Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP
C_S4PM
SAP Certified - Managing SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition Projects

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-s4pm

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Unified Scenario Simulation
2. Micro Skill Drill Exam

Topic: 1
Unified Scenario Simulation
Lindholm Mobility Group's SAP S/4HANA Cloud Rollout
Business Context
Lindholm Mobility Group operates electric-vehicle charging networks across four European countries and is consolidating five legacy finance and operations systems onto a single cloud platform. The group runs a lean central programme team alongside country teams of differing maturity. Leadership has framed the move as the foundation for faster country launches, consistent reporting, and a simpler operating model, and expects the programme to prove that a standardized core can still respect each country's commercial and legal realities.
Programme Landscape
The implementation is delivered on SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, with the implementation project run in SAP Cloud ALM and configuration carried out in the central business configuration environment. A starter system supported the early fit-to-standard work, and the build now runs through a development, test, and production landscape. Master and transactional data are being moved from the legacy estate using the SAP S/4HANA Migration Cockpit, and several integrations connect the new system to charging-network and partner-settlement platforms.
Transformation Goals
The group wants one shared template that most countries adopt with minimal variation, faster period close, and the ability to bring a new country live without rebuilding the model each time. Leadership has been clear that the value case depends on adopting standard processes and keeping the core clean, so the system can take the platform's regular upgrades without expensive rework. The countries, in turn, want assurance that genuine local obligations will still be met.
Delivery Approach
The programme is past its fit-to-standard workshops and is moving through build and into user acceptance testing, with a phased country go-live planned. The central team favours a shared template confirmed against the standard, while two country teams have continued to describe ways of working carried over from their legacy systems. The first country is treated as the pilot, with later countries following in waves, though the wave order has not been firmly settled and several teams are lobbying for their own position in the sequence.
Country Footprint
The four countries differ in size, regulatory detail, and team strength. One large country generates most of the group's revenue and has the most vocal leadership; a smaller country has a statutory invoicing requirement that surfaced only recently, after the shared template had largely been agreed. The central team had assumed the standard country settings would cover all local needs, and this later requirement has raised questions about how far the shared template can stay identical across the group.
Data Foundations
The legacy data carries years of history, duplicated customer records, and inconsistent product identifiers across the five source systems. The data team is under pressure to fit the migration into a short cutover window and has floated loading everything as it stands to save time, with clean-up to follow once the business is live. Early trial loads showed that some records did not reconcile against their source, and a few migration objects completed only partially.

Visit us at: https://www.examsboost.com/test/c-s4pm

Integration Footprint
End-to-end integration testing began in parallel with the data work. Several integration tests failed in ways the integration team first attributed to interface configuration, though the affected interfaces depend on master data that has not yet been fully migrated. The settlement integration in particular cannot be meaningfully exercised until the relevant customer and contract data is present and reconciled, and the team is debating whether to keep testing now or wait.
Release Environment
Because the platform is delivered continuously, a scheduled upgrade is due to land during the user acceptance testing window. The upgrade is expected to touch some configured processes and a small number of planned extensions. Some team members want to press on toward the fixed go-live date and deal with any effects afterwards, while others have suggested trying to hold the system steady until the programme is through its critical period.
Stakeholder Map
The large country's managing director has asked for a bespoke commercial feature that the standard, combined with a supported extension, could largely deliver. The request has been presented as essential and urgent, and the MD's seniority has made the central team hesitant to push back. At the same time, the group's lean finance function means the same few people would, in places, both create and approve transactions unless the access design accounts for it.
Cutover Outlook
The programme board has asked for a credible plan that protects the group's reporting and settlement obligations from day one without overcommitting the team. Status reporting has so far stayed optimistic, even as the data, integration, and upgrade questions have grown. The project manager has been asked to bring the competing pressures into a single, defensible sequence the board can stand behind, and to set expectations with the countries about what go-live will and will not include. The board is wary of a date slipping unannounced, yet equally wary of a go-live that looks complete on paper while reporting or settlement quietly fails in a live country. It has asked for an honest read of what is ready, what is not, and what each decision will cost the group.
Your assignment
You are the project manager for Lindholm Mobility Group's SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition programme. Leadership wants a standardized core, faster country launches, and reporting and settlement that are dependable from go-live, while the countries expect their genuine local obligations to be met. You must advise the programme board on a defensible sequence across rollout, clean-core governance, data and integration readiness, and a scheduled upgrade landing during testing. Your recommendations should reflect SAP Activate, clean-core, and cloud-lifecycle expectations rather than legacy habit, and should be framed for stakeholders rather than expressed as system click-paths
1. CHALLENGE 1 — Sequencing a Multi-Country Go-Live Against Localization Readiness
• Advise whether the group should go live in all countries at once or in readiness-based waves, and on what basis the wave order should be set.
• Advise how to handle the statutory invoicing requirement that surfaced after the shared template was largely agreed, without abandoning standardization.
• Position the recommendation so leadership understands what each country's go-live will and will not include.
Checkpoints
• The wave plan is justified by localization and dependency readiness, not by revenue or volume alone.
• The late statutory requirement is met through standard country localization scoped for that country, leaving the shared template intact elsewhere.
• The board can see why an all-at-once date or a frozen template would expose the group.
2. CHALLENGE 2 — Holding Clean Core Against a Country Director's Customization Demand

