

Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP

C_TS4FI_2601

**SAP Certified - SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private 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

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1

Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

An asset accountant in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition is validating first-month depreciation for a newly created asset class used for office technology. In the web-based UI, the asset masters are created successfully, acquisitions are posted, and the depreciation run completes without technical errors. However, the new assets do not receive depreciation in the acquisition month, while older asset classes in the same company code begin depreciating immediately when similar assets are acquired. The finance manager does not want manual catch-up journals because the new asset class will be used for many future purchases. One consultant suggests waiting until the next period to see whether depreciation starts automatically. The constraint is to fix the configuration dependency that controls repeated depreciation-start timing for this class, not just observe the symptom for one cycle. Which action best addresses the root cause?

Response:

- A. Wait for the next depreciation period and monitor whether the missing amount appears automatically before making any configuration change.
- B. Post manual depreciation journals for the first month and continue using the same asset-class defaults for future acquisitions.
- C. Reverse the acquisitions and recreate the assets under an older class that already starts depreciation in the acquisition month.
- D. Review the depreciation key or period-control settings inherited by the new asset class and align them with the intended start-of-depreciation behavior.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

The depreciation run itself completes, so the process is not technically failing. The issue is the timing behavior for the new asset class. That points to the chain asset-class defaults → inherited depreciation key or period-control logic → depreciation calculation timing → month-end validation. Reviewing and aligning the depreciation-start behavior in the inherited settings fixes the repeated root cause for future assets in the class.

Question: 2

A finance consultant configures a new input tax code in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition to support a local procurement requirement. In the web-based UI, users can enter supplier invoices with the new tax code, and the tax amount is calculated correctly in the entry screen. When they try to post, the

document fails with an account-determination message indicating that no posting can be made for the tax line. Other invoice postings using older tax codes work without issue.

The tax rate itself is confirmed as correct, and the supplier and expense accounts are valid. The business wants to use the new tax code immediately, but they do not want a workaround that forces users to remove tax from invoices or manually adjust entries outside the normal process. The constraint is to restore standard invoice posting behavior for this tax code going forward.

Which action best resolves the posting failure?

Response:

- A. Maintain the required automatic tax account determination for the new tax code, then repost the invoice.
- B. Reduce the tax percentage temporarily so the document can post without generating a separate tax line.
- C. Post the invoices without tax and enter separate manual tax journals at period-end.
- D. Recreate the supplier master records so the new tax code is inherited correctly during invoice entry.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The system calculates tax but cannot post the tax line. That means entry logic is functioning, while the downstream accounting integration is incomplete. The dependency chain is tax code setup → automatic account determination for tax posting → invoice posting execution → document validation. Maintaining the required tax account assignment fixes the integration layer that the posting process depends on.

Question: 3

An implementation consultant configures a new asset class in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition for internally used production support equipment. In the web-based UI, the team can create asset master records successfully, and the assets are saved in the correct company code. However, when they post the first acquisition for assets in this new class, the document fails during posting with a message indicating that no valid account determination is available for the asset transaction. Existing acquisitions for older asset classes still post correctly.

The asset accountant wants the new class retained because it supports reporting separation required by the business. Another team member proposes using a general expense account temporarily and moving the value later through manual journals. The constraint is to enable proper integrated acquisition posting for this asset class without creating recurring reconciliation work outside the standard asset process.

Which action best resolves the root cause?

Response:

- A. Post the acquisition directly to a general expense account this period and transfer the balance manually at month-end.
- B. Recreate the asset master records under an older asset class that already posts acquisitions correctly.
- C. Review and complete the account determination assigned to the new asset class so acquisition postings can generate the required accounting entries.

D. Extend the user roles for the fixed asset team so the acquisition transaction can proceed with the current setup.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

Asset master creation succeeds, so the issue is not basic master-data setup. The failure occurs only when the system tries to create the accounting lines for the acquisition. That means the dependency chain is asset class design → account determination for acquisition posting → integrated asset transaction execution → accounting document validation. Completing the account determination for the new asset class fixes the upstream integration point.

Question: 4

During management reporting validation in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition, a consultant compares detailed journal entries with the monthly financial statement output in the web-based UI. Adjustment postings entered for period-end review are visible in line-item analysis and are posted successfully to the intended accounts. However, the management report still shows pre-adjustment balances. The accounting manager confirms that no posting errors occurred and does not want the team to duplicate those adjustments through additional journals.

