

Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP C_THR86

SAP Certified - SAP SuccessFactors Compensation



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 consumer products company is validating SAP SuccessFactors Compensation before opening annual merit planning. The rewards policy states that employees hired after a defined cutoff date should appear on the worksheet for manager awareness but must not receive merit guideline amounts. In the worksheet preview, new hires appear correctly, but the guideline column still shows recommended ranges for them.

The compensation manager suggests keeping the worksheet as-is because planners can choose zero increases for new hires. The HR policy owner says the worksheet should clearly reflect the approved rule so managers do not interpret guideline ranges as permission to award merit. The constraint is that the validation cycle must prove policy-aligned guidance before managers begin planning.

Which action should the consultant recommend?

Response:

- A. Keep the worksheet unchanged and rely on managers to apply the new-hire cutoff policy during recommendation entry.
- B. Remove all new hires from the worksheet so no manager can accidentally enter a merit recommendation for them.
- C. Correct the guideline or eligibility rule behavior so new hires remain visible but do not receive merit guideline amounts.
- D. Allow guideline ranges to display for new hires and add a comment field instructing managers not to use them.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation targets the rule behavior that controls policy-aligned guidance. New hires should remain visible while guideline amounts are suppressed or excluded according to the approved cutoff rule. This validates that worksheet population and guideline logic work together before managers enter recommendations.

Question: 2

A renewable energy company is starting its first SAP SuccessFactors Compensation implementation. You are supporting the consultant assigned to prepare the configuration approach before template setup begins. The rewards team has confirmed that merit planning, bonus planning, and employee group

eligibility will be in scope, but regional HR teams have not yet agreed on the required planning groups, data ownership, or timing for Employee Central data validation. The project sponsor wants configuration to begin immediately to protect the timeline.

The implementation lead proposes creating a generic compensation template first and refining ownership and eligibility details during worksheet testing. The HRIS manager warns that unresolved source data and planning responsibility decisions may cause rework after configuration starts. The measurable constraint is that the first prototype must be usable for stakeholder validation, not just a technical placeholder.

What should the consultant recommend before proceeding with template configuration?

Response:

- A. Start with a generic template so stakeholders can react to a visible worksheet and refine planning ownership later.
- B. Configure merit and bonus plans separately first, then decide Employee Central validation responsibilities during testing.
- C. Ask each regional HR team to maintain its own eligibility assumptions and reconcile differences after the prototype review.
- D. Confirm planning groups, eligibility assumptions, data ownership, and validation timing before creating the prototype template.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation establishes the required implementation foundation before template setup begins. Confirming planning groups, eligibility assumptions, data ownership, and validation timing ensures that the prototype reflects the intended compensation process. It protects the timeline by reducing avoidable rework during worksheet validation.

Question: 3

A media services company has completed its bonus planning cycle in SAP SuccessFactors Compensation. Finance has approved the final worksheet totals, and the rewards team is preparing a summary report for leadership before employee statements are generated. The report output shows the correct total payout, but it groups employees under legacy department names that were replaced during the current planning cycle.

The finance controller wants to use the report because the total payout is correct and the leadership meeting is scheduled the next morning. The HR operations lead argues that leadership will compare report groupings with current organizational data and may question the result. The constraint is that the report must support leadership review without reopening approved bonus recommendations.

Which recommendation best fits the reporting issue?

Response:

- A. Use the report as-is because the approved total payout is correct and leadership can disregard department labels.
- B. Reopen bonus planning so planners can reapprove all recommendations using the current department names.

- C. Correct the reporting attribute mapping or source grouping used by the output, then validate the report against approved totals.
- D. Remove department grouping from the leadership report and present only the overall payout total.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation corrects the report at the output and attribute-mapping layer while preserving approved planning results. Validating the corrected report against approved totals confirms that leadership sees current department groupings without changing payout decisions. It satisfies the requirement for review-ready reporting without reopening the cycle.

Question: 4

A regional legal services firm is preparing SAP SuccessFactors Compensation testing for partner-led salary planning. The project team has created a reviewer role for the compensation committee. During validation, a committee reviewer can see the correct worksheet population and approval progress, but can also change recommendation amounts before partner planners submit their final decisions. The security lead suggests keeping this access temporarily because the committee review must start the next day.

The rewards director wants the committee to monitor progress without influencing planner entries. The measurable constraint is that reviewers must validate progress and population visibility while avoiding planner-level update rights and unnecessary compensation data exposure.

Which recommendation best balances the review deadline with governance requirements?

Response:

- A. Keep the reviewer access unchanged through committee review and remove update rights after the review window closes.
- B. Remove all committee reviewer access and ask partner planners to provide offline progress summaries.
- C. Adjust role-based permissions so reviewers can monitor progress and assigned population visibility without editing recommendations.
- D. Allow reviewers to retain update access but require approval from the rewards director before they change any amount.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation corrects the access-control layer while preserving the review objective. Reviewers can monitor progress and confirm population visibility without receiving recommendation update capability. Validating the adjusted role proves that access scope and user activity match the intended compensation governance model.

