SAP

C_TS4FI

SAP Certified - SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition, Financial Accounting

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Unified Scenario Simulation
2. Micro Skill Drill Exam

Topic: 1
Unified Scenario Simulation
Nordlys Kraft: First Year-End Close on S/4HANA Private Edition
Business Context
Nordlys Kraft AS is a Norwegian renewable-energy producer operating hydropower stations across the western fjords and an expanding onshore wind portfolio in the north. The group runs several legal entities: a Norwegian parent, a Swedish trading entity that sells surplus generation into the Nordic power exchange, and a small German service company that maintains turbine assets on contract. Each entity reports under local statutory rules, while the group consolidates under IFRS. Energy revenue is volatile, settlement currencies span NOK, SEK and EUR, and treasury hedges a portion of cross-border power sales.
Implementation Background
Over the past year the group completed a system conversion of its long-running ERP onto SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition, retaining historical financial data and moving to a single client for all three entities. The conversion was chosen over a greenfield build to preserve open items, asset histories and prior-year balances. The project team adopted a fit-to-standard posture and kept enhancements on governed extensibility layers, but several finance settings were carried forward from the legacy design rather than re-validated against the new ledger model.
Reporting Landscape
Group controllers require complete balance sheets and profit-and-loss statements per profit center and per segment, because regulators and the group treasury both demand dimension-complete views of the generation, trading and service lines. The conversion activated a ledger model intended to carry both the local valuation and the IFRS valuation in parallel. Management accounting objects are assigned to the generation and turbine assets so that depreciation flows to the correct reporting dimensions.
Close Preparation
The finance organization is now preparing its first full year-end close in the new system, and the close calendar is being orchestrated centrally rather than run ad hoc by each entity as before. During trial runs of the period-end steps, controllers noticed that a handful of cross-entity journal postings produced statements that did not balance when sliced by profit center, even though the company-code-level trial balance was correct.
Currency Observations
Treasury reviewed the open receivables from the Swedish trading entity, denominated mostly in EUR against power buyers in continental Europe. After the period-end currency step ran, some open items still carried their original booking rate in the reporting view, while others had been revalued. A separate working list of receivables grouped by remaining term did not reconcile to the aged-items report that the previous system used to produce.
Asset Observations
The asset accountants ran the periodic asset steps for the hydropower fleet. Several recently capitalized turbine components, transferred during the year from an assets-under-construction collector, showed depreciation in the local area but no corresponding values in the parallel area used for IFRS. A second group of refurbishment costs that the business intended to capitalize sat unsettled on the construction collector at the cut-off date.

Posting Control Observations

The Swedish entity posts most of its trading documents through a shared document type, and a recurring set of manual adjustment entries was being keyed directly to balance-sheet accounts at period end. Some of those adjustments needed to land only in the IFRS valuation, not in the local books, but the trial postings appeared in both. Controllers also found that a small number of statutory-only entries had been blocked during a closed posting interval, while a parallel set of entries for a different account range had gone through unexpectedly.

Governance Pressure

The CFO has set a hard internal deadline for the audited group statements and wants the close sequenced and monitored so that no entity can start a downstream step before its prerequisites complete. At the same time, the controllers are under pressure to clear the dimension-balancing and currency anomalies without introducing manual workarounds or uncontrolled core changes that would jeopardize the clean upgrade path the group committed to during the conversion.

Validation Expectation

Leadership expects the team to identify the root causes behind the dimension-incomplete statements, the inconsistent currency treatment, the missing parallel asset values and the selective posting blocks, and to correct the underlying configuration and process sequence rather than patch the symptoms. The first close must produce auditable, dimension-complete, multi-valuation statements that the group auditor can trace end to end.

Your assignment

You are acting as the financial accounting configuration consultant for Nordlys Kraft AS in its converted SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition system. Three legal entities share one client, report under local rules, and consolidate under IFRS with parallel valuation. You are supporting the group's first year-end close. Work within the standard configuration and the governed extensibility layers; do not introduce uncontrolled core changes or manual workarounds that break auditability. Where exact technical identifiers are not provided, work by the function and its configuration intent

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Producing Dimension-Complete Statements Through Document Splitting

• Review the converted document-splitting configuration and confirm which splitting characteristics are active and which are defined as mandatory for the dimensions the group must report.

