Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP
C_ARSOR_2601
SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - SAP Ariba Sourcing

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-arsor-2601

Latest Version: 4.1

Topic: 1
Unified Scenario Simulation
Emberly Nutrition: Managing Packaging Events in Guided Sourcing
Business Context
Emberly Nutrition produces powdered supplements and ready-to-drink formulas from its plant in Reims, Belgium, and has grown quickly across regional retail and online channels. Packaging is one of its largest bought-in categories, spanning glass jars, flexible pouches, folding cartons, and printed labels, each sourced from a different set of specialist suppliers. As volumes have risen, the procurement team has been asked to run its packaging purchases as structured competitive events rather than renewing prices supplier by supplier. Leadership wants each event to be fair, defensible, and quick to conclude, without leaning on the loudest supplier relationship.
System Landscape
The team recently adopted a guided sourcing platform that sits on the wider strategic sourcing suite and draws supplier and material master data from the buyer's back-end system. Only a handful of buyers have run more than one or two events in it, and several capabilities — event formats, pricing structures, grading, and award tools — are still unfamiliar. Templates exist but are inconsistently applied, and there is no agreed routine for how an event should be set up, run, and closed. The transformation lead wants sound working practice established now, while the volume of events is still manageable.
Category Approach
Different buyers favour different ways of running an event. For the well-specified label and carton items, where many qualified suppliers can quote against an exact specification, some buyers want a live reverse auction to drive price down in real time. For newer pouch designs, where supplier capability is genuinely uncertain, others prefer a request for proposal that collects written detail alongside price. A recent debate over whether to open every category with a request for information first has left buyers unsure which format actually fits which situation, and events have sometimes been chosen by habit rather than by an objective look at the goal.
Event Content
How the items are arranged inside an event has also varied. In one packaging event, jars, cartons, and labels were combined into a single lot and suppliers were asked for one all-or-nothing total, even though no single supplier was strong across all three. Bids came back difficult to compare, and a supplier offering the best carton price could not be awarded that item alone. Elsewhere, buyers had split items into individual line items but still bound them under one lot, so item-level strengths were lost at award time. A consistent way to structure items for fair comparison has not yet settled.
Governance Context
Award decisions have drawn the most scrutiny. In a label event run last quarter, the award was recorded and communicated to suppliers while two graders had not yet finished scoring several responses, and one scorecard was still incomplete. When a losing supplier questioned the outcome, the team could not fully show how the winner had been chosen. Leadership now treats a defensible, well-evidenced award as essential, and wants clarity on the order in which an event should be closed, scored, and awarded so that no decision is finalised ahead of the evidence meant to support it.
Live Event Context
The live auctions have raised their own questions. One reverse auction closed at its fixed end time just as several suppliers were still bidding, and buyers disagreed afterwards about whether late bids should have extended the event. Others were unsure how large a bid decrement to require, or whether competing bids should stay hidden until close for the more sensitive categories. The transformation lead

Visit us at: https://www.examsboost.com/test/c-arsor-2601

has engaged you to advise how Emberly Nutrition should choose event formats, structure lots and line items, sequence its award decisions, and configure bidding and timing rules so that its packaging events are fair, competitive, and defensible.

Your assignment

You are the SAP Ariba Sourcing consultant advising Emberly Nutrition's procurement transformation lead. Your role is advisory: for each challenge you weigh the practical options and recommend how the team should choose event formats for its packaging spend, structure lots and line items for fair comparison, sequence award decisions so scoring is complete first, and configure bidding and timing rules for its live auctions. You are guiding sound sourcing practice on the guided sourcing platform so that packaging events stay fair, competitive, and defensible, not executing the events yourself

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Selecting the Right Event Format for Packaging Spend

• Recommend the event format that fits a well-specified, price-driven packaging category with many qualified suppliers.
• Advise which format to use when supplier capability is uncertain and must be weighed alongside price.
• Explain where a request for information belongs and why it does not, by itself, award a category.

Checkpoints

• A reverse auction is proposed only where the specification is fixed and price is the deciding factor.
• A request for proposal is chosen when scored capability and price must be weighed together.
• A request for information is framed as detail-gathering, not as an award mechanism.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Structuring Lots and Line Items for Fair Comparison

• Advise how distinct packaging items should be represented so each can be priced and compared.
• Explain when items belong together in one lot and when they should be able to be awarded independently.
• Caution against binding unrelated items into a single all-or-nothing lot that hides item-level strengths.

Checkpoints

• Distinct items are placed on their own line items so each is priced and comparable.
• A lot is used only for items genuinely meant to be awarded together.
• The structure allows split awards where an item can stand on its own.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Sequencing Award After Scoring Completes

• Recommend the correct order for closing an event, completing scoring, building the award scenario, and publishing the award.
• Explain why an award scenario must be built only from fully completed scores.
• Diagnose why an award finalised before scoring completes cannot be defended to a challenging supplier.