Question: 5

A regional architectural design firm is validating SAP SuccessFactors Compensation before opening a seniority-based salary review. The worksheet must use Employee Central hire date, role level, current salary, and supervisor relationship to determine salary guidance and planner responsibility. During validation, salary values and supervisor visibility are correct, but employees with corrected hire dates still show the old seniority band in the worksheet.

The compensation lead wants to proceed because managers can see the correct employees and salary values. The HRIS owner says the corrected hire dates must be validated in Employee Central and reflected in a regenerated worksheet. The measurable constraint is that seniority-based guidance must be current before managers enter recommendations.

What should the consultant recommend?

Response:

- A. Proceed with planner access because salary values and manager visibility are already correct.
- B. Ask managers to manually apply the corrected seniority band when entering recommendations.
- C. Hide seniority-based guidance and review affected recommendations after the cycle closes.
- D. Validate the Employee Central hire date corrections and regenerate the worksheet so current seniority guidance is displayed.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation addresses the source-data dependency that controls seniority-based guidance. Validating Employee Central hire date corrections and regenerating the worksheet confirms that current employee attributes are retrieved and applied before planner activity begins. It supports accurate recommendations at the point of decision.

Question: 6

A regional outsourcing provider is preparing to hand over SAP SuccessFactors Compensation administration to the customer's HR operations team. The worksheet, report, and statement samples have passed validation. However, the customer has not confirmed who will review quarterly configuration changes, who will approve updates to eligibility assumptions, or how analysts should document validation evidence before each planning cycle.

The sponsor wants to close the project because the system outputs are correct. The consultant must provide a closure recommendation. The measurable constraint is that the customer must be able to manage routine compensation-cycle changes without informal dependency on the implementation partner, while avoiding a new full-cycle test.

Which recommendation best fits the closure requirement?

Response:

- A. Close the project because validated outputs prove that the customer can run future compensation cycles.
- B. Give all HR operations users template maintenance access so routine changes can be made without partner involvement.

C. Complete a focused handover review covering change ownership, eligibility approval, and validation evidence before closure.

D. Start another full planning-cycle test to prove every future configuration change can be handled internally.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation addresses the readiness dependency required for sustainable administration. A focused handover review confirms change ownership, eligibility approval, and validation evidence without repeating a full planning cycle. It supports project closure while reducing informal dependency on the implementation partner.

Question: 7

A regional industrial automation distributor has completed SAP SuccessFactors Compensation planning for merit increases and targeted retention awards. The approved worksheet includes final amounts, award categories, and a leadership analytics report that should show average award value by category. During validation, the total award cost matches the worksheet, but the average award value calculation includes employees who were reviewed but intentionally received no award.

The rewards analyst wants to use the report because the total cost is accurate. The compensation director says leadership needs average award values that represent only employees who received awards. The measurable constraint is that analytics must preserve approved total cost and correct category-average interpretation without reopening planner approvals.

Which recommendation best supports the analytics validation requirement?

Response:

A. Use the report because total award cost matches the approved worksheet and zero-award employees do not change cost.

B. Reopen planner approvals so managers can reconfirm employees who intentionally received no award.

C. Correct the analytics output so category-average award value uses only awarded employees, then validate against approved worksheet results.

D. Remove average award value from the report and provide leadership only with total award cost by category.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation acts at the analytics-output layer while preserving completed approvals. Correcting the category-average calculation to use only awarded employees confirms that total cost and average award interpretation are both represented appropriately. It satisfies the analytics requirement without reopening planner decisions.

Question: 8

A regional publishing group has completed annual compensation planning in SAP SuccessFactors Compensation. The approved worksheet includes final merit increases, bonus adjustments, and manager-entered rationale for awards outside standard guidance. The rewards team generates a leadership summary report and notices that totals match the worksheet, but the report excludes the outside-guidance rationale column required for executive review.

The finance lead wants to use the report because the totals reconcile and the review meeting is scheduled that afternoon. The HR director says executive review requires the rationale evidence before employee statements are prepared. The measurable constraint is that the report must support exception review without reopening approved planner recommendations.

Which action should the consultant recommend?

Response:

- A. Use the report because totals reconcile with the approved worksheet and rationale can be discussed verbally.
- B. Correct the report output to include approved outside-guidance rationale and validate it against the worksheet results.
- C. Reopen the worksheet so managers can reconfirm all outside-guidance recommendations before reporting continues.
- D. Remove all outside-guidance awards from the leadership report and review only standard recommendations.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation addresses the report output layer while preserving approved planning results. Including outside-guidance rationale and validating it against worksheet data confirms that totals and exception evidence are both represented. It satisfies the executive review requirement without reopening planner recommendations.

Question: 9

A regional energy analytics company is validating SAP SuccessFactors Compensation for a performance bonus cycle. The rewards policy states that bonus eligibility must be based on approved bonus-plan participation, while guideline percentage must be based on final performance rating. During worksheet preview, eligible employees with final ratings receive correct guideline percentages, but employees removed from bonus-plan participation before planning still appear eligible because their final rating remains populated.

The compensation manager suggests proceeding because managers can avoid recommending bonuses for removed participants. The rewards governance lead says eligibility must be controlled before planning begins. The measurable constraint is that validation must prove removed bonus-plan participants are excluded while preserving final-rating guidance for active participants.

