Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP
C_ARSUM_2601
SAP Certified Associate - Implementation Consultant - SAP Ariba Supplier Management



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-arsum-2601

Latest Version: 4.0

Topic: 1
Unified Scenario Simulation
Standing Up Structured Supplier Management for a Connector Maker
Business context
Company Background
Dorven Components manufactures electrical connectors for industrial equipment from its plant in Leon, Spain. It employs roughly two hundred staff and sells across Europe. A small procurement team buys raw metals, plastics, and machined parts from a growing pool of suppliers. The company recently adopted SAP Ariba for sourcing and buying, and leadership now wants supplier onboarding and oversight to be as disciplined as the rest of its operations rather than an afterthought handled in scattered inboxes.
Current Process
Today suppliers are added by email and spreadsheets. Each Ariba solution effectively keeps its own list, so the same supplier can appear more than once with slightly different details. Nobody owns a single, trusted supplier record. There is no consistent onboarding sequence, no formal gate before a supplier starts transacting, and no structured way to watch for financial or operational trouble at a supplier. Data quality has quietly eroded as the supplier base has grown.
Current Situation
A key metals supplier hit financial trouble and delivered late, stalling a production line for several days. Leadership was surprised because nothing in the system had signalled the risk in advance. They now want a single supplier record shared across solutions, a clear onboarding gate before any supplier can transact, and risk visibility that works quietly in the background alongside day to day buying.
The Team
Ana leads procurement and wants the process simple and repeatable. Marco, an IT analyst, cares about how the supplier record connects to the back end vendor master. Priya, a category buyer, wants to know exactly when a new supplier is allowed to receive orders. Together they must decide which Ariba supplier management capabilities to adopt and in what order, without over engineering the rollout.
Program Goals
The team wants one authoritative supplier record used everywhere, a predictable path from proposing a supplier to letting it transact, and continuous risk monitoring that runs alongside rather than blocking the flow. They are not trying to build everything at once. They want the core architecture and sequence right first, so later work on qualification and preferred status has a solid foundation.
Your assignment
You are advising Dorven Components as it stands up SAP Ariba Supplier Management. For each question, choose the single best answer that reflects real SAP Ariba Supplier Lifecycle and Performance and Supplier Risk behaviour
1. CHALLENGE 1 — Choosing the Right Supplier Management Solution
• Distinguish SLP from Supplier Risk and from the classic SIPM architecture.
• Confirm what the unified vendor model means for the supplier record.
• Clarify where risk monitoring sits relative to onboarding.
Checkpoints
• The team can state which solution owns the request to qualification lifecycle.
• The team agrees risk monitoring runs alongside, not as an onboarding step.
2. CHALLENGE 2 — Sequencing the Onboarding Process
• State the core onboarding sequence in order.

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

• Define what a supplier request represents.
• Identify the gate that must pass before transacting.

Checkpoints

• Everyone can recite the request to segmentation order.
• The team agrees transacting is gated behind registration and qualification.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Connecting Supplier Management to Procurement

• Describe how Supplier Management integrates with the back end vendor master.
• Identify an AI capability that improves data quality.

Checkpoints

• The team confirms master data integration keeps identifiers aligned.
• The team knows duplicate detection runs at request time.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Choosing the Right Supplier Management Solution
Ana wants one supplier record and a structured path of request, registration, qualification, and segmentation. Which solution provides these supplier lifecycle capabilities?

A. SAP Ariba Supplier Lifecycle and Performance (SLP)
B. SAP Ariba Supplier Risk, which aggregates a risk exposure score across financial, operational, and regulatory categories for every supplier
C. SAP Ariba Supplier Information and Performance Management, the classic predecessor architecture
D. SAP Ariba Buying, the transactional procurement solution

Answer: A

Explanation:
SLP owns the supplier lifecycle of request, registration, qualification, and segmentation or preferred status.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Choosing the Right Supplier Management Solution
Marco asks how the supplier record behaves across Ariba solutions under the unified vendor model. What is true?

A. Each Ariba solution keeps its own separate supplier record that must be manually reconciled every time any single supplier detail changes
B. A single supplier record is shared across the Ariba solutions
C. Only Supplier Risk stores a supplier record and the others link to it by email
D. Supplier records exist only in Buying and are copied nightly to Sourcing

Answer: B

Explanation:
The unified vendor model means one supplier record is shared across the Ariba solutions.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 1 — Choosing the Right Supplier Management Solution
Priya asks where supplier risk monitoring fits relative to onboarding. Which statement is correct?

A. Risk monitoring is a mandatory final onboarding step that every supplier must clear before any registration questionnaire can even be started
B. Risk monitoring replaces the qualification process entirely
C. Risk monitoring runs alongside the lifecycle, not as a step within onboarding
D. Risk monitoring exists only in the classic SIPM architecture

Answer: C

Explanation:
Risk monitoring runs alongside the lifecycle so risk signals inform decisions without being an onboarding gate.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 2 — Sequencing the Onboarding Process
Priya asks for the correct order of the core supplier onboarding process. Which sequence is right?