Visit us at: https://www.examsboost.com/test/c-s4pm

• Advise how to respond to the managing director's demand for a bespoke feature, given that the standard plus a supported extension could largely deliver it.
• Advise on the extensibility route appropriate to a requirement that exceeds in-app configuration and touches an external system.
• Position the decision so it rests on governance and clean-core impact rather than on seniority.

Checkpoints

• The response routes the demand through governance with a standard-plus-supported-extension alternative and clear trade-offs.
• The chosen extensibility route keeps the core clean and matches the weight of the requirement.
• Where the standard already meets part of the need, it is adopted, with extension reserved for the genuine gap.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Aligning Data Migration and Integration Within the Cutover Window

• Advise how to interpret the failing end-to-end integration tests given the state of the migrated data.
• Advise how to handle imperfect, high-volume legacy data within a short cutover window, and how to sequence migration against integration testing.
• Advise on the migration approach that fits an existing SAP source system.

Checkpoints

• Integration failures are diagnosed against their data dependency before interface rework is considered.
• Critical data is made trustworthy before loading, with the load rehearsed and reconciled, rather than loaded as-is to fit the window.
• Integration end-to-end tests run after the migration load they depend on, on real, reconciled data.

4. CHALLENGE 4 — Absorbing a Scheduled Upgrade During User Acceptance Testing

• Advise how to handle the scheduled upgrade arriving during the testing window, given its effect on configured processes and planned extensions.
• Advise which existing test evidence remains valid and how to scope re-testing.
• Advise how the go/no-go decision and stakeholder expectations should reflect the upgrade.

Checkpoints

• The upgrade's impact is assessed and the affected areas are regression-tested rather than ignored or blocked.
• Unaffected test evidence is retained and only the touched areas are re-validated, using traceability to scope the work.
• The go/no-go and the communication to stakeholders rest on confirmed regression evidence for the affected scope.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Sequencing a Multi-Country Go-Live Against Localization Readiness

Leadership wants every country live on a single date to simplify the programme, while the countries differ in readiness and one has an unresolved statutory requirement.
How should the project manager advise the group to approach the go-live?
A. Commit all four countries to one go-live date and resolve any country's gaps in the weeks after go-live.
B. Let each country choose its own go-live date so every team moves at a pace it is comfortable with.
C. Roll out in readiness-based waves, beginning with a pilot country.
D. Hold the entire programme until every country, without exception, is fully ready to go live together.

Answer: C

Visit us at: https://www.examsboost.com/test/c-s4pm

Explanation:
A readiness-based wave rollout starting with a pilot contains risk, lets each wave learn from the last, and brings countries live only when they can operate, which fits a multi-country programme with uneven readiness. It protects both the group and the countries that are ready. It is the controlled middle path between an all-at-once gamble and an open-ended hold.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Sequencing a Multi-Country Go-Live Against Localization Readiness

The smaller country's statutory invoicing requirement surfaced after the shared template was largely agreed, and the central team had assumed standard settings would cover all local needs.
How should the project manager advise handling this late requirement?
A. Treat it as a genuine localization gap and meet it through that country's standard country localization.
B. Keep the shared template unchanged everywhere and have the country operate around the missing requirement until a later release.
C. Build the statutory rule directly into the shared template's core so every country carries the same configuration.
D. Remove the smaller country from the programme scope so the shared template can stay identical across the remaining countries.