The saved report variant was copied from an earlier validation cycle and is used repeatedly by the reporting team. The constraint is to correct the reporting result through the appropriate reporting dependency so future runs reflect the intended balances without changing already valid postings.

Which action best resolves the reporting mismatch?

Response:

- A. Repost the adjustment entries with a different document type so the management report recognizes them during summarization.
- B. Reopen the period and execute the same valuation-related activities again before rerunning the report.
- C. Review the report selection or saved variant to ensure it includes the intended ledger or reporting scope, then rerun the statement.
- D. Reassign the adjusted accounts to a different reporting node so all future postings appear under a broader statement section.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The postings are valid and visible in detailed analysis, which means the transaction layer is working. The mismatch appears only in the summarized management output. That points to the chain posting completion → report selection/reporting scope in the saved variant → statement generation → balance validation. Reviewing the saved variant or report selection is the best next step because it corrects how the report is pulling data rather than altering correct accounting entries.

Question: 5

An AP team in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition is testing supplier invoice posting for a newly introduced vendor template used for service providers. In the web-based UI, invoices post successfully, the vendor balances update correctly, and payment processing remains available. However, the accountants notice that withholding tax is not calculated for these new vendors even though the same type of invoices for older service vendors still calculate the expected tax automatically in the same company code.

The tax team does not want users to calculate and post withholding tax adjustments manually because the template will be used for many more vendors after go-live. One consultant proposes delaying the correction until the first statutory review cycle. The constraint is to fix the master-data dependency that controls repeated withholding-tax behavior without changing each posted invoice individually.

Which action best resolves the root cause?

Response:

- A. Repost the affected supplier invoices with a different document type so withholding tax is recalculated during entry.
- B. Increase tolerance settings for AP postings so the system can absorb the missing withholding tax amounts automatically.
- C. Post separate withholding tax adjustment journals at month-end and keep using the current vendor template.
- D. Review the vendor company code data or template and maintain the intended withholding tax settings before further invoice posting.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

Invoices post and vendor balances update, so the problem is not general AP integration. The missing behavior is tax calculation for vendors created from the new template. That places the issue in the chain vendor company code master/template → withholding tax settings → invoice posting behavior → AP and tax validation. Correcting the vendor setup or template addresses the upstream dependency that governs repeated tax calculation.

Question: 6

A reporting analyst in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition reviews month-end results after a new G/L account was introduced for liability tracking. In the web-based UI, postings to the new account are successful and line-item display shows the expected transactions. However, when the financial statement output is validated, the balances appear in the profit and loss section rather than under liabilities. Other liability accounts continue to display correctly, and the reporting hierarchy itself has already been used successfully for prior periods.

The finance lead does not want the team to compensate with manual reclassification journals because the new account will be used continuously. Another consultant suggests changing the reporting node

only for the current statement output. The constraint is to correct the design dependency that drives consistent classification in future reporting.

Which action is the best next step?

Response:

- A. Repost the existing transactions to a temporary liability account and move them back after the next reporting cycle is completed.
- B. Change the statement output layout for this month only so the new account is displayed in a different report section.
- C. Review the master classification of the new G/L account and correct whether it is defined with the intended balance-sheet or profit-and-loss behavior.
- D. Increase reporting authorizations for the analysts so the system can display the new account with broader balance-sheet visibility.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The account posts successfully and line items are visible, so the transaction layer is functioning. The problem is that the account is classified incorrectly in financial statement behavior. The dependency chain is G/L account master classification → financial statement behavior during reporting → statement generation → reporting validation.

Correcting whether the account is set up as a balance-sheet or profit-and-loss account addresses the structural cause of the misclassification.

Question: 7

A payment team in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition is testing the first outbound payment run for a new supplier population. In the web-based UI, supplier invoices are selected successfully in the payment proposal, and the vendors already have valid payment methods in their company code data.

a. However, when the team executes the payment run, the log indicates that no suitable bank can be determined for the selected payment method and currency. Older payment configurations in the same company code still complete normally.