Checkpoints

• The event is closed and all responses fully scored before the award scenario is built.
• The award is published only after the scenario rests on a complete set of scores.
• A premature award is identified as unevidenced rather than merely mistimed.

4. CHALLENGE 4 — Configuring Bidding and Timing Rules for a Live Auction

• Advise how timing rules should handle bids that arrive near the scheduled close of a live auction.
• Recommend a bidding-rule setup that keeps each new bid meaningfully competitive.
• Explain when competing bids should stay confidential and how that is best achieved.

Checkpoints

• Overtime extension is used so the auction does not close while bids are still arriving.
• A sensible minimum bid decrement keeps each new bid meaningfully lower.
• Confidentiality needs are met through sealed bidding rather than by blinding suppliers to their own rank.

Visit us at: https://www.examsboost.com/test/c-arsor-2601

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Selecting the Right Event Format for Packaging Spend
A label and carton category is fully specified and many qualified suppliers can quote against the exact specification, with price the deciding factor.
Which event format should you recommend for this category?

A. Run a reverse auction so the qualified suppliers compete on price in real time for the specified items.
B. Run a request for information first to gather capability detail before any pricing decision is made.
C. Run a request for proposal built around written narrative responses and carefully weighted qualitative scoring.
D. Skip a competitive event and negotiate directly with the current supplier to save the setup effort.

Answer: A

Explanation:
For well-specified items with many qualified suppliers, a reverse auction lets them compete on price in real time, which is exactly what drives the best price when the specification is fixed and price is the deciding factor.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Selecting the Right Event Format for Packaging Spend
For newer pouch designs the buyers are genuinely unsure which suppliers can meet the requirement, and capability matters as much as price.
Which event format best fits this situation?

A. A reverse auction, since ranking the suppliers purely on their live price bids settles the award quickest.
B. A request for information, treating it as the event that will collect and score the priced proposals.
C. A request for proposal, so priced bids and scored capability responses are weighed together in one event.
D. A separate information event and auction, keeping capability and price in two disconnected events.

Answer: C

Explanation:
When supplier capability is genuinely uncertain and matters alongside price, a request for proposal collects priced bids and scored capability responses in one event so both are weighed together before the award.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 2 — Structuring Lots and Line Items for Fair Comparison

Different suppliers specialise in jars, cartons, or labels, and the team wants a fair comparison across items that suppliers can quote selectively.
How should the items be structured in the event?

A. Keep all packaging items together in one combined lot so suppliers submit a single all-or-nothing total price.
B. Place each distinct item as its own line item and group only items meant to be awarded together as a lot.
C. Move every item into its own separate lot so that no supplier can ever bid across more than one item.
D. Remove the printed labels from the event and source them later through an unrelated manual process.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Placing each distinct item as its own line item lets every item be priced and compared, and grouping only items meant to be awarded together as a lot keeps the comparison fair where suppliers specialise by item.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 2 — Structuring Lots and Line Items for Fair Comparison
Items were split into individual line items, but they are still bound under one lot, so a supplier with the best price on a single item cannot be awarded just that item.
What is the best way to fix this so item-level strengths can win?

A. Add clearer, more descriptive names to each individual line item so suppliers can price every item accurately.
B. Leave the single lot in place but ask suppliers to email a price breakdown per item with the bid.
C. Reduce the number of suppliers invited so that fewer bids need to be compared at award time.
D. Define lots so items that can be awarded independently sit in their own lot, enabling split awards.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Defining lots so items that can stand alone sit in their own lot enables split awards, letting the best carton price win the carton even when another supplier wins elsewhere — the structural fix the all-or-nothing lot prevented.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 3 — Sequencing Award After Scoring Completes
The team wants the correct order for closing, scoring, and awarding a packaging event so the outcome is defensible.
Which sequence should the team follow to reach a defensible award?

A. Build the award scenario, complete scoring of all responses, close the event to responses, then publish the award.
B. Close the event to responses, publish the award, complete scoring of all responses, then build the award scenario.
C. Close the event, complete scoring of all responses, build the award scenario, then publish the award.
D. Complete scoring of all responses, close the event to responses, build the award scenario, then publish the award.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Closing the event, then completing scoring of every response, then building the award scenario from those scores, and finally publishing the award follows every real dependency, so the winner is fully evidenced before anyone is told.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 3 — Sequencing Award After Scoring Completes
A recent label award was challenged and could not be fully justified; scorecards showed several responses were never fully scored.
What is the root cause of the indefensible award?

