

Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP C_TS422

**SAP Certified - SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition,
Production Planning and Manufacturing**



For More Information – Visit link below:

<https://www.examsboost.com/>

Product Version

- ✓ Up to Date products, reliable and verified.
- ✓ Questions and Answers in PDF Format.

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Unified Scenario Simulation
2. Micro Skill Drill Exam

Topic: 1

Unified Scenario Simulation

Tamesford Appliances: First Manufacturing Planning Cycle on S/4HANA

Business Context

Tamesford Appliances is a mid-sized discrete manufacturer of domestic appliances supplying retail and wholesale customers across two regions. The company is implementing SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition for manufacturing and is approaching its first live planning cycle for a new product line. A small manufacturing project team — a consultant and two business users — is preparing master data, running planning, and rehearsing the production order lifecycle before go-live, so that the first MRP run and the first production orders behave as expected.

Master Data Context

The new appliance is assembled from purchased and in-house components. The team has created the bill of material and the routing, and has set up the work centers that the routing operations refer to. During the first walkthrough, most assemblies plan correctly, but one in-house component does not generate the expected planned orders, even though demand exists for it. The team has confirmed the component's demand and that it is flagged for in-house production.

Planning Context

The project plans to use MRP Live for the regular planning run and is evaluating advanced methods for a constrained, high-variability subassembly. The business expects the planning run to create planned orders for in-house items and purchase requisitions for externally procured items, and to surface exception messages where coverage cannot be met. A category manager has asked whether make-to-stock or make-to-order is the right strategy for the configurable variant the company sells to wholesale customers.

Capacity Context

Two work centers are shared between the new line and existing production. After the first planning run, the team wants to see whether the planned load exceeds available capacity at those work centers before committing to dates. The expectation is that capacity evaluation shows the load against available capacity so the team can decide whether any levelling is needed, rather than discovering an overload only when orders are executed.

Advanced Planning Context

The constrained subassembly has sequence-dependent setup and limited resource availability, so the team is weighing the embedded advanced planning and detailed scheduling capability against the standard run for that item. The goal is finite, resource-aware scheduling for the bottleneck without over-engineering planning for the rest of the catalogue, which the standard run handles well.

Execution Context

For shopfloor execution the team is rehearsing the production order lifecycle: creating and releasing orders, confirming operations, and completing them. During the rehearsal, one released order cannot be confirmed at a particular operation, and the team needs to determine whether the cause sits in the order, the master data the order copied, or the confirmation step itself, before they repeat the rehearsal.

Process Manufacturing Context

A separate liquid-detergent area runs as process manufacturing rather than discrete, with its own master data and shopfloor process. The team must keep the two streams distinct, because the same business intent is modelled with different objects across discrete and process manufacturing, and reusing a discrete assumption in the process area has already caused confusion once.

Go-Live Readiness Context

Before go-live, the team wants confidence that master data is complete enough for planning to resolve, that the planning run and capacity evaluation produce a readable result, that the chosen strategy and method fit each item, and that the production order lifecycle can be executed end to end. Management wants the first cycle to validate the setup rather than expose gaps to the shopfloor.

Your assignment

You are the manufacturing consultant on the Tamesford S/4HANA project. Working in the project system before go-live, you must prepare master data, run and interpret planning, choose fit-for-purpose strategies and methods, and execute the production order lifecycle. Validate each result against observable system evidence; do not assume a re-run will fix a master-data or strategy gap

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Completing Manufacturing Master Data Before Planning

- Review the new product's bill of material, routing, work centers, and in-house production settings.
- For an in-house item that planning skips, identify which master-data prerequisite is missing rather than re-running planning blindly.
- Correct the prerequisite and confirm the item becomes eligible for planning.

Checkpoints

- The previously skipped item generates the expected planned order after correction.
- No item is left planning-ineligible due to an incomplete master-data prerequisite.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Running MRP and Reading the Planning Result

- Execute the planning run and review planned orders, purchase requisitions, and exception messages.
- Distinguish an exception that signals a real coverage problem from one that is informational.
- Use capacity evaluation to see planned load against available capacity at the shared work centers.

