

Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP C_CI325

**SAP Certified - Configuration Consultant - Concur Invoice
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. Unified Scenario Simulation
2. Micro Skill Drill Exam

Topic: 1

Unified Scenario Simulation

Business Context

Laventille Pan Foundry hand-tunes chromatically pitched steelpans for touring ensembles and music schools across the Caribbean and North America. The foundry buys rolled steel, chroming services, packing crates, and freight from a mix of local and overseas suppliers. Until this quarter its accounts-payable team keyed invoices into spreadsheets and a legacy ledger. To prepare for a busier carnival-season production run, the finance lead engaged a configuration consultant to stand up Concur Invoice as the foundry's first structured invoice-processing environment.

System Landscape

The environment is a fresh Concur Invoice configuration with no history carried over. The consultant has loaded a small set of reusable lists, defined the invoice form the accounts-payable staff will code against, and begun linking expense types to the foundry's account codes. The foundry works from one production yard and a separate finishing workshop that receives goods under its own delivery and billing details. Both sites will submit invoices through the same environment, and both need their addresses to appear correctly on the coded invoices.

Operational Context

During an early walkthrough, the accounts-payable staff coded a handful of practice invoices for the finishing workshop. The billing details that printed on those coded invoices did not match the workshop, and in some cases showed no address at all. The staff had expected the address to be selectable on the form, but the choices available did not represent the finishing workshop as a distinct site. Coding continued while the finance lead asked the consultant how the address information should be sourced so that it appears the same way on every invoice.

Review Practice

The processors who will review coded invoices raised a working-style question. When an invoice is not ready to advance — a missing document, an unclear charge, a mismatch against what was ordered — they want to send it back to the coder with a consistent reason that finance can later summarize. In the walkthrough, each processor typed their own wording into a free-text note, so the same situation was described several different ways. Finance wants returns to be recorded the same way every time so month-end summaries are meaningful and comparable.

Governance Context

The finance lead is eager to move quickly and initially suggested applying each configuration change straight into the live environment so the team could start clearing the real backlog. The consultant noted that changes in this shared environment reach every accounts-payable user at once, and that the foundry had no way to see how a change would behave before the whole team felt it. The two discussed how the foundry could confirm that forms, addresses, and return reasons behave as intended without exposing untested behavior to the working queue.

Close Preparation

With the first month-end close approaching, the finance lead wants the foundations settled: correct billing and delivery addresses on coded invoices, a consistent way for processors to return work, and confidence that each change has been checked before the live team relies on it. The consultant has been

asked to advise on the right setup decisions and the order in which to make them, so the foundry's first close runs on trustworthy invoice data rather than on last-minute corrections.

Your assignment

You are the configuration consultant advising Laventille Pan Foundry as it brings up Concur Invoice for the first time. The finance lead and the accounts-payable processors look to you for setup decisions and their correct order ahead of the first month-end close. Your guidance must keep the foundry's invoice data trustworthy while respecting that this is a single shared environment used by the whole team. Reason from the foundry's stated goals and constraints toward the recommendation an experienced consultant would give

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Sourcing Correct Billing and Delivery Addresses on Coded Invoices

- Advise the finance lead on where the finishing workshop's billing and delivery addresses should originate so they appear consistently on every coded invoice.
- Explain why the practice invoices printed blank or mismatched addresses, tracing the outcome to the configuration layer that supplies address information.
- Recommend the order in which the site, the form's reference to it, and the validation step should be carried out.

Checkpoints

- A coded practice invoice for the finishing workshop prints the correct billing and delivery address.
- The recommendation places address data in configuration rather than in each coder's manual entry.
- The sequence respects that an address must exist before a form can reference it and before a coder can select it.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Standardizing How Processors Return Invoices for Rework

- Recommend how processors should record why an invoice is sent back so that the same situation is captured the same way each time.
- Explain why a set of return reasons alone did not let finance produce a grouped month-end summary.
- Advise how the return reasons should be maintained as new return situations arise during the busy season.

Checkpoints

- Returns can be rolled up into a meaningful, grouped month-end summary.
- The recommendation favors governed, selectable classification over free-text wording.
- New return situations are handled by extending the governed set, not by reverting to free text.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Validating Configuration Before the Live Team Relies On It

- Advise how the foundry can confirm that new addresses, form behavior, and return reasons work without disrupting the live coding team.
- Weigh the competing expectations of confirming behavior before go-live and keeping a clear record of what changed.
- Respond to a proposal to push all remaining configuration straight to live to clear the backlog faster.