Answer: A

Explanation:
A genuine statutory obligation is exactly what standard country localization exists to meet, scoped for that country while leaving the shared template intact elsewhere. Treating it as a localization gap and adjusting that country's wave honours both compliance and standardization. The requirement is met the supported way, in the right place.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 1 — Sequencing a Multi-Country Go-Live Against Localization Readiness

The central team is under pressure to freeze the shared template to protect the dates, even as the smaller country's legal requirement remains open, leaving standardization and compliance pulling against each other.
How should the project manager advise resolving this tension?
A. Freeze the template now to protect the dates and address the country's legal requirement after go-live.
B. Reopen the shared template for all countries so the legal requirement can be considered everywhere at once.
C. Grant the smaller country a one-off core modification so its legal need is met without changing the shared template.
D. Keep the shared template intact and meet the legal need through that country's standard localization.

Answer: D

Explanation:
The two governance imperatives — a stable shared template and statutory compliance — are both honoured by meeting the legal need through the country's standard localization while leaving the

shared template intact. It resolves the tension rather than sacrificing one side. Standardization holds where it can; compliance is met where it must.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 1 — Sequencing a Multi-Country Go-Live Against Localization Readiness

With waves agreed in principle, several country teams are lobbying for their position in the sequence, and leadership is inclined to order the waves by country revenue.
On what basis should the project manager advise setting the wave order?
A. Order the waves by country revenue so the largest contributor goes live first and demonstrates value.
B. Order the waves by readiness and dependency, with a pilot country first.
C. Order the waves by which country teams have lobbied hardest for an early position.
D. Return to a single combined go-live, since ordering the waves is proving contentious.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Wave order should follow what actually determines a safe go-live — data, integration, and localization readiness and their dependencies — with a pilot first to prove the approach. Readiness, not revenue or lobbying, predicts whether a country can operate. It sequences risk, not politics.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 2 — Holding Clean Core Against a Country Director's Customization Demand

The large country's managing director has demanded a bespoke commercial feature, presented as essential and urgent, that the standard plus a supported extension could largely deliver. The central team is hesitant to push back given the MD's seniority.
How should the project manager respond to the demand?
A. Approve and build the bespoke feature as demanded, since the MD is senior and considers it essential.
B. Take the demand through governance with a standard-plus-extension alternative.
C. Refuse the demand on clean-core grounds and inform the MD that customization is not available.
D. Quietly build the feature and present it to

Answer: B

Explanation:
Routing the demand through governance with a worked standard-plus-extension alternative and clear trade-offs respects the MD, protects the clean core, and keeps the decision properly owned. It converts a confrontation into a governed choice on the merits. The relationship is managed and the core is held.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 2 — Holding Clean Core Against a Country Director's Customization Demand

On analysis, the genuine part of the requirement involves complex logic and a live connection to an external partner system, beyond what in-app configuration is intended to carry.
Which extensibility route should the project manager recommend for the genuine requirement?
A. Modify the standard core so the logic and the external connection are built directly into the system.

B. Add the complex logic and external connection through key-user in-app extensibility within the standard apps.
C. Drop the requirement, since meeting it cleanly is not straightforward.
D. Build the requirement as a side-by-side extension on the cloud platform, off the core.

Answer: D

Explanation:
A side-by-side extension on the cloud platform carries complex logic and a live external integration off the core, which fits a requirement heavier than in-app extension is meant to hold while keeping the core clean and upgrade-safe. It is the right tier for the weight of the need. The standard stays untouched.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 2 — Holding Clean Core Against a Country Director's Customization Demand

The managing director escalates, and the programme's governance body must decide how to weigh the demand.
What basis should the project manager advise the governance body to use?
A. Evaluate the demand on its merits against clean-core impact and value, as a governed body.
B. Defer to the managing director's seniority, since the largest country's leadership should carry the most weight.
C. Approve a temporary core change now and commit to removing it in a later phase once pressure eases.
D. Postpone the decision indefinitely so the escalation loses momentum and resolves itself.

