Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP
C_LIXEA
SAP Certified - Enterprise Architecture Consultant - SAP LeanIX

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-lixea

Latest Version: 4.1
Subjects

1. Tahat Gold Company Builds Its Application Portfolio in SAP LeanIX
2. Kaieteur Linen Services Reviews Its LeanIX Application Portfolio
3. Momotombo Retail streamlines its store systems in SAP LeanIX
4. Structuring the First LeanIX Inventory at Berbice Union Bank
5. Boka Shipyards Builds a Technology Standards View in LeanIX
6. Nyala Instruments: Planning a Modernization Program in LeanIX
7. Coralline Aquafarms Keeps Its LeanIX Landscape Board-Ready
8. Durmitor Heritage Group Builds One Application Inventory in LeanIX
9. Zerafshan Health Network Plans a LeanIX Portfolio Rationalization
10. Saloum Linen Services shapes its LeanIX application portfolio
11. Izalco Testing Labs Sets Up Its First LeanIX Meta Model and Reports
12. Demerara Outfitters Consolidates a Post-Merger Application Estate
13. Nyika Secure Print — Consolidating a Multi-Plant Application Estate
14. Aquaculture Landscape Modeling for a Greenland Data-Centre Exit
15. Standing Up a Trustworthy LeanIX Inventory at a Diamond-Cutting House
16. Boka Marine Craft Portfolio Assessment for Yacht Manufacturing
17. Kayor Linen Group: Rationalizing a Merged Application Estate
18. Namkhan Linen Group Rationalizes Its Rental Application Landscape
19. Unifying the Application Landscape at a Kosovo Textile-Rental Group
20. Emzuni Bank Rebuilds Its Application Inventory in LeanIX
21. Betsiboka Vanilla Exporters Populates Its LeanIX Inventory
22. Blueshore Cinemas Prepares Its Landscape for a Distribution Carve-Out
23. Baie Harmonics Standardizes Its Architecture Inventory in LeanIX
24. Thabana Air Rescue Matures Its LeanIX Inventory for Audit
25. Adoption, Collaboration & Automation
26. Modeling Basics & Fact Sheet Types
27. Application Portfolio Assessment
28. Application Rationalization
29. Diagrams & Out-of-the-box Integrations
30. Data Import & Inventory Population
31. Meta Model Configuration & Data Quality
32. LeanIX Fundamentals & Meta Model

Topic: 1
Tahat Gold Company Builds Its Application Portfolio in SAP LeanIX
Business Context
First Data Load
The application count in Tahat Gold Company's new SAP LeanIX inventory passed six hundred entries within a fortnight of the first data load, well above the figure the enterprise architect had expected for a business of its size. The entries had been imported from spreadsheets that each mine site and the corporate office maintained in their own way, and a first glance showed databases, reporting tools, and integration middleware sitting in the list beside the business applications they supported.

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

Business Context

Tahat Gold Company mines and processes gold from two open-pit operations in the Hoggar highlands of southern Algeria, refines doré at a central plant outside Tamanrasset, and runs sales, treasury, and group functions from a corporate office in Algiers. Over the past few years it absorbed two smaller concession operators, each of which arrived with its own applications, its own spreadsheets, and its own way of naming systems. Finance and procurement run on a shared SAP core, but most site-level tooling — maintenance planning, shift logging, geology and stores — grew up locally, and the naming conventions from the two acquisitions were never reconciled against each other.

System Landscape

The architecture team had chosen LeanIX to bring this scattered estate into one inventory, model it with fact sheets, and give leadership a portfolio view it could act on. The fact sheets had come in from spreadsheet exports that no one had agreed a common identifier for, and reports were already being built straight on the inventory for a first leadership readout. The meta model offers distinct fact sheet types — Application, IT Component, Tech Category, Platform, and Initiative — but the first load had treated almost everything as an Application. Because the plant historians, authentication services, and middleware were entered as applications, the count of applications supporting each capability read as far more crowded than the business actually was.

Portfolio Ambition

Leadership's real interest was consolidation. The two acquisitions had left overlapping tools for the same work — most visibly two maintenance-management applications, one inherited from each operator. One was cheaper to keep running but a poor fit for how the mines actually plan maintenance; the other fit the processes well but cost more. Corporate finance had floated a simpler idea: rank every application by annual running cost, retire the most expensive third, and be done with it.

Contributor Reality

Data quality depended on people who had little time for it. The site IT leads updated fact sheets only occasionally, and the geologists and maintenance supervisors who knew the tools best rarely logged into anything central at all. When the EA team proposed making several fields mandatory on every application to force completeness, the site leads warned that hard-blocking their saves would make them stop contributing, leaving the inventory more stale, not less.

