

**Boost up Your Certification Score**

# SAP C\_S4CFI

**SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - SAP S/4HANA  
Cloud Public Edition, Financial Accounting**



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

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

## **Product Version**

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

# Latest Version: 4.0

## Subjects

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

**Topic: 1**  
**Micro Skill Drill Exam**

### Question: 1

A consultant is validating an accounts payable process in a public cloud finance tenant using a web-based UI. Test users can enter supplier invoices and save them successfully. For one invoice category, however, the documents remain parked and do not move into the expected approval-dependent payment preparation flow. Other invoice categories are proceeding normally. The finance lead wants the issue corrected before the next payment simulation, but the implementation lead does not want a design change that creates a separate exception process outside the approved configuration. One team member proposes manually reposting the parked invoices as a different category so the next simulation can continue. Another suggests checking whether the affected invoice category is bound correctly to the intended downstream process settings used for payment preparation.

Which action should the consultant take first?

Response:

- A. Repost the parked invoices under a different invoice category that already enters the payment preparation flow correctly.
- B. Open broader payment-related permissions for AP users so parked invoices can advance without additional process checks.
- C. Review the configuration binding for the affected invoice category and correct the downstream process assignment if it is inconsistent.) Feedback: The issue affects only one invoice category while others proceed normally. That points to a category-specific configuration dependency, not a general AP execution failure. Checking the binding between the invoice category and the downstream process assignment targets the upstream cause and preserves the approved configuration model.
- D. Delay the next simulation and replace the parked invoices with manual test postings created directly in the ledger.

**Answer: C**

### Question: 2

A consultant is validating asset lifecycle processing in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition through a web-based UI. Asset master data is available, acquisition postings can be created, and most asset groups complete the next validation step successfully. However, one migrated asset grouping returns an inconsistent lifecycle status during a follow-on process, while newly prepared asset groups in the same company code behave correctly. The finance lead wants today's rehearsal to continue, but the

implementation lead requires that the correction remain reusable for future close cycles and avoid introducing a separate long-term handling model only for migrated assets.

One team member proposes manually correcting the affected asset results after each run. Another suggests checking whether the migrated asset grouping is aligned with the intended lifecycle configuration and related control assignments before the next validation cycle.

Which action should the consultant take first?

Response:

- A. Manually correct the affected asset results after each run so the rehearsal can stay on schedule.
- B. Create a separate handling method for migrated assets so the standard lifecycle remains unchanged for all others.
- C. Check whether the migrated asset grouping is aligned with the intended lifecycle configuration and related control assignments.) Feedback: The inconsistency affects one migrated asset grouping while newly prepared asset groups behave correctly. That points to a second-order dependency between migration-prepared asset setup and lifecycle configuration rather than a general asset-processing failure. Reviewing lifecycle alignment and related control assignments targets the upstream cause in a reusable way.
- D. Exclude the affected asset grouping from the current rehearsal and continue only with assets that already work correctly.

**Answer: C**

### Question: 3

During receivables validation in a public cloud finance deployment, users can post customer invoices and review open items in the web-based environment. However, a subset of customer items is not entering the intended follow-up handling path after a defined event occurs, while similar items for other customer groups move correctly into the expected process. The collections lead wants the issue resolved before tomorrow's end-to-end simulation, but the implementation lead requires that the process remain standardized and support later operational handover.

One team member recommends transferring the affected items to a manual follow-up list outside the system. Another suggests investigating whether the affected customer subset is linked to the correct process-routing settings used by the standardized receivables flow.

Which action is most appropriate?

Response:

- A. Move the affected items to a manual follow-up list so the collections team can continue the simulation without process interruption.
- B. Create a separate receivables handling path for the affected customer subset to preserve the simulation schedule.
- C. Check whether the affected customer subset is correctly linked to the standardized process-routing settings and correct any mismatch.) Feedback: The issue is selective to a subset of customers while similar items process correctly elsewhere. That pattern strongly supports a routing or assignment mismatch tied to the affected subset. Correcting the standardized routing configuration resolves the root cause and preserves a maintainable operating model.

