

Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP

C_TS4CO_2601

**SAP Certified - SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition,
Management 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

A regional media production company is adding a new post-production unit to its SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition management accounting structure. The unit's cost center exists, and test vendor expenses post successfully to accounting. During validation, the expenses appear in a general overhead report, but the post-production manager cannot retrieve them in the unit-level responsibility view for the same posting period.

The observable artifact is an activation inconsistency: the cost center is available for posting, but the responsibility view does not behave as expected. The constraint is to keep the approved unit structure and avoid reposting expenses until the master data and reporting relationship are verified. The environment is system-based, mixed UI, and functional configuration oriented.

What should the consultant validate first to correct the unit-level responsibility view?

Response:

- A. Repost the vendor expenses so the post-production manager can retrieve the transactions from the unit-level report.
- B. Validate the cost center's responsibility assignment and effective reporting relationship for the relevant posting period.
- C. Create a separate temporary report that filters general overhead costs by the post-production unit's expense types.
- D. Change the cost center description and responsible manager text so users can identify the unit more clearly.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the issue occurs after successful posting and before unit-level retrieval. Validating the responsibility assignment and effective reporting relationship addresses the configuration and master data layer that determines whether posted costs appear under the intended responsibility view.

Question: 2

A household appliance manufacturer is preparing a pilot product cost estimate in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition after introducing a new valuation approach for selected finished goods. The estimate is created successfully, and the costing result is visible to finance. However, the planned cost does not

reflect the agreed valuation approach for a component that production planning considers critical to margin review.

The observable artifact is a valuation-rule mismatch: the estimate exists, but one component's planned value does not follow the expected costing basis. The constraint is to avoid changing the component planning data until configuration influence has been confirmed. The environment is system-based, functional configuration oriented, and aligned to a hybrid lifecycle implementation context.

What should the consultant do first to correct the planned component valuation issue?

Response:

- A. Validate the costing and valuation configuration that determines how the component value is derived in the material cost estimate.
- B. Change the component planning data immediately so the next estimate matches the agreed margin-review expectation.
- C. Release the estimate and let profitability reporting identify whether the component value creates a material planning variance.
- D. Create a manual planning adjustment for the component so finance can complete the pilot margin review on schedule.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the cost estimate exists but does not reflect the intended valuation basis for a critical component. Validating costing and valuation configuration addresses the layer that determines how planned component values are derived before planning data or downstream analysis is changed.

Question: 3

A regional translation services company is configuring SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition management accounting for a newly created localization quality unit. The cost center is active, and test expenses for review software post successfully to financial accounting. During validation, the postings are visible in a direct cost center report, but the quality unit is still grouped under the former language operations responsibility view in the current management summary.

The observable artifact is a responsibility transition mismatch: current-period costs exist, but the management summary retrieves them through the previous organizational alignment. The constraint is to preserve prior-period reporting and avoid reposting current expenses until the assignment timeline is verified. The environment is system-based, mixed UI, and functional configuration focused within a mixed SAP S/4HANA lifecycle.

Which action best addresses the cause of the current responsibility classification issue?

Response:

- A. Change the former language operations responsibility view globally so all prior and current costs align with the new unit.
- B. Repost the review software expenses so the current management summary can classify the values under the quality unit.
- C. Create a manual adjustment line that moves the current values into the localization quality responsibility summary.

D. Validate the effective-dated cost center assignment and responsibility relationship used for current-period summary retrieval.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because current values are still retrieved through the former responsibility alignment.

Validating the effective-dated cost center assignment and responsibility relationship targets the master data and configuration layer that determines current-period classification.

Question: 4

A specialty foods manufacturer is testing cost object controlling in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition for a new batch-production process. Actual material and production costs collect during the month, and preliminary costing values are visible. At period end, the closing activity completes, but the validation report shows that only objects with a completed production state receive final period-end results.

The observable artifact is a lifecycle-state dependency mismatch: cost data exists, but final period-end outcomes depend on object readiness. The constraint is to avoid changing production status solely for reporting and avoid manual completion entries. The environment is system-based, mixed UI, and functional configuration focused for management accounting close validation.

What should the consultant validate first to resolve the missing final period-end results?

Response:

A. Manually complete the missing period-end results so the validation report reflects all batch-production objects.

B. Broaden the close validation report to include both active and completed production states for the current period.

C. Validate the cost object lifecycle state and processing conditions that control eligibility for final period-end results.

D. Copy final results from completed objects to active objects that use the same batch-production process.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because cost data exists while final results depend on object readiness. Validating lifecycle state and processing conditions targets the layer that determines whether each cost object can receive final period-end outcomes during close.