Consolidation Question

The shared payroll service showed the loading problem in miniature: it had come in on two registers and now appeared as two fact sheets, quietly double-counting. As the team prepared to load the second acquired operator's register, the question was no longer how to get data in, but how to get it in once, typed correctly, and kept current — so that when the maintenance overlap finally reached a decision, the portfolio numbers behind it could be trusted.

Your Assignment

You are advising the enterprise architect leading Tahat Gold Company's LeanIX adoption. The company has loaded a first inventory from mixed site spreadsheets, is preparing to load a second acquired operator's register, and wants a portfolio it can use to consolidate overlapping applications left by two acquisitions. Your role is to guide modeling, import, assessment, and adoption decisions so that the inventory is meaningful, loaded once, assessed on the right dimensions, and kept current by the people who own the data. Recommendations must respect the small central team, the limited time of site contributors, and the need to protect active mining operations during any consolidation

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Typing Acquired Systems as Applications, Components, and Platforms

• Advise how databases, middleware, and authentication services that were loaded as Application fact sheets should be represented so portfolio counts stay meaningful.

• Position the roles of the Application, IT Component, and Tech Category fact sheet types when a site lead lists a mix of business applications and underlying technology.

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

• Recommend a response when a team member proposes hiding or deleting incomplete fact sheets to make the landscape look tidier before a steering review.

CHECKPOINTS

• The application-per-capability picture reflects business applications only, with underlying technology typed as components rather than applications.

• Fact sheet type decisions can be justified to leadership without reference to cosmetic count reduction.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Loading Two Site Registers Without Creating Duplicate Fact Sheets

• Recommend how to load the second acquired operator's register so that applications shared across sites update in place instead of creating duplicate fact sheets.

• Advise on the evidence that should be checked after a corrected load before the data is used for portfolio work.

CHECKPOINTS

• Applications present in both registers resolve to a single fact sheet maintained by both sources.

• Post-load assurance rests on verifiable merge evidence rather than on row counts, verbal sign-off, or completeness scores alone.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Scoring Applications on Business Value and Technical Fit

• Advise whether ranking applications on running cost alone is a sound basis for the portfolio assessment, and position the dimensions an assessment should weigh.

• Recommend which of two overlapping maintenance-management applications to keep when one is cheaper but a weak fit and the other fits well but costs more.

• Guide the ordering of steps that consolidates onto the chosen application without stranding active mining operations.

CHECKPOINTS

• Retain or retire decisions are traceable to both business value and technical fit, not to a single dimension.

• The consolidation sequence migrates active business off the retiring application before it is switched off.

4. CHALLENGE 4 — Driving Owner Updates Through To-Dos and Automations

• Advise how to reconcile a data-quality push toward mandatory fields with the risk that occasional site contributors will stop participating.

• Recommend an approach that sustains input from geologists and maintenance supervisors who rarely log into the full tool.

CHECKPOINTS

• Data quality improves through assigned ownership and in-tool prompts rather than through hard blocks or central re-keying.

• Occasional contributors can maintain their data through a lighter-touch path without full editing effort.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Typing Acquired Systems as Applications, Components, and Platforms

The redundancy report shows far more applications supporting each capability than the architecture lead expected, and the total application count sits near six hundred. Reviewing the load, the team sees that each site's databases and integration middleware were entered as Application fact sheets alongside the business applications they support. Which explanation and correction best fit what happened?

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

A. The count is realistic for two acquired operators, so keep every entry as an Application and instead raise the redundancy threshold so that fewer overlaps are flagged in the report.
B. The spreadsheets were loaded twice, so the fix is to delete roughly half of the Application fact sheets at random until the total count matches the architect's earlier estimate.
C. Databases and middleware were mistyped as Applications, so re-type them as IT Components classified by Tech Category and reserve Application fact sheets for business applications.
D. The meta model is too strict, so add a custom field to each Application marking it as technical and leave the fact sheet type unchanged in order to avoid re-work.

Answer: C

Explanation:
The inflated picture comes from underlying technology being modeled as business applications, which over-counts the portfolio and the per-capability view. Re-typing databases and middleware as IT Components (classified by Tech Category) and reserving Application fact sheets for business applications restores counts leadership can trust. This is a modeling-guideline fix at the source, not a report or threshold adjustment.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Typing Acquired Systems as Applications, Components, and Platforms
A site IT lead lists three systems for the inventory: the shared authentication service, the plant historian database, and the mobile geology app that field crews use to record samples. How should these three be represented so the inventory stays meaningful?

