SAP

C_THR85

SAP Certified - SAP SuccessFactors Succession Management

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam

Topic: 1
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 1

A consultant is validating a customer's updated planning setup in SAP SuccessFactors Succession Management. A job-related classification that should support succession decisions appears correctly in People Profile for most test users, but for a smaller employee group it does not appear in the succession planning context where planners expect to compare candidates. The customer wants the smallest corrective action before sign-off and does not want a broad redesign because other planning settings are already accepted.
The environment is public cloud and web-based. Access is working, profile pages load normally, and the issue is limited to how a job-related value is carried into succession usage. The team must choose the most effective next step without assuming the problem is only visual.
What is the best next action?
Response:

A. Increase planner permissions so the missing job-related value becomes visible in all succession views
B. Refresh all affected employee profiles so the job-related classification reloads into the planning screens
C. Remove the new classification from the current validation cycle and continue with older planning criteria
D. Check whether the job-related classification is aligned correctly between people-profile setup and succession-planning usage for the affected group

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
The value exists in profile data for most users, so the issue is not simple field absence. The symptom is a cross-context alignment gap: profile presence does not reliably translate into succession usage for one employee group. The correct chain is: job-related classification maintained → aligned to succession-planning usage → available in candidate comparison context → planners can use it consistently. Validating that alignment is the most targeted next action.

Question: 2

A consultant is preparing a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Succession Management tenant for a customer walkthrough. The succession org chart opens correctly, and planners can view successors, but a newly added field intended for succession planning does not appear where planners expect to use it

during review activities. The customer confirms that the field was introduced as part of the current configuration cycle, and the project lead wants the smallest corrective action before testing continues. The environment is web-based, and the team can access both Admin Center and the appropriate configuration paths used during implementation. A junior team member suggests refreshing employee data first. Another suggests checking whether the field was introduced only at the display layer without being properly carried through the underlying succession configuration path.
What is the best next action?
Response:

A. Reimport employee records so the newly added field becomes available in all succession planning screens
B. Validate whether the field is correctly included in the relevant succession configuration path before changing user data
C. Grant broader planner permissions so the field becomes visible during review activities
D. Rebuild the succession org chart layout so all new fields are loaded from the latest page design

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
The field is newly introduced, but the problem appears in its succession usage, not necessarily in basic employee data storage. The correct reasoning chain is: field introduced → included in the correct configuration path → exposed to succession use → visible during planner activity. Validating that path first is the smallest and most direct action.

Question: 3

A consultant is supporting a same-day succession review in a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Succession Management tenant. Managers can open nomination pages, review existing successors, and submit standard nominations for positions already included in the approved review cycle. However, after a newly added priority-role group was brought into scope, managers can open nomination for those positions but the completion step fails only for that added group. The customer wants the smallest stable correction before the meeting begins and does not want broad manager-role redesign because access for the overall cycle has already been approved.
The environment is web-based, and succession functionality is already active. Because standard nomination still works elsewhere, the consultant suspects the problem is tied to how the newly added group is included in the nomination path rather than to a system-wide activation issue.
What is the best next action?
Response:

A. Re-enable succession functionality globally so the newly added priority-role group inherits the same nomination behavior as the rest of the cycle
B. Review whether the newly added priority-role group is fully included in the nomination scope and completion path used for submission
C. Rebuild manager permissions so all nomination-related actions are reassigned before the meeting begins

D. Ask managers to record nominations for the priority-role group outside the system and enter them after the review

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
Managers can already access the positions and begin nomination for the new group, and standard nomination still works for the original scope. That means the issue is not general activation and not total loss of access. The likely chain is: succession active → managers authorized → new group included in nomination scope and completion path → submission succeeds. Reviewing whether the added group is fully included in that configured path is the most targeted corrective action.

Question: 4

During a customer pilot, managers can open succession planning pages and review existing successor information, but they cannot submit new nominations for a set of positions that was added to the pilot scope this week. The same managers can still submit nominations for positions already included in the original scope. The customer wants the issue fixed quickly without widening access beyond what is needed for the pilot. No large redesign should be attempted because the workshop starts in one hour. The tenant is public cloud and web-based. The consultant confirms that succession features are active and that manager access is generally working. The symptom is limited to the newly added pilot scope, which suggests the problem is not platform-wide activation.
What is the best next action?
Response:

A. Re-enable succession functionality globally so newly added pilot positions inherit the same nomination behavior
B. Review whether the newly added pilot positions are included in the intended nomination scope and related planning configuration
C. Ask managers to document successor choices outside the system and enter them after the pilot workshop
D. Recreate manager roles so all nomination permissions are reassigned from the beginning

Answer: B

Question: 5

A partner consultant is reviewing a controlled update in a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Succession Management tenant before user testing. After the update, administrators can see a new succession-related element in one maintenance area, and initial testers assume the change is complete. However, a follow-up configuration check still reports that the element is not consistently available for downstream succession behavior. The customer wants the smallest corrective action because the validation window is short and broad rework should be avoided unless truly necessary.