Question: 5

A regional airport services provider is configuring SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition to track seasonal runway inspection work using internal orders. The pilot order is active, and safety equipment purchases

post successfully to accounting. During validation, labor support costs appear in the internal order analysis, but equipment-related inspection costs remain visible only in the general overhead view. The observable artifact is a selective cost update mismatch: one campaign cost type updates the monitoring object, while another valid cost type does not. The constraint is to preserve the approved inspection campaign structure and avoid reversing posted purchasing documents until the update dependency is verified. The environment is system-based, mixed UI, and functional configuration focused within a hybrid SAP S/4HANA lifecycle context.

What should the consultant validate first to resolve the missing equipment-related costs in the internal order analysis?

Response:

- A. Create a separate internal order for equipment purchases so the campaign can distinguish inspection cost categories more clearly.
- B. Reverse and repost the equipment purchase documents after confirming that labor support costs update the pilot order.
- C. Validate the assignment and update logic that determines whether equipment-related postings are captured by the intended internal order.
- D. Build a combined overhead report that displays general equipment costs beside internal order labor costs for the pilot period.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the artifact shows that valid costs exist but only selected cost types update the internal order. Validating assignment and update logic targets the configuration layer that determines whether equipment-related postings are captured by the intended campaign object.

Question: 6

A regional hospitality group is moving part of its cost planning review into SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition while keeping legacy review files available during transition. Approved planning values for housekeeping, catering support, and maintenance have been entered. The management report opens successfully and reconciles at total plan level, but the service-area comparison view does not match the approved review baseline.

The observable artifact is a planning comparison mismatch: data is present and totals reconcile, but the management view used for service-area decisions is unreliable. The constraint is to avoid changing approved plan values and preserve the limited modernization scope. The environment is system-based, mixed UI, and functional configuration focused with moderate transition pressure.

What should the consultant validate first to correct the service-area comparison view?

Response:

- A. Continue using legacy review files for service-area comparison because SAP total plan values already reconcile.
- B. Change the approved planning values by service area so the comparison report matches the current SAP output.

- C. Validate the planning assignments and reporting dimension configuration used to classify values by service area.
- D. Restrict the report to total plan values until service-area planning is included in a later transition phase.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because totals reconcile while the service-area view is inconsistent. Validating planning assignments and reporting dimension configuration addresses the layer that determines how approved plan values are classified and retrieved for management analysis.

Question: 7

A regional consumer goods company is testing its first management accounting period-end cycle after moving selected controlling processes into SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. Production orders have collected actual costs during the period, and finance expects settlement results to support management reporting. During validation, the period-end activity completes for some objects, but several cost objects remain excluded from the expected reporting output.

The observable artifact is an execution inconsistency: period-end processing runs, but only part of the cost object population is reflected in the validation report. The constraint is to correct the cause without redesigning the closing calendar or changing the approved production scenario. The environment is system-based and functional configuration oriented, requiring the consultant to reason through configuration, object eligibility, execution, and reporting validation.

What should the consultant do first to correct the incomplete period-end result?

Response:

- A. Extend the reporting variant to include all production-related cost objects so the validation report captures the missing entries.
- B. Rerun the period-end activity for the same population after confirming that the completed objects appear correctly in reporting.
- C. Validate whether the excluded cost objects meet the configuration and master data conditions required for period-end processing and reporting.
- D. Shift the excluded objects to the next closing cycle so the current period can be finalized using the successfully processed results.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the artifact shows partial execution rather than total period-end failure. The consultant must validate whether excluded cost objects satisfy the setup and eligibility conditions that allow them to be processed and then represented correctly in management accounting reporting.

Question: 8

A regional professional training company is adding a new curriculum support unit to its SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition management accounting structure. The cost center is active, and test expenses for digital course materials post successfully to financial accounting. During validation, finance can retrieve the postings in a direct cost center view, but the current-period responsibility rollup still shows the unit as empty.

The observable artifact is a rollup inclusion inconsistency: transaction data exists, but the approved responsibility view does not retrieve it. The constraint is to preserve the approved organizational effective date and avoid reposting expense documents. The environment is system-based, mixed UI, and functional configuration focused within a mixed SAP S/4HANA lifecycle.

Which action best addresses the upstream cause of the empty responsibility rollup?

Response:

- A. Repost the digital course material expenses so the responsibility rollup can retrieve a fresh set of transactions.
- B. Create a temporary report that reads the direct cost center view and distribute it as the responsibility rollup.
- C. Validate the effective cost center assignment and responsibility rollup relationship for the current reporting period.
- D. Update the cost center description so the curriculum support unit is easier to identify in management reporting.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the cost center and postings exist, but the responsibility rollup remains empty. Validating the effective cost center assignment and rollup relationship targets the master data and configuration layer that determines current-period responsibility retrieval.