Answer: A

The governance body should decide on the merits — weighing clean-core impact and value across the standard, extension, and custom options — so the outcome rests on analysis, not authority. That is what governance is for. It gives the MD a fair, evidence-based answer the programme can stand behind.
Explanation:

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 2 — Holding Clean Core Against a Country Director's Customization Demand

Closer analysis shows the standard already meets part of the demanded feature, with only a narrower piece representing a true gap.
How should the project manager advise meeting the requirement?
A. Build the entire feature, including the part the standard already covers, as one custom solution for consistency.
B. Build the part the standard covers as custom too, so the whole feature behaves in a single bespoke way.
C. Adopt the standard where it meets the objective and extend only for the genuine gap.
D. Drop the genuine gap and deliver only the part the standard already provides.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Adopting the standard where it already meets the objective and reserving a supported extension for the true remaining gap meets the need while minimizing divergence from the core. It separates genuine gap from preference. Only what is genuinely missing becomes extension work.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 3 — Aligning Data Migration and Integration Within the Cutover Window

Several end-to-end integration tests are failing, and the integration team first attributed the failures to interface configuration, though the affected interfaces depend on master data that has not yet been fully migrated.
How should the project manager advise diagnosing the failures?
A. Recognize the failures stem from incomplete migrated master data, not the interfaces.
B. Direct the integration team to rework the interface configuration until the end-to-end tests pass.
C. Disable the failing interfaces for go-live and reintroduce them once the programme has stabilized.
D. Re-run the failing end-to-end tests unchanged, on the expectation that the results will settle.

Answer: A

Explanation:
The interfaces depend on master data that is not yet fully migrated, so the failures are a second-order symptom of the data gap, not an interface fault — fixing the migration scope and reconciliation first is the real correction. Diagnosing to the data dependency avoids wasted interface rework. The root cause sits upstream of the interface.

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 3 — Aligning Data Migration and Integration Within the Cutover Window

The legacy data carries duplicates and inconsistent identifiers, the cutover window is short, and the data team has proposed loading everything as-is to save time.
How should the project manager advise approaching the migration?
A. Load all the legacy data as-is to fit the cutover window and clean up the duplicates and identifiers in production.
B. Delay the go-live until the entire legacy dataset has been fully cleansed to a perfect state.
C. Cleanse the critical data first, load it through the migration cockpit, and stage the rest.
D. Have the team re-key the most critical records by hand during the cutover window to keep tight control.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Cleansing the critical data first, loading it through the cockpit, staging the rest, and rehearsing and reconciling the load fits the window while protecting the quality that matters most. It prioritizes rather than sacrificing data quality or the schedule outright. The business starts on trustworthy critical data, with the remainder controlled.

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 3 — Aligning Data Migration and Integration Within the Cutover Window

The integration and migration workstreams are running in parallel, and the settlement integration cannot be meaningfully exercised until the relevant customer and contract data is present and reconciled.
How should the project manager advise sequencing the work?

A. Keep both workstreams fully in parallel and reconcile any differences between them after go-live.
B. Sequence the end-to-end integration tests after the migration load they depend on.
C. Run the integration end-to-end tests now on placeholder data so the test schedule is not delayed.
D. Remove the settlement integration from the test scope so the other tests can proceed unblocked.

Answer: B

Explanation:
The settlement integration depends on migrated, reconciled data, so its end-to-end tests must follow the migration load to produce meaningful results. Sequencing along the dependency means the tests run on real data and actually prove readiness. It manages the dependency instead of fighting it.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 3 — Aligning Data Migration and Integration Within the Cutover Window

The migration moves data from an existing SAP source system, and the data lead, most comfortable with spreadsheets, has proposed exporting everything to files and loading from there.
Which migration approach should the project manager recommend?
A. Export the data to files and load it that way, matching the data lead's preferred working style.
B. Re-key the data into the new system by hand to keep the team in direct control of every record.
C. Build a custom load program to read the source and push the records into the new system.
D. Use the migration cockpit's direct transfer from the SAP source system.