Checkpoints

- Behavior is confirmed in a controlled way before any live coder depends on the change.
- The recommendation recognizes that a change in a shared environment reaches every user at once.
- Speed pressure is met by validating efficiently, not by skipping validation.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Sourcing Correct Billing and Delivery Addresses on Coded Invoices

The accounts-payable staff coded practice invoices for the finishing workshop, but the billing details printed incorrectly or blank.

What is the most likely reason?

- A. The invoice form was published without any address field, so the coders had nowhere to record the workshop's billing and delivery details for the run.
- B. The expense types used on those invoices were imported but not activated, so the form suppressed the associated address information for the workshop.
- C. The finishing workshop was not maintained as a distinct site, so its billing and delivery addresses were not available for the form to display.
- D. The vendor records for the workshop's suppliers were loaded as unapproved, so the system withheld the billing address until each supplier was approved.

Answer: C

Explanation:

The addresses shown on a coded invoice are sourced from a maintained site definition; because the finishing workshop was never set up as a distinct site, the form had no address to draw on and printed blank or fell back to the wrong location. Establishing the workshop as a site is the foundational step that supplies the missing data.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Sourcing Correct Billing and Delivery Addresses on Coded Invoices

The finance lead asks where the workshop's billing and delivery addresses should come from so they appear consistently on every coded invoice.

What should the consultant advise?

- A. Maintain the finishing workshop as a site carrying its own billing and delivery addresses, so every coded invoice sources them consistently.
- B. Ask each coder to type the workshop's billing and delivery addresses into a note on every invoice, so the details always travel with the coded document.
- C. Store the workshop address once on a single high-value invoice and copy it forward, so later invoices inherit the same billing and delivery details each time.
- D. Record the workshop address inside the vendor master for each supplier, so the address is pulled from the vendor record whenever an invoice is coded for it.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Addresses that must appear reliably on coded invoices belong in the site definition that the form displays; maintaining the workshop as a site makes its billing and delivery details consistent across every invoice without manual effort or per-coder judgment.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 1 — Sourcing Correct Billing and Delivery Addresses on Coded Invoices

Before the finishing workshop's addresses can appear as a correct, selectable choice on the coded invoice form, the consultant must order the foundational steps.
Which sequence should the consultant follow?

- A. Validate the printed address on a coded practice invoice for the workshop, then maintain the workshop as a site, then have the form reference site addresses.
- B. Have the form reference site addresses, then validate the printed address on a coded invoice, then maintain the workshop as a site with its details.
- C. Maintain the workshop as a site, then validate the printed address on a coded invoice, then have the form reference site addresses for the workshop.
- D. Maintain the workshop as a site, then have the form reference site addresses, then validate the printed address on a coded invoice.

Answer: D

Explanation:

The address must exist before anything can use it, the form must reference site addresses before a coder can select the workshop, and validation can only confirm the result once both are in place — so define the site, wire the form to it, then validate.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 2 — Standardizing How Processors Return Invoices for Rework

Processors currently type their own free-text wording when they send an invoice back to a coder, so the same situation is described in many different ways.

What should the consultant recommend so returns can be summarized consistently?

- A. Publish a written guideline asking processors to use agreed wording in their free-text notes, so returns are phrased in a similar way across the whole team.
- B. Configure standardized return reasons that processors select, so the same situation is recorded the same way every time and can be summarized.
- C. Route every returned invoice through the finance lead, who rewrites the note into consistent wording before it is passed back to the coder for rework.
- D. Add a mandatory comment field to the invoice form so that processors must always explain the return in their own words before they can send it back.

Answer: B

Explanation:

A defined, selectable set of return reasons captures the same circumstance identically each time, so month-end summaries become meaningful; the classification lives in configuration rather than in each person's wording.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 2 — Standardizing How Processors Return Invoices for Rework

The consultant configured a set of return reasons, and processors are selecting them, yet finance still cannot produce a clean grouped month-end summary of why invoices were returned. What best explains this outcome?