Treasury wants to keep the standard automatic payment process because daily volume is expected to increase after go-live. One consultant suggests paying the first batch manually and correcting configuration later. The finance lead wants the correct dependency fixed now so future payment runs can create payments consistently without additional manual processing.

Which action best resolves the root cause?

Response:

- A. Maintain the required bank determination or house-bank assignment for the company code, payment method, and currency, then rerun payment execution.
- B. Change the due dates of the current supplier invoices so the run can search a wider range of items during the next execution.
- C. Post the bank payments manually outside the standard run and match the supplier items during the next closing cycle.
- D. Broaden the payment-run authorizations for treasury users so the system can complete bank selection with the current setup.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The proposal already selects the invoices, and vendor payment methods are present. The failure appears later, when the system needs a bank to execute payment. The dependency chain is company code payment configuration → bank determination/house-bank assignment for method and currency → payment execution → payment run validation. Maintaining the missing bank-determination setup fixes the upstream integration point that the execution step depends on.

Question: 8

A finance configuration team in an SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition landscape is validating outbound payment processing for a newly onboarded supplier population. Supplier invoices are posted successfully in one company code, the due date has already passed, and no payment blocks were used during entry. During payment proposal execution in the web-based UI, the run finishes without technical errors, but the log shows that the open items were not selected for payment. The treasury lead wants the issue fixed without changing invoice data one by one because the same supplier setup will be reused for many future invoices.

The team confirms that bank determination is already available for the paying company code and that the invoices are posted to the correct reconciliation accounts. The constraint is to correct the issue at the right dependency layer so the next proposal run works consistently for current and future supplier items.

Which action best resolves the upstream cause of the payment proposal exclusion?

Response:

- A. Repost the supplier invoices with a different document type so the proposal run reevaluates due dates.
- B. Maintain the required outgoing payment method in the supplier company code data, then regenerate the proposal.
- C. Open the next payment run date earlier so the system includes the overdue invoices automatically.
- D. Remove the reconciliation account assignment from the supplier master and post the invoices again.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario points to a master-data-driven selection failure, not a posting failure. The invoices exist, are overdue, and no payment block is present. The payment proposal log excludes items even though core AP postings are valid. That means the issue is in the dependency chain supplier company code data → payment method eligibility → payment proposal selection → execution validation. Maintaining the outgoing payment method at the supplier company code level fixes both current and future items when the proposal is regenerated.

Question: 9

A consultant introduces a new document type for year-end audit adjustments in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. In the web-based UI, users can enter the adjustment document and pass all required account and amount checks. When they try to post, the system stops with a number-range-related error. Another team member already created a new number range interval earlier that day, but the posting error still occurs for this document type in the target company code.

The project lead does not want users to switch back to a generic document type because the new type is intended for controlled adjustment tracking after go-live. The constraint is to correct the design so the document type can be used consistently without weakening posting discipline or manual workarounds.

What is the best next step?

Response:

- A. Recreate the journal entry with a smaller posting amount so the new interval can be picked up during validation.
- B. Grant the finance users broader posting rights for adjustment transactions before posting the same document again.
- C. Keep the current design and post all audit adjustments temporarily with a standard document type until year-end is completed.
- D. Verify that the correct number range is assigned to the new document type in the relevant configuration, then repost the document.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario says an interval was created, yet the new document type still cannot post. That means the problem is not simply “missing interval,” but the second-order dependency document type configuration → number range assignment/binding → document posting execution → number issuance validation. Verifying and correcting the assignment is the right fix because the document type can only post when it is linked to an available range.

Question: 10

An asset accountant in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition is testing the disposal of older office equipment in the web-based UI. The related asset masters exist, depreciation has posted correctly in prior periods, and the retirement transaction can be entered with the expected sale information. However, when the retirement posting is executed, the system stops with a message indicating that no valid account determination is available for the gain or loss generated by the retirement. Standard acquisition and depreciation postings for the same asset class continue to work normally.

The business wants to keep the asset-class design because it is already aligned with reporting requirements. One consultant proposes posting the sale proceeds manually through a general journal and removing the asset later. The constraint is to restore the integrated retirement process so future disposals can be handled without manual side postings.

Which action best resolves the root cause?