• Verify that the postings failing to balance per dimension are reaching the splitting logic, and determine whether the document types and item categories involved are correctly classified for splitting.

• Confirm zero-balance behavior so that each balancing dimension nets to zero within every document.

• Re-validate the converted design against the new ledger model rather than reclassifying balances after the fact.

Checkpoints

• A trial statement balances per profit center and per segment, not only at company-code level.

• Cross-entity documents show split, balanced line items across the reporting dimensions.

• No manual reclassification is required to make the dimension slices balance.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Correcting Period-End Foreign Currency Valuation of Open Items

• Establish the scope and method of the period-end foreign currency valuation so that all in-scope open items in foreign currency are revalued on a consistent basis.

• Confirm whether the open items that retained their booking rate were excluded from the valuation scope or processed under a different setting.

• Run the valuation and then perform the term-based regrouping of receivables and payables as a distinct step, in the correct order.

• Reconcile the regrouped working list to the aged open-item view.

Checkpoints

• All in-scope foreign-currency open items reflect a consistent revaluation in the reporting view.

• The currency valuation and the regrouping are executed as separate, correctly sequenced steps.
• The regrouped list reconciles to the aged open-item report.
3. CHALLENGE 3 — Restoring Parallel Valuation in Asset Accounting
• Examine how each depreciation area is defined to post and which areas serve the parallel IFRS valuation, and confirm that capitalized assets are assigned values in every required area.
• For the turbine components transferred during the year, confirm the transfer and settlement path so values exist in both the local and parallel areas.
• Identify the refurbishment costs left on the construction collector and complete settlement to the final assets before treating them as in service.
• Re-run the periodic depreciation step and verify postings in each area.
Checkpoints
• Depreciation posts in both the local and parallel areas for the affected assets.
• Construction-collector costs intended for capitalization are settled to final assets before cut-off.
• No manual journal is used to fabricate the missing parallel-area values.
4. CHALLENGE 4 — Directing Manual Adjustments to the Correct Ledger Group
• Determine which manual period-end adjustments belong to a single accounting principle and which are shared across all valuations.
• Post the principle-specific adjustments so they affect only their intended valuation, and post shared adjustments so they affect all ledgers.
• Confirm that an IFRS-only adjustment does not appear in the local statutory view.
• Keep the entries within standard posting functions without uncontrolled enhancements.
Checkpoints
• An IFRS-only adjustment is reflected only in the IFRS valuation.
• Shared adjustments are reflected consistently across all ledgers.
• The local statutory result is not distorted by valuation-specific entries.
5. CHALLENGE 5 — Orchestrating the Close Sequence and Posting Periods
• Review the posting-period control to confirm which account ranges and authorization groups are open for the close, and align the open intervals to the entries the close requires.
• Diagnose why a statutory entry was blocked while an entry to a different account range posted, considering the period and account-range settings.
• Define the close sequence so each dependent step is gated by completion of its prerequisites across the three entities.
• Use the central close orchestration to monitor and control the sequence rather than letting entities self-pace.
Checkpoints
• Required statutory entries can post in the intended interval, and unintended ranges remain controlled.
• Dependent close steps cannot begin before their prerequisites complete.
• The close runs as a centrally monitored, controlled sequence.
Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Producing Dimension-Complete Statements Through Document Splitting

Cross-entity documents balance at company-code level but the statements do not balance when sliced by profit center, while single-entity operational postings split correctly.
What is the most likely root cause the consultant should investigate first?

A. The document types used for the cross-entity entries are not classified for splitting in a way that derives and balances the profit center on every line, so those documents bypass the dimension logic that the operational postings use.
B. The fiscal year variant assigned to the company codes differs between entities, so the cross-entity documents post into mismatched periods and cannot be balanced by dimension at all.
C. The currency types active in the ledger were reduced during conversion, so cross-entity documents lose the dimension values when translated into the group currency view.
D. The profit centers used by the trading entity were marked for deletion after conversion, so postings to them are silently redirected to a default profit center and then quietly excluded from the dimension that the balanced statement is built on at reporting time.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Dimension-complete statements depend on every line in a document carrying and balancing the splitting characteristic; if the cross-entity document types or item categories are not classified for splitting, those documents skip the logic that the working operational postings rely on. Company-code totals stay correct because the document still balances overall, but the profit-center slice does not net to zero. The fix is to re-validate the converted splitting classification, not to reclassify balances afterward.
Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Producing Dimension-Complete Statements Through Document Splitting

The consultant confirms splitting is active and the characteristics include profit center, yet a balancing dimension still does not net to zero inside individual cross-entity documents.
Which configuration aspect most directly explains a dimension that fails to net to zero within the document?