Answer: D

Explanation:
For an existing SAP source, the cockpit's direct transfer fits the source and reduces the manual export, mapping, and re-import that file staging adds, with status tracking and reconciliation confirming the load. Source and method are matched. It is the controlled, repeatable route.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 4 — Absorbing a Scheduled Upgrade During User Acceptance Testing

A scheduled platform upgrade is due to land during the user acceptance testing window and is expected to touch some configured processes and a small number of planned extensions.
How should the project manager advise handling the upgrade?
A. Proceed toward the fixed go-live date and deal with any effects of the upgrade after the business is live.
B. Attempt to hold the system steady and block the upgrade until the programme is through its critical period.
C. Restart user acceptance testing from the beginning once the upgrade lands, to be certain everything is retested.
D. Assess the upgrade's impact, regression-test the affected areas, and re-baseline the results.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Assessing the upgrade's impact, regression-testing the affected processes and extensions, and re-baselining the results protects against regression while respecting both the platform's delivery model and the schedule. It manages the upgrade deliberately rather than ignoring or fighting it. Testing then rests on a current, trustworthy baseline.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 4 — Absorbing a Scheduled Upgrade During User Acceptance Testing

After the upgrade lands, the team needs to decide which of the already-completed user acceptance test results can still be relied upon.
How should the project manager advise scoping the re-testing?
A. Treat all previously completed test results as still valid, since the testing was done thoroughly before the upgrade.
B. Re-validate the areas the upgrade touched, retain the unaffected results, and scope via traceability.
C. Discard every completed test result and re-run the entire test plan from the start to remove any doubt.
D. Accept the prior results on the team's confidence that the upgrade most likely changed very little.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Re-validating only the areas the upgrade touched while retaining results for unaffected areas, scoped through requirement-to-test traceability, focuses effort where risk actually changed. It is efficient and evidence-based. Coverage stays honest without redoing everything.

Question: 15

CHALLENGE 4 — Absorbing a Scheduled Upgrade During User Acceptance Testing

With the regression work underway, the programme board needs a go/no-go decision, and the fixed date is now in question.
How should the project manager advise making the go/no-go decision?
A. Go live on the fixed date regardless of the regression outcome, to hold the commitment already made.
B. Delay the go-live indefinitely until the team is completely certain nothing could possibly go wrong.
C. Base the go/no-go on confirmed regression evidence for the affected scope.
D. Go live on the date but switch off the affected extensions so the upgrade cannot disrupt the live system.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Basing the go/no-go on confirmed regression evidence for the affected scope, and moving the date only if real blockers remain, ties the decision to fact rather than to the calendar or to fear. It protects the go-live without over-delaying. The evidence, not the date, drives the call.

Question: 16

CHALLENGE 4 — Absorbing a Scheduled Upgrade During User Acceptance Testing

The upgrade response has re-baselined parts of the test plan and may shift the timeline, while status reporting to date has stayed optimistic.
How should the project manager advise handling stakeholder communication?
A. Update stakeholders and the communication plan to reflect the re-baselined timeline.

B. Keep the communication optimistic and say nothing about the re-baseline to avoid alarming the countries.
C. Inform only the programme board of the re-baseline and leave the country teams to find out at go-live.
D. Defer all communication about the upgrade and timeline until after go-live, once the picture is settled.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Updating stakeholders and the communication plan to reflect the re-baselined timeline and what changed keeps reporting honest and adoption aligned as the plan shifts. Transparency sustains trust and readiness. People can plan around a change they can see.

Topic: 2
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 17

A retailer is moving master and transactional data from its legacy SAP ERP system into Public Edition. Under time pressure, part of the data team proposes keying the most critical records in by hand to avoid the setup involved in a tooled migration.
The project manager wants a controlled, repeatable load with validation and a clear status for each data object, using an approach that fits the legacy source. Balancing the team's wish to save setup time against the need for a trustworthy, traceable migration, he must recommend how the data is moved.
What should the project manager recommend?
A. Use the SAP S/4HANA Migration Cockpit, tracking each object's status.
B. Key all the critical records into the new system by hand to avoid the setup effort.
C. Copy the legacy data straight into production without a validation step.
D. Build a custom data-load program outside the provided migration tooling.

Answer: A

Explanation:
The SAP S/4HANA Migration Cockpit gives a controlled, repeatable load with validation and per-object status, and supports the approach that fits the source. It meets the need for a trustworthy, traceable migration. It is the tool built for the job.

