SAP
C_ARSCC
SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - SAP Business Network Supply Chain

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

You are supporting a beverage bottling group that wants to add stock transport order collaboration in SAP Business Network Supply Chain Collaboration. Operations wants transfer-related collaboration visibility for selected replenishment lanes, while the supply chain lead warns that purchase order confirmation assumptions should not be reused automatically for stock transport order processes. Suppliers and logistics partners will interact through a web-based public cloud environment.
One advisor suggests extending the existing purchase order collaboration setup to the stock transport order release to save time. Another advisor recommends defining the stock transport order collaboration scope separately, validating representative transfer documents, and confirming that reporting reflects the intended transfer status before adding more lanes. The first release must cover only two high-volume replenishment lanes.
Which recommendation best protects stock transport order process reliability during the first release?
Response:

A. Reuse the purchase order collaboration setup for stock transport orders because both processes require document visibility and supplier response tracking.
B. Delay stock transport order collaboration until every replenishment lane is ready, because partial lane coverage could reduce reporting completeness.
C. Enable all replenishment lanes at once and use early production reporting to identify which lanes need process-specific adjustment.
D. Define the stock transport order collaboration scope separately, validate representative transfer documents, and confirm transfer status reporting before expanding to additional lanes.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation addresses the correct process-specific validation layer. It separates the stock transport order scope from purchase order assumptions, uses representative transfer documents as evidence, and confirms that reporting reflects the intended transfer status before expansion.

Question: 2

You are advising an agricultural machinery manufacturer preparing supplier onboarding for SAP Business Network Supply Chain Collaboration. Procurement wants to include suppliers that support strategic components, while the implementation lead wants the first wave to prove that supplier responsibilities,

collaboration process scope, and reporting evidence can be managed consistently. The environment is public cloud with web-based supplier participation.
A sourcing manager proposes onboarding every supplier selected by the strategic procurement team so commercial priorities drive the first release. The implementation lead recommends grouping suppliers by collaboration process readiness and responsibility clarity, validating a representative mix of strategic suppliers, and using first-wave evidence to shape later onboarding waves. The first release must support strategic procurement goals without overloading enablement support.
Which recommendation best aligns supplier onboarding with strategic procurement goals and scalable implementation readiness?
Response:

A. Onboard every supplier selected by strategic procurement immediately, because strategic importance should determine the first collaboration wave.
B. Start only with suppliers that require the least enablement support, because a low-effort first wave is the best way to prove implementation readiness.
C. Group suppliers by process readiness and responsibility clarity, validate a representative mix of strategic suppliers, and use first-wave evidence to plan later onboarding waves.
D. Postpone strategic supplier onboarding until every collaboration process is configured, because partial process scope can weaken supplier adoption.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation balances business priority with implementation evidence. It uses process readiness and responsibility clarity to shape onboarding, includes a representative strategic supplier mix, and turns first-wave results into a practical basis for later expansion.

Question: 3

You are advising a construction hardware manufacturer preparing a staged SAP Business Network Supply Chain Collaboration rollout. Procurement wants suppliers for fast-moving parts onboarded first, while the operations lead wants the initial design to prove that the same collaboration foundation can support both order response and later inventory-related processes. The environment is public cloud with web-based supplier participation.
One proposal is to design only for the immediate order-response requirement and revisit the foundation when inventory collaboration becomes active. Another proposal is to establish a reusable collaboration foundation, validate order-response responsibilities in the first wave, and document which supplier and process rules must be confirmed before inventory-related scope is added. The first release must stay small but avoid a redesign later.
Which recommendation best balances a small first release with a scalable collaboration foundation?
Response:

A. Build only the immediate order-response setup and postpone foundation decisions until the inventory-related process scope is formally approved.
B. Activate inventory-related collaboration now, because future process coverage should be available before suppliers begin the first order-response wave.

C. Establish a reusable collaboration foundation, validate order-response responsibilities first, and document rule prerequisites before adding inventory-related scope.
D. Use separate supplier onboarding models for each future process so each team can optimize its own collaboration setup independently.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation addresses the foundation layer without overextending the active scope. It validates the immediate order-response process, preserves a reusable collaboration model, and identifies the rule prerequisites needed before later inventory-related expansion.