Checkpoints

- Procurement proposals match each item's procurement type.
- Capacity load is visible against available capacity before dates are committed.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Choosing the Strategy and Planning Method per Item

- Decide make-to-stock or make-to-order per item from its demand pattern and configuration needs.
- Decide standard planning versus the embedded advanced method for constrained, sequence-dependent items.
- Record the choice and the reason it fits that item.

Checkpoints

- The configurable wholesale variant uses a strategy consistent with its demand and variant nature.
- The constrained subassembly uses finite, resource-aware scheduling without over-engineering the rest.

4. CHALLENGE 4 — Executing the Production Order Lifecycle

- Create and release a production order, confirm its operations, and complete it.
- For an operation that cannot be confirmed, locate the cause in the order, its copied master data, or the confirmation step.
- Keep discrete and process execution distinct, using each stream's own objects.

Checkpoints

- A released order is confirmed at every operation and completed.
- A confirmation failure is traced to the responsible layer, not worked around by retrying.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Completing Manufacturing Master Data Before Planning

An in-house component has clear demand and is flagged for in-house production, yet the planning run creates no planned order for it, while other in-house items on the same bill of material plan correctly. Which check most directly explains why this one item is skipped?

- A. Confirm the item has the master data needed to be produced in-house, since the working items prove the run itself is fine
- B. Re-run the planning job for the whole plant and assume the planned order appears on the second pass, since the configuration looks correct and the first pass was probably incomplete
- C. Change the item to external procurement so a purchase requisition is created instead
- D. Raise the planning horizon for the plant so more periods are included

Answer: A

Explanation:

Other in-house items plan correctly, so the planning run works; the fault is specific to this item's readiness to be produced in-house. Checking that it has the master data required for in-house production (so planning can build a make proposal) targets the actual gap rather than the run.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Completing Manufacturing Master Data Before Planning

The routing for the new appliance refers to a work center, but one operation cannot find valid capacity or scheduling basis when the order is later scheduled. The bill of material is complete and the routing exists.

What is the most likely cause to correct?

- A. The bill of material is missing a component and must be extended before scheduling, on the assumption the scheduling basis comes from the component list rather than the work center
- B. The work center the operation refers to is not set up with the data scheduling needs, so it must be completed
- C. The order quantity is too large and should be reduced to schedule the operation
- D. The item should be switched to make-to-order so scheduling is skipped

Answer: B

Explanation:

The bill of material is complete and the routing exists, so the gap is the work center the operation depends on: if it lacks the data scheduling relies on, the operation cannot be scheduled. Completing the work center setup it references resolves the scheduling basis at the right layer.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 1 — Completing Manufacturing Master Data Before Planning

A business user proposes copying an existing similar product's master data wholesale to the new appliance to save time, then adjusting later. The team needs the first planning cycle to be trustworthy. Which evaluation is correct for this approach?

- A. Copying wholesale is the fastest route, and the two products are close enough that the copied bill of material and routing can be relied on without checking each one against the new appliance
- B. Copying wholesale is fine provided the planning run is executed twice afterward
- C. Copying is acceptable only if the strategy is changed to make-to-stock first
- D. Copying can speed setup but each copied object must be verified against the new appliance, or planning will resolve against wrong details

Answer: D

Explanation:

Copying accelerates setup but carries the source product's details, which may not match the new appliance; if a copied bill of material, routing, or setting is wrong, planning resolves against incorrect data. Verifying each copied object against the new appliance keeps the first cycle trustworthy.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 1 — Completing Manufacturing Master Data Before Planning

After correcting the skipped in-house item, the team must confirm the fix before go-live rather than assume it worked.

Which validation evidence best confirms the master-data gap is closed?

