

Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP

C_CE325_2601

**SAP Certified - Configuration Consultant - Concur Expense
Professional Edition**



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 heritage rail operator is refining support responsibilities in Concur Expense Professional Edition ahead of a multi-city restoration program. The tenant is public cloud and managed through a web-based UI. Central support wants depot administrators to maintain selected non-sensitive supporting administration locally so routine traveler corrections are resolved faster during the program. Finance accepts limited delegation, but warns that local teams must not gain authority over settings that could alter how expense behavior is experienced across depots or introduce inconsistent administrative practices.

Leadership wants measurable backlog reduction before program launch, but it also wants a model that remains maintainable once the restoration program ends. The consultant must recommend a support design that improves local responsiveness without weakening tenant-wide control discipline.

Which recommendation best fits the stated objective?

Response:

- A. Expand depot administrator authority broadly so most support requests can be handled locally without central escalation during the restoration program.
- B. Keep all administration centralized and rely on stricter ticket response targets so no local delegation can introduce inconsistent behavior.
- C. Split administrative ownership entirely by depot so each location can tune its own settings to match operational needs during the program.
- D. Delegate only clearly bounded supporting administrative responsibilities to depot administrators, while keeping behavior-sensitive settings under central ownership.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario asks for backlog reduction without weakening long-term governance. This option directly supports that by giving local teams bounded responsibility for routine supporting administration while retaining centrally controlled ownership of settings with broader behavioral impact. That improves responsiveness and remains sustainable after the program ends.

Question: 2

A child advocacy travel service is introducing a new expense flow in Concur Expense Professional Edition for supervised placement-review visits. The environment is public cloud and administered through a web-based UI. Finance needs consistent structured reference data for local transport and temporary-lodging expenses so donor-funded reconciliation remains accurate. The safeguarding lead has also warned that staff must not enter broad child-identifying notes into ordinary fields visible during review. Program managers need the flow active before the next review cycle and do not want unrelated forms across the tenant redesigned.

Two viable approaches remain: one preserves flexible free-text entry for staff convenience, while the other narrows field behavior only in the affected flow and relies on structured reference capture. The consultant must recommend the best configuration approach under the stated privacy and reporting constraints.

Which action should the consultant recommend?

Response:

- A. Keep the current free-text model for the affected expenses and train approvers to remove overly specific child details during review.
- B. Apply targeted field controls on the affected forms so only required non-identifying reference data is captured in a structured way for those placement-review expenses.
- C. Add a mandatory case-note field to every expense form in the tenant so reporting becomes more complete in all travel scenarios.
- D. Create separate placement-review forms by region so local managers can decide how much detail each team should enter.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario requires both stronger donor reconciliation and tighter protection against exposure of sensitive personal details. This option addresses both at source by limiting the affected flow to structured, non-identifying reference capture only where needed. That improves consistency, reduces safeguarding risk, and avoids a broader redesign of unrelated forms.

Question: 3

A district cooling maintenance company is updating Concur Expense Professional Edition before a summer outage-readiness program. The environment is public cloud and administered through a web-based UI. Finance wants additional pre-reimbursement review for urgent chiller-part courier claims because exception rates rise when technicians arrange same-day pickups during unplanned cooling interruptions. Operations agrees that true outage-response courier activity needs tighter control, but warns that if the policy conditions are too broad, routine scheduled parts movements will also move into slower approval and delay preventive maintenance.

Two governance-aligned strategies remain under review. One broadens the stricter path for all courier activity during the readiness window. The other limits it to claims meeting defined outage-response conditions, but requires more careful policy upkeep. Reviewer capacity is fixed and cannot be expanded during the program.

Which approach should the consultant recommend?

Response:

- A. Create a temporary readiness-program workflow for all logistics claims so urgent and routine courier activity are managed under one seasonal structure.
- B. Define policy conditions so only courier claims meeting the outage-response criteria enter the stricter review path, while scheduled parts movement remains on standard workflow.
- C. Keep the current workflow unchanged and ask maintenance supervisors to notify approvers separately whenever a courier claim should be treated as urgent.
- D. Route all courier claims through the stricter review path during the readiness program so no outage-response case bypasses additional control.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario requires tighter control for a specific high-risk pattern without expanding approval friction to ordinary activity. This option ties the stricter path to the actual outage-response condition and preserves the normal workflow for scheduled parts movements. That satisfies both governance and the fixed reviewer-capacity constraint.