- A. The return reasons were configured but never activated in the environment, so the processors could select them but finance was unable to report on any of the returns.
- B. The processors ignored the new return reasons and kept using free-text notes, so the summary drew on wording that had never been standardized in the first place.
- C. The invoice form was not republished after the return reasons were added, so the reasons never actually became visible to the processors during their reviews.
- D. The return reasons were created but not grouped into categories, so returns are recorded yet cannot roll up into the grouped summary finance expects.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Return reasons are rolled up by the categories they belong to; with reasons present but no categories, each return is recorded but there is nothing to group by, so the grouped summary cannot be produced. Completing the categories finishes the configuration.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 2 — Standardizing How Processors Return Invoices for Rework

Finance wants the return-reason summary to stay meaningful as new return situations arise during the busy season.

What is the best advisory approach for maintaining the return reasons over time?

- A. Maintain the return reasons and their categories as a governed set, adding new reasons under the correct category as fresh situations arise.
- B. Let each processor add their own return reasons whenever they meet a new situation, so the list grows quickly enough to cover every case the team encounters.
- C. Freeze the return reasons after go-live and have processors fall back to free-text notes whenever an existing reason does not quite fit their situation.
- D. Replace the return reasons with a single generic returned reason, so processors never have to choose and every return is captured in the same way.

Answer: A

Explanation:

A governed reason set stays meaningful because new situations are added deliberately under the right category, preserving the ability to summarize; ownership stays central so the list does not fragment into inconsistent entries.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 3 — Validating Configuration Before the Live Team Relies On It

The consultant sets up cloned test users to check the new configuration before go-live.
What should that validation actually exercise to give the foundry confidence?

- A. Confirm only that the test users can sign in and open the invoice form, since a successful login shows the environment is ready for the whole team.
- B. Check that the reusable lists and expense types still load in the environment without coding an invoice, since the earlier setup already covered the form behavior.
- C. Reproduce the flows the live team will use — code a workshop invoice to confirm its address prints and process a return to confirm the reason groups.
- D. Have the test users code a large volume of invoices as quickly as they can, treating throughput as the signal that the configuration is ready for go-live.

Answer: C

Explanation:

The validation gives confidence only if it exercises the behavior that actually changed — sourcing the workshop's address on a coded invoice and grouping a return reason — so test users should reproduce those real flows end to end rather than run a surface check.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 3 — Validating Configuration Before the Live Team Relies On It

With limited time before the first close, two governance expectations compete: keeping an accurate record of each configuration change as it is made, and assembling a polished configuration report to present at a later review.

How should the consultant prioritize?

- A. Assemble the polished configuration report first and then reconstruct the individual change details from memory afterward, since the report is what the later review board will actually read.
- B. Keep an accurate record of each change as it is made and build the polished report from it afterward, since the record cannot be reconstructed reliably later.
- C. Skip the running record entirely and rely on the team to recall the changes whenever the later review asks, since the close leaves very little time for documentation right now.
- D. Treat the polished report as the only record that is needed and capture nothing while changing configuration, since maintaining two separate documents would duplicate the same information.

Answer: B

Explanation:

An accurate record captured as each change is made is the one thing that cannot be rebuilt reliably afterward, while the polished report can always be assembled from that record; under time pressure the consultant protects the record first and defers the presentation, meeting both expectations in the right order.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 3 — Validating Configuration Before the Live Team Relies On It

To clear the backlog faster, the finance lead proposes pushing all remaining configuration straight into the live environment now and validating it later.

What is the best response for the consultant to give?

- A. Advise validating the remaining changes with test users before promoting them, because a change in this shared environment reaches every coder at once.
- B. Agree to push everything live now and schedule validation for after the close, since clearing the backlog quickly outweighs confirming the behavior first.
- C. Push the changes live but disable the return reasons temporarily, so the processors are not affected while the rest of the configuration is validated later.
- D. Let the finance lead approve the direct-to-live push as a one-time exception, since the backlog pressure this season justifies skipping the usual validation just once.

Answer: A

Explanation:

In a shared environment every coder is affected the moment a change is promoted, so validating with test users first is the safeguard; the time saved by skipping it is lost many times over if a misbehaving change forces the whole team into rework during the close.

Topic: 2

Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 10

You are a Configuration Consultant supporting a home-appliance manufacturer in Brazil that is rolling out Concur Invoice for its accounts-payable teams. The AP lead imported an updated vendor file, and the import completed without errors. One newly onboarded vendor is classified as approved and its record is visible when the AP lead searches for it.