- A. The item no longer appears in the list of items flagged for in-house production, which the team reads as a sign the correction removed whatever was blocking it
- B. An administrator can display the item's bill of material without an error
- C. The planning run now creates the expected planned order for the item with correct coverage
- D. The item's demand has increased since the correction was made

Answer: C

Explanation:

The gap was that planning created no planned order for the item; the direct proof it is closed is that the planning run now produces the expected planned order with correct coverage. That demonstrates the item is genuinely plannable, not just changed.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 2 — Running MRP and Reading the Planning Result

After the planning run, an externally procured component shows a procurement proposal, and the team must confirm the proposal type matches how the component is obtained.

Which result is correct for an externally procured component?

- A. A planned order for in-house production is created for the component, on the assumption the planning run makes every component regardless of its procurement type
- B. A purchase requisition is created for the component, matching external procurement
- C. No proposal is created because external items are excluded from planning
- D. A process order is created for the component regardless of its type

Answer: B

Explanation:

A planned order represents in-house production, which contradicts an externally procured component and would propose making something meant to be bought.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 2 — Running MRP and Reading the Planning Result

The planning result shows an exception message on a finished product indicating its coverage cannot be met within the requested dates. A business user wants to ignore all exception messages as noise.

How should the team treat this exception?

- A. Investigate it as a real coverage signal, because it indicates demand that cannot be met as requested
- B. Treat the message as low priority and release the plan now, intending to revisit coverage only if the shopfloor later reports that the product has run short
- C. Delete the finished product's demand so the exception disappears
- D. Switch the plant to a different planning method to remove all exceptions

Answer: A

Explanation:

An exception that says coverage cannot be met within the requested dates is an actionable signal about unmet demand, not noise; investigating it lets the team address the shortfall (timing, capacity, or supply) before it reaches the shopfloor.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 2 — Running MRP and Reading the Planning Result

Before committing dates, the team wants to know whether the planned load at the two shared work centers exceeds what is available, rather than finding out during execution.

Which action gives them that visibility at the right time?

- A. Release all planned orders first and watch for delays on the shopfloor, treating any delays that appear during execution as the signal that capacity was exceeded
- B. Increase the available capacity of both work centers so no overload can occur
- C. Use capacity evaluation to compare planned load against available capacity at the work centers
- D. Reduce every order quantity so the load is certainly under capacity

Answer: C

Explanation:

Capacity evaluation shows planned load against available capacity at the work centers, which is exactly the pre-commitment visibility the team needs to decide whether any levelling is required before dates are fixed.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 2 — Running MRP and Reading the Planning Result

The project plans to use MRP Live for the regular run. A team member asks why MRP Live is chosen for the routine plant run rather than a manual item-by-item approach.

Which statement best fits MRP Live's role here?

- A. MRP Live is only for externally procured items and cannot plan in-house items, so in-house items must be planned separately by a manual item-by-item method
- B. MRP Live replaces the need for any master data because it infers everything
- C. MRP Live should be avoided for routine runs because it cannot raise exceptions
- D. MRP Live performs the regular plant planning run efficiently across items, producing proposals and exceptions for review

Answer: D

Explanation:

MRP Live is suited to the routine plant planning run: it plans across items and produces the procurement proposals and exception messages the team reviews, which fits the project's need for a regular, readable planning cycle.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 3 — Choosing the Strategy and Planning Method per Item

The configurable variant sold to wholesale customers is ordered to specific customer configurations with limited predictability. The team must choose make-to-stock or make-to-order for it.

Which choice fits this item, and why?

- A. Make-to-stock, because keeping the configurable variant in finished stock gives wholesale customers the fastest possible response whenever they place an order for it
- B. Make-to-stock, because the variant should be built to a forecast and stored ahead of orders
- C. Make-to-order, because the configurable, customer-specific variant should be produced against actual orders
- D. Either is equally valid, so pick whichever is faster to configure

Answer: C

Explanation:

A configurable, customer-specific variant with limited predictability is best produced against actual sales orders, which is make-to-order; it avoids stocking configurations that may never be ordered and ties production to real demand.