A. The aged open-item report was generated before the splitting run, so it shows pre-split balances that no longer match the document-level dimension totals after posting.
B. The zero-balance setting for the balancing characteristic is not enforced, so the document is allowed to post even though the dimension does not net to zero within it.
C. The exchange rate type used for the document differs from the one used for the statements, so rounding leaves the dimension slightly unbalanced inside the document.
D. The segment was derived from the profit center after posting, so the document balances on profit center but the derived segment introduces an offset that breaks the dimension.

Answer: B

Explanation:
For a balancing characteristic to produce dimension-complete statements, the document must be forced to net to zero on that characteristic at posting time; without zero-balance enforcement the system permits a document whose dimension does not balance, which is exactly the observed symptom. Enforcing zero balance on the balancing characteristic restores per-dimension balance at the document level.
Question: 3

CHALLENGE 1 — Producing Dimension-Complete Statements Through Document Splitting

A controller proposes posting a manual reclassification journal each period to force the profit-center slices to balance before statements are produced.
Why is this approach the weaker choice for this group?

A. It posts to the wrong ledger group, so the reclassification would only correct the local valuation and leave the IFRS dimension view unbalanced each period.
B. It would require opening a closed posting interval for every entity each period, which the centrally monitored close orchestration is specifically designed to prevent so that no step posts outside its controlled, sequenced window.
C. It re-runs the foreign currency valuation as a side effect, which would revalue open items a second time and distort the receivables that treasury is already reconciling.
D. It masks the configuration root cause with a recurring manual workaround that undermines auditability and the clean upgrade path the group committed to, instead of fixing the splitting classification.

Answer: D

Explanation:
The dimension imbalance is a configuration defect in the converted splitting design, and a recurring manual reclassification only hides it while creating audit exposure and drift from clean-core discipline. The group explicitly wants root-cause correction without manual workarounds, so re-validating the splitting classification is the appropriate path.
Question: 4

CHALLENGE 1 — Producing Dimension-Complete Statements Through Document Splitting

Single-entity operational postings in the generation line split correctly by profit center, confirming the base splitting framework works for ordinary documents.
What does this most directly tell the consultant about where to focus the dimension investigation?

A. The base splitting framework is functioning, so the defect is most likely in how the specific cross-entity documents are classified or balanced for splitting rather than in the framework itself.
B. The splitting framework is irrelevant here because ordinary operational postings never actually use document splitting at all, so the cross-entity dimension failure must instead come entirely from the currency translation step.
C. The framework must be globally broken, so the entire splitting configuration should be rebuilt before examining any specific documents.
D. The operational postings succeed only because they avoid profit centers entirely, so the fix is to remove profit centers from the cross-entity documents as well.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Because ordinary documents split correctly, the splitting framework itself is sound, which narrows the investigation to the classification or balancing behavior of the specific cross-entity documents that fail. This avoids re-engineering working configuration and targets the actual defect.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 1 — Producing Dimension-Complete Statements Through Document Splitting

The group committed to a clean upgrade path during the conversion, and the controllers are weighing how to resolve the dimension and currency anomalies under that commitment.
Which course of action best respects both the close deadline and the clean-core commitment?

