptions trigger review.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This direction applies decision logic at the request capture and approval-routing layer. Structured supplier, budget, and term-variance inputs allow routine requests to move efficiently while exceptions generate review evidence before downstream purchasing activity.

Question: 3

You are advising a regional security services company moving branch purchasing from shared mailboxes into SAP Ariba Procurement. Branch supervisors need fast access to routine uniforms, radios, and site supplies, while procurement leadership wants approved suppliers, approval paths, and spend categories captured consistently before purchase orders are created.

One branch manager recommends keeping local mailbox requests for the first release because service-site staffing changes quickly. The procurement transformation lead recommends moving routine branch supplies into the configured procurement flow while defining a controlled exception path for urgent site mobilization needs. Leadership wants visible modernization progress, but it cannot delay time-critical security deployments.

Which recommendation best balances modernization progress with operational responsiveness?

Response:

- A. Keep branch mailbox requests for all site supplies and upload summarized purchasing activity after each month-end review.
- B. Require central procurement approval for every branch supply request so all supplier and category decisions are standardized immediately.
- C. Move routine branch supplies into SAP Ariba Procurement and define a governed exception path for urgent site mobilization needs.

D. Postpone branch supply purchasing in SAP Ariba Procurement until routine and urgent site needs can follow one identical process.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation supports incremental modernization while preserving operational responsiveness. Routine supplies gain structured purchasing control, while urgent mobilization cases remain possible through a governed exception path with traceable justification.

Question: 4

You are advising a mid-sized electronics assembler adopting SAP Ariba Procurement in a public cloud, web-based environment. The COO wants the new process to reduce off-contract buying, while the procurement lead wants users to keep a familiar requisition experience. Finance also wants purchasing data to remain reliable for spend visibility after go-live.

Two approaches are being discussed. One group recommends allowing requesters to submit broad free-text requisitions first, then letting buyers correct supplier, category, and policy details before purchase orders are issued. Another group recommends designing the process so users are guided to the correct purchasing channel, catalog or contract source, and approval path during requisition creation. The project must avoid slowing adoption, but governance leaders do not want compliance controls moved only to late-stage buyer cleanup.

Which recommendation best supports the process objective while maintaining governance and downstream data quality?

Response:

- A. Allow broad free-text requisitions initially and use buyer review before purchase order creation as the main control point for supplier and category accuracy.
- B. Guide users during requisition creation toward the appropriate catalog, contract source, and approval path so compliant purchasing data is captured early.
- C. Keep the existing purchasing behavior unchanged for the first release and introduce SAP Ariba Procurement process controls only after user adoption stabilizes.
- D. Require finance to review all requisitions before buyers act so spend categories can be corrected before purchase orders are generated.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation aligns the user experience with policy, source selection, approval routing, and reporting needs at the point of requisition creation. It supports adoption while ensuring that downstream purchase order processing and spend visibility rely on structured, compliant procurement data.

Question: 5

You are advising a regional diagnostic equipment distributor using SAP Ariba Procurement for service parts and outsourced logistics. Executives want a dashboard showing touchless purchasing rate and buyer intervention trends. During validation, the analyst notices that purchase orders automatically created from approved requisitions are counted as touchless even when buyers later changed supplier delivery instructions before transmission.

The procurement director wants the dashboard published quickly because leadership needs a baseline. The reporting owner recommends separating fully touchless orders from buyer-modified orders so leaders can identify where process friction occurs. The organization needs timely visibility, but overstating automation performance could misdirect improvement priorities.

Which reporting recommendation best supports timely insight and accurate automation interpretation?
Response:

- A. Publish the dashboard as-is and explain during the meeting that some touchless orders included buyer delivery changes.
- B. Separate fully touchless orders from buyer-modified orders and document how each contributes to automation reporting.
- C. Remove buyer-modified orders from the dashboard so the touchless rate reflects only automated purchase order creation.
- D. Export order history to spreadsheets and manually recalculate automation rates before each leadership review.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation addresses reporting logic at the order-intervention layer. Separating fully touchless orders from buyer-modified orders preserves timely visibility while giving leaders reliable context for automation and process improvement.

Question: 6

You are advising an industrial packaging company preparing SAP Ariba Procurement integration with its ERP purchasing process. In test execution, several purchase orders created from approved requisitions do not appear in the expected ERP queue because supplier and purchasing organization assumptions differ between the procurement realm and the ERP integration mapping.