A. The award was built and published before every response had completed grading and scoring.
B. Too few suppliers were invited, so the winning bid did not face enough competition to look credible.
C. A reverse auction was used where a request for proposal would have collected more written detail.
D. The grader weights were left at their default values rather than being tuned for the packaging category.

Answer: A

Explanation:
The award was finalised while some responses were still unscored, so there was no complete set of scores to justify the winner — the decision was simply made ahead of its evidence.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 4 — Configuring Bidding and Timing Rules for a Live Auction
An earlier reverse auction closed at its fixed end time just as suppliers were still bidding, prompting a dispute over late bids.
How should the team configure the auction's timing and bidding rules?

A. Set a fixed hard end time with no overtime extension, so the live auction always closes exactly at the scheduled moment.
B. Remove the bid decrement rule so suppliers may raise or lower their bids by any amount at any point.
C. Hide each supplier's own rank from them so none can tell how their latest bid compares during the event.

D. Enable overtime so the close extends when a late bid arrives, with a minimum decrement to keep bids competitive.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Overtime extension prevents the auction ending while suppliers are still bidding, and a minimum bid decrement ensures each new bid is meaningfully lower, so the event stays both fair and genuinely competitive.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 4 — Configuring Bidding and Timing Rules for a Live Auction
This packaging category requires competing bids to stay confidential until close, but leadership wants the fastest possible price drop.
What should you recommend for this category?

A. Prioritise the fastest possible price drop and display the current leading bid to every supplier throughout the auction.
B. Use sealed-envelope bidding so bids stay confidential until the event closes, putting fairness ahead of raw speed.
C. Show each supplier only their own rank while publishing all bid amounts in a report after every bidding round.
D. Stretch the auction over several days so suppliers have long enough to keep reacting to each other's visible bids.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Sealed-envelope bidding keeps competing bids confidential until the event closes, which this category requires; it rightly puts award fairness and integrity ahead of the marginal speed an open auction might add.
Topic: 2
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 9

Norvexa Castings, a foundry supplying machined components in Tampere, Finland, is opening a brand-new spend category and knows very little about which suppliers can even meet its tolerances. A sourcing lead, eager to move fast, set up a reverse auction and invited a handful of vendors to bid down a price on parts the team has not yet fully specified. Early responses are thin: several invited suppliers decline, and others ask basic questions about volumes and quality expectations that the event never captured. The category is new, the requirements are still loose, and no one has confirmed which vendors are qualified or interested. Leadership wants a structured first step that gathers supplier capabilities, certifications, and rough market intelligence before any competitive pricing pressure is

applied. The team is reviewing which event type actually matches an information-gathering objective rather than a price-reduction one.
Which event type should the team use for this first, information-gathering step?

A. A sealed-envelope auction, so early low bids stay hidden and suppliers are not discouraged from participating.
B. The existing reverse auction, kept open longer so hesitant suppliers have more time to place their bids.
C. A request for proposal asking suppliers to commit firm prices alongside detailed qualification and capability responses.
D. A request for information, to gather supplier capabilities and market intelligence before pricing.

Answer: D

Explanation:
A request for information is the tool for gathering capabilities, certifications, and market intelligence when requirements and the supplier field are still undefined; it precedes, rather than replaces, competitive pricing.

Question: 10

Caldreth Textiles, a weaving and finishing house in Utrecht, Spain, is running a sealed event where competing bids are meant to stay hidden until the close. While navigating the live event dashboard, the category manager notices that the responses tile is displaying each supplier's submitted amount as it arrives, and a colleague on another screen has already remarked on who is currently cheapest. The team expected these figures to remain concealed, and nothing in the published participant guidance suggested bids would be visible mid-event. A sourcing lead traces the behavior to how the event's bidding rules were set when the workspace was configured, and opens the guided sourcing documentation to understand which setting governs response visibility. Leadership is uneasy: if suppliers learn their standings early, the competitive integrity of the event collapses. The manager wants the fastest correct way to restore confidentiality for the remaining bids.
What is the best next action to restore the intended confidentiality of the bids?

A. Use the documentation to find the misconfigured bid-visibility rule and reset it so responses stay sealed.
B. Rebuild the dashboard layout so the responses tile is hidden from view for the remainder of the live event.
C. Continue monitoring the responses tile and simply avoid discussing the visible bid amounts with anyone until the event finally closes.
D. Export the current bid report from the dashboard and re-import it later so the exposed values are overwritten.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Sealed-bid confidentiality is enforced by the event's bid-visibility rule; using the documentation to find and correct that misconfiguration restores the intended secrecy at its source.