A. Qualification first, then a request, then registration, and finally a separate re registration before segmentation can be considered by the category team
B. Registration first, then the request, then qualification
C. Segmentation first, then registration, then the request
D. Request, then registration, then qualification, then segmentation or preferred

Answer: D

Explanation:
The core flow proposes a supplier (request), collects data (registration), qualifies it, then segments or marks it preferred.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 2 — Sequencing the Onboarding Process
Marco wants a plain definition of a supplier request. What does it represent?

A. The entry point that proposes adding a supplier
B. A finalized legal contract that binds the supplier to Dorven Components terms and immediately allows purchase orders to be issued against it
C. The qualification decision for a category
D. The preferred status award for a region

Answer: A

Explanation:
A supplier request is the entry point proposing that a supplier be added.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 2 — Sequencing the Onboarding Process
Priya asks when a new supplier is allowed to transact in Buying or Sourcing. When does that happen?

A. Immediately after the internal requester submits the request, before any approval or registration questionnaire has been completed at all
B. After passing the registration and qualification gate
C. Only after being removed from the preferred list
D. Never, because Supplier Management blocks all transactions

Answer: B

Explanation:
Transacting is gated behind completing registration and qualification.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 3 — Connecting Supplier Management to Procurement
Marco asks how Supplier Management keeps the back end ERP vendor master aligned. How does it integrate?

A. By exporting a printed supplier directory each quarter that procurement staff manually key into the ERP vendor master by hand
B. By replacing the ERP vendor master entirely with the Ariba Network
C. Through master data integration that matches supplier identifiers
D. By disabling the ERP so only Ariba stores vendors

Answer: C

Explanation:
Master data integration matches and aligns supplier identifiers between Ariba and the buyer back end.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 3 — Connecting Supplier Management to Procurement
Ana wants an AI capability that helps keep supplier data clean. Which one applies?

A. Automatic generation of legally binding purchase contracts complete with negotiated pricing for every newly requested supplier without human review
B. Automatic approval of every registration questionnaire
C. Automatic deletion of suppliers that have any open risk alert
D. Duplicate supplier detection during requests

Answer: D

Explanation:
Duplicate detection at request time is an AI capability that prevents creating redundant supplier records.
Topic: 2
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 9

Breven Components runs SAP Ariba across sourcing, buying, and contracts from a single office in Turku, Finland. Last month a buyer raised a purchase order against a vendor that had never completed onboarding, and finance later discovered its bank details were unverified. The procurement lead wants suppliers to reach the transacting solutions only after supplier management has vetted them, working from the unified supplier record shared across the Ariba solutions instead of separate vendor lists per module. The team debates whether to police this by hand, build a spreadsheet check, or rely on a built-in control. They want one governance gate that holds no matter which module a buyer starts in, and that keeps a single supplier identity intact across sourcing, buying, and contracts rather than drifting apart per solution.
How should the consultant enforce that suppliers can transact only after Supplier Management vetting?

A. Use the registration and qualification gate so a supplier must be registered and qualified before it can transact in Buying, Sourcing, or Contracts.
B. Have each buyer keep a shared spreadsheet of approved vendors and manually cross-check every purchase order against it before release, escalating to the procurement lead whenever a vendor is missing from the list.
C. Create a separate vendor master in each Ariba solution so every module maintains its own approved supplier list independently.
D. Rely on the Supplier Risk dashboard alerts to block any purchase order raised against an unvetted supplier.

Answer: A

Explanation:
The registration and qualification gate is the built-in control that stops a supplier from transacting in the procurement solutions until Supplier Management has vetted it, all on one shared record.

Question: 10

Calford Instruments imported its vendor master from an on-premise ERP into SAP Ariba and now sees confusion on the supplier management dashboard. One precision-gauge supplier carries an ERP vendor

ID in the back end and a separate Ariba Network ID after it linked its account, and a junior analyst assumed these were two different companies. The primary supplier manager wants the 360-degree profile to present one coherent supplier, with its contacts, registration, and certificate areas intact, not a fragmented view. The team in Graz, Austria is unsure whether the mismatch is a defect or expected behaviour, and how the platform is meant to reconcile the different identifiers each system assigns. They want a dashboard search to return a single, correct supplier rather than several partial echoes of the same vendor.
How should the consultant explain and resolve the differing supplier identifiers?

A. Manually merge the two entries by deleting the record that carries the Ariba Network ID and re-keying its contacts, certificates, and registration answers under the ERP vendor ID so only one identifier survives across the platform.
B. Recognize that the SM vendor ID, ERP vendor ID, and Ariba Network ID are distinct by design and are matched during integration to one supplier record.
C. Treat the Ariba Network ID as the single master identifier and discard the ERP vendor ID from the supplier profile.
D. Raise a duplicate supplier request so the D&B check can merge the two identities into one.

Answer: B

Explanation:
SMVendorID, ERP vendor ID, and ANID legitimately differ; integration matching maps them to the same supplier so the 360 profile stays unified.