Question: 4

You are advising a precision tools manufacturer that is selecting suppliers for the first SAP Business Network Supply Chain Collaboration rollout. Procurement wants to prioritize suppliers with the highest annual spend, while the implementation lead wants the first group to include suppliers whose collaboration processes can be validated across order response, exception handling, and reporting. The environment is public cloud with web-based supplier participation.
The business sponsor expects ten suppliers in the first wave and wants evidence that the collaboration foundation can scale. A spend-only selection would include several suppliers with limited process readiness. A process-readiness selection would include fewer high-spend suppliers but would produce stronger validation of buyer-supplier responsibilities, collaboration behavior, and reporting output before later waves.
Which recommendation best supports supplier selection for a scalable first-wave rollout?
Response:

A. Select only the highest-spend suppliers, because spend impact is the best indicator that the first wave will prove business value.
B. Select suppliers based on process readiness, collaboration relevance, and ability to validate reporting evidence, while keeping spend impact as a secondary prioritization factor.
C. Select suppliers that already exchange documents outside the network, because existing manual collaboration proves readiness for the public cloud rollout.
D. Select the suppliers with the fewest expected exceptions, because a low-error first wave gives the strongest evidence that the collaboration foundation is stable.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation aligns supplier selection with the purpose of the first rollout. It prioritizes suppliers that can validate collaboration responsibilities, process behavior, and reporting output, while still considering spend impact so the pilot remains commercially meaningful.

Question: 5

You are advising a specialty packaging company that wants suppliers to participate in quality review follow-up through SAP Business Network Supply Chain Collaboration. The quality team wants suppliers to submit corrective-response information faster, while plant operations wants quality notifications to remain open until the buyer confirms that the response is usable for follow-up. The environment is public cloud with web-based supplier participation.
A plant supervisor suggests closing quality follow-up as soon as the supplier submits any response, because this would reduce aging notifications. The quality lead recommends defining acceptable supplier response evidence, validating that responses are visible in collaboration reports, and keeping buyer review as the control point before follow-up closure. The first release must reduce notification aging without creating false closure evidence.
Which recommendation best supports faster supplier quality response while preserving reliable follow-up closure?
Response:

A. Close quality follow-up whenever a supplier submits a response, because supplier action is the main evidence needed to reduce aging notifications.
B. Define acceptable supplier response evidence, validate response visibility in collaboration reports, and retain buyer review before quality follow-up closure.
C. Keep supplier quality responses outside the collaboration process until every supplier can submit the same evidence format.
D. Enable supplier responses broadly and use monthly quality reports to identify notifications that were closed with incomplete evidence.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation addresses the correct quality review layer. It defines what supplier evidence is acceptable, validates that the response is visible through collaboration reporting, and preserves buyer review before closure so faster supplier participation does not create false completion evidence.

Question: 6

You are advising a laboratory equipment company that is introducing supplier-managed inventory for calibration parts through SAP Business Network Supply Chain Collaboration. Operations wants suppliers to see inventory signals and propose replenishment quickly, while finance requires replenishment responsibility to apply only to parts with approved commercial terms. The environment is public cloud with web-based supplier collaboration.
During testing, suppliers can view inventory information for the pilot parts, but replenishment proposals are inconsistent because some parts were included based on item visibility rather than approved supplier-managed inventory responsibility. One team wants to correct the visible inventory list only. Another recommends aligning approved parts, supplier-specific responsibility rules, and replenishment validation before accepting the pilot.
Which recommendation best addresses the inconsistent replenishment proposal behavior?
Response:

A. Correct only the visible inventory list, because supplier access to the right parts is the main requirement for reliable replenishment proposals.
B. Expand supplier-managed inventory to all calibration parts, because broader item coverage will make replenishment behavior more consistent across suppliers.
C. Ask suppliers to manually confirm replenishment responsibility for each visible part until the commercial terms are updated.
D. Align the approved pilot parts, supplier-specific responsibility rules, and replenishment validation before accepting the supplier-managed inventory pilot.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation resolves the issue at the correct configuration and validation layer. It connects approved parts with supplier-specific responsibility rules and confirms replenishment proposal behavior before the pilot is accepted as reliable.