A regional purchasing group now reports a problem: when their users create invoices, this approved vendor never appears as a selectable option, even though other groups can select vendors normally. The purchasing lead is frustrated because invoices for this supplier are piling up and cannot be processed. The client wants the vendor made usable for this group without loosening controls that keep other groups restricted to their own approved suppliers. You confirm the vendor exists, is approved, and imported cleanly.

Which configuration best explains why the approved vendor is not selectable for this purchasing group, and what should you advise?

Which action correctly restores the vendor for this purchasing group while preserving vendor controls for other groups?

- A. Re-import the vendor file so the record is fully recreated, because a vendor must be re-imported and refreshed before any purchasing group is able to select it on an invoice.
- B. Configure Vendor Access Mapping to permit this purchasing group to use the vendor, because access mapping controls which users and groups may select a vendor.
- C. Change the vendor's classification from approved to unapproved, because only unapproved vendors are made available for selection on invoices.

D. Assign a Default Expense Type to the vendor, because a vendor cannot be chosen on an invoice until a default expense type is attached to it.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Whether a vendor exists is a separate question from whether a given group may use it. Vendor Access Mapping governs which users and groups are allowed to select a vendor, so an approved, imported vendor stays invisible to a group that is not mapped to it. Mapping this purchasing group to the vendor grants selection to exactly that group and leaves every other group's restrictions intact, which is what the client asked for.

Question: 11

You are a Configuration Consultant for a grocery retailer in Poland implementing Concur Invoice. The client wants the invoice form to behave in a guided way: when a user selects a business unit in the first field, a second field should offer only the cost categories that are valid for that business unit.

You defined both fields, placed them on the invoice form, and loaded a list of cost categories for the second field. During testing, however, the second field shows no selectable values at all, no matter which business unit the user selects. The list clearly contains items, and both fields appear on the form. The client is concerned that users will be unable to complete invoices and asks why the second field is empty and how to make it present the correct dependent values.

Which configuration cause and corrective advice is correct?

What is the most likely reason the second field returns no values, and what should you advise to make it show the valid dependent choices?

A. Reload the list through the On-Demand Import, because a list on a form returns no values until it is re-imported after both fields have been placed.

B. Mark both fields as required on the form, because a dependent field only returns selectable values once its parent field is set as mandatory.

C. Reposition the second field above the first field on the invoice form, because a dependent field must always appear before its driving field on the layout in order to populate.

D. Configure the second field as a Connected List tied to the first field, because a connected list returns values that depend on the selection made in the parent field.

Answer: D

Explanation:

The requirement is for the second field to present only the choices valid for the selected business unit, which is exactly what a connected list does. Configuring the second field as a Connected List bound to the parent field makes its available values depend on the parent's selection, so the field returns the correct filtered choices once a business unit is chosen.

Question: 12

You are a Configuration Consultant for a healthcare services provider in Canada configuring Concur Invoice approvals. The client requires that invoices charged to a specific cost object route to the manager accountable for that cost object, in addition to the standard approval already in place. You configured Authorized Approvers for the invoice workflow, but invoices charged to those cost objects are not reaching the responsible cost-object managers. The standard approval still works, and the managers confirm they can log in and approve items that do reach them. The finance director explains the business impact: budget owners are not seeing spend charged against their cost objects before it is approved, which undermines their accountability. The client asks you to identify the configuration that routes invoices to the manager responsible for the charged cost object. Which configuration should you advise? Which configuration correctly routes invoices to the manager responsible for the charged cost object?

- A. Configure Cost Object Approvers for invoices, because routing an invoice to the manager of the charged cost object is driven by cost object approver configuration.
- B. Add more Authorized Approvers to the invoice workflow, because increasing the number of authorized approvers in the flow extends its routing to include the responsible cost-object managers.
- C. Create a new Invoice Approval Status for these invoices, because a dedicated approval status must exist before any cost-object routing can take effect.
- D. Enable Email Notifications on the invoice workflow, because managers only receive invoices routed to them once workflow notifications are switched on.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Routing that depends on the cost object charged on an invoice is handled by Cost Object Approvers, which are configured specifically to send invoices to the manager accountable for that cost object. Configuring cost object approvers for invoices adds the required routing on top of the standard approval, so budget owners see the spend charged against their cost objects before approval.