D. Repost the customer items so the system reevaluates their eligibility for follow-up processing from the start.

**Answer: C**

### Question: 4

A consultant is preparing integrated finance testing in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition. The project uses a web-based implementation environment, and business users can sign in and open most required apps. One tester, however, can display master data and reporting apps but cannot complete a specific configuration-validation task assigned to the finance workstream. Another consultant suggests giving the tester a broader business role so the test can continue immediately.

The project lead adds a governance constraint: the fix must support role discipline and should not expand access beyond what is needed for controlled testing. The consultant notices that other testers in the same workstream can complete the task successfully, and no general system error is visible.

Which action should the consultant take first?

Response:

A. Assign a broad finance role temporarily so the tester can complete the task before the session ends.

B. Restart the tester's user setup from the beginning to regenerate all role-based authorizations in the tenant.

C. Move the task to another tester and leave the current access issue for a later project phase.

D. Compare the tester's assigned access scope with the role requirements of the failing task and correct the missing authorization alignment.) Feedback: This scenario includes a governance-sensitive access constraint. The tester can already use some apps, and other testers in the same workstream can complete the task. That indicates a specific access-scope mismatch rather than a system-wide failure. Comparing the assigned access scope to the task requirement addresses the exact dependency while preserving controlled role design.

**Answer: D**

### Question: 5

A consultant is preparing an integrated finance validation session in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition through a web-based implementation environment. Testers can sign in and execute most assigned finance activities. However, one required workstream task is not available for a specific tester population, while related activities in the same approved scope are visible and working. The project manager wants today's workshop to continue, but the implementation lead requires that any correction preserve governance discipline and avoid broader access than the task actually requires.

One colleague proposes assigning a wider finance authorization bundle so the affected users can proceed immediately. Another suggests checking whether the activity is active in the approved scope and whether the tester population has the correct role alignment for that scoped activity before changing access.

Which action should the consultant take first?

Response:

- A. Assign a wider finance authorization bundle so the affected users can continue the workshop immediately.
- B. Check whether the activity is active in the approved scope and whether the tester population has the required role alignment.) Feedback: The activity is missing only for one tester population while related scoped activities already function correctly. That points to a combined dependency involving scope activation and role alignment, not a general tenant or account failure. Checking both dependencies first is the most targeted and governance-aligned response.
- C. Recreate the affected tester accounts so all entitlements are rebuilt from the beginning of the setup process.
- D. Restart the finance workstream setup so the missing activity is regenerated for all users in the tenant.

**Answer: B**

## Question: 6

A consultant is preparing a new public cloud finance scope for integrated testing in a web-based implementation environment. Organizational elements and baseline Financial Accounting settings were transported into the test tenant, and users can sign in successfully. However, when the project team begins executing finance process tests, only some of the configured process steps are available in the expected business apps. The project manager wants testing to start immediately because the schedule is tight, but the implementation lead insists the solution must remain aligned with the approved scope and clean-core operating model.

One team member proposes assigning broad temporary access to the finance testers. Another suggests checking whether the relevant scope-dependent configuration content was activated consistently for the tenant before changing user access.

Which action should the consultant take first?

Response:

- A. Assign broader temporary business access so testers can begin process execution while the missing setup is reviewed later.
- B. Verify whether the required scope-dependent activation and related configuration content were completed correctly for the affected finance processes.) Feedback: The symptom is selective process availability, not a total access failure. Users can already sign in, and only some expected finance process steps are missing. That points more strongly to incomplete or inconsistent scope-dependent activation than to a broad user issue. Verifying the underlying activation and configuration content addresses the upstream dependency and keeps the tenant aligned to the approved implementation model.
- C. Recreate the affected tester users so the missing process apps are regenerated with a fresh user profile.
- D. Delay all finance testing and restart the tenant setup sequence from the beginning to ensure consistency across all processes.