Question: 4

An international language-testing provider is adding a candidate-relocation stipend program in Concur Expense Professional Edition. The public-cloud tenant already supports standard employee travel and examiner out-of-pocket reimbursements through the web interface. Finance requires the new stipend to remain separately traceable because it is funded under a restricted program budget and must not be blended into normal operating reimbursement. Operations wants a simple user experience because regional coordinators will be managing the stipend process during a busy examination season. One option would reuse the existing examiner reimbursement setup to reduce change effort. Another would introduce more precise configuration relationships for the stipend while leaving current employee and examiner processing unchanged. There is one approved change window before the next international test cycle begins.

Which recommendation should the consultant make?

Response:

- A. Configure the candidate-relocation stipend with relationships that preserve distinct downstream treatment while leaving the existing employee and examiner reimbursement structures unchanged.
- B. Reuse the existing examiner reimbursement handling so coordinators can process stipends through the most familiar structure during the exam season.
- C. Consolidate the stipend and standard reimbursements into one shared treatment model so finance can reduce classification effort during close.
- D. Keep the current setup and ask finance to separate stipend-related transactions manually during restricted-budget reporting until a later release.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The stated requirement is downstream separation for a restricted-budget stipend without destabilizing current reimbursement processing. This Option satisfies that by giving the new stipend its own treatment relationship while protecting the employee and examiner structures already in use. That preserves accounting clarity and respects the single approved change window.

Question: 5

A regional engineering company is finalizing its initial Concur Expense Professional Edition setup in a public-cloud, web-based environment. The project team has configured report submission, core expense categories, and approval routing for most employees. During pilot testing, support consultants find that newly hired field supervisors can open expense reports, but several core behaviors do not apply consistently after submission. Some of those users bypass intended defaults that work correctly for the rest of the workforce.

The HR integration for user onboarding will not be changed before go-live. Finance wants the rollout to stay on schedule, but leadership has stated that core expense behavior must be applied consistently from the first day of production. The consultant must recommend a configuration-focused action that stabilizes behavior without forcing a redesign of unrelated components.

What should the consultant recommend?

Response:

- A. Expand reviewer checks after submission so exceptions created by new field supervisors can be corrected manually during approval.
- B. Verify the upstream configuration relationships that determine how the affected employee population inherits core expense behavior, and correct that assignment path before go-live.
- C. Duplicate the working setup into a separate configuration branch for field supervisors so their reports stop depending on the standard setup.
- D. Delay core behavior enforcement for new hires and let the payroll team reconcile any mismatches during the first reimbursement cycle.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario points to a second-order dependency issue rather than a simple data-entry problem. The affected users can access the system, but core expense behavior is not applied consistently. That means the symptom appears during report behavior, while the root cause is more likely in the upstream configuration relationship that determines how that user population inherits baseline expense setup. B addresses the dependency chain at the correct level without redesigning the wider tenant.

Question: 6

A hydrographic mapping company is onboarding a temporary sonar-survey workforce into Concur Expense Professional Edition for a three-month coastal contract. The environment is public cloud and administered through the web UI. During pilot activity, the new users can access report creation and save entries, but several expected baseline expense behaviors do not apply consistently once reports

move forward for submission. The project lead cannot delay field deployment because the survey vessel schedule is fixed. Finance has also stated that repeated manual correction during the first reimbursement cycle is not acceptable because the same team is closing month-end project reporting. The external workforce onboarding source will not be redesigned during this contract phase. The consultant must recommend a configuration action that restores consistent baseline behavior without introducing a parallel long-term setup just for the temporary survey workforce.

Which recommendation should the consultant make?

Response:

- A. Create a separate survey-program baseline setup so the temporary workforce no longer depends on the standard inheritance path used by existing users.
- B. Keep the current setup and assign finance reviewers to correct inconsistent survey reports manually during the first reimbursement cycle.
- C. Review and correct the upstream configuration relationship that determines how the survey workforce inherits the intended baseline expense behavior before activation.
- D. Delay activation for the temporary workforce until the onboarding source can be redesigned in a later release cycle.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The users can already create and save reports, so the problem is not basic access. The inconsistency appears later when baseline behavior should be applied, which points to a second-order dependency issue in the inheritance relationship for this population. This option addresses the upstream cause directly and preserves a cleaner, more maintainable structure.

Question: 7

A coastal wind-turbine maintenance contractor is extending Concur Expense Professional Edition to a temporary blade-inspection team for a seven-week offshore service program. The environment is public cloud and administered through a web-based UI. During pilot execution, the new team can create expense reports and save entries, but several baseline expense behaviors expected for that population do not apply consistently once reports move into submission. The operations lead cannot delay activation because vessel schedules and weather windows are already fixed. Finance has also stated that repeated manual correction during the first reimbursement cycle is not sustainable because the same analysts are supporting contract-close review.

The external staffing feed will remain unchanged during this release. The consultant must recommend a configuration action that restores consistent baseline behavior without creating a separate long-term setup that will require retirement after the program ends.

