

**Boost up Your Certification Score**

# SAP C\_TS452

**SAP Certified - SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition,  
Sourcing and Procurement (C\_TS452\_2601)**



**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

## Subjects

1. Micro Skill Drill Exam
2. Unified Scenario Exam - US01
3. Unified Scenario Exam - US02
4. Unified Scenario Exam - US03
5. Unified Scenario Exam - US04
6. Unified Scenario Exam - US05
7. Unified Scenario Exam - US06
8. Unified Scenario Exam - US07
9. Unified Scenario Exam - US08
10. Unified Scenario Exam - US09

**Topic: 1**

**Micro Skill Drill Exam**

### Question: 1

A project team is activating a new purchasing organization in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition for a recently acquired business unit. Material masters and supplier data have been loaded, and users can create purchase requisitions without issue. Buyers also see the requisitions in their processing worklist. However, when they attempt to create scheduling agreements for frequently ordered components, the system rejects only the new purchasing organization, while the same suppliers and materials work in an existing organization already running in production.

The rollout manager wants a correction that can be reused in future acquisition waves. Temporary processing under the legacy purchasing organization is not allowed because regional ownership and reporting are part of the approved target model.

What is the best first action?

Response:

- A. Route the components through the existing purchasing organization for the first months and align ownership later.
- B. Recreate the supplier records because scheduling agreement rejection usually indicates duplicate master data in all cases.
- C. Check whether the new purchasing organization is fully integrated into the relevant procurement structure and document-processing scope.
- D. Add a temporary enhancement that redirects rejected agreement creation to a shared organizational unit.

**Answer: C**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The selective failure by purchasing organization points to an organizational foundation or scope-assignment issue, not a universal supplier or material problem. The reasoning chain is: organizational integration and document scope setup → agreement eligibility for the new organization → execution of scheduling agreement creation → rollout validation. Verifying structural readiness is the right upstream step.

## Question: 2

A home-appliances company is validating release-based purchase requisition processing in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition for a newly introduced indirect procurement category. End users can create requisitions in SAP Fiori, and the documents are submitted successfully. For most categories, approved requisitions then appear in the buyer conversion queue and are processed into purchase orders. However, requisitions from the new category remain in approved status without becoming available for the expected downstream buyer step, even though document data is complete and approval logs show successful completion.

The project lead wants the issue corrected before user acceptance testing expands to more departments. The team must preserve the standard approval-to-procurement flow, avoid manual reassignment of approved requisitions, and stay within clean core controls because the same process design will be reused for later categories.

What should the consultant check first?

- A. Review whether the new procurement category is correctly included in the downstream buyer-processing determination after approval.
- B. Ask buyers to search and process the approved requisitions manually until all categories are stabilized after rollout.
- C. Rebuild the approval sequence because approved requisitions should always enter the buyer step automatically in every case.
- D. Grant broader buyer access so the missing approved requisitions become visible in the conversion queue.

**Answer: A**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The requisitions are created and approved successfully, so the problem is not upstream document creation or release logic. The failure occurs in the transition from approved requisition status to downstream buyer-processing visibility for one new category. That points to a category-dependent determination or assignment issue. The dependency chain is: category configuration and processing determination → post-approval routing/binding → buyer conversion visibility → PO execution. Checking that binding is the correct first step.

## Question: 3

A facilities-services company is validating service procurement in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition for a new maintenance category. Requesters can create service purchase requisitions in SAP Fiori, and the requisitions pass release successfully. Buyers can open the approved documents in their worklist and

begin conversion. However, when they attempt to create purchase orders for one service category, the system stops processing because the follow-on document cannot complete the required account-assignment step.

A comparable service category in the same company structure converts without issue, and the affected requisitions already show approved status and valid requester data.

a. The project lead wants the team to correct the issue without using manual free-text purchase orders. The fix must stay within standard configuration and support automated test execution for later rollout waves.

What should the consultant check first?

A. Verify whether the affected service category is correctly linked to the required account-assignment settings and follow-on purchasing determination.

B. Ask buyers to create manual service purchase orders until the maintenance rollout is fully stabilized.

C. Rebuild the release workflow because approved requisitions should always carry complete account information into purchase-order creation.

D. Grant broader buyer authorization so the account-assignment step can be bypassed during conversion.

**Answer: A**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The requisitions are created and approved successfully, so the upstream requester and release layers are functioning. The break appears during follow-on PO conversion for one service category when account-assignment handling is required. That points to a configuration or determination dependency between the service category and downstream purchasing/account-assignment behavior. The chain is: service-category configuration → account-assignment and purchasing determination binding → PO conversion execution → validation outcome.