Question: 9

A medical device manufacturer is validating period-end activities in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition for a production scenario introduced during its first controlled rollout. Actual costs are collected on production-related cost objects during the month. At close, finance sees the period-end activity finish with no general processing failure, but the validation report shows that variance-related results are available only for some objects.

The observable artifact is a partial close result: processing completes, yet a subset of cost objects does not produce the expected period-end values. The constraint is to avoid adjusting the closing calendar or manually overriding reporting values. The environment is functional configuration focused, with system-based execution and validation across a mixed SAP S/4HANA lifecycle context.

Which action best targets the cause of the incomplete period-end validation result?

Response:

- A. Broaden the validation report selection so all production-related objects are visible before analyzing configuration.

- B. Manually enter the missing period-end values so finance can complete close reporting for the affected objects.
- C. Rerun the period-end activity immediately because the absence of a general failure indicates a timing issue.
- D. Validate the cost object setup and processing eligibility conditions that determine whether period-end values can be calculated.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the artifact shows selective exclusion rather than a complete processing failure. Validating cost object setup and processing eligibility addresses the layer that controls whether period-end values are calculated and then represented in management accounting reporting.

Question: 10

A wholesale electronics company is validating profit center accounting after introducing SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition for a controlled transition from established reporting practices. Sales postings are visible in financial accounting, and profitability reporting produces totals, but the profit center view does not align with the responsibility structure approved for the new operating model. The business wants the pilot to remain limited to the current product line.

The observable artifact is an analytical assignment mismatch: totals are available, but profit center responsibility reporting is unreliable for the pilot scope. The constraint is to correct the assignment behavior without expanding the transition design to additional product lines or reporting dimensions. The environment is system-based and functional configuration focused, with moderate modernization pressure.

Which action best corrects the profit center reporting issue while respecting the pilot constraint?

Response:

- A. Expand the pilot to additional product lines so profit center reporting can be validated against a broader transaction population.
- B. Accept the financial accounting totals for the pilot and defer profit center validation until all transition phases are complete.
- C. Validate the configuration and assignment logic that determines profit center derivation for the current pilot product line.
- D. Replace the approved responsibility structure with a simplified profit center model that matches the visible report totals.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is correct because the issue is not missing transaction totals but unreliable responsibility assignment. Validating configuration and derivation logic for the current pilot product line addresses the layer that determines whether profit center reporting reflects the approved operating model.

Topic: 2
Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Assembly and Repair Activity Allocation Readiness

During UAT, calibration bench labor is posted to the expected repair support cost center. After allocation processing, one repair receiver still shows values under the support cost center view rather than the repair service receiver used for acceptance reporting.

What should the consultant validate first?

Response:

- A. Whether sender postings, activity quantities, activity rates, allocation logic, and repair receiver assignment are aligned for the pilot division.
- B. Whether the UAT dashboard can be filtered so the support cost center view is hidden from service managers.
- C. Whether the repair support cost center balance is complete, because a complete sender balance proves allocation readiness.
- D. Whether the repair receiver value can be manually moved before the acceptance workshop.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The sender posting exists, but the receiver result indicates a dependency across activity setup, allocation logic, and receiver assignment. Validating the full allocation chain supports formal UAT evidence without masking configured behavior.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 1 — Assembly and Repair Activity Allocation Readiness

The UAT team compares assembly line and repair technician allocations. Assembly line allocation has approved activity quantities and receiver assignments. Repair technician allocation has planned quantities, but its receiver assignment was copied from a legacy repair location reference that has not been reviewed.

Which action best supports formal UAT evidence?

Response:

- A. Include both allocations because the allocation process can run successfully for both activity groups.
- B. Validate the copied receiver assignment before treating repair technician allocation as formal acceptance evidence.
- C. Exclude both allocations because any copied receiver reference prevents allocation reporting during UAT.
- D. Replace repair technician receiver values manually so both activity groups appear consistently in the dashboard.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

Repair technician allocation has an unvalidated receiver assignment even though planned quantities exist and processing can run. Validating the copied assignment protects the acceptance baseline while allowing the already validated assembly allocation to support evidence.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 1 — Assembly and Repair Activity Allocation Readiness

An allocation result reconciles at total sender level, but repair service receivers show a lower share than expected while assembly receivers show a higher share. Activity quantities were loaded from the UAT file, but receiver weighting was not reviewed after the repair location hierarchy changed.