The environment is web-based, and partner-managed configuration access is available. One team member recommends approving the change because the new element is already visible. Another suggests the update may exist only in one layer while remaining incomplete in the broader configuration path used by validation and downstream succession execution.
What should the consultant do first?
Response:

A. Approve the update because visibility in the maintenance area proves the new element is ready for use
B. Reload related planning data so the validation check can detect the element during the next run
C. Broaden administrator permissions so downstream succession behavior can recognize the new element consistently
D. Confirm whether the new element has been propagated through the required succession configuration layers before approval

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This is the required second-order cause drill. The visible symptom suggests success, but the validation artifact says otherwise. That means the likely issue is cross-layer configuration propagation, not simple visibility. The dependency chain is: element introduced → propagated through required configuration layers → validation confirms readiness → downstream succession behavior works consistently. Confirming that propagation is the best first step.

Question: 6

A customer has activated position-based succession planning for a restricted pilot group in SAP SuccessFactors Succession Management. Managers can open the succession org chart and view incumbent positions, but several vacant positions that should be part of planning are missing from the chart entirely. The project lead confirms that the customer specifically wants vacancy-based planning visible in the pilot. The team must keep the fix small because the workshop starts later the same day. The environment is a public cloud, web-based tenant. General succession access is working, and managers can see occupied positions without issue. A junior consultant proposes expanding manager populations first. Another proposes checking whether the relevant position setup and org-chart inclusion logic are aligned for vacancy display, since the symptom affects only one structural subset of the chart.
What is the best next action?
Response:

A. Increase manager population scope so all positions, including vacant ones, become visible in the org chart
B. Rebuild the full succession org chart layout so the missing positions are redrawn from the latest screen definition
C. Verify the position-related configuration and org-chart inclusion logic that controls whether vacant positions appear in planning

D. Ask managers to perform the pilot using incumbent-only succession planning and postpone vacancy review to a later phase

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
The problem is specific: occupied positions appear, but relevant vacant positions do not. That points to a binding/configuration condition in the position model and org-chart logic rather than a general access failure. The reasoning chain is: position data maintained → positions qualify for org-chart inclusion → chart resolves vacant and occupied structures correctly → managers can plan against both. Validating the inclusion logic for vacant positions is the smallest corrective action aligned to the stated requirement.

Question: 7

A consultant is validating a position-based succession demo in SAP SuccessFactors Succession Management. Managers can open the succession org chart and review most of the approved hierarchy correctly. After a recent structural change, however, one newly created supervisory position appears in the chart, but the vacant positions that should report beneath it do not appear there. Those vacant positions can still be found elsewhere in the tenant, and occupied positions under the same branch display normally.
The customer insists that the walkthrough must show vacancy-aware planning and does not want a broad redesign before the meeting. The environment is public cloud and web-based. Access is stable, and the symptom is limited to one structural scenario inside the org chart.
What is the best next action?
Response:

A. Increase manager visibility so vacant positions inherit the missing parent relationship automatically
B. Replace the demo with employee-based planning because the vacant positions are still searchable elsewhere
C. Verify the position inclusion and structural relationship configuration that determines whether vacant positions appear beneath the new supervisor
D. Rebuild the org-chart page definition so the hierarchy redraws using the latest layout

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
Occupied positions under the branch display, but vacant ones do not. That means general org-chart access is not the issue. The missing layer is tied to how a subset of position records is structurally resolved in the chart. The reasoning chain is: position records maintained → inclusion and parent-child relationships configured correctly → org chart resolves vacant and occupied positions as intended → managers can review the branch properly. Validating that structural inclusion path targets the actual defect.

Question: 8

A consultant is validating a talent review session in a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Succession Management tenant. Managers can open the matrix grid and view employees, but after recent readiness updates several employees still appear in the same matrix cells they occupied before the change. The same updated readiness values are visible on employee-related pages. The customer wants the correction completed before the next review meeting and does not want manual cell movement used as a workaround because the session output will be used for later decisions.
The environment is web-based, and access to the review session is already stable. One team member proposes manually moving employees during the meeting. Another suggests the active talent review setup may still be interpreting an older readiness structure instead of the current one.
What is the best next action?
Response:

A. Re-enter readiness values for all affected employees so the matrix receives a fresh update before the meeting
B. Expand manager permissions so the matrix can apply current readiness values across all displayed employees
C. Ask managers to move employees manually during the session and correct the setup after the meeting
D. Validate whether the active matrix configuration is still using the intended readiness mapping and interpretation logic

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
This drill targets the second-order cause requirement. The observable artifact is a state mismatch: profile pages show updated readiness values, but matrix placement remains unchanged. That indicates the issue is likely not missing data, but the configuration path that interprets readiness inside the matrix session. The reasoning chain is: readiness values maintained → readiness mapping interpreted by the active matrix configuration → employees placed in updated cells → review session reflects current planning state. Validating the mapping and interpretation logic addresses the upstream cause.