## Question: 4

A biotechnology distributor is validating physical-inventory completion in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition while migrating a regional warehouse from a standalone stock-control tool into the shared inventory template. Inventory documents can be created, count entry works, and variance review completes for most storage zones. However, for one controlled-reagent group in the migrated warehouse, the document remains in a review-finished state and the system blocks the final difference posting. The same reagent group completes correctly in an already stabilized warehouse, and other groups in the migrated warehouse post without issue.

The migration lead wants the defect corrected before mock cutover. Manual stock correction is not allowed, and the warehouse process must remain standard because the same migration template will be reused for additional sites.

What is the most appropriate first action?

A. Ask warehouse users to process the controlled reagents through the stabilized warehouse until migration is complete.

B. Recreate the inventory documents because blocked final posting usually begins with count-entry inconsistency.

- C. Check whether the migrated warehouse has reagent-group-specific status or control settings preventing the transition from reviewed variance to final difference posting.
- D. Broaden warehouse authorization so users can force the final difference posting for the blocked documents.

**Answer: C**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The issue is selective by warehouse and item group, while earlier inventory steps and other groups succeed. That indicates a warehouse-specific control or status dependency governing the transition from reviewed variance to final posting. The dependency chain is: warehouse/item-group control settings → eligibility for final difference posting → posting execution → cutover validation outcome.

### Question: 5

A company is preparing its first integrated purchasing test in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition after loading procurement master data for a newly activated plant. Users can create material master records and supplier-related purchasing data, and requisitions can be entered without error. However, when buyers attempt to create purchase orders for the new plant, the system rejects the documents for that plant only, while the same purchasing process works in an already-live plant within the same company structure.

The implementation lead wants a correction that is transportable and suitable for rollout governance. The team must not create plant-specific custom logic or temporary exceptions because the design is intended to scale to additional plants in later phases.

What is the best first action?

- A. Confirm that the new plant is correctly assigned within the required procurement organizational structure and is usable in the purchasing process scope.
- B. Instruct buyers to create the purchase orders under the existing live plant and later transfer stock internally after go-live.
- C. Rebuild supplier master data for all plants because plant-specific document rejection usually indicates supplier duplication issues.
- D. Add a plant-specific enhancement to redirect purchasing documents to a fallback organizational unit.

**Answer: A**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The issue occurs only for the new plant, while the same process works elsewhere. That strongly indicates an organizational foundation or assignment problem rather than a universal purchasing failure. The dependency chain is: organizational setup → plant availability within procurement scope → PO execution eligibility → process validation. Before changing master data or process logic, the consultant should verify that the plant is properly integrated into the purchasing structure used for the tested scenario.

## Question: 6

### CHALLENGE 1 — Requisition Flow Alignment Across Plants and Buying Groups

A buyer proposes a quick adjustment that would let requisitions bypass part of the shared approval progression for one plant so order conversion can keep pace with the central hub. Audit stakeholders are concerned that different routing behavior will become normal before broader rollout. Which action is most appropriate?

- A. Apply the plant-specific bypass because validation speed is more important than template consistency at this stage
- B. Pause requisition testing completely until all plants have identical transaction volumes
- C. Preserve the common approval model and investigate why comparable requisitions are not following the same route under aligned business conditions
- D. Replace shared buying-group handling with local buyer ownership for all plants in the current wave

**Answer: C**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario calls for validating whether requisitions follow the intended shared governance pattern, not whether volume can be pushed through by local exceptions. Preserving the common approval model while investigating inconsistent routing protects rollout stability and exposes the real dependency.

## Question: 7

### CHALLENGE 2 — Planning and Source Setup for Repetitive Material Demand

For frequently consumed maintenance materials, buyers report that one plant can process recurring demand smoothly while another plant must intervene repeatedly before purchasing documents follow the expected replenishment path. The project team wants to confirm whether the template supports scalable behavior for high-volume items. What should be validated first?

- A. Whether planning-relevant and procurement-relevant master data were prepared with the same assumptions for the affected materials
- B. Whether buyers at the slower plant have enough training to remember the manual workaround steps
- C. Whether invoice verification tolerances should be loosened for repetitive-demand materials
- D. Whether all repetitive-demand materials should be converted to free-text requisitioning during rollout

**Answer: A**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario explicitly states that downstream purchasing behavior depends on earlier planning assumptions for repetitive-demand materials. Validating the interaction of planning-relevant and

procurement-relevant master data is the correct first step because it addresses the second-order cause rather than the later symptom.