Which recommendation best fits the scenario?

Response:

- A. Create a dedicated offshore-program baseline setup so the temporary team no longer depends on the standard inheritance path used by existing users.
- B. Delay activation for the temporary team until the external staffing feed can be redesigned in a later project phase.

- C. Review and correct the upstream configuration relationship that determines how the inspection team inherits the intended baseline expense setup before activation.
- D. Keep the current setup and assign finance analysts to correct inconsistent team reports manually during the first reimbursement cycle.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The team can already create and save reports, so the issue is not basic access. The inconsistency appears later, when baseline behavior should be applied during submission. That points to a second-order dependency issue in the upstream relationship governing inherited setup. This option fixes that root cause directly and preserves a maintainable structure for a temporary user population.

Question: 8

A behavioral health nonprofit is configuring a new expense flow in Concur Expense Professional Edition for outreach counselors who submit local transport and short-stay expenses tied to protected client engagements. The environment is public cloud and administered through a web-based UI. Finance needs enough reference detail to support auditability, but the privacy officer has warned that counselors must not enter broad client-identifying text into standard expense fields because too many approvers can view those entries during review. Program managers also want the new flow live before the next grant-reporting cycle and do not want a tenant-wide redesign of unrelated forms. Two viable approaches remain: one preserves full free-text flexibility for counselor notes, while another narrows entry behavior in the affected flow and relies on controlled reference handling. The consultant must recommend the best configuration approach under the stated privacy and reporting constraints. Which recommendation best fits the scenario?

Response:

- A. Keep the current free-text entry model for the affected expenses and train approvers to ignore sensitive details that appear during review.
- B. Apply targeted field controls on the affected expense forms so only the required non-identifying reference data is captured in a structured way for those counselor expenses.
- C. Add a mandatory privacy disclaimer field to every form in the tenant so users can confirm that any client details they enter are appropriate.
- D. Create separate counselor forms by program so local managers can define their own note-entry standards for each outreach team.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario requires two things at once: enough reporting support for auditability and reduced exposure of sensitive client-related information in ordinary review paths. This option addresses the source of the problem by changing field behavior only in the affected expense flow and structuring entry

around non-identifying reference data. That improves consistency, supports governance, and avoids unnecessary tenant-wide disruption.

Question: 9

A marine salvage operator is extending Concur Expense Professional Edition to a temporary harbor-recovery team for a six-week vessel-clearance program. The environment is public cloud and administered through a web-based UI. During controlled testing, the new team can create expense reports and save entries, but several baseline expense behaviors expected for that population do not apply consistently once reports progress toward submission. The operations lead cannot delay activation because port-clearance deadlines are fixed. Finance has also stated that manual correction during the first reimbursement cycle is not sustainable because the same analysts are supporting insurance recovery reporting.

The external contractor feed will remain unchanged during this release. The consultant must recommend a configuration action that restores consistent baseline behavior without creating a separate long-term setup that becomes difficult to retire after the recovery program ends.

What is the best recommendation?

Response:

- A. Create a dedicated harbor-recovery baseline setup so the temporary team no longer depends on the standard inheritance path used by existing users.
- B. Keep the current setup and assign finance analysts to correct inconsistent recovery-team reports during the first reimbursement cycle.
- C. Review and correct the upstream configuration relationship that determines how the harbor-recovery team inherits the intended baseline expense setup before activation.
- D. Delay activation for the temporary team until the external contractor feed can be redesigned in a later release phase.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The team can already create and save reports, so the issue is not basic access. The inconsistency appears later when baseline expense behavior should be applied during submission, which indicates a second-order dependency problem in the upstream relationship that governs inherited setup. This option fixes that root cause while preserving a cleaner lifecycle model for a temporary population.

Question: 10

A mountain rescue training provider is preparing Concur Expense Professional Edition for a multi-region winter instruction season. The environment is public cloud and administered through a web-based UI. Central support wants course-center coordinators to maintain selected non-sensitive supporting administration locally because routine traveler corrections and value-maintenance requests are increasing. Finance supports limited delegation, but warns that local coordinators must not gain authority over settings that could create inconsistent behavior between centers or weaken centrally governed controls tied to expense handling.

Leadership wants measurable backlog reduction before seasonal travel intensifies, but it also wants a support model that remains stable after the winter program ends. The consultant must recommend an administrative design that improves local responsiveness without fragmenting long-term governance. Which recommendation best fits the stated objective?