A. Apply uncontrolled core modifications to force the anomalies to resolve as quickly as possible, accepting the resulting upgrade risk on the basis that the hard close deadline must take priority over the clean-core commitment this period.
B. Defer the entire close until a future release upgrade is delivered, on the assumption that the upgrade will resolve the configuration anomalies without further work.
C. Correct the underlying configuration within standard settings and governed extensibility, so the anomalies are resolved at the root while preserving the upgrade-stable core for the deadline.
D. Resolve every anomaly with recurring manual journals for this close, and plan to address the configuration only in a later period once the deadline has passed.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Resolving the anomalies through standard configuration and governed extensibility fixes them at the root and keeps the core upgrade-stable, satisfying both the deadline and the clean-core commitment. This is the path the group's stated priorities require.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 2 — Correcting Period-End Foreign Currency Valuation of Open Items

After the period-end currency step, some EUR receivables in the Swedish entity are revalued in the reporting view while others still carry their original booking rate.
What is the most likely reason only part of the open-item population was revalued?

A. The revalued items were already cleared before the step ran, so only open items kept their booking rate, which is the correct and expected behavior for the valuation.
B. The regrouping step was run before the valuation, so it locked the booking rate on the items it touched and prevented the later valuation from revaluing them.
C. The valuation scope did not include all the relevant account ranges or item selection, so a subset of open items fell outside the run and retained the booking rate.
D. The parallel depreciation area was not active for the trading entity, so the currency valuation could not write revalued amounts for those receivables.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Inconsistent revaluation across an otherwise similar open-item population points to a scope or selection gap in the valuation run, where some account ranges or items were not included and therefore kept the

booking rate. Aligning the valuation scope so all in-scope foreign-currency open items are processed produces a consistent revalued population.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 2 — Correcting Period-End Foreign Currency Valuation of Open Items

The controllers had been treating the currency revaluation and the term-based grouping of receivables and payables as one combined activity, and the grouped working list no longer reconciles to the aged report.

What is the correct way to handle these two activities?

A. Merge them into a single run so the term grouping always uses the freshly revalued amounts, which is the only way the grouped list can reconcile to the aged report.

B. Run them as two distinct period-end steps in the proper order, because foreign currency valuation and regrouping by remaining term are separate functions serving different purposes.

C. Replace the regrouping with a second currency valuation pass, since regrouping by term is a special case of currency valuation for open items.

D. Skip the regrouping entirely for foreign-currency items, because once they have been revalued at the period-end rate the term-based classification view is no longer considered meaningful or necessary for those particular receivables.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Foreign currency valuation and regrouping of receivables and payables by remaining term are distinct period-end closing functions; valuation adjusts amounts for exchange-rate changes, while regrouping reclassifies open items by remaining term and by debit/credit. Running them separately and in the correct order, then reconciling, restores the agreement between the grouped list and the aged view.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 2 — Correcting Period-End Foreign Currency Valuation of Open Items

Treasury wants assurance that, after the corrected steps, the revalued figures are auditable for the group statements.

Which validation best confirms the currency treatment is now consistent and traceable?

A. Confirm that the company-code trial balance is completely unchanged after the valuation run, demonstrating that the period-end currency step did not alter any reported balances anywhere in the ledger view.

B. Confirm that every foreign-currency open item now carries the group currency as its document currency, showing the items were converted at source.

C. Confirm that the cleared items from prior periods were also revalued, proving the run reached the full historical population.

D. Confirm that all in-scope foreign-currency open items reflect a consistent revaluation and that the regrouped list reconciles to the aged open-item view.

Answer: D

Explanation:
The defining evidence of a correct period-end currency treatment is a consistently revalued in-scope open-item population whose regrouped view ties back to the aged report; that combination is what an auditor can trace. It directly addresses both observed anomalies: inconsistent revaluation and the broken reconciliation.
Question: 9

CHALLENGE 3 — Restoring Parallel Valuation in Asset Accounting

Turbine components transferred during the year show depreciation in the local area but no values at all in the parallel area used for IFRS.
What should the consultant examine as the most likely root cause?

A. The asset class for turbine components was configured as non-depreciating during conversion, so the local area posts only manual depreciation entries while the parallel IFRS area correctly stays empty for every affected asset.
B. The transfer was posted in the wrong period, so the parallel area will catch up automatically at the next fiscal year change without any configuration review.
C. The parallel depreciation area is not set up to take values for these assets, so the transfer and depreciation populate the local area but never reach the parallel area.
D. The construction collector was already settled, so the parallel values were cleared during settlement and only the local area retained them.