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 3 — Choosing the Strategy and Planning Method per Item

A constrained subassembly has sequence-dependent setup and limited resource availability and is the line's bottleneck, while the rest of the catalogue plans well with the standard run. Which planning approach best fits the subassembly?

- A. Plan it with the standard run like everything else, since that already works for the catalogue, on the assumption the bottleneck needs no different treatment from unconstrained items
- B. Stop planning it and expedite it manually whenever it is needed
- C. Move the whole catalogue to advanced planning so everything is scheduled identically
- D. Use the embedded advanced planning and detailed scheduling capability for finite, resource-aware scheduling of the subassembly

Answer: D

Explanation:

A bottleneck with sequence-dependent setup and limited resources needs finite, resource-aware detailed scheduling, which the embedded advanced planning capability provides; applying it to the constrained item addresses the constraint where it exists.

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 3 — Choosing the Strategy and Planning Method per Item

Leadership asks the consultant to apply one identical planning strategy and method to every item to keep the setup simple. Items in the catalogue have clearly different demand patterns and constraints. Which response is correct under these conditions?

- A. Match strategy and method to each item's demand and constraints; a single uniform approach would misfit many items

- B. Apply one strategy to all items, because a uniform setup is simpler to maintain and the differences between the catalogue's items can be managed operationally afterward
- C. Apply make-to-order to everything so nothing is ever stocked
- D. Apply advanced planning to everything so the setup is consistent

Answer: A

Explanation:

Items with different demand patterns and constraints need fit-for-purpose strategy and method; forcing one uniform approach would misfit many items (over-stocking some, under-controlling bottlenecks). Matching each item to its pattern is the correct, defensible choice.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 3 — Choosing the Strategy and Planning Method per Item

The team has chosen make-to-order for the configurable variant and must confirm the choice behaves correctly before go-live.

Which validation evidence best confirms the strategy fits?

- A. The variant is held as finished stock ahead of any customer order, which is taken as evidence that the variant is available whenever wholesale customers order it
- B. A customer order for a specific configuration drives a corresponding production proposal for that order
- C. An administrator can display the variant's bill of material
- D. The variant appears in the plant's stock overview with a positive balance

Answer: B

Explanation:

Make-to-order ties production to actual orders, so the confirming evidence is that a customer order for a specific configuration drives a production proposal for that order; that demonstrates demand-driven behaviour for the variant.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 4 — Executing the Production Order Lifecycle

A production order has been created but the team cannot yet confirm work against it on the shopfloor. The order's data looks correct.

Which step most likely must happen first?

- A. The order must be completed before any operation can be confirmed, on the assumption completion is what opens the order for shopfloor confirmation
- B. The order must be deleted and recreated to allow confirmation
- C. A new bill of material must be assigned before confirmation is possible

D. The order must be released, because confirmation of work follows release in the lifecycle

Answer: D

Explanation:

In the production order lifecycle, work is confirmed after the order is released; an order that is only created has not yet reached the state where operation confirmation is allowed, so releasing it is the prerequisite step.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 4 — Executing the Production Order Lifecycle

A released order cannot be confirmed at one operation, while its other operations confirm normally. The team suspects the operation's underlying detail. Where should they look first for the cause?

- A. In the sales order that generated the demand for the finished product, on the assumption the demand source controls whether each operation can be confirmed
- B. In the plant's overall planning horizon settings
- C. In the operation's master-data basis that the order copied, since peer operations confirm fine
- D. In the bill of material of an unrelated product

Answer: C

Explanation:

Other operations on the same order confirm normally, so the order and confirmation step are generally sound; the fault is specific to this operation, pointing to the master-data basis it copied (for example its work-center or operation detail). That is where to look first.

Question: 15

CHALLENGE 4 — Executing the Production Order Lifecycle

The liquid-detergent area runs as process manufacturing. A team member starts executing it using the discrete production order assumptions that worked for the appliance line. Which correction keeps the two streams correct?