Response:

- A. Reverse prior-period depreciation so the retirement can be posted without generating any gain or loss line.
- B. Recreate the assets under a different asset class that already supports retirement postings for unrelated asset populations.
- C. Review and complete the account determination used for asset retirement gain or loss posting for the intended asset-class design, then retest the disposal.
- D. Broaden the fixed-asset posting roles so the user can complete the retirement despite the current account setup.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The retirement can be entered, and the asset class already supports acquisition and depreciation. The error appears only when the system tries to create the accounting impact for the retirement result. The dependency chain is asset retirement configuration → gain/loss account determination → retirement posting execution → asset and G/L validation. Completing that account determination fixes the missing integration needed for disposals.

Topic: 2

Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

Unified Scenario: Solvantis Health Finance Cutover for Private Cloud Launch

CHALLENGE 1 — Period Opening and Recurring Entry Sequencing

During cutover rehearsal, all three entities complete opening-period postings, but one clinic processes recurring entries before controlled posting release to reduce queue time. The finance hub notices that downstream balance interpretation no longer lines up cleanly across the entities. Which action best supports launch readiness?

Response:

- A. Accept the faster local order because all postings are technically completed within the rehearsal window
- B. Revalidate the sequence between period opening, recurring entries, and controlled release before treating the cutover order as launch-ready
- C. Let each entity keep the sequence that clears work fastest and compare balances after go-live
- D. Remove recurring entries from the rehearsal and focus only on opening-period postings

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is the best answer because the scenario requires a repeatable launch sequence, not just completed activity. Revalidating the order of period opening, recurring entries, and controlled release addresses the dependency that determines whether balances can be interpreted consistently across entities.

Question: 12

Unified Scenario: Solvantis Health Finance Cutover for Private Cloud Launch

CHALLENGE 1 — Period Opening and Recurring Entry Sequencing

Recurring entries are processed successfully in the rehearsal, yet the entity teams reach different conclusions about readiness once they review balances later in the sequence. What is the most appropriate interpretation?

Response:

- A. The reporting layer is solely responsible because successful recurring processing proves the sequence is correct
- B. The setup likely contains a second-order sequencing inconsistency between period control and recurring entry timing
- C. The main issue is approval scope because recurring entries always depend first on local manager release
- D. The best response is to accelerate more recurring entries so the balance pattern becomes clearer

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is the best answer because the symptom appears after the activities complete, not at the point of execution. That pattern suggests a second-order inconsistency in how period control and recurring timing interact within the cutover sequence.

Question: 13

Unified Scenario: Solvantis Health Finance Cutover for Private Cloud Launch

CHALLENGE 3 — Equipment Capitalization and Asset Timing Alignment

During rehearsal, equipment capitalization postings are entered in all entities, but one clinic processes them earlier in the cutover flow to finish faster. Later, the program team finds that asset-related launch interpretation is no longer fully comparable across the three clinics. What is the best response?

Response:

- A. Keep the faster local timing because all capitalization postings are visible in the system
- B. Reassess capitalization timing relative to the intended cutover flow before accepting the asset sequence as launch-ready
- C. Let each clinic choose its own capitalization timing because equipment procurement differs by entity
- D. Narrow the launch decision to non-asset transactions and treat capitalization as a post-launch alignment topic

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is the best answer because the scenario requires comparable launch evidence, not merely posted asset activity. Reassessing capitalization timing addresses the dependency between when equipment transactions are processed and how their outputs are interpreted later.

Question: 14

Unified Scenario: Solvantis Health Finance Cutover for Private Cloud Launch

CHALLENGE 3 — Equipment Capitalization and Asset Timing Alignment

Asset-related postings complete successfully, but local teams still need to explain why capitalization results look different depending on when transactions were processed within the rehearsal sequence. Which interpretation is most appropriate?

Response:

- A. The scenario points to a second-order timing dependency between capitalization sequence and entity-level asset interpretation
- B. The main weakness is reporting color and layout because asset postings have already completed correctly
- C. Approval scope is the true root cause because capitalization always depends first on manager routing
- D. The difference can be ignored because local explanation is an acceptable substitute for governed launch evidence

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is the best answer because the question describes a second-order exposure point: the postings complete, but interpretation changes based on when the activity occurred in the sequence. That points to a timing dependency in capitalization handling rather than a simple posting failure.

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-ts4fi-2601>