Answer: C

Explanation:
When one area carries depreciation and a required parallel area is entirely empty for the same assets, the parallel area is most likely not configured to receive and post values for those assets, so the transfer and depreciation never populate it. Aligning the depreciation-area setup so the parallel area takes values for these assets restores matched depreciation across areas.
Question: 10

CHALLENGE 3 — Restoring Parallel Valuation in Asset Accounting

A group of refurbishment costs intended for capitalization remained on the assets-under-construction collector at the cut-off date.
What is the correct treatment before these costs are reported as in-service assets?

A. Post unplanned depreciation on the collector at cut-off so the refurbishment costs reflect wear before they are capitalized to the final assets.
B. Leave the costs on the collector and let the year-end closing program reclassify them to in-service assets automatically as part of the close.
C. Capitalize the costs by adjusting the depreciation key on the collector so it begins depreciating as though the assets were already in service.
D. Settle the assets under construction to the final assets so the costs are capitalized and depreciated correctly once the assets are treated as in service.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Assets under construction are represented, distributed and settled to final assets; only after settlement are the costs capitalized to in-service assets and depreciated correctly. Completing settlement before cut-off ensures the refurbishment costs are reported as in-service assets rather than sitting on the collector.
Question: 11

CHALLENGE 3 — Restoring Parallel Valuation in Asset Accounting

An asset accountant suggests posting a manual journal directly to the parallel-area accounts to insert the missing IFRS depreciation values so the close can proceed.
Why is this the weaker approach?

A. It would require the foreign currency valuation step to be re-run for the asset accounts before it could take effect, delaying the close substantially while treasury has to re-reconcile all of the affected receivables again.
B. It fabricates parallel values outside the asset subledger, breaking the link between asset master data and the ledger and masking the depreciation-area configuration defect.
C. It posts to a closed period, which the orchestration prevents, so the manual journal cannot be entered until the entire close sequence is reopened.
D. It would overwrite the local-area depreciation, leaving the local statutory statements understated by the amount of the manual entry.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Inserting parallel values by manual journal disconnects the ledger from the asset subledger and the asset master data, leaving an unauditable gap and hiding the real cause, which is a parallel area not configured to take values. The correct path is to fix the depreciation-area setup so the subledger posts the parallel values itself.
Question: 12

CHALLENGE 3 — Restoring Parallel Valuation in Asset Accounting

During the asset review, the consultant must distinguish the fiscal year change program from the year-end closing program in Asset Accounting before re-running periodic steps.
Why does this distinction matter for restoring correct asset values?

A. Both programs do the same thing, so running either one will rebuild the parallel-area values and the distinction has no practical effect on the close.
B. The year-end closing program opens the new posting periods, while the fiscal year change program produces the financial statements, so they must run in reverse order.
C. The fiscal year change program settles assets under construction automatically as part of its run, so once it has executed the unsettled refurbishment collector costs no longer require any separate settlement step before cut-off.
D. They are distinct Asset Accounting programs with different purposes, and conflating them risks running the wrong step, so the consultant must apply each in its correct role and sequence.

Answer: D

Explanation:
The fiscal year change and the year-end closing program in Asset Accounting are separate programs serving different purposes, and conflating them is a classic trap that leads to running the wrong step at the wrong time. Applying each in its correct role and order is required to restore and lock correct asset values.
Question: 13

CHALLENGE 4 — Directing Manual Adjustments to the Correct Ledger Group

Several IFRS-only manual adjustments posted at period end appeared in both the local and the IFRS valuations.
What is the correct way to ensure these adjustments affect only the intended valuation?

A. Post the adjustments to all ledgers and then reverse them in the local ledger afterward, so the net effect remains only in the IFRS valuation.
B. Use a separate dedicated document type that explicitly excludes the local company code, so the adjustment is structurally prevented from ever reaching the local statutory books at all under any circumstance.
C. Post the adjustments as ledger-group-specific entries targeting only the ledger group for the IFRS valuation, so they do not affect the local valuation.
D. Change the exchange rate type on the adjustments so the local valuation translates them to zero while the IFRS valuation retains the amount.