Which recommendation best satisfies the validation requirement?

Response:

- A. Correct and validate bonus-plan participation eligibility while retaining final-rating guideline percentages for active participants.
- B. Proceed because managers can see final rating and avoid recommending bonuses for employees removed from participation.
- C. Remove final-rating guideline percentages from the worksheet and let managers use judgment for all bonus recommendations.
- D. Ask managers to enter zero bonus recommendations for employees removed from bonus-plan participation.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation targets the eligibility rule while preserving valid guideline logic. Approved bonus-plan participation should determine whether an employee is eligible, while final performance rating continues to determine guideline percentage for active participants. Validating both outcomes confirms policy control and planning guidance accuracy.

Question: 10

A regional construction services company is preparing for SAP SuccessFactors Compensation implementation. The customer wants to include union and non-union employees in the same annual compensation cycle, but discovery reveals different eligibility rules, approval responsibilities, and communication requirements for each group. The project sponsor wants the team to start configuration because the compensation calendar is already compressed.

The consultant sees that the draft design identifies worksheet columns but does not confirm whether union employees should be planned by project managers, HR compensation specialists, or regional directors. The measurable constraint is that the first design review must confirm a workable planning responsibility model and avoid later reconfiguration of worksheet routing and eligibility behavior.

Which recommendation best supports the implementation objective?

Response:

- A. Configure the worksheet columns first and resolve union planning responsibility after stakeholders see the prototype.
- B. Confirm eligibility treatment, planner responsibility, and communication handling for union and non-union groups before worksheet setup.
- C. Exclude union employees from the first prototype and add them after non-union planning behavior is approved.
- D. Let each region choose its own union planning owner and standardize the differences before compensation statements are released.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

This recommendation addresses the implementation dependencies before configuration begins. Eligibility treatment, planner responsibility, and communication handling influence worksheet setup, routing assumptions, and downstream output behavior. Confirming them first supports a meaningful design review and reduces reconfiguration risk.

Topic: 2

Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 1 — Planner Ownership Across Employee Central Alignment

Alpine Market Group sees planner ownership in the compensation preview report that differs from the current manager relationship shown in Employee Central for several employees. Finance wants to proceed because budget meetings are scheduled next week.

Which recommendation best supports the pilot launch decision?

Response:

- A. Proceed with worksheet launch because the preview report already shows each employee assigned to a planner.
- B. Reconcile Employee Central manager data with compensation planner assignment before launch, then use the preview report to confirm the corrected routing.
- C. Change the compensation worksheet template so all employees route to regional HR for this cycle.
- D. Ask managers to manually forward worksheet entries to the correct approver after launch if ownership appears incorrect.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

Planner ownership depends on the relationship between source employee data and compensation routing behavior. Reconciling Employee Central alignment first and then validating through preview reporting protects the launch from wrong-manager worksheet routing.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 1 — Planner Ownership Across Employee Central Alignment

The implementation consultant finds that the affected employees recently transferred between store regions. Their current Employee Central records show the new manager, but the compensation preview still reflects the prior planner relationship.

What is the most likely second-order dependency to investigate?

Response:

- A. Whether compensation statements have been enabled for employees with approved recommendations.
- B. Whether the compensation data used for form launch reflects the intended Employee Central manager and job attributes.

- C. Whether finance increased the total budget pool for the affected regions before preview.
- D. Whether managers have completed training on entering merit and bonus recommendations.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The symptom points to timing and data alignment between Employee Central and the compensation launch population. The second-order dependency is whether the compensation data snapshot or launch data reflects the intended manager and job attributes.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 2 — Worksheet Visibility Within Role-Based Access Boundaries

Some regional managers can edit merit and lump-sum columns, while managers in comparable roles can only view one of those sections. The HRIS group asks whether access should be expanded globally to remove the inconsistency.

What should the consultant recommend first?

Response:

- A. Compare role-based permissions, template field settings, and employee population assignment before changing access globally.
- B. Grant all regional managers the same administrative permission set used by the HRIS group.
- C. Remove field restrictions from the worksheet template so visibility is controlled only by manager discretion.
- D. Launch the pilot and ask managers to report any missing columns during recommendation entry.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

The visibility difference may come from access permissions, field configuration, or the population presented to each planner. Comparing these dependencies first preserves governance and targets the correction.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 2 — Worksheet Visibility Within Role-Based Access Boundaries

The project sponsor asks for the fastest way to make all worksheet columns visible so managers can complete recommendations before budget meetings. HR operations objects because administrative access is restricted.

Which option best balances performance and governance?

Response:

- A. Expand provisioning access temporarily to all regional managers, then remove it after the compensation cycle.

- B. Duplicate the plan template and let each region adjust field visibility independently.
- C. Delay all validation until after managers submit recommendations so the budget meeting date is preserved.
- D. Correct the specific permission or template-field dependency after validation, then confirm equivalent visibility for comparable planner groups.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option addresses speed by targeting the validated dependency instead of reopening the entire design. It also preserves access governance and confirms consistent behavior for equivalent managers.

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-thr86>