**Answer: B**

## Question: 7

A consultant is supporting a period-end rehearsal in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition through a web-based environment. Several close activities have completed, and operational postings for the period are visible in daily finance apps. However, one close-monitoring step shows a completed-with-warning state, and the related reporting output still excludes balances from a specific reporting area. Finance wants a management view today, but the implementation lead requires that any output remain defensible for formal close and avoid spreadsheet reconciliation outside the controlled process. One analyst proposes sending the report with a note that the missing balances will be adjusted later. Another suggests verifying whether the warning-state close step is a prerequisite for the affected reporting area before rerunning the report. Which action should the consultant take first?  
Response:

- A. Send the report now and note that the missing balances will be adjusted after the rehearsal is completed.
- B. Create a provisional reporting version for management and defer correction of the close sequence until later.
- C. Verify whether the warning-state close step is a prerequisite for the affected reporting area before rerunning the report.) Feedback: This drill requires second-order reasoning. The visible issue is incomplete reporting, but the close-monitoring artifact shows an upstream step in a warning state. That suggests a lifecycle misalignment where the reporting problem is downstream of an incomplete or inconsistent prerequisite activity.
- D. Grant broader report access so finance users can compare more output variants and choose the closest result.

**Answer: C**

## Question: 8

A consultant is validating asset accounting in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition through a web-based UI. Asset master data is available, acquisition postings can be entered, and most test assets move correctly into the next lifecycle step. However, one asset category shows a validation-state mismatch during a follow-on asset process, while other categories in the same company code behave correctly. The finance lead wants the rehearsal to continue today, but the implementation lead requires that the correction remain reusable for future close cycles and avoid introducing a parallel handling method only for this category. One colleague proposes manually correcting the affected asset transactions after each run. Another suggests checking whether the affected asset category is aligned to the intended lifecycle configuration and related control assignments before repeating the test. Which action should the consultant take first?  
Response:

- A. Manually correct the affected asset transactions after each run so the rehearsal can stay on schedule.

- B. Create a separate handling method for the affected asset category so the standard lifecycle remains unchanged for all others.
- C. Check whether the affected asset category is aligned with the required lifecycle configuration and related control assignments.) Feedback: The failure is limited to one asset category while other categories in the same company code behave correctly. That points to a category-specific configuration or control-assignment dependency rather than a general asset accounting defect. Reviewing lifecycle configuration and related control settings targets the root cause and supports repeatable future execution.
- D. Exclude the affected asset category from the current rehearsal and continue only with categories that already work correctly.

**Answer: C**

### Question: 9

A consultant is supporting a period-end close rehearsal in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition through a web-based UI. Users can complete most close activities successfully, and source postings for the period are visible in daily finance apps. However, one reporting output used for management review excludes balances from a specific reporting area, while other close-related outputs remain consistent. The finance manager wants a review pack today, but the implementation lead requires that the reporting chain remain defensible for formal close and not rely on spreadsheet adjustments outside the controlled process.

One analyst proposes issuing the report with a note that the missing balances will be reconciled later. Another suggests checking whether the prerequisite close activity feeding that reporting area completed correctly before the reporting step ran.

Which action should the consultant take first?

Response:

- A. Issue the report now and document that the missing balances will be reconciled after the rehearsal.
- B. Create a provisional reporting version for management and defer correction of the close sequence until later.
- C. Check whether the prerequisite close activity for the affected reporting area completed correctly before rerunning the report.) Feedback: The visible symptom is incomplete reporting, but the scenario indicates that source postings already exist. That means the likely problem is upstream in the close lifecycle, not at the transaction-entry layer. Verifying whether the prerequisite close activity completed correctly targets the second-order dependency that must be resolved before the report can be trusted.
- D. Grant broader reporting access so finance users can compare alternative outputs and choose the closest result.