## Question: 8

### CHALLENGE 3 — Workflow Control for Contract-Based Purchasing Decisions

In contract-supported purchasing tests, some users can move through purchasing more quickly when they rely on lighter operational practices, but the shared procurement lead finds that approval control becomes less consistent across plants. The sourcing objective is to support strategic suppliers without weakening the common governance model. What is the best validation decision?

- A. Keep workflow conditions aligned to the common approval model and verify whether contract-based purchasing still supports the intended sourcing route
- B. Remove approval control for all contract-based purchasing because contracts already provide enough operational discipline
- C. Allow each plant to decide when contract-based purchasing should require workflow review
- D. Focus only on whether purchase orders are created successfully, not on how approval behavior differs between users

**Answer: A**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The challenge is not simply to execute contract-based purchasing quickly, but to confirm that strategic sourcing can operate within the intended workflow control. Keeping workflow aligned while validating the sourcing route preserves both contract usage and common governance.

## Question: 9

### CHALLENGE 3 — Workflow Control for Contract-Based Purchasing Decisions

During testing, one team proposes that contract-based purchasing for selected suppliers should move through a lighter approval route because those suppliers are already part of the strategic sourcing model. Another stakeholder argues that changing approval behavior by supplier group could make later rollout governance harder to support.

Which concern should carry more weight in this validation cycle?

- A. The lighter route should be accepted because strategic supplier usage always outweighs workflow discipline
- B. The team should prioritize preserving a common approval structure unless the existing workflow prevents the intended contract-based purchasing path from functioning
- C. Approval routing should be ignored during validation because it can be standardized after go-live
- D. Strategic sourcing scenarios should be removed from the test scope to avoid governance discussions

**Answer: B**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario places governance stability and strategic sourcing consistency in the same decision space. A common approval structure should remain the default unless workflow itself blocks intended execution, because the template must support later rollout waves without supplier-specific governance exceptions.

## Question: 10

### **CHALLENGE 4 — Goods Receipt and Invoice Validation for Shared Template Stability**

Invoice verification results are stable for one plant but harder to interpret for another, even though both plants processed similar purchasing scenarios. Reviewers notice that the weaker results appear in cases where earlier purchasing and receipt assumptions were not prepared in the same way. What is the most likely next step?

- A. Increase invoice-processing speed targets so plants complete more scenarios before comparing results
- B. Align upstream purchasing and goods receipt assumptions, then repeat invoice verification for representative cases
- C. Remove blocked-invoice validation from the current cycle and validate only routine invoices
- D. Ask finance users to manually release more invoices so payment timing appears consistent during testing

**Answer: B**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario identifies invoice instability as a downstream effect of differing upstream assumptions. Re-aligning purchasing and goods receipt conditions before repeating invoice verification addresses the second-order dependency and tests whether the template sequence is stable.

## **Unified Scenario Exam - US02**

## Question: 11

### **CHALLENGE 1 — Supplier Allocation Readiness for Shared Material Demand**

During cutover rehearsal, two plants generate recurring demand for the same packaging material family. Both plants have approved suppliers available, but only one plant follows the expected supplier distribution pattern once purchase documents are created. The sourcing lead wants to preserve a shared support model after go-live rather than rely on local buyer judgment. What is the best first validation action?

- A. Let the slower plant choose suppliers manually until the first live week is complete
- B. Compare source-maintenance setup and purchasing conditions for the material across both plants before changing execution behavior
- C. Reduce approval involvement for packaging purchases so supplier selection can move faster
- D. Assign one preferred supplier to both plants temporarily so cutover rehearsal can finish on time

**Answer: B**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The visible difference appears during purchasing execution, but the scenario points to earlier sourcing preparation as the likely cause. Comparing source-maintenance setup and purchasing conditions addresses the upstream dependency before changing live-operating behavior.

## Question: 12

### **CHALLENGE 1 — Supplier Allocation Readiness for Shared Material Demand**

A plant buyer argues that urgent materials should allow local supplier substitution whenever the expected allocation pattern does not appear quickly enough during rehearsal. The cutover office is concerned that this approach will create unpredictable post-go-live support demands. Which decision is most appropriate?

- A. Permit local supplier substitution for all urgent materials because speed is more important during rehearsal
- B. Preserve centrally governed allocation behavior and confirm whether shared-demand materials enter purchasing execution with aligned sourcing assumptions
- C. Pause all supplier-allocation validation until the legacy system is fully shut down
- D. Remove shared-demand materials from rehearsal scope and validate only plant-specific items

**Answer: B**

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario is testing whether shared-demand materials can follow the intended sourcing model under cutover pressure. Preserving centrally governed allocation behavior while validating aligned sourcing assumptions protects both go-live supportability and template reuse.

# 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-ts452>