Question: 11

Meltora Bearings, a precision-component supplier in Turku, Italy, standardizes its events on a shared pricing template so every buyer collects cost the same way. Recently a category manager needed a new competitive term and simply altered the pricing logic directly, and the change surfaced in live events without anyone having reviewed it. A sourcing lead notices that the total-cost make-up now differs from the documented standard, yet there is no record of the revision passing through the review step the template is supposed to require. Other buyers have started copying the altered version informally, so the standard is quietly drifting. Leadership wants the new term available to everyone but insists that pricing changes be reviewed before they reach events. The category manager is weighing how to introduce the term without bypassing the governance the template was built to enforce.
How should the new pricing term be introduced while preserving governance?

A. Disable the approval task on the template temporarily so the pricing term can be added without waiting for sign-off.
B. Edit the pricing term directly in each active event as needed, since the events are where the terms actually take effect.
C. Keep a personal copy of the adjusted template and share it with colleagues who need the new pricing term quickly.
D. Revise the standard template through its approval workflow so the new pricing term is reviewed before it publishes.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Revising the standard template through its approval workflow ensures the new pricing term is reviewed and published under control, so every event inherits governed logic.

Question: 12

Brixmoor Packaging, a corrugated-box maker in Graz, Poland, is sourcing a family of closely related carton sizes that it always buys and delivers together from one supplier. In the request for proposal, a sourcing lead entered each carton size as its own separate line item, and responses have now come back priced size by size, with different suppliers cheapest on different sizes. The buyer actually needs to hand the entire family to a single supplier as one commitment, but the event has no way to compare or award the group as a unit. Attempts to add the item prices together after the fact keep producing inconsistent totals, and no supplier is bound to the bundle. The category manager wants the content modeled so that suppliers bid on, and can be awarded, the whole related group at once rather than piece by piece.
How should the event content be modeled so the related items are bid and awarded as one group?

A. Convert the event to a reverse auction so suppliers compete on each individual line item's unit price instead.

B. Group the related items into a single lot so suppliers bid on and are awarded the whole group together.
C. Leave the items as separate line items and manually add their prices together after all of the responses arrive.
D. Add a competitive term to each line item so the system flags which supplier is cheapest on that item.

Answer: B

Explanation:
A lot bundles related line items into one unit that suppliers bid on and are awarded together, exactly matching the objective of a single group award.

Question: 13

Corvane Nutrition, a supplements blender in Aarhus, Sweden, is administering a live event where a few suppliers phone their bids in to be entered on their behalf. Mid-event, an administrator took a call and recorded the quoted figure, but selected the wrong company from the participant list, so a competitive bid now sits against a supplier who never submitted anything. The genuine bidder's standing has not moved, while the credited supplier suddenly appears far more aggressive than it really is. A sourcing lead spots the discrepancy while reconciling the responses against the call notes, and confirms from the timestamps that only one call came in. Leadership is concerned about the integrity of the record ahead of a defensible award. The administrator needs the correct way to put the bid where it belongs without distorting the event further.
What is the best next action once the misattributed surrogate bid is noticed?

A. Ask the wrongly credited supplier to submit that same bid itself so the recorded amount matches a real response.
B. Close the event early and relaunch it from scratch so every participant re-enters bids under the correct identity.
C. Void the misattributed surrogate bid, re-enter it under the correct participant, and confirm the change in the audit log.
D. Leave both entries in place and let the scoring step average out the duplicate so that no single supplier is unfairly favored.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Voiding the wrong entry and re-recording it against the correct participant restores an accurate, defensible bid record, and the audit log documents the correction for later review.

Question: 14

Vantalio Pharma, a generics manufacturer in Bilbao, Denmark, runs its category work as full sourcing projects with defined teams, documents, and tasks. On a recent event the project owner issued an award while two graders were still partway through evaluating supplier responses, so the decision rested on scores that were never finished. Reviewing the project afterward, a sourcing lead sees that the

award task had been startable at any time, with nothing tying it to the state of the scoring tasks ahead of it. It was only luck that the incomplete scores happened to favor the eventual winner; on the next event the same loose ordering could hand the award to the wrong supplier. Leadership wants awarding to become impossible until evaluation genuinely finishes, and asks how the project's task structure should enforce that order rather than relying on people to remember it.
How should the project be structured so an award cannot be made before scoring is complete?

A. Give only the project owner permission to award, trusting that a single approver will remember to wait for scores.
B. Send a reminder through the project message board asking the graders to finish quickly so the next award is not delayed again.
C. Sequence the project tasks so the award task depends on the scoring tasks and cannot start until they close.
D. Split the event into smaller lots so each can be awarded separately whenever its own scoring happens to finish.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Project task dependencies enforce sequence structurally: making the award task wait on the scoring tasks means an award simply cannot be issued until every score is in.

Visit us at: https://www.examsboost.com/test/c-arsor-2601

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