- A. Force the detergent area to use the discrete order objects for consistency across the plant, so every area is executed with the same objects the appliance line already uses
- B. Execute the process area with its own process manufacturing objects, since discrete and process model the work differently
- C. Stop running the detergent area until it is converted to discrete manufacturing
- D. Use the appliance line's order for the detergent area and adjust quantities afterward

Answer: B

Explanation:

Discrete and process manufacturing model the same intent with different objects, so the process detergent area must be executed with its own process manufacturing objects; reusing discrete assumptions there is the source of the confusion.

Question: 16

CHALLENGE 4 — Executing the Production Order Lifecycle

After resolving the operation issue, the team wants to confirm the production order lifecycle works end to end before go-live.

Which evidence best demonstrates that?

- A. An order is created, released, confirmed at each operation, and completed
- B. An order is created and immediately completed without confirmation, which the team records as a fast demonstration that the lifecycle can run start to finish
- C. An order remains in created status while components are displayed
- D. An order is released but left unconfirmed pending the next rehearsal

Answer: A

Explanation:

End-to-end proof of the lifecycle is an order that is created, released, confirmed at each operation, and completed; that shows every stage works in sequence, which is exactly what go-live readiness requires.

Topic: 2

Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 17

A food and beverage manufacturer runs a liquid-products area as process manufacturing on SAP S/4HANA, alongside a discrete packaging line. A team member who set up the discrete line tries to execute the liquid area the same way, using the discrete production order approach that worked for packaging. The liquid area, however, does not behave correctly under the discrete approach, and the team is unsure whether to push the discrete objects onto it, convert the area to discrete, or run it in some other way. The packaging line continues to run normally through its discrete path, so the issue is specific to how the liquid area is being executed. The consultant must decide how to execute the liquid area correctly while keeping it distinct from the discrete packaging line, and stop reusing a discrete assumption where it does not apply. The correction must let both areas run validly side by side, with the liquid area executed in the way that suits how it actually works rather than by the discrete assumption that does not fit it.

Which approach correctly executes the liquid area while keeping both streams valid?

- A. Convert the liquid area to discrete manufacturing so it can reuse the packaging line's order approach directly

- B. Execute the liquid area with its own process manufacturing objects, since process and discrete model the work with different objects
- C. Force the liquid area onto the discrete production order so the whole plant executes through one consistent path, reusing the packaging line's setup even though the liquid area is process manufacturing
- D. Run the packaging line's discrete order for the liquid area and adjust the quantities and components afterward

Answer: B

Explanation:

Process and discrete manufacturing represent the same intent with different objects, so the liquid area must execute through its own process manufacturing path. That keeps both streams valid and removes the confusion caused by reusing the discrete approach.

Question: 18

An electronics manufacturer on SAP S/4HANA plans most of its catalogue successfully with the standard planning run. One subassembly, however, is a genuine bottleneck: it has sequence-dependent setup, limited availability on a specialised resource, and tight delivery commitments, so its scheduling must respect finite capacity and setup sequence rather than assume unlimited capacity. The standard run keeps proposing dates that the bottleneck resource cannot actually meet during execution, and the planner must decide how to plan this item so its schedule reflects the real resource and setup limits. The consultant must decide how to plan the bottleneck without disturbing the rest of the catalogue, which the standard run handles well. The bottleneck's specialised resource is available only in limited windows, and its setup time depends on the sequence in which items are produced. Moving everything to advanced planning would over-engineer the unconstrained majority, while leaving the bottleneck on the standard run keeps producing unrealistic dates. The correction must give this constrained item a schedule that respects its finite resource and setup limits, while the unconstrained items remain on the standard run that already serves them well.

Which planning approach fits the bottleneck subassembly without over-engineering the rest?

- A. Keep the bottleneck on the standard run like the rest of the catalogue, since that run already plans most items well
- B. Move the entire catalogue to advanced planning so every item is scheduled in exactly the same consistent way, including the many items the standard run already plans well without constraints
- C. Stop planning the bottleneck in the system and expedite it manually each time its delivery date approaches
- D. Apply the embedded advanced planning and detