Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP
C_ARSOR
SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - SAP Ariba Sourcing

Exams Boost
Boost Up Your Career

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-arsor

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A specialty chemicals manufacturer has completed a SAP Ariba Sourcing event for regional packaging suppliers. The sourcing director asks the implementation consultant to recommend how the category team should validate the outcome before presenting savings to finance. The event includes supplier responses across several line items, and the team also needs a downloadable event-level view for immediate review.
Finance wants a defensible report that connects supplier response data to the sourcing document, not a manually edited spreadsheet. The category manager prefers using the quickest available event report, while the procurement analytics lead wants the team to consider analytical sourcing reports for recurring comparisons across future events. Leadership expects a recommendation that supports both immediate evidence and reusable reporting discipline.
Which recommendation best supports the reporting need without weakening validation evidence?
Response:

A. Download the relevant event report for the completed sourcing event and use analytical sourcing reports where recurring sourcing-document facts and fields are needed.
B. Export supplier response attachments manually, combine them into a spreadsheet, and use the spreadsheet as the finance-facing sourcing result.
C. Create a new sourcing event only for reporting purposes so the category team can re-enter final supplier prices in a simplified structure.
D. Ask finance to accept the award summary without event reporting because the supplier responses have already been reviewed by the sourcing team.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option preserves the connection between the sourcing document and the report evidence. Event reports support immediate review of the completed event, while analytical sourcing reports support recurring analysis using sourcing-document facts and fields. The recommendation satisfies finance validation without replacing system-derived evidence with uncontrolled manual consolidation.

Question: 2

A regional veterinary clinic network is onboarding sourcing assistants to SAP Ariba Guided Sourcing in a web-based public cloud environment. The assistants will support project owners by monitoring

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

worklists, locating current system documents, and confirming where project-related guidance is available before live event preparation begins. The rollout team has five business days for readiness. The procurement trainer wants to cover broad sourcing theory and let users discover guided sourcing behavior during live work. The system administrator expects support tickets if users misunderstand dashboard views, preferences, and documentation access. The sourcing director wants a focused recommendation that enables practical first-wave execution without introducing advanced award or reporting topics.
Which recommendation best prepares the assistants for first-wave guided sourcing support?
Response:

A. Assign all dashboard monitoring to project owners until assistants have completed several live sourcing events.
B. Provide a high-level strategic sourcing overview and allow assistants to learn system document access during live event preparation.
C. Require assistants to complete advanced award scenario and analytical reporting readiness before they support any project owner.
D. Deliver focused readiness on dashboard use, preferences, documentation access, and system documents before assistants support live sourcing work.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option targets the required readiness layer for first-wave support. Dashboard use, preferences, documentation access, and system documents directly affect how assistants monitor work and help project owners follow current guidance. The recommendation fits the short timeline without adding unrelated advanced topics.

Question: 3

A public-sector utilities buyer is running a SAP Ariba Sourcing event for maintenance contractors. The event has completed supplier response collection, and the project team must prepare an award recommendation. Procurement wants to announce the award quickly because existing contracts expire soon. The compliance officer requires that supplier responses be evaluated consistently using the approved scoring approach before any award scenario is presented.
The sourcing analyst proposes moving directly to the lowest-price award scenario because it is the fastest path and appears to meet the budget target. The technical evaluator warns that several supplier responses require grading before the final score can be trusted. Leadership asks you to recommend the next step that balances time pressure, governance, and award reliability.
Which recommendation best protects the sourcing decision while respecting the urgency?
Response:

A. Present the lowest-price award scenario immediately and document that qualitative grading will be completed after leadership approval.
B. Extend the event response period so suppliers can revise all qualitative answers before the sourcing analyst creates any award scenario.

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

C. Complete the required grading and scoring activities, then generate the award scenario using validated supplier evaluation results.
D. Create an award scenario using price data only, then ask the technical evaluator to update the scoring report separately for audit support.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option preserves decision reliability by completing the evaluation steps that make the award scenario meaningful. Grading and scoring convert supplier responses into validated evaluation results before the award recommendation is prepared. The approach respects urgency by focusing on the required evaluation checkpoint rather than restarting the event or bypassing governance.

Question: 4

A telecommunications tower operator is designing a SAP Ariba Sourcing event for maintenance suppliers across urban, coastal, and remote tower groups. Some suppliers are approved only for urban sites, while others can support remote maintenance but require different response questions for travel readiness. The sourcing lead wants one event to reduce administration, but operations needs comparable line-item responses by tower group.
A project owner suggests asking all suppliers to respond to all tower groups and filtering unsuitable bids later. Another stakeholder recommends separate events for each tower group, even though several suppliers overlap. The consultant must recommend an event design that limits irrelevant supplier content while preserving efficient comparison.
Which recommendation best supports supplier relevance and structured evaluation?
Response:

A. Use separate events for urban, coastal, and remote tower groups so each event contains only one supplier capability profile.
B. Use one event with open text questions and allow suppliers to describe which tower groups they can support.
C. Use one structured event with tower-group lots, line items, participant controls, and conditional content where response needs differ.
D. Invite all suppliers to every tower group and remove ineligible bids when preparing the award scenario.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option uses the event design to control both response structure and content relevance. Tower-group lots and line items support comparable responses, participant controls align supplier access to approved scope, and conditional content handles different response needs. The recommendation prevents irrelevant content without splitting the sourcing activity unnecessarily.

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

Question: 5

A regional food services company is configuring SAP Ariba Sourcing for its first public cloud rollout. The buying teams need separate sourcing templates for equipment, ingredients, and facilities services, but procurement operations wants common approval behavior and consistent supplier instructions. The consultant is asked to advise how template changes should be governed before the first live events are created.
The facilities team wants project owners to adjust bidding rules and timing settings directly in each event to meet local deadlines. Procurement operations prefers centrally maintained templates but accepts controlled variation when justified by category requirements. The implementation must avoid slowing the rollout while preventing unmanaged template changes from becoming the default operating model.
Which recommendation best supports controlled template administration while allowing category-specific sourcing needs?
Response:

A. Let project owners adjust timing and bidding rules directly in each event, then review supplier-facing settings after the event is published.
B. Maintain governed templates with common approval behavior and supplier instructions, and manage approved category variation through template administration.
C. Create one template for all categories and prohibit any variation in bidding rules, timing settings, or line-item structure during the first release.
D. Allow each category team to maintain its own separate template library without shared controls so local sourcing requirements can be handled faster.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option places sourcing behavior under template administration while preserving controlled flexibility. Common approval behavior and supplier instructions support consistency across buying teams, and approved category variation can be maintained without unmanaged event-level edits. The recommendation satisfies rollout speed by reusing governed templates rather than rebuilding controls in each event.

Question: 6

A consumer electronics company is configuring a guided sourcing event in SAP Ariba Sourcing for packaging materials used across three product lines. The sourcing manager wants suppliers to bid only on the lots relevant to their approved capabilities, while the category team needs comparable line-item responses across all invited suppliers. The event must be ready for supplier invitation by the end of the week.
Two internal recommendations are being debated. One team suggests creating separate events for each product line to reduce supplier confusion. Another suggests using one structured event with lots, line items, participant controls, and event rules that guide supplier responses. Procurement leadership

prefers lower administration effort but will reject an event design that prevents fair response comparison or exposes irrelevant content.
Which recommendation best supports controlled supplier participation while preserving comparable sourcing responses?
Response:

A. Create one event with all lots visible to all suppliers and use post-event analysis to ignore bids submitted against irrelevant product lines.
B. Create three separate events by product line so suppliers see only relevant content, then manually consolidate responses after the events close.
C. Create a single event with only summary-level questions and request suppliers to attach their detailed pricing spreadsheets separately.
D. Create one structured event with appropriate lots and line items, apply participant access controls, and use event rules to guide eligible supplier responses.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option uses the event structure to control both supplier eligibility and response comparability. Lots and line items provide the required bid structure, participant access keeps suppliers focused on relevant content, and event rules guide response behavior before submission. The recommendation balances administration effort with fair and analyzable sourcing output.

Question: 7

A regional coworking-space operator has completed SAP Ariba Sourcing events for cleaning contracts, furniture repair, and access-control support. The procurement director needs evidence for an executive review showing supplier participation, response coverage, and awarded values by sourcing document. The event-level information is needed this week, but leadership also wants recurring quarterly comparisons across similar sourcing documents.
The sourcing analyst proposes copying selected event values into a formatted spreadsheet because it can be prepared quickly. The governance lead is concerned that manual consolidation will become the standard reporting process and weaken traceability. The consultant must recommend a reporting approach that supports the immediate review while preserving a repeatable analytical pattern.
Which recommendation best satisfies the immediate and recurring reporting requirements?
Response:

A. Create a new summary sourcing event containing only final awarded suppliers and values for executive review.
B. Copy selected event values into a spreadsheet and treat the spreadsheet as the official evidence for current and future reviews.
C. Ask leadership to rely on the procurement director’s summary because supplier participation and awarded values were already reviewed internally.
D. Use event reports for immediate completed-event evidence and analytical sourcing reports for recurring comparison across sourcing-document facts and fields.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option uses the appropriate reporting layer for each requirement. Event reports support immediate evidence for completed events, while analytical sourcing reports support recurring comparison across sourcing-document facts and fields. The recommendation preserves system-derived evidence and avoids making manual consolidation the recurring reporting pattern.

Question: 8

A regional laboratory services provider is preparing its first SAP Ariba Guided Sourcing rollout in a web-based public cloud environment. New sourcing coordinators must begin creating basic sourcing projects within one week. During user readiness sessions, several coordinators ask which dashboard views they should monitor, where current system documents are accessed, and how personal preferences affect their sourcing worklist.
The training manager wants to shorten readiness by covering only high-level purchasing concepts. The system administrator warns that most early support issues will come from users relying on outdated local instructions or misunderstanding dashboard behavior. The sourcing director wants a focused approach that enables first-wave execution without delaying the rollout with advanced event analysis topics.
Which recommendation best supports practical first-wave guided sourcing readiness?
Response:

A. Deliver targeted readiness on dashboards, preferences, documentation access, and system documents before users create live sourcing projects.
B. Provide only a strategic purchasing overview and let coordinators learn guided sourcing dashboard behavior during live project execution.
C. Require every coordinator to complete award optimization and analytical reporting preparation before any guided sourcing access is granted.
D. Assign all first-wave project creation to the system administrator so coordinators can avoid using guided sourcing dashboards initially.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option targets the user interaction layer required for first-wave execution. Dashboards, preferences, documentation access, and system documents directly affect how coordinators locate work, follow current guidance, and begin live sourcing projects. The recommendation supports readiness without expanding the training scope into advanced analysis activities.

Question: 9

A regional insurance services firm has completed a SAP Ariba Sourcing event for outsourced claims-support providers. The sourcing manager needs to show the evaluation committee which suppliers

participated, which line items received responses, and how the final recommendation relates to the sourcing document. The committee meeting is tomorrow, and the finance team also wants a reusable reporting pattern for future sourcing reviews.
The analyst proposes copying key values from the event into a presentation because it is fast. The procurement governance lead wants downloadable event evidence for this event and a reporting approach that can later support comparisons across sourcing documents. The consultant must recommend a reporting approach that satisfies both immediate validation and future repeatability.
Which recommendation best addresses the reporting requirement without disconnecting the evidence from SAP Ariba Sourcing?
Response:

A. Copy the final supplier values into a presentation and treat the presentation as the official evidence for the evaluation committee.
B. Use the relevant event report for immediate sourcing-document evidence and plan analytical sourcing reports for recurring cross-document comparisons.
C. Build a new simplified event that contains only the final recommended supplier values so the committee can review a cleaner artifact.
D. Ask the evaluation committee to rely on the sourcing manager's verbal summary because supplier participation has already been reviewed internally.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option uses the correct reporting layer for each need. Event reports provide immediate evidence connected to the completed sourcing event, while analytical sourcing reports support reusable comparisons across sourcing-document facts and fields. The recommendation preserves traceability for the committee and future reporting discipline.

Question: 10

A regional packaged foods producer is standardizing SAP Ariba Sourcing templates for raw materials, plant maintenance, and marketing services. Procurement operations wants consistent approval behavior and supplier communication wording, but each category requires different bidding rules and line-item structures. The first release must be practical, because buying teams will start live events within two weeks.
The marketing services team wants project owners to copy old events and adjust settings manually for each campaign. The raw materials team wants stricter timing rules for supplier bidding. The governance lead wants variation to be controlled through template administration rather than unmanaged event edits. The consultant must recommend how to support category needs without creating template drift.
Which recommendation best balances template governance and category-specific flexibility?
Response:

A. Require every category to use one identical event template with the same bidding rules, timing settings, and line-item structure.
B. Let each project owner copy previous events and adjust supplier communication, timing, and line-item settings before publication.

C. Maintain governed templates with shared approval behavior and supplier communication wording, while managing approved category-specific settings through template administration.
D. Launch the first release using informal event copies and document recurring category differences after several live sourcing events are completed.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This option places recurring sourcing behavior under controlled template administration while preserving justified category variation. Shared approval behavior and supplier communication wording support consistency, and approved category-specific settings can be maintained without unmanaged event-level edits. The recommendation supports the first release while reducing long-term template drift.
Topic: 2
Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Guided Project Setup for Regional Packaging Events
Verdant Foods wants to publish the packaging sourcing event before the monthly category review. The project team confirms that all local buyers are listed as team members, but one buyer can update participant content and cannot approve the final supplier invitation task.
What is the best recommendation before publication?
Response:

A. Add all local buyers to a broad project administrator role so the approval task can be completed quickly.
B. Keep the project template approval path intact and adjust task ownership or approver assignment so the correct role can complete the supplier invitation approval.
C. Publish the event with the current approval status because the participant list is already accurate at the project level.
D. Remove the supplier invitation approval task from the project template for the pilot and restore it after the event closes.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
The project team needs the approval sequence to remain governed while correcting the ownership or approver assignment that blocks publication. This addresses the actual readiness dependency without weakening the project template controls.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 1 — Guided Project Setup for Regional Packaging Events

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

The sourcing lead wants local buyers to maintain regional participant details without delaying the guided sourcing project. Governance still expects a clear approval path for supplier invitation and event publication.
Which setup best reflects this requirement?
Response:

A. Let local buyers maintain participant content while keeping final approval responsibility with the designated sourcing or governance approver.
B. Restrict all local buyers from the project and require the sourcing lead to maintain every participant record manually.
C. Give the first local buyer who finishes content maintenance the authority to approve supplier invitations.
D. Move participant maintenance outside the guided sourcing project so approvals can be handled after publication.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
This separates operational participation from approval authority. Local buyers can support regional content while the final approval remains controlled by the appropriate project role.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 4 — Reporting Evidence for Sourcing Readiness Review
Leadership asks for a readiness summary before the event is opened to suppliers. The sourcing lead can show event activity details, but leadership also needs confidence in project controls, participant readiness, content coverage, and the evaluation approach.
Which evidence set should the consultant recommend?
Response:

A. A combined readiness view using project task status, participant readiness, line-item coverage, event setup evidence, and the planned evaluation approach.
B. A download of event activity logs because activity volume proves that the team has prepared the event.
C. A supplier invitation list because supplier readiness is the main factor before event publication.
D. A draft award comparison report because leadership mainly needs to see how the final recommendation will look.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
The go/no-go discussion needs evidence across both project controls and event setup readiness. A combined view connects task status, participant scope, content completeness, and evaluation preparation.

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

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 4 — Reporting Evidence for Sourcing Readiness Review
The procurement director wants a concise readiness summary for a go/no-go meeting. The governance office wants enough evidence to review approval discipline and supplier eligibility later.
Which reporting recommendation is most appropriate?
Response:

A. Present only the simplest leadership dashboard and keep governance evidence outside the meeting to save time.
B. Provide a concise readiness summary supported by traceable project and event records that can be reviewed if governance questions arise.
C. Export all available sourcing reports and attach them to the meeting invite so no one can claim evidence was missing.
D. Wait until after supplier bidding starts to prepare readiness evidence because live participation will show whether setup was correct.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
This balances leadership readability with governance traceability. The summary remains concise while the underlying records support later review of approvals, eligibility, and event readiness.

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

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