

**Boost up Your Certification Score**

# SAP C\_S4CPR

**SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - SAP S/4HANA  
Cloud Public Edition, Sourcing and 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.**

# Latest Version: 4.0

## Subjects

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

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

### Question: 1

A regional clean-room components supplier is validating procurement data access in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition. An external quality monitoring application retrieves purchase order headers and supplier identifiers successfully, but it cannot retrieve goods receipt confirmation status for selected direct material orders. The integration log shows successful authentication and document retrieval, while the response payload leaves receipt-confirmation values blank for items that have already been received.

The integration owner needs the issue corrected before expanding the pattern to more supplier-facing scenarios. The customer requires governed API access and no separate reconciliation extract.

Which action best addresses the missing receipt-confirmation values?

Response:

- A. Ask the external application to treat all retrieved purchase orders as received when supplier identifiers are present.
- B. Verify receipt-confirmation data availability, API exposure, and authorization scope for the purchasing items, then retest the external retrieval.
- C. Create a separate receipt-confirmation export and reconcile it with the API response outside SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition.
- D. Reload the purchase orders because successful header retrieval should automatically return all goods receipt-related response fields.

**Answer: B**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This addresses the data, exposure, and authorization layers that determine whether receipt-confirmation values can be returned for purchasing items. Retesting confirms that the integration retrieves the required procurement status through the intended governed access pattern.

### Question: 2

A regional healthcare procurement team is preparing a controlled fit-to-standard session in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition. A business tester can execute purchase order creation in the test tenant, but cannot view the supporting supplier data needed to validate the same scenario. The access evidence

shows that purchasing document processing authorization is assigned, while supplier display authorization is missing for the relevant organizational scope.

The workshop lead wants the tester to complete the scenario independently, but access changes must stay minimal because the same tenant will later be used for migration validation evidence.

Which action best resolves the scenario execution gap?

Response:

- A. Grant the tester broad supplier master data maintenance access so all related display restrictions are removed for the workshop.
- B. Ask another user to provide supplier screenshots while the tester continues creating purchase orders independently.
- C. Align the tester's supplier display authorization with the organizational scope required for the purchasing scenario, then retest the complete validation step.
- D. Remove the supplier verification step from the workshop because purchase order creation authorization is already working.

**Answer: C**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This addresses the missing supplier display authorization required for the purchasing scenario. Retesting confirms that the tester can execute the purchase order step and validate supporting supplier data within the intended organizational scope.

### Question: 3

A consumer goods company is transitioning legacy purchasing data into SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition. After a migration test, procurement analytics show incomplete spend visibility for a group of suppliers that were active in the legacy environment. The migrated purchase orders are visible in operational apps, but the analytics view groups several records under an unclassified supplier segment. The data migration checklist shows no technical load error.

The procurement sponsor wants the analytics issue resolved before approving the next migration cycle, but the implementation team must avoid custom reporting because embedded analytics are part of the target operating model.

What is the best next action to address the second-order cause of the analytics inconsistency?

Response:

- A. Validate the migrated supplier and purchasing master data classification used by analytics, correct the mapped values, and rerun the affected migration validation.
- B. Export the operational purchase order list and build a temporary spreadsheet report for sponsor review.
- C. Reload all migrated purchase orders because the operational documents are visible but the analytics result is incomplete.
- D. Add a custom analytics field immediately so unclassified suppliers can be grouped manually after migration.

**Answer: A**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This targets the upstream data classification used by embedded analytics rather than the visible purchase order records alone. Correcting the mapped supplier and purchasing master data values supports the migration cycle and validates whether analytics can consume the data as intended.

### Question: 4

A regional industrial services company is validating an external spend monitoring integration with SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition. The API call successfully returns purchase order totals and supplier identifiers, but it does not return the purchasing category needed by the monitoring application. The integration log shows successful authentication and document retrieval, while the response payload leaves the category field empty for affected purchase orders.

The integration owner needs the issue resolved before reusing the pattern for additional reporting scenarios. The customer requires governed access and no separate extract for the first release.

Which action best addresses the missing purchasing category in the integration response?

Response:

- A. Ask the monitoring application to classify spend from supplier names until purchasing category data is available later.
- B. Create a separate export of purchase order categories and combine it with the API result outside SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition.
- C. Reload the purchase orders because a successful API call should automatically return all reporting attributes.
- D. Verify the purchasing category data, API exposure, and authorization scope used by the response payload, then retest the integration call.

**Answer: D**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This addresses the data, exposure, and authorization layers that determine whether purchasing category values are returned to the consuming application. Retesting confirms that the integration retrieves the intended procurement attributes through the governed access pattern.

### Question: 5

A regional industrial filtration buyer is validating RFQ award conversion in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition. Buyers compare quotations, award the preferred supplier, and generate a contract. During contract review, however, the agreed delivery tolerance from the awarded quotation is not available for release validation. The award evidence is saved, while the contract validation artifact shows the tolerance field as blank and buyers must check the quotation manually.