Question: 7

You are advising a modular battery enclosure manufacturer preparing subcontracting collaboration in SAP Business Network Supply Chain Collaboration. The buyer wants the prime supplier to coordinate assembly readiness, while an approved coating supplier provides a surface-treatment step that affects whether the enclosure can move to final assembly. The environment is public cloud with web-based supplier participation.
The production lead recommends letting the coating supplier update readiness directly against the buyer's assembly schedule because the surface-treatment step is the current bottleneck. The supplier relationship manager recommends keeping assembly readiness accountability with the prime supplier, allowing controlled visibility for the approved coating step, and validating that reports show the coating dependency without making the coating supplier appear responsible for the entire subcontracted assembly. The release must reduce bottleneck escalation time during a nine-week pilot, but it must preserve accountability for final assembly readiness and support later addition of other approved dependency steps.
Which recommendation best balances bottleneck visibility with subcontracting accountability?
Response:

A. Let the coating supplier update readiness directly against the buyer's assembly schedule because the bottleneck step determines final assembly timing.
B. Keep the coating supplier outside collaboration and require the prime supplier to summarize coating status manually for the buyer during the pilot.
C. Give the buyer team direct ownership of coating-step follow-up so accountability can be managed centrally until additional dependency steps are added.
D. Keep assembly readiness accountability with the prime supplier, allow controlled coating-step visibility, and validate reporting without shifting full assembly responsibility.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation preserves the correct subcontracting responsibility boundary. It gives visibility to the approved coating dependency, validates report evidence for the bottleneck step, and keeps final assembly readiness accountability with the prime supplier for scalable expansion.

Question: 8

You are advising a specialty chemicals buyer that already runs purchase order collaboration through SAP Business Network Supply Chain Collaboration. Suppliers can confirm original orders, but the procurement team now wants to include purchase order changes for selected materials where quantity revisions occur frequently. The environment is public cloud with web-based supplier interaction.
The supply planner wants change-order collaboration enabled quickly for all purchase orders so suppliers always see the latest buyer request. The purchasing manager is concerned that broad activation could make suppliers respond to low-priority changes and create unnecessary exception volume. A controlled approach would enable change collaboration only for the material groups with frequent quantity revisions, validate supplier responses on representative changed orders, and then adjust monitor thresholds before expansion.
Which recommendation best supports reliable purchase order change collaboration without creating excessive supplier response noise?
Response:

A. Enable change-order collaboration for all purchase orders first, because suppliers should always respond to the latest buyer request regardless of material relevance.
B. Enable change collaboration only for the affected material groups, validate supplier responses on representative changed orders, and tune monitor thresholds before broader expansion.
C. Keep purchase order changes outside the collaboration process and ask buyers to communicate urgent revisions directly to suppliers until exception volumes are understood.
D. Enable change-order collaboration only for suppliers with the fastest historical response time, because response speed is the strongest indicator of readiness.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation targets the correct process and validation layer. It limits change collaboration to material groups where quantity revisions are meaningful, confirms supplier response behavior through representative changed orders, and tunes monitor thresholds before expansion so collaboration evidence remains actionable.

Question: 9

You are advising a regional hospital consumables buyer that uses SAP Business Network Supply Chain Collaboration for purchase order confirmations. Procurement wants suppliers to confirm urgent orders quickly, while supply planning wants exception follow-up to focus on line items that affect critical replenishment dates. The environment is public cloud with web-based supplier interaction.

During testing, suppliers can confirm purchase orders, but planners report that the monitor view treats small noncritical timing differences and critical-date changes with similar urgency. One team proposes asking planners to review every supplier confirmation manually during the first release. Another team recommends refining the collaboration and monitor logic around priority items, validating representative confirmations, and using the resulting exception evidence for supplier onboarding decisions. The first release must reduce planner review effort.
Which recommendation best supports meaningful purchase order exception handling without overloading planners?
Response:

A. Ask planners to manually review all supplier confirmations during the first release so no urgent replenishment issue is missed.
B. Disable monitor-based exception follow-up for the first release and rely on suppliers to contact procurement when confirmation changes affect urgent orders.
C. Treat every supplier confirmation difference as a high-priority exception because urgent purchase orders require maximum visibility.
D. Refine collaboration and monitor logic around priority items, validate representative confirmations, and use exception evidence to guide supplier onboarding decisions.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation addresses the correct exception-handling layer. It aligns collaboration behavior with priority item impact, validates representative supplier confirmations, and produces monitor evidence that supports scalable onboarding without forcing planners to review every low-impact difference.