Question: 18

A medical-devices firm's Public Edition project needs a custom field and a small piece of business logic that the standard apps do not provide, in order to capture a regulatory attribute on a document.
The edition mandates a clean core so the system stays upgrade-safe, and the project manager must deliver this genuine requirement without compromising that. Weighing the need to capture the attribute against the discipline of keeping the core clean, she must choose how the extension is built.
How should the project manager deliver the requirement?
A. Drop the requirement, since the standard apps do not already include it.
B. Use key-user in-app extensibility for the field and logic.
C. Capture the regulatory attribute in a separate spreadsheet outside the system.
D. Modify the standard core objects directly to add the field and the logic.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Key-user in-app extensibility adds the custom field and business logic on top of the standard without touching the core, which keeps the system upgrade-safe. It delivers the regulatory requirement within the clean-core tiers the edition provides. It is the fit-for-purpose route.

Question: 19

On a utilities company's Public Edition implementation, the workstreams are tracking their tasks, test cases, and integration status in separate spreadsheets and email threads. The project manager finds it hard to get a reliable, current view of progress and risk across the teams.
She wants one place that supports project tasks, test plans, and integration monitoring together, so status is consistent and traceable as the project moves toward testing and go-live. Weighing the effort of changing how teams work against the cost of fragmented tracking, she must decide how to bring the project's monitoring together.
What should the project manager recommend?
A. Adopt a separate generic project-management tool disconnected from the implementation.
B. Keep the spreadsheets but add a weekly status meeting to reconcile them.
C. Track progress only at major milestones to reduce the reporting effort.
D. Use SAP Cloud ALM as the single base for tasks, tests, and integration monitoring.

Answer: D

Explanation:
SAP Cloud ALM is the project base for the implementation, bringing project tasks, test plans, and integration monitoring together in one traceable place. It directly resolves the fragmented-tracking problem with the tool intended for it. Status becomes consistent across the workstreams.

Question: 20

During fit-to-standard workshops for a food manufacturer's Public Edition project, the procurement department insists that a long-standing custom approval process from their legacy system be reproduced exactly in the new system. The standard process covers the same control objective through a slightly different flow.
The edition is built around adopting standard processes and keeping the core clean, and the project manager must respond without derailing that approach or dismissing a department that fears losing a control it relies on. She must guide how the request is handled as the design is confirmed.
How should the project manager guide the decision?
A. Adopt the standard process and record only genuine gaps as scope.
B. Reject the department's requirement so the standard is simply used unchanged.
C. Customize the whole procurement area to match the legacy system's flow end to end.
D. Reproduce the legacy approval process exactly by modifying the standard core objects.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Adopting the standard process where it meets the same control objective, and recording only the genuine gaps as scope, honors clean core while taking the department's real need seriously. It resolves the tension between standard adoption and a valid control. Only true gaps become work.

Question: 21

A hospitality group is three-quarters of the way through its Public Edition implementation. Organizational change management has not started, and the current plan is a single end-user training session at go-live.
The project manager is concerned about user adoption given the new ways of working the system introduces, and knows the change effort is meant to run alongside the project rather than appear only at the end. With go-live approaching and little done on the people side, he must advise on the change-management approach.
What should the project manager advise?
A. Leave user adoption to line managers to handle on their own after go-live.
B. Add extra training sessions only if adoption problems appear after go-live.
C. Keep the single go-live training session as the whole change plan.
D. Start change-impact assessment and engagement now, across the lifecycle.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Starting change-impact assessment and stakeholder engagement now and sustaining them across the lifecycle is how the people side is meant to be managed, even when begun late. It builds readiness rather than hoping for it. It is the soundest path from here.

Question: 22

A regional logistics company is beginning a new SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition implementation, and the project manager is planning the early phases. Leadership, eager to move quickly, wants the project team to settle the detailed business-configuration decisions up front during preparation, before any workshops are held with the business.
The project manager knows the methodology is built around validating requirements against the standard solution before configuring, and that committing detailed design too early risks reworking those decisions once the standard is actually seen. With the pressure to start fast pulling against the sequence the methodology intends, she must advise on when and how the configuration design should be settled.
What should the project manager recommend?
A. Defer all design decisions until the build is already underway in the Realize phase.
B. Lock the detailed configuration decisions during preparation, before any workshops, to save time.
C. Confirm the design in fit-to-standard workshops in the Explore phase before configuring.
D. Skip the workshops and configure directly from the project team's own process knowledge.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Fit-to-standard workshops in the Explore phase confirm the requirements against the standard before configuration begins, which is where the methodology places the design decision. It satisfies the wish to progress while avoiding premature commitment. The design is settled on validated ground.

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