The ERP lead wants to correct the failed test documents manually so the go-live rehearsal can continue. The procurement workstream lead wants to validate reusable master data assumptions, supplier mapping, and transaction handoff rules before approving readiness. The go-live date is near, and leadership wants only targeted remediation that prevents repeat failures without expanding the release scope.

Which implementation response best addresses the readiness issue?

Response:

- A. Manually correct the failed purchase orders and continue the rehearsal because the requisition approvals completed successfully.

- B. Validate supplier mapping, purchasing organization assumptions, and transaction handoff rules before marking integration readiness complete.
- C. Disable ERP handoff validation for the first release and reconcile failed purchase orders through post-go-live monitoring.
- D. Add more approvers to affected requisitions so purchase orders receive additional review before being sent to the ERP process.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This response targets the integration readiness layer where supplier mapping, organizational assumptions, and transaction handoff rules must align. It prevents repeated purchase order transfer failures while keeping remediation focused on dependencies required for the approved release.

Question: 7

You are advising a regional insurance claims processor using SAP Ariba Procurement for office services and investigation support purchases. The procurement director wants a monthly view of spend by service type, approval cycle time, and exception frequency. Claims managers want quick visibility into their own department activity, but governance requires supplier-rate details and requester names to remain limited to authorized procurement reviewers.

A reporting analyst proposes publishing a full transaction-level dashboard to all claims managers so they can act quickly. The governance lead proposes restricting the dashboard to central procurement only. The organization needs department-level insight for the next review meeting without creating uncontrolled access to sensitive purchasing details.

Which reporting recommendation best supports department visibility while preserving governance control?

Response:

- A. Publish the full transaction-level dashboard to all claims managers and review access concerns after the next meeting.
- B. Provide department-level summaries to claims managers with controlled drill-down to sensitive details for authorized procurement reviewers.
- C. Restrict the dashboard to central procurement and send claims managers manual extracts only when they request follow-up.
- D. Export purchasing data into department spreadsheets so each claims manager can remove sensitive fields before local review.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation applies governance at the reporting-access layer while still giving departments usable performance insight. Summarized metrics support local review, and controlled drill-down preserves sensitive transaction evidence for roles authorized to investigate it.

Question: 8

You are advising a regional printing company preparing SAP Ariba Procurement catalog content for paper, toner, and finishing supplies. The procurement team wants users to find items through a clear catalog hierarchy, but validation review shows that several items are mapped to broad parent categories instead of the intended purchasing subcategories.

The production manager wants the catalog published quickly because teams are ready to stop using email requests. The catalog owner recommends correcting hierarchy mapping before release because category placement affects item discovery, approval behavior, and spend analysis. The launch window is fixed, but leadership does not want users trained on a catalog structure that will need immediate correction.

Which action should the consultant recommend?

Response:

- A. Publish the catalog with broad parent categories and refine the hierarchy after users identify the most confusing items.
- B. Release the catalog only to procurement users first and let them redirect production teams to the correct items manually.
- C. Correct the catalog hierarchy mapping before release so item discovery, approval behavior, and reporting align from the start.
- D. Replace catalog purchasing with free-text requests until every supplier item can be mapped to a detailed subcategory.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This action addresses the catalog structure before users begin purchasing. Correct hierarchy mapping supports item discovery, approval logic, and spend analysis while avoiding immediate rework in the user experience after release.

Question: 9

You are advising a regional technical testing company using SAP Ariba Procurement for subcontracted inspection services. A supplier invoice has been corrected after an earlier reconciliation exception, but the payment request still appears blocked because the exception resolution note was not linked to the corrected invoice evidence.

Accounts payable wants to release payment based on the supplier relationship manager's email confirmation because the service was completed. The procurement controller recommends validating the corrected invoice, reconciliation exception status, and payment request evidence before releasing payment. The company wants timely supplier payment, but the payment request must show why the earlier exception no longer applies.

Which recommendation best supports payment release while preserving exception-resolution evidence?

Response:

- A. Release payment based on the relationship manager's email and attach the explanation during month-end review.
- B. Validate the corrected invoice, reconciliation exception status, and payment request evidence before releasing payment.
- C. Ask the supplier to resubmit the same corrected invoice again so accounts payable can restart the review from the beginning.
- D. Override the blocked payment request because the supplier has confirmed that the completed service was invoiced correctly.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation acts at the exception-resolution and payment request tracking layer. Validating the corrected invoice, exception status, and payment evidence supports timely release while preserving why the earlier exception no longer blocks payment.