Answer: C

Explanation:
FI documents can be posted to a specific ledger group, which is the standard mechanism to confine an entry to one accounting principle; targeting the IFRS ledger group keeps the adjustment out of the local valuation. Shared entries, by contrast, post to all ledgers. This directly resolves the symptom of IFRS-only adjustments appearing in both books.
Question: 14

CHALLENGE 4 — Directing Manual Adjustments to the Correct Ledger Group

A controller asks how to handle a shared accrual that should affect every valuation consistently, alongside the principle-specific adjustments.
What is the appropriate posting treatment for the shared accrual?

A. Post the shared accrual as a normal entry that affects all ledgers, reserving ledger-group-specific posting for entries that belong to a single accounting principle.
B. Post the shared accrual separately to each individual ledger group in turn, on the principle that every period-end accrual in a parallel-ledger system must always be entered one valuation at a time to stay consistent.
C. Post the shared accrual to the local ledger group only and let the parallel valuation derive it automatically during the close.

D. Post the shared accrual to the IFRS ledger group only, since IFRS is the group reporting standard and the local books will inherit it.

Answer: A

Explanation:
An entry that should affect every valuation consistently is posted as a normal document that updates all ledgers, while ledger-group-specific posting is reserved for principle-specific entries. Matching the posting method to whether the entry is shared or principle-specific is the core decision.
Question: 15

CHALLENGE 5 — Orchestrating the Close Sequence and Posting Periods

A statutory entry to one account range was blocked during a closed posting interval, while an entry to a different account range posted unexpectedly in the same interval.
What is the most likely cause of this selective behavior?

A. The two entries used different document types, and only one specific document type is permitted to post during any year-end close regardless of the posting-period settings, so the other was blocked purely on that document-type rule.
B. The posting-period control opens and closes intervals by account-type or account range and by authorization group, so the two ranges had different open status or authorization for that interval.
C. The blocked entry targeted the parallel ledger group, which is always closed earlier than the local ledger group during the year-end sequence.
D. The blocked entry failed a foreign currency valuation check, while the other entry was in local currency and therefore bypassed the period control.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Posting-period control governs which account ranges and authorization groups may post within an interval, so two entries to different ranges can have different open status or authorization, producing exactly this selective block-and-pass pattern. Aligning the open intervals and authorizations to the entries the close requires resolves it.
Question: 16

CHALLENGE 5 — Orchestrating the Close Sequence and Posting Periods

The CFO requires that no entity can start a downstream close step before its prerequisites complete across all three entities.
Which approach best meets this requirement?

A. Let each entity self-pace its own close and reconcile the timing afterward, since the entities post to separate company codes and rarely interfere with each other.
B. Open all posting periods for all entities at the start of the close so every step can run whenever an entity is ready, then close them all together at the end.
C. Sequence and monitor the close centrally so dependent steps are gated by completion of their prerequisites across entities, rather than letting entities self-pace.

D. Run the entire close for one entity end to end before starting the next entity, so prerequisites are inherently satisfied within each entity in turn.

Answer: C

Explanation:
A centrally orchestrated and monitored close lets prerequisites gate dependent steps across all entities, which is exactly what the CFO's requirement demands. It replaces ad hoc self-pacing with a controlled, observable sequence that prevents premature step starts.
Question: 17

CHALLENGE 5 — Orchestrating the Close Sequence and Posting Periods

Before the controlled close runs, the consultant must confirm that posting-period access is aligned to the close's needs without leaving unintended ranges open.
Which validation best confirms posting-period control is correctly aligned?

A. Confirm that all account ranges are open for all authorization groups, demonstrating that no required entry could be blocked during the close.
B. Confirm that the required statutory entries can post in the intended interval while unintended account ranges remain controlled for the relevant authorization groups.
C. Confirm that the period is closed for every account range, demonstrating that the close has fully locked the ledger against any further postings.
D. Confirm that the foreign currency valuation completed, since the valuation run is what opens the posting periods for the close steps.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Correct alignment means the entries the close requires can post in the intended interval while everything else stays controlled, which is the balance posting-period control is meant to strike. This validation directly addresses the earlier selective block-and-pass anomaly.
Topic: 2
Micro Skill Drill Exam
Question: 18

Nordwind Dairy Cooperative is standing up Financial Accounting on its SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition system. A junior consultant has created a new company code for the cooperative's milk-processing entity and has maintained its address, currency, and fiscal-year settings. When the cooperative's general-ledger lead attempts to post the first test document in that company code, the system refuses the posting and reports that no chart of accounts has been determined for the entity. The lead confirms that an operating chart of accounts already exists on the system and is used by the cooperative's other entities. The consultant insists every required field on the company-code definition was completed and asks why posting still fails. The implementation team needs the new entity to begin recording G/L postings during the validation cycle, so the missing dependency must be identified and corrected before further test transactions are attempted in that company code.
Which action correctly resolves why the new company code cannot accept G/L postings?