What does this indicate?

Response:

- A. The allocation should be accepted because the total sender amount reconciles after processing.
- B. Receiver weighting and the changed repair location hierarchy should be validated before accepting the allocation result.
- C. The sender cost center should be renamed so users understand the cost source more clearly.
- D. The repair location hierarchy should be ignored because total allocation reconciliation is the primary acceptance requirement.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

Sender-level reconciliation confirms that costs were allocated, but not that receiver splits follow the current structure. The hierarchy change creates a second-order dependency through receiver weighting that must be validated.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 1 — Assembly and Repair Activity Allocation Readiness

Operations asks finance to approve allocation dashboards for service commitment discussions before all receiver assignments are validated. Finance can either release provisional dashboards for discussion or delay all service cost visibility until formal UAT evidence is complete.

Which decision best balances the UAT objective?

Response:

- A. Allow provisional service discussion while limiting formal UAT evidence to allocations with validated activity and receiver setup.
- B. Approve all allocation dashboards for formal UAT because customer service commitments are commercially urgent.
- C. Delay every dashboard until all receiver assignments for future manufacturing divisions are reviewed.

D. Manually adjust unvalidated receiver values so provisional dashboards and formal evidence remain identical.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario supports early service visibility, but formal UAT evidence should rely on validated allocation behavior. Separating provisional discussion from formal evidence balances business timing with a reusable acceptance baseline.

Question: 15

CHALLENGE 2 — Warranty Repair Order Settlement Treatment

A warranty repair order contains inspection costs and appears in the customer service campaign report. The order was copied from a legacy service program reference, and no settlement receiver has been validated. Service managers want it included in formal UAT evidence because the customer commitment is active.

What is the best decision?

Response:

- A. Include it in formal evidence because active customer commitments require complete campaign visibility.
- B. Keep it visible for service discussion but exclude it from settlement-ready evidence until the receiver is validated.
- C. Remove it from all campaign reporting because missing settlement readiness invalidates every use of the order.
- D. Post the inspection costs directly to a repair cost center so settlement validation is no longer required.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The order can support customer service visibility, but it cannot support settlement-ready evidence until the settlement receiver is validated. This separates operational discussion from formal management accounting readiness.

Question: 16

CHALLENGE 2 — Warranty Repair Order Settlement Treatment

Finance reviews six warranty repair orders. Four have approved control settings, planned budgets, representative postings, settlement rules, and validated receivers. Two were copied from legacy service references and are still used for customer communication.

Which approach best supports UAT acceptance?

Response:

- A. Include all six orders because customer communication depends on the complete repair campaign list.
- B. Use the four complete orders for formal evidence and keep the copied orders visible as operational discussion items.
- C. Remove all six orders from the UAT pack until copied references are fully validated.
- D. Create manual settlement entries for the copied orders so the full campaign list can be formally approved.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

Formal evidence should rely on orders with complete control, budget, posting, settlement, and receiver readiness. Keeping copied orders visible for discussion supports service teams without overstating the validated UAT scope.

Question: 17

CHALLENGE 2 — Warranty Repair Order Settlement Treatment

A refurbishment order has an approved budget and representative postings, but settlement is configured to a receiver that belongs to a legacy repair grouping. The service program manager argues that the budget and postings are enough for UAT discussion.

What should finance validate before formal inclusion?

Response:

- A. Whether the settlement receiver aligns with the approved management accounting view for the pilot division.
- B. Whether the service program manager confirms the customer still requires refurbishment tracking.
- C. Whether the order budget is large enough to affect the repair campaign report.
- D. Whether the legacy receiver can be hidden from the UAT dashboard layout.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

Budget and postings validate tracking, but the settlement receiver determines whether costs flow into the approved management accounting view. The legacy grouping creates a downstream dependency that must be validated before formal evidence.

Question: 18

CHALLENGE 2 — Warranty Repair Order Settlement Treatment

The UAT pack includes warranty repair orders that are settlement-ready and others that remain tracking-only. A controller proposes using one combined order report with no distinction because service managers prefer a single view.

Which response best protects governance and usability?

Response:

- A. Provide a combined operational view if needed, but mark formal UAT evidence only for orders with validated settlement readiness.
- B. Use the combined report as formal evidence because one view is easier for service managers.
- C. Remove tracking-only orders from every report so no user can confuse them with settlement-ready orders.
- D. Convert tracking-only orders into settlement-ready evidence by applying a manual settlement adjustment.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario requires business visibility and controlled evidence. A combined operational view can support usability, while formal UAT evidence should distinguish orders with validated settlement readiness.

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-ts4co-2601>