Question: 10

You are advising a home healthcare supplies distributor that wants to introduce returns collaboration through SAP Business Network Supply Chain Collaboration. The customer service team wants suppliers to respond faster to rejected delivery items, while warehouse operations wants returns to follow approved reason categories so downstream status reporting remains consistent. The environment is public cloud with web-based supplier interaction.
A project lead proposes enabling returns collaboration broadly for all active suppliers and allowing suppliers to choose any return reason during the first release. The warehouse manager recommends limiting the first release to approved suppliers and configured return reason categories, validating sample return requests, and expanding after exception reports show consistent status handling. The release window is three weeks, and rework must be minimized.
Which recommendation best supports fast supplier participation while protecting return process consistency?
Response:

A. Limit the first release to approved suppliers and configured return reason categories, validate sample return requests, and expand after exception reporting confirms consistent status handling.

B. Enable returns collaboration for all active suppliers immediately and allow flexible reason selection so supplier participation can begin without configuration delays.
C. Keep returns outside SAP Business Network Supply Chain Collaboration until all suppliers agree to the same return handling process.
D. Activate returns collaboration only for suppliers with the highest return volume and rely on warehouse review to correct reason-category inconsistencies.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
This recommendation controls the correct process setup layer. It aligns supplier enablement with configured return reasons, validates sample return behavior, and confirms that reporting reflects consistent status handling before broader rollout. The approach supports the release timeline while producing reliable evidence for the returns collaboration process.
Topic: 2
Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Supplier Wave Selection for Collaboration Scope
A supplier has reliable purchase order confirmation history from the pilot. The rollout team wants to add the supplier to the next wave, but the supplier has not yet been aligned to the planning or scheduling agreement scope requested by maintenance planners.
What should the consultant recommend?
Response:

A. Add the supplier to all next-wave processes because reliable purchase order collaboration proves overall readiness.
B. Include the supplier only for the collaboration processes where its participation and supplier-specific rules are validated.
C. Exclude the supplier from the next wave because planning and scheduling agreement readiness are not yet complete.
D. Use the pilot supplier setup as the default template for the supplier's next-wave participation.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
The supplier's purchase order history is useful evidence, but it does not prove readiness for planning or scheduling agreement collaboration. Including the supplier only where process participation and rules are validated preserves wave governance while allowing scoped onboarding.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 1 — Supplier Wave Selection for Collaboration Scope

Procurement prefers a smaller rollout wave if it produces reliable adoption evidence. Asset planners want more suppliers included because several influence maintenance-window readiness.
Which recommendation best balances the competing priorities?
Response:

A. Include every supplier that affects maintenance windows so planners receive broader visibility as early as possible.
B. Limit the wave to suppliers with validated process participation and sequence additional suppliers based on planning relevance.
C. Keep only the original pilot suppliers because adding new suppliers could reduce the reliability of adoption evidence.
D. Add suppliers based on purchase order volume and defer supplier-specific rule validation until after enablement.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option balances planning relevance with controlled supplier onboarding. It allows staged inclusion while keeping adoption evidence tied to validated collaboration processes.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 3 — Subcontract Repair Visibility Across Component Dependencies
A subcontract repair partner depends on two component suppliers, but only one supplier is proposed for the rollout wave. The repair partner cannot confirm assembled kit readiness from the current visibility.
What should the consultant recommend first?
Response:

A. Validate subcontracting visibility against the repair partner's approved component dependencies and supplier responsibilities.
B. Give the repair partner full visibility to all component suppliers so it can confirm kit readiness faster.
C. Remove the repair partner from subcontracting collaboration until all component suppliers join a later wave.
D. Ask the repair partner to use email for missing component dependency updates during the next wave.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
The scenario points to an incomplete dependency view for subcontracting readiness. Validating visibility against approved component responsibilities supports kit readiness while preserving supplier data boundaries.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 3 — Subcontract Repair Visibility Across Component Dependencies
The supplier governance lead is concerned that repair partners may infer component demand outside their assigned work. Maintenance planners argue that assembled kit readiness is the main operational goal.
Which recommendation best handles the trade-off?
Response:

A. Expand repair partner visibility across all component demand because maintenance readiness is the highest priority.
B. Keep visibility limited to approved kit dependencies and validate whether the missing supplier dependency belongs in the wave.
C. Hide all component-level visibility from repair partners and let planners confirm kit readiness internally.
D. Add every component supplier to the wave so repair partners can see complete dependency information.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option preserves data boundaries while addressing the operational need for kit readiness. It focuses on whether the missing dependency is approved and belongs in the wave.

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