A. Model the geology app as an Application, and record the authentication service and historian database as IT Components related to the applications they support.
B. Model all three as Applications, because each one is used by staff and the portfolio should capture everything that people log into during a normal working day.
C. Model the geology app as a Platform, the authentication service as an Application, and the historian database as an Initiative, so the fact sheet types stay varied across the load.
D. Leave all three out of the inventory for now and add only the finance and procurement systems, since those are the systems corporate leadership actually cares about seeing.

Answer: A

Explanation:
The geology app is a business application, while the authentication service and the historian database are underlying technology, so they belong on IT Component fact sheets related to the applications they support. Typing each object by the role it plays keeps the application count and the per-capability view meaningful. This follows the modeling guidelines for the fact sheet types.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 1 — Typing Acquired Systems as Applications, Components, and Platforms

To bring the application count down quickly before a steering review, a team member proposes hiding every fact sheet that is missing a description so the landscape presents a cleaner headline number on the day. What is the sounder response?

A. Approve it for the steering review only and then unhide the fact sheets afterwards, since the committee mainly wants to see a tidy headline number on the day of the meeting itself.
B. Hide the incomplete fact sheets and also lower the required-field bar, so that fewer of them are counted as incomplete in the data-quality views going forward.
C. Delete the incomplete fact sheets outright, because a fact sheet that is missing its description carries little useful information for the portfolio in its current state.
D. Keep the fact sheets visible, assign each one an owner, and address completeness at the source, since hiding records distorts the portfolio instead of improving its quality.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Hiding or removing incomplete fact sheets changes what the portfolio shows without changing what is true, which misleads the very review it is meant to serve. Assigning ownership and improving completeness at the source raises real data quality. Data quality is fixed by maintenance and ownership, not by concealment.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 2 — Loading Two Site Registers Without Creating Duplicate Fact Sheets
The two acquired operators kept separate spreadsheets, and several applications — for example a shared payroll service — appear in both. On the first load each row created a new fact sheet, so payroll now appears twice. What is the correct way to load the second register?

A. Load the second register into a separate workspace so its rows never touch the first register, and then compare the two workspaces by eye once every quarter to spot overlaps.
B. Match incoming rows to existing fact sheets on a stable identifier, so that shared applications update in place instead of creating duplicate fact sheets.
C. Load everything again from scratch and then manually delete whichever duplicate looks less complete, repeating that clean-up after every future import into the inventory.
D. Rename one payroll entry so the two no longer collide, and keep both fact sheets because each site should own its own separate copy of the shared record.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Matching incoming rows to existing fact sheets on a stable identifier lets shared applications update the record that is already there rather than spawning a second one. This prevents the double-counting the first load produced and keeps portfolio counts accurate. Fixing the match key is the durable solution, not a repeated clean-up.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 2 — Loading Two Site Registers Without Creating Duplicate Fact Sheets
After a corrected import, the architecture lead wants assurance that shared applications were merged rather than duplicated before the data is used for portfolio work. Which check gives the best evidence?

A. Confirm that the total row count of the import file matches the number of new fact sheets created, which shows that every row in the file was loaded into the inventory successfully.
B. Ask each site IT lead whether the load looks about right to them, and then proceed as soon as both leads have given a verbal sign-off on their own register.
C. Verify that applications appearing in both registers now resolve to a single fact sheet updated by both sources, rather than to two separate entries in the inventory.
D. Trust the completeness percentage shown after the load, since a higher completeness score after an import indicates that the duplicate fact sheets were resolved automatically.

Answer: C

Explanation:
The specific risk is duplication, so the evidence must show that a shared application now maps to one fact sheet fed by both registers. Confirming single-record resolution for cross-register applications directly tests whether the merge worked. This is verifiable inventory evidence rather than an indirect proxy.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 3 — Scoring Applications on Business Value and Technical Fit
Corporate finance suggests ranking every application by annual running cost and retiring the most expensive third. The enterprise architect is asked whether that is a sound basis for the portfolio assessment. What is the best advice?

A. Assess each application on both its business value and its technical fit, so that cost is weighed against contribution rather than driving the retirement decision on its own.
B. Rank by running cost as finance suggests, because a cheaper landscape is the healthier one and cost is the single metric that group leadership already knows and trusts.
C. Rank by the number of users instead, since an application with few users is usually the safest and least disruptive one for the business to retire ahead of the others.
D. Rank by age and retire the oldest systems, because older applications tend to be the poorest technical fit as well as the least valuable to the business that runs them.