Question: 9

A consultant is preparing a talent review pilot in SAP SuccessFactors Succession Management. Managers can open the matrix grid and see employees, but one business unit’s employees are showing in the grid without the expected readiness-based labels that other units display correctly. The same employees have valid readiness values visible elsewhere in the tenant. The customer wants the smallest corrective action because the pilot starts later today, and manual explanation during the meeting is acceptable only if the underlying issue cannot be fixed quickly.
The environment is public cloud and web-based. Access is already working, and the grid itself loads normally. The consultant must decide whether the issue is more likely caused by missing data, incorrect

permissions, or a configuration mismatch in how readiness information is surfaced inside the review artifact.
What is the best next action?
Response:

A. Re-enter readiness values for the affected business unit so the labels regenerate the next time the grid loads
B. Increase manager permissions so readiness-based labels are exposed for all employees in the pilot
C. Check whether the active talent review artifact is configured to use the intended readiness setup for that business unit
D. Ask managers to continue the pilot using cell placement only and ignore the missing labels until after go-live

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
The grid loads, employees are visible, and readiness values exist elsewhere. The missing piece is how those values are surfaced inside the talent review artifact for one business unit. That points to a configuration dependency: readiness data exists → review artifact uses intended readiness setup → labels render correctly in the matrix. Validating that active artifact configuration is the most direct next step.

Question: 10

A partner consultant is completing final configuration validation in SAP SuccessFactors Succession Management before user testing. A newly added succession-related field is visible in one maintenance area, and initial reviewers assume the update is complete. However, a downstream validation check still reports that the field is not consistently available for broader succession behavior. The customer wants the smallest stable correction because the testing window begins later the same day and unnecessary rework could delay sign-off.
The environment is public cloud and web-based, with partner-managed access available for deeper configuration review. The visible state suggests partial success, but the validation artifact suggests the field may exist in one layer without being fully propagated across the required succession path.
What should the consultant do first?
Response:

A. Reload related employee planning data so the downstream validation check can detect the field during the next run
B. Approve the update because visibility in the maintenance area proves the field is ready for downstream succession use
C. Confirm whether the field has been propagated consistently across the required succession configuration layers before approval
D. Expand administrator permissions so all succession functions can recognize the field consistently

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
This is the second-order cause drill. The visible evidence suggests success, but the upstream issue is that downstream readiness is still incomplete. That points to incomplete propagation across required configuration layers rather than a display-only success. The dependency chain is: field introduced → field propagated through required succession layers → validation confirms readiness → downstream succession behavior uses it consistently. Confirming cross-layer propagation is the correct first step.

Topic: 2

Unified Scenario Exam

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 3 — Grounding Cards and Presentations in People Profile Data
The cards and presentation should show talent data that already exists for employees.
Where does that data come from?
Response:

A. Succession creates the talent data fresh when a card is opened.
B. The company logo settings supply the talent data for the cards.
C. The Upgrade Center generates the talent data for each employee.
D. People Profile holds the talent data these tools surface.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Feedback:
People Profile holds the employees' talent data, and the cards and presentation surface it rather than creating it. The presentation layer shows what the profile already holds.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 3 — Grounding Cards and Presentations in People Profile Data
The same piece of information is missing on several candidates' cards at once.
What should the consultant check?
Response:

A. Whether the whole succession module has stopped working for everyone.
B. Whether that information is maintained in People Profile for them.
C. Whether the company logo loaded on those particular cards.
D. Whether the members' computers need to be replaced with new ones.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:

The same field missing across several candidates points to that information not being maintained in their profiles rather than a card fault. Checking the profile data targets the shared cause.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 4 — Controlling Who Can View and Present the Information
Succession information is sensitive, and only the talent committee should view the cards and presentation.
What should the consultant use?
Response:

A. Role-Based Permissions to grant viewing to the right roles.
B. A shared password given to everyone on the committee.
C. The company logo applied so the material looks confidential.
D. Relying on others choosing not to open what they can see.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Feedback:
Role-Based Permissions grant viewing of the material to the intended roles and withhold it from others, which is how sensitive succession information is protected. It scopes access to the committee.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 4 — Controlling Who Can View and Present the Information
One committee member cannot open the presentation that the others can view.
What should the consultant check first?
Response:

A. Whether the presentation feature is switched off for every user.
B. Whether the company logo loaded correctly for that member only.
C. Whether that member's role has the permission granted to it.
D. Whether that member's computer hardware must be replaced.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Feedback:
When others can view but one member cannot, the likely cause is that member's role missing the permission. Checking Role-Based Permissions targets the gap.

Question: 15

CHALLENGE 4 — Controlling Who Can View and Present the Information

Brightmoor wants members to view the material but not change the succession data behind it.
What should the consultant configure?
Response:

A. Full administrator access for every member, to be safe.
B. Permissions that allow viewing without edit rights.
C. A shared administrator login for the whole committee.
D. The company branding to mark the material as view-only.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Feedback:
Permissions that grant viewing without edit rights let members see the material while the succession data stays protected. Access is scoped to what members need.