Question: 13

You are a Configuration Consultant for a water utility in Australia. The compliance team wants an exception raised whenever an invoice breaches a defined spending condition, so processors are alerted before payment.

You built a custom audit rule that carries the correct condition and an exception message, and you confirmed the rule appears in the configuration list exactly as designed. During testing, however, invoices that plainly meet the condition are processed without any exception message being raised. Reviewing the rule, you find its condition, its exception message, and its scope all look correct, and no other rule is overriding it.

The compliance lead needs the exception to fire reliably before the utility relies on it. The rule was created but one required step in bringing a custom audit rule into effect was not completed.

Which single omitted step explains why the exception never fires?

Which prerequisite step, if skipped, best explains why the correctly defined audit rule never raises its exception message?

- A. Assigning the exception message to a processor queue, because an audit exception is only raised after it has been routed to a processor queue.

- B. Adding the invoice's vendor to Vendor Access Mapping, because an audit rule evaluates only invoices whose vendor is mapped to the rule owner.
- C. Activating the custom audit rule, because a custom audit rule does not evaluate transactions or raise its exception until it has been activated.
- D. Creating a General Ledger for the condition's account code, because an audit condition is not checked until the related account code has a general ledger.

Answer: C

Explanation:

A custom audit rule must be activated before it evaluates transactions and raises its exception. Because the rule was created and defined correctly but never activated, it remains dormant and lets qualifying invoices pass untouched. Activating it is the upstream step that turns the defined rule into one that actually checks invoices and raises the exception.

Question: 14

You are a Configuration Consultant for an electronics company in Japan working in the client's Concur Invoice environment. You have updated primary configuration that changes how an invoice form and its policy behave, and the change now needs to reach users.

The AP manager is under deadline pressure and wants the change switched on for all live users immediately so month-end can proceed. Because Concur Invoice is a shared, multi-tenant cloud product, any misconfiguration would take effect for every user at once, and a faulty form or policy could block live invoice processing across the whole AP team.

The client asks you for the safest way to confirm the change behaves as intended before it affects real users, while still moving quickly.

Which approach should you recommend?

Which approach best lets the client confirm the primary-configuration change behaves correctly before it reaches live users?

- A. Switch the change on for all live users now and closely monitor invoices afterward, because behavior observed directly in production is the only truly reliable way to confirm the configuration works.
- B. Ask each AP user to try the change on their own live profile first, because testing on real user profiles gives the most accurate confirmation of behavior.
- C. Export a configuration report and review it for errors before release, because a documented review of the settings confirms the change will behave correctly.
- D. Validate the change with activated Test Users that clone real profiles before promoting it, because test users confirm behavior without exposing live users to a misconfiguration.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Test Users can be activated and cloned from real profiles specifically to validate configuration before it reaches live users. Exercising the change with cloned test users reproduces real behavior in a contained way, so problems surface without affecting the live AP team, which meets the client's need to confirm the change safely while still moving forward.

Question: 15

You are a Configuration Consultant for a logistics company in Germany administering Concur Invoice. A newly created AP staff member is expected to work invoices from the processor queue, but reports they cannot reach any processor tasks.

You confirm the user's profile was created successfully: the person can sign in, see their own profile, and search normally. Nothing about the account looks broken, and other processors are working invoices without issue. The user simply has no ability to act on invoices in the processor queue.

The AP supervisor needs this person productive today and asks you what configuration lets a signed-in user actually perform processor work on invoices.

Which action should you advise?

Which configuration enables this signed-in user to perform processor work on invoices?

- A. Assign the required user permissions in Company Administration, because a user can sign in yet still lack the permissions needed to work invoices in the processor queue.
- B. Reset the user's password and have them sign in again with new credentials, because processor access on invoices is granted the first time a user signs in right after a password reset.
- C. Proxy as the user to submit invoices for them, because proxying is the way a user who lacks a full profile performs processor work on invoices.
- D. Add the user to Vendor Access Mapping, because processor tasks on invoices become available once a user is mapped to the relevant vendors.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Being able to sign in confirms only that the account exists and is valid; it does not grant the permissions that let a user perform processor work. User permissions are assigned in Company Administration and determine which tasks a user may carry out, so granting the appropriate processor permissions is what lets this signed-in user work invoices in the queue.

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-ci325>