Answer: A

Explanation:
An application portfolio assessment weighs more than one dimension — typically business value and technical fit — so that investment and retirement decisions reflect contribution, not just cost. Ranking on a single metric can retire a low-cost application the business depends on, or keep a costly one that adds little. Two-dimensional scoring is the assessment's core discipline.

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

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 3 — Scoring Applications on Business Value and Technical Fit
Two overlapping maintenance-management applications came in with the acquisitions. One is cheaper to operate but a weak functional and technical fit; the other fits the mines' maintenance processes well but costs more to run. Which recommendation best reflects a portfolio assessment?

A. Keep the cheaper application because lowering run cost is the fastest visible win, and plan to work around its functional gaps with manual spreadsheets maintained at each mine site.
B. Keep the better-fitting application and retire the weaker one, because functional and technical fit protect the maintenance capability even though its run cost is higher.
C. Keep both applications running for now so that no site loses a tool it already knows, and revisit the overlap only if a future budget cut eventually forces the question.
D. Replace both applications with a brand-new build straight away, since a single new system would be a cleaner answer than keeping either of the two inherited tools.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Because the assessment weighs business value and technical fit, the better-fitting application is the one that protects the maintenance capability, and the higher run cost is justified by that fit. Consolidating onto it and retiring the weaker tool reduces redundancy without weakening the business. Fit, not the lowest cost, drives the retain decision here.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 3 — Scoring Applications on Business Value and Technical Fit
Having chosen to consolidate onto the better-fitting maintenance application, the team must sequence the switch-off of the weaker one. Which ordering completes the rationalization without stranding the business?

A. Switch off the weaker application first, then map which work-order history mattered, then migrate whatever can still be recovered, and finally confirm the surviving application is in use.
B. Migrate the open work orders first, then switch off the weaker application, then map the maintenance capability, and only afterwards decide which of the two applications should survive.
C. Confirm the surviving application is adopted first, then switch off the weaker one, then migrate the history, and finally map which capability each of the two applications actually served.
D. Map the shared capability, confirm the better-fit application, migrate active work-order history off the weaker one, then retire it once the business has moved across.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Rationalization protects the business capability first: map the capability, confirm the better-fit target, migrate the active work-order history, and only then retire the weaker application. Migrating active

business off a system before switch-off is what prevents lost history and stranded work. The order follows the real dependency, not a convenient shortcut.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 4 — Driving Owner Updates Through To-Dos and Automations
The EA team wants stronger data quality, so one proposal is to make several fields mandatory on every Application fact sheet. Site contributors, who update fact sheets only occasionally, warn that hard-blocking their saves will make them stop contributing altogether. How should the team reconcile data quality with adoption?

A. Make all of the fields mandatory now and accept that some sites will stop contributing, because complete data matters more than keeping occasional contributors engaged with the tool.
B. Drop the data-quality push entirely and let each site record whatever it likes, since any amount of friction at all will only discourage the site contributors from taking part in future.
C. Assign fact sheet owners and use to-dos and automations to prompt updates, tightening required fields gradually so quality rises without blocking the occasional contributors.
D. Route every site update through the central EA team for manual entry, so the team controls quality directly and the site contributors never have to touch the fact sheets at all.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Ownership plus to-dos and automations raises completeness by prompting the right people in-tool, and phasing in required fields lets quality climb without hard-blocking occasional contributors. This balances the data-quality goal against the adoption goal rather than sacrificing one for the other. Both governance aims are served by pacing the change.

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 4 — Driving Owner Updates Through To-Dos and Automations
A number of occasional contributors — geologists and maintenance supervisors at remote sites — need to confirm a few details on their applications but rarely log into the full tool. Which approach best sustains their input without overloading the EA team?

A. Give occasional contributors a lighter-touch access path and use automated to-dos, so they can confirm their details without full editing effort or central chasing by the team.
B. Have the EA team email each contributor individually every month and re-key the replies by hand, since personal follow-up is the most reliable way anyone has to keep the data fresh.
C. Remove the remote-site applications from the inventory until those sites have time to maintain them properly, and then add them back later once staffing has improved at each location.
D. Grant every occasional contributor full editing rights across the whole inventory, so that anyone can change anything and the data will then stay current without any further effort.

Answer: A

Explanation:
A lighter-touch contributor path plus automated to-dos lets occasional contributors confirm their details without learning the full tool or waiting on the EA team to chase them. It sustains input at the source while keeping the central team's load low. This matches how adoption is meant to scale beyond the core users.

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