A. Open the posting periods for the new company code so the entity accepts documents in the current period and the validation postings can be entered.
B. Assign the existing operating chart of accounts to the new company code so account determination resolves and the entity can record G/L postings.
C. Define a new chart of accounts dedicated to the milk-processing entity so its accounts stay separate from the other cooperative entities during validation.
D. Recreate the company code from scratch and re-enter the address and currency so the system rebuilds the entity with a valid posting profile that accepts documents.

Answer: B

Explanation:
A company code can only post G/L documents once a chart of accounts is assigned to it, because account determination depends on that assignment. The operating chart already exists and is shared by the other entities, so assigning it to the new company code restores account determination and lets the entity record validation postings. This addresses the actual missing dependency.
Question: 19

Nordwind Dairy Cooperative wants its financial statements to be complete at profit-center and segment level so it can report results by processing site within its SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition system. During a validation review, the controlling lead notices that some balance-sheet line items, such as the payables arising from a cross-functional vendor invoice, do not carry a profit center on every line. As a result, a balance sheet drawn for an individual profit center does not balance on its own. The cooperative confirmed that profit centers and segments are defined and assigned to the relevant accounts, yet the line-level characteristics are still incomplete on documents that touch multiple assignments. The finance architect needs the General Ledger function that derives and inherits these characteristics onto all line items so that profit-center-level and segment-level statements can be produced correctly.
Which General Ledger function ensures all line items carry the profit center and segment so entity-level statements balance?

A. Configure validations on the affected accounts so postings without a profit center are blocked, forcing users to enter the characteristic before the document is saved.
B. Configure document splitting so line items are split and inherited by profit center and segment to produce complete sub-entity statements.
C. Open additional posting periods for the affected accounts so the documents repost with the characteristics and the profit-center statements then balance correctly.
D. Maintain additional profit centers and segments so more master-data values exist for the documents to use and the balance-sheet lines receive the missing assignments.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Document splitting is the General Ledger function that splits line items by characteristics such as profit center and segment and inherits them onto otherwise unassigned lines. With splitting configured for those characteristics, every line carries the assignment, allowing complete and balanced financial statements at profit-center and segment level. This resolves the stated root cause.
Question: 20

The closing team at Nordwind Dairy Cooperative is finalizing the prior month in its SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition system. An accountant needs to post a late adjustment document dated in the prior period, but the system rejects the entry and reports that posting is not allowed in that period for the relevant account type. The team confirms the prior period was deliberately closed after the month-end run, while the current period is open and accepting documents. The cooperative's policy requires this specific adjustment to be recorded back in the prior period rather than the current one, and only the closing supervisor is authorized to permit such postings. The supervisor wants the period reopened in a controlled, temporary way so the adjustment can be entered without exposing the closed period to unrestricted postings by other users.
Which action allows the controlled prior-period adjustment to be posted as required?

A. Re-run the entire month-end closing program for the prior period so the period reopens automatically and the late adjustment can then be recorded by the team.
B. Disable period control for the company code so any open or closed period accepts documents and the supervisor can enter the adjustment without further restriction.
C. Reopen the prior period in the posting-period configuration, restricting it to the authorized group so only the supervisor can enter the adjustment.
D. Change the document date to the current open period so the adjustment posts immediately and the closed prior period remains untouched for all users.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Posting periods are opened and closed through posting-period configuration, which can restrict a temporarily reopened interval to an authorization group. Reopening the prior period for the authorized group lets only the supervisor enter the adjustment while other users stay blocked. This satisfies the policy and keeps the closed period controlled.
Question: 21

The accounts-receivable team at Nordwind Dairy Cooperative received a payment from a wholesale customer in its SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition system. The incoming amount matches the total of several open invoices, and the accountant posted the incoming payment to the customer account. During a review, the team finds that the original invoices still show as open items on the customer's account even though the cash has been received and posted. The accountant confirms the payment document itself posted successfully and the customer balance is correct, but the invoices were never matched against the payment. The cooperative needs the customer's open-item list to reflect reality before dunning is run, because overdue notices would otherwise be issued for invoices that have already been paid. The accountant must take the correct action to resolve the open items.
Which action correctly removes the paid invoices from the customer's open-item list?