Question: 10

You are advising a regional facilities inspection company using SAP Ariba Procurement for supplier invoices submitted through SAP Business Network. Accounts payable wants faster payment request completion, but procurement governance requires review when an invoice includes a fuel surcharge not present on the approved order or service confirmation.

A supplier relationship manager suggests accepting the invoice when the base inspection service matches, because surcharges are common during busy periods. The controller recommends reconciliation handling that allows clean matches to progress while surcharge differences remain visible for review. The company wants timely supplier payment, but unapproved surcharges affect project cost allocation and exception reporting.

What is the best advisory recommendation for the consultant to provide?

Response:

- A. Accept invoices when the base inspection service matches and review surcharge differences during month-end cost allocation.
- B. Require manual review for every facilities inspection invoice so surcharge differences cannot pass reconciliation unnoticed.
- C. Ask suppliers to include surcharge notes on invoices so accounts payable can decide whether the charge is acceptable.
- D. Configure reconciliation handling so clean invoices progress while surcharge differences remain reviewable before payment request completion.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation acts at the reconciliation layer where invoice, order, and service confirmation evidence should align. It supports timely processing for clean invoices while preserving review control for surcharge differences that affect cost allocation and exception reporting.

Topic: 2

Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 2 — Catalog Attribute Control for Laboratory Items

A supplier catalog loads successfully and users can search for laboratory items, but some sponsor-sensitive items trigger unexpected approval after selection because attributes are incomplete or interpreted late. What should the consultant recommend?

Response:

- A. Release the catalog because searchable item descriptions prove that buyers can find the needed materials.
- B. Validate item attributes, commodity classification, visibility, and approval behavior for sponsor-sensitive items before treating the catalog wave as ready.
- C. Remove approval triggers from all catalog items so buyers have a predictable shopping experience during hypercare.
- D. Ask grant administrators to review every catalog purchase after invoice reconciliation to identify items that needed sponsor treatment.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This distinguishes catalog technical availability from practical purchasing readiness. The recommendation checks whether the catalog data supports predictable visibility and approval behavior for items with sponsor-related treatment.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 2 — Catalog Attribute Control for Laboratory Items

Procurement wants to keep the catalog wave available because researchers are entering a busy buying period. Grant administrators want stricter handling for items with incomplete project-relevant attributes. Which decision best reflects governance-vs-governance prioritization?

Response:

- A. Keep the full catalog active because procurement adoption is the main governance target during hypercare.
- B. Hold every supplier catalog until all items have identical project-relevant attributes across all research departments.
- C. Allow validated ordinary consumables to remain available while limiting or correcting sponsor-sensitive items whose attributes or approval behavior cannot be trusted.

D. Move all sponsor-sensitive purchasing to free-text requests because free-text entry lets users explain the research need in more detail.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This weighs catalog adoption governance against sponsor-related purchasing control. It keeps usable low-risk content available while applying stricter handling to items whose attributes affect funding treatment.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 3 — Supplier Invoice Evidence for Lab Services

A supplier invoice for an external lab service arrives through SAP Business Network with a valid purchase order reference. Finance still cannot complete reconciliation because service confirmation and grant context are incomplete. What is the best decision?

Response:

- A. Allow the invoice to proceed because the purchase order reference proves the supplier matched the approved purchasing document.
- B. Hold or route the invoice according to the configured evidence requirement, while confirming whether service confirmation and grant context should have been captured earlier.
- C. Reject the supplier invoice and require resubmission after the laboratory team adds service confirmation.
- D. Route all SAP Business Network invoices to finance review until the next rollout wave is complete.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The valid purchase order reference is necessary but not sufficient when service and grant evidence are required. The best decision follows the evidence dependency and checks whether missing context should be corrected upstream.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 3 — Supplier Invoice Evidence for Lab Services

Hypercare tickets show that invoice clarification is most common for lab service orders where receiving evidence is entered after the supplier invoice arrives. Which root cause should be investigated first?

Response:

- A. Whether service receipt expectations, local confirmation responsibility, and invoice reconciliation dependency are aligned for lab service purchases.
- B. Whether suppliers should stop using SAP Business Network until laboratory users complete all receiving activities.

C. Whether finance should receive authority to approve payment requests without waiting for service confirmation.

D. Whether all lab service orders should be converted into catalog item purchases before the next rollout wave.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario points to a timing dependency between service confirmation and invoice reconciliation.

The correct investigation checks whether responsibilities and evidence requirements are aligned before finance review.

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-arp2p>