Question: 11

Fenhaven Foundry casts specialty alloys and adds new metal suppliers as projects shift. Last quarter two buyers independently proposed the same scrap-metal vendor, and because each typed the details fresh, the platform ended up with two near-identical suppliers that later diverged in spend reporting. The category manager wants the entry point that proposes a new supplier to catch this before any record is created, ideally enriching the proposal with external business data so requesters do not rekey addresses by hand. The team in Bilbao, Spain also wants internal requesters and any self-registration invites routed through the same safeguard. They are weighing whether to keep cleaning up duplicates after the fact or stop them at the moment someone proposes the supplier, before divergent spend history has a chance to accumulate on two competing records.
How should the consultant prevent duplicate suppliers from being created through the request process?

A. Schedule a monthly reconciliation where an analyst exports all suppliers, sorts them by name and address, manually identifies likely duplicates, and merges the matching pairs after they have already been transacting for weeks.
B. Require every new supplier to be added only through an external self-registration invite so buyers can never enter one internally.
C. Use the supplier request with its built-in D&B lookup and duplicate check so a proposed supplier is matched against existing records before one is created.
D. Turn off internal supplier requests entirely and create suppliers directly in the back-end ERP instead.

Answer: C

Explanation:
The supplier request runs a D&B lookup and duplicate check at entry, matching against existing suppliers so a duplicate is never created.

Question: 12

Halcombe Textiles is migrating a batch of long-standing mills that legal and finance already vetted through an acquisition due-diligence exercise. Forcing each one through the full registration questionnaire feels redundant, and the onboarding team in Porto, Portugal is frustrated that trusted mills sit in an Invited state waiting to answer legal, bank, and tax questions the buyer already holds. The supplier manager wants these pre-approved mills usable quickly while ordinary new suppliers still complete the standard questionnaire and approval. At the same time, one mill's registration was denied on a technicality and must be reworked rather than abandoned. The team wants the sanctioned way to fast-track the vetted mills without inventing an off-platform workaround that would leave the supplier records incomplete and untraceable.
How should the consultant onboard the already-vetted mills within Supplier Management?

A. Invite every mill to the standard registration questionnaire but pre-fill each legal, bank, and tax field on their behalf, then walk each supplier contact through submitting the answers so the full approval workflow still runs end to end.
B. Cancel the in-progress registrations and create the mills as suppliers directly, skipping Supplier Management altogether.
C. Mark the denied registration as registered manually so it no longer needs reworking.
D. Bypass registration for the pre-approved mills so they are onboarded without the full questionnaire, while new suppliers still complete standard registration.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Supplier Management supports bypassing registration for pre-approved suppliers, onboarding them without the full questionnaire while others follow the standard flow.

Question: 13

Jorgarde Logistics relies on carriers whose liability insurance and safety certifications lapse on rolling dates. Today an admin tracks these in a personal calendar, and last month a carrier kept hauling loads three weeks after its insurance certificate had expired because nobody was reminded. The compliance lead wants each certificate type held on the supplier profile with its own expiration, so the platform can flag expiring and expired documents and prompt the carrier to submit a fresh one, independent of any registration cycle. The team in Antwerp, Belgium also wants to collect a one-off compliance attestation from carriers that is reusable and not bolted onto registration. They are deciding how to structure this so certificate currency is enforced by the system rather than by one person's memory.
How should the consultant manage certificate expiration and the reusable attestation?

A. Hold each certificate with its type and expiration in the certificates area so expiring and expired ones are flagged, and capture the attestation via a standalone modular questionnaire.
B. Have the compliance lead maintain a shared spreadsheet of every carrier's certificate dates, set personal reminders a month ahead, and email each carrier individually to request renewed documents whenever a date approaches.
C. Attach the certificate and the attestation to the registration questionnaire so they are only revisited when registration is updated.
D. Rely on the qualification process to re-check certificate validity each time a supplier is qualified for a category.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Certificate types with expirations let the platform flag expiring and expired certificates and prompt renewal, and a standalone modular questionnaire captures reusable data outside registration.

Question: 14

Lomholt Ceramics sources raw glazes and kiln parts, and its quality team insists a supplier proven for one material must not be treated as approved for everything. Under the old approach, a glaze vendor qualified for tableware glazes was informally assumed fit for structural ceramics too, and a defect batch slipped through as a result. The category manager in Faenza, Italy wants qualification scoped to specific categories and regions, with a clear umbrella to also handle disqualifying or discontinuing a supplier when quality drops. The team is moving off legacy qualifications and wants a sanctioned structure that records status decisions and internal questionnaires per process. They ask how to model this so a supplier's approval is never broader than the categories and regions it was actually assessed for.
How should the consultant structure supplier qualification for specific categories and regions?

A. Keep the legacy qualification record but add a free-text note on the supplier profile listing which categories and regions each buyer believes the vendor is acceptable for, and ask buyers to consult that note before every award.
B. Run qualification through a process project that qualifies the supplier for specific categories and regions, using the same umbrella to disqualify or discontinue when needed.
C. Qualify the supplier once at the company level so any category or region can use it without a separate assessment.
D. Mark the supplier as preferred for the tableware category instead of qualifying it, since preferred status already proves eligibility.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Process projects are the umbrella for qualification scoped to specific categories and regions, and for disqualification and discontinuation, replacing legacy qualifications.

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