The sourcing manager needs the issue corrected before governance playback because awarded purchasing terms must remain traceable without manual lookup.

Which action best resolves the missing awarded tolerance in the generated contract?

Response:

- A. Ask buyers to copy the awarded delivery tolerance manually from the quotation into the contract review notes.
- B. Recreate the RFQ because a completed award should automatically regenerate every contract term.
- C. Add a custom contract field so buyers can enter awarded tolerance values during release validation.
- D. Verify the awarded quotation tolerance data and contract creation mapping, correct the missing transfer, and retest RFQ-to-contract processing.

**Answer: D**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This addresses the awarded quotation data and contract creation mapping that determine whether agreed tolerance values are carried into the generated contract. Retesting confirms that awarded terms remain traceable through standard RFQ-to-contract execution.

### Question: 6

A regional laboratory network is preparing the first procurement playback in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition. The business wants to demonstrate requisitioning, supplier onboarding data, purchasing approvals, analytics, and external access in a single session. The implementation lead sees that requisitioning and supplier data readiness are stable, while analytics measures and external access scopes still have open design decisions.

The steering group wants a visible playback this week, but the project sponsor requires evidence that can support later automated testing rather than a broad walkthrough with unstable dependencies.

Which playback approach best balances progress with reliable implementation evidence?

Response:

- A. Demonstrate all requested areas together and mark incomplete analytics and access steps as known limitations.
- B. Delay the full playback until analytics measures, external access scopes, supplier data, and approval decisions are all finalized.
- C. Run a focused playback for the stable requisitioning and supplier-data path, document deferred dependencies, and schedule separate validation for analytics and external access.
- D. Replace unstable SAP execution steps with slide-based process explanations so the steering group can see the complete procurement scope.

**Answer: C**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This supports progress while preserving evidence quality. Testing the stable requisitioning and supplier-data path creates reliable validation output, while documenting deferred dependencies keeps later analytics and external access work traceable.

## Question: 7

A regional manufacturing group is preparing a SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition sourcing and procurement scope for fit-to-standard testing. The purchasing process was configured in SAP Central Business Configuration, and test users can create purchase requisitions from the SAP Fiori launchpad. However, when they convert approved requisitions into purchase orders, the expected purchasing process variant is not applied. The test log shows that the requisition is approved, but the purchase order inherits a generic processing path.

The implementation lead must resolve the issue without modifying standard application behavior, because the customer has a clean core governance rule and a short testing window before data migration validation begins.

What should the consultant do first to correct the execution behavior at the appropriate system layer?

Response:

- A. Adjust the purchase order document manually during testing and document the difference as a user training exception.
- B. Review the configured procurement process variant and its binding to the relevant organizational and purchasing data before retesting the end-to-end flow.
- C. Extend the purchase order app so that users can select the preferred processing path directly during document creation.
- D. Re-run only the approval workflow test because the approval status confirms the purchasing configuration is already correct.

**Answer: B**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This addresses the correct execution layer because the approved requisition is already available, but the purchase order is not inheriting the intended process variant. Verifying the configuration and its binding to organizational and purchasing data supports clean core governance and validates the complete requisition-to-purchase-order behavior.

## Question: 8

A logistics services company is connecting an external supplier portal to sourcing and procurement data in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition. The integration test returns purchase order header data, but item-level details for selected procurement documents are missing. The API test record shows a successful response, and the external application can authenticate, but the consuming team cannot validate delivery quantities from the returned payload.

The customer requires the correction to remain lifecycle-compliant and auditable because the same integration pattern will be reused for additional supplier-facing scenarios after go-live.

Which action best addresses the integration behavior at the correct dependency layer?

Response:

- A. Review the API access scope, data exposure setup, and document-level authorization relevant to item details, then retest the supplier portal call.
- B. Ask the external portal team to calculate item quantities from header totals until the integration is expanded after go-live.
- C. Create a custom extraction report that sends item-level purchasing data to the portal outside the governed integration setup.
- D. Reload the affected purchase orders because the API response confirms that the technical connection is already working.

**Answer: A**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This targets the access and exposure layer that determines whether item-level purchasing data is available to the consuming application. Retesting the portal call confirms that authentication, authorization, data exposure, and retrieval behavior are aligned.

### Question: 9

A regional industrial cleaning supplier is preparing supplier data for SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition purchasing validation. Buyers can create purchase orders for a chemical supplier, but the expected tax-relevant purchasing value is not proposed for one organizational assignment. The supplier is active, the purchasing organization is valid, and the purchase order can be completed after the buyer manually enters the missing value.

The procurement data owner must correct the issue before migration acceptance because manual completion would hide incomplete supplier purchasing data and distort purchasing document validation.

What should the consultant verify first to correct the tax-relevant purchasing proposal?

Response:

- A. Ask buyers to enter the missing tax-relevant value manually during purchasing validation and record it as a training requirement.
- B. Add a custom warning to the purchase order so buyers notice when the tax-relevant value is not proposed.
- C. Reload all supplier records because active suppliers should automatically provide complete tax-relevant purchasing values.
- D. Verify the supplier purchasing data for the affected organizational assignment, correct the missing tax-relevant value, and retest purchase order creation.