A. Exclude the customer from the next dunning run so the paid invoices are not selected for overdue notices while they continue to show as open on the account.
B. Reverse the incoming payment and re-post it so that the new posting automatically links to the open invoices and removes them from the open-item list during entry.
C. Post a manual adjustment that writes the open invoices down to zero so the customer's open-item list no longer displays them before the dunning run is executed.

D. Clear the open invoices against the posted payment so the matched items are set to cleared and drop off the open-item list.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Open-item clearing matches the posted payment against the corresponding open invoices and sets the matched items to cleared, removing them from the open-item list. Because the payment and balance are already correct, clearing is the precise step needed so the items no longer appear and dunning will not flag paid invoices. This resolves the root cause.
Question: 22

Nordwind Dairy Cooperative is extending its profit-center reporting in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition to show results for a newly opened cheese-maturing facility. A master-data specialist created a profit center for the facility but a colleague reports that postings to it are not appearing in the intended reporting dimension, and a balance sheet by segment does not show the new facility's results. The specialist confirms the profit center master record was saved with its name and basic data. The cooperative's reporting design groups profit centers under segments so that segment-level statements aggregate correctly, and other facilities already appear under their segments. The reporting lead wants the new facility's results to roll up to the correct segment without redesigning the existing structure, so the specialist must correct the master-data setup that drives this aggregation.
What is the correct master-data correction so the new facility's results aggregate to the intended segment?

A. Re-post the affected documents to a different existing profit center that already rolls up correctly so the facility's figures appear under that segment instead.
B. Assign the appropriate segment to the new profit center master record so its postings roll up and appear in segment-level statements as designed.
C. Create a new segment specifically for the cheese-maturing facility so its results are reported separately and no longer depend on the existing segment structure.
D. Define a substitution that fills the segment during posting for the facility's documents so the entries acquire the segment value at the moment they are recorded.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Segment-level aggregation is driven by the segment assigned to the profit center master record. The new profit center was saved without its segment link, so its postings do not roll up. Assigning the appropriate segment to the master record makes the facility's results appear under the intended segment, matching how the other facilities are set up. This corrects the actual master-data gap.
Question: 23

At Nordwind Dairy Cooperative, the receivables team is onboarding a regional supermarket chain as a new customer in the SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition system. A clerk created the customer using only the sales-area data because the supermarket was first contacted by the sales department. When the receivables accountant tries to post the customer's opening invoice in Financial Accounting, the system blocks the posting and indicates the company-code view of the customer is not maintained. The accountant verifies the general business-partner record exists and that the sales data is complete. The

cooperative needs this customer ready for receivables postings before the next billing cycle, and the data-quality lead wants the master record completed using the correct master-data approach rather than a workaround. The team must decide what to maintain so the customer can be used for FI postings in this entity.
What must be maintained so the new customer can be used for receivables postings in this company code?

A. Maintain the company-code (Financial Accounting) view of the business partner so the customer carries the entity-specific data required for receivables.
B. Open the posting periods in the company code so the entity accepts the opening invoice and the customer can be used for receivables postings this cycle.
C. Create a second business-partner record limited to Financial Accounting so the receivables team has an independent customer master for posting in this company code.
D. Adjust the sales-area data on the existing record so the additional fields it contains satisfy the company code and allow the invoice to post in receivables.

Answer: A

Explanation:
A business partner used as a customer needs its company-code (Financial Accounting) view maintained before it can be posted in that entity, because reconciliation and posting control live in that view. The general and sales data exist but the FI view is missing, which is exactly what the system reported. Completing this view makes the customer postable for receivables.