Response:

- A. Expand course-center coordinator authority broadly so most support requests can be resolved locally without central escalation during the season.
- B. Keep all administration centralized and rely on tighter response targets so no delegated access introduces cross-center inconsistency.
- C. Split administrative ownership fully by training center so each location can adjust its own settings to match local operational demands.
- D. Delegate only clearly bounded supporting administrative responsibilities to course-center coordinators, while retaining behavior-sensitive settings under central ownership.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario asks for faster local support, but only within a controlled governance boundary. This Option provides that balance by delegating routine, bounded secondary administration while keeping settings with broader behavioral impact under central ownership. That reduces backlog and improves responsiveness without creating center-specific divergence that becomes difficult to govern later.

Topic: 2

Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Mixed Report Entry Behavior for Event-Driven Spend

During hypercare, Meridian Venues finds that venue managers can submit a report containing local transport and hosted meals without obvious blocking issues, but finance reviewers later see that the supporting detail is inconsistent when those lines appear together. The program office wants to preserve the live baseline for later rollout waves. Which action is the best fit?

Response:

- A. Ask reviewers to request the missing detail after submission and keep the current mixed-report behavior unchanged.
- B. Tighten the entry behavior for the mixed-report scenario so the report captures the stronger supporting-detail requirement when the more controlled spend type is present.
- C. Split the live baseline into separate site-specific report structures for each venue type.
- D. Remove hosted meals from mixed reports so venue teams always submit them separately.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario points to a mixed-report dependency problem in live entry behavior, not simply a reviewer training issue. The best correction is to align entry logic so the report reflects the stronger control requirement when combined spend patterns appear, while preserving the reusable baseline.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 1 — Mixed Report Entry Behavior for Event-Driven Spend

Venue supervisors say fast completion is essential during event days, while finance wants less follow-up for mixed reports that include higher-control spend types. Which configuration direction best supports both needs?

Response:

- A. Preserve the fast entry path for all report combinations and rely on review teams to identify which lines need stronger documentation.
- B. Make all spend types follow the highest-control entry path, regardless of report content, so finance never has to interpret mixed reports.
- C. Keep the live entry path compact for common low-control spend, but apply tighter behavior only when mixed-report content includes spend that carries stronger supporting-detail expectations.
- D. Delay any adjustment until after the next rollout wave so venue users do not experience entry changes during hypercare.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option best matches the scenario's performance-versus-governance weighting. It preserves operational speed for common venue activity while tightening behavior only where mixed-content reports create downstream inconsistency.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 1 — Mixed Report Entry Behavior for Event-Driven Spend

A mixed report behaves correctly when it contains only urgent supply purchases and local transport, but becomes inconsistent when hosted meals are added to the same report. What is the most appropriate conclusion?

Response:

- A. The review workflow is the main source of the problem because all entry behavior is already valid once the report can be submitted.
- B. The mixed-report entry behavior is not sufficiently reacting to the presence of the spend type with stronger supporting-detail expectations.
- C. The live baseline should be abandoned because mixed reports are not supportable in hypercare.
- D. The only practical answer is to train venue managers to remember which combinations require more detail.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This is a second-order misalignment: the basic entry path works for lower-control combinations but not when a more governed spend type joins the same report. The correct diagnosis is that mixed-report logic is too weakly tied to the more controlled scenario.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 2 — Payment Type Treatment and Review Path Consistency

A live report that contains only reimbursable items moves through review as expected, and a report with only company-paid items also behaves acceptably. Review inconsistency appears mainly when both payment types are combined in one report. Which interpretation best fits the scenario?

Response:

- A. Payment-type setup is probably acceptable in isolation, but the interaction between mixed payment content and downstream review handling is not aligned tightly enough.
- B. The payment-type design is fully correct because both single-pattern report types work independently.
- C. Review inconsistency in mixed reports is mainly a receipt-image issue rather than a payment-treatment issue.
- D. Mixed payment reports should be removed from the live operating model until the next rollout wave.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The strongest interpretation is that the live design holds up for isolated scenarios but not for the interaction between mixed payment behavior and review handling. This indicates a multi-layer dependency, not a purely missing configuration element.

Question: 15

CHALLENGE 2 — Payment Type Treatment and Review Path Consistency

Finance wants reviewers to move quickly during hypercare, but also wants mixed payment reports to be treated more consistently before first close. Which direction is most appropriate?

Response:

- A. Keep the current treatment and allow reviewers to decide case by case how mixed payment reports should be handled.
- B. Validate and tighten the mixed payment handling path so representative reports can move through review without repeated manual interpretation.
- C. Route every mixed payment report to a central specialist so no normal review path is used during hypercare.
- D. Convert all mixed payment reports into reimbursable reports so review becomes more uniform.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This best supports both throughput and control by improving consistency in the actual mixed-payment review path. It avoids forcing all reports into specialist handling or depending on variable manual judgment.

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-ce325-2601>