**Answer: D**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This targets the organizationally assigned supplier purchasing data that drives the tax-relevant proposal during purchase order creation. Retesting confirms that standard proposal behavior works without manual completion.

## Question: 10

A regional utilities maintenance company is validating procurement for emergency repair parts in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition. Approved requisitions convert into purchase orders successfully, and the supplier is accepted. During follow-on validation, however, the purchasing document does not carry the expected goods receipt requirement for the selected material. The test evidence shows the material is procurement-ready, while the purchase order item control indicates that receipt confirmation is not required.

The procurement lead must correct the behavior before receiving tests because bypassed goods receipt evidence would make later invoice validation unreliable.

What should the consultant verify first to correct the goods receipt requirement behavior?

Response:

- A. Ask invoice users to confirm receipt manually before validating supplier invoices for emergency repair parts.
- B. Verify the direct material purchasing setup and item-level receipt control, correct the maintained dependency, and retest requisition conversion through goods receipt validation.
- C. Reapprove the requisition because approval completion should refresh receipt-relevant controls during purchase order creation.
- D. Add a custom checklist to purchase orders so buyers can indicate when goods receipt evidence is expected.

**Answer: B**

Explanation:

Feedback:

This addresses the purchasing setup and item-level control that determine whether goods receipt is required for the material. Retesting from requisition conversion through goods receipt validation confirms that the procurement flow carries the correct receipt requirement into execution.

**Topic: 2**

**Unified Scenario Exam**

## Question: 11

### **CHALLENGE 2 — Workflow Routing for Mixed Procurement Scenarios**

The business sponsor wants low-value store consumables to move quickly, while finance wants higher-value direct-material orders to retain approval control. Both scenarios use procurement documents in the same pilot rollout.

Which configuration validation approach best balances the competing priorities?

Response:

- A. Route all pilot purchasing documents through the highest-value approval path until production stabilization.
- B. Route all low-value and high-value documents through the same buyer approval to simplify UAT evidence.

- C. Validate only the low-value consumable path first because it represents the highest transaction volume.
- D. Validate workflow conditions separately for routine and controlled purchasing scenarios using representative documents.

**Answer: D**

Explanation:

Feedback:

Separate validation with representative documents allows the team to preserve fast routing for routine consumables while confirming control for higher-value commitments. This directly reflects the performance-versus-governance weighting in the scenario.

## Question: 12

### **CHALLENGE 2 — Workflow Routing for Mixed Procurement Scenarios**

After recent role refinements, an approval that worked during configuration playback no longer selects the same approver during UAT preparation. The document values and purchasing organization appear unchanged.

Which next step is most appropriate?

Response:

- A. Replace the workflow with manual approval instructions for the first pilot wave.
- B. Compare role-related responsibility assignments and workflow rule inputs before changing the workflow definition.
- C. Ask the approver from configuration playback to approve all affected documents outside the system.
- D. Remove the approval rule condition that depends on organizational responsibility.

**Answer: B**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The change appeared after role refinements, so workflow inputs and responsibility assignments should be compared before altering the workflow definition. This avoids changing working logic when the dependency may be user or responsibility context.

## Question: 13

### **CHALLENGE 3 — Procurement Data Readiness for Analytics Review**

Procurement analytics show total spend for pilot purchasing documents, but regional buyer-level monitoring is incomplete. The purchasing documents were created successfully during process testing.

What should the consultant validate first?

Response:

- A. Whether migrated master data and purchasing documents contain the buyer and category attributes required by the analytics view.

- B. Whether the procurement team can export all spend results and classify buyers manually in a spreadsheet.
- C. Whether purchasing users should stop creating documents until all analytics dashboards are redesigned.
- D. Whether the total spend figure alone is sufficient for pilot readiness approval.

**Answer: A**

Explanation:

Feedback:

Successful purchasing execution does not guarantee that analytics-relevant attributes are complete. Buyer and category attributes must be validated because reporting readiness depends on consistent data context, not only document creation.

### Question: 14

#### **CHALLENGE 3 — Procurement Data Readiness for Analytics Review**

The project manager asks whether UAT should continue while procurement analytics are only partially usable. Store purchasing tests are progressing, but management review requires regional spend visibility.

Which decision best reflects the scenario priorities?

Response:

- A. Continue all UAT activities and postpone analytics validation until after production go-live.
- B. Stop all procurement testing until every analytics view is fully redesigned.
- C. Allow only sourcing users to continue because analytics are mainly relevant to contracts.
- D. Continue bounded process testing while prioritizing correction of analytics inputs needed for readiness review.

**Answer: D**

Explanation:

Feedback:

Bounded process testing can continue where execution evidence remains valid, while analytics inputs needed for regional review receive priority. This balances progress with the governance need for reliable readiness evidence.

# 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-s4cpr>