**Answer: C**

**Topic: 2**  
**Unified Scenario Exam**

### Question: 10

### **CHALLENGE 1 — Payment Run Readiness Across Municipal Service Zones**

During payment proposal validation, HarborGrid finds that two municipal service zones use the same supplier group and payment calendar, but suppliers with similar open items are proposed in one zone and excluded in the other. The project manager does not want a local exception process introduced before the first quarter-end close. Which action should the consultant take first to preserve standardized payment execution?

Response:

- A. Allow local finance teams to process urgent items manually outside the proposal run for the affected zone
- B. Compare company-code payment configuration together with supplier payment attributes and open-item details for the affected suppliers) Feedback: This is the strongest first step because the scenario points to inconsistent downstream behavior across similar suppliers and zones, which usually requires validating both configuration alignment and master/open-item completeness together. It preserves the standard template and tests the real dependency sequence instead of masking the inconsistency operationally.
- C. Expand payment processing access so shared service users can override exclusions directly during proposal review
- D. Create a temporary zone-specific payment method so the excluded suppliers can be picked up this quarter

**Answer: B**

## **Question: 11**

### **CHALLENGE 1 — Payment Run Readiness Across Municipal Service Zones**

The shared service lead proposes correcting the current quarter by updating only the excluded supplier open items in the affected zone, because supplier master maintenance can be reviewed after close. Which response best fits HarborGrid's validation objective?

Response:

- A. Accept the proposal because open-item correction is the fastest way to confirm the payment run can complete
- B. Accept the proposal only for high-value suppliers, then create a local exception log for the remaining items
- C. Defer all corrections until after quarter-end and instruct the team to proceed with a reduced payment scope
- D. Validate whether the exclusion pattern is driven by both business partner payment data and payment setup before limiting correction to open items only) Feedback: This is the best answer because a correction limited to open items may solve the visible symptom without addressing whether supplier payment attributes or zone-level setup are also contributing. The scenario explicitly requires a repeatable template outcome, so the consultant must test whether the cause sits across multiple dependency points.

**Answer: D**

## Question: 12

### CHALLENGE 2 — Receivables Follow-Up With Controlled Access Boundaries

HarborGrid's shared service center requests broader receivables access for a few specialists so quarter-end follow-up can move faster across company codes. Local finance managers want responsibilities to remain clearly separated for audit readiness. Which approach best aligns with the project's operating model?

Response:

- A. Map the required period-end receivables tasks to targeted role assignments and keep broader business ownership boundaries intact) Feedback: This option balances two governance priorities that both matter in the scenario: controlled access and operational execution. It preserves role discipline while enabling the exact receivables activities needed for period-end processing, which is more consistent with the project's public-cloud governance approach.
- B. Grant full receivables access to shared service specialists until the first quarter-end close is completed successfully
- C. Leave the access model unchanged and ask local finance users to complete all receivables follow-up activity themselves
- D. Create one broad temporary finance role for quarter-end and remove it after reporting is finalized

**Answer: A**

## Question: 13

### CHALLENGE 2 — Receivables Follow-Up With Controlled Access Boundaries

A receivables specialist can post routine customer transactions but cannot reach the work items needed for end-of-period follow-up in one company code. Another specialist in a different zone can complete the same follow-up activities. What should the consultant determine next?

Response:

- A. Whether customer master data was migrated differently in the two company codes
- B. Whether the affected user should be reassigned to accounts payable until quarter-end is complete
- C. Whether the role design and assignment for the affected user include the specific receivables follow-up responsibilities and work access needed for that company code) Feedback: The scenario describes a user who can perform routine postings but cannot reach the end-of-period receivables scope, which points first to role design and assignment alignment. Comparing required work access against defined responsibilities is the most direct way to validate the governance-controlled execution model.
- D. Whether the first specialist should be given unrestricted finance access because the close window is already open

**Answer: C**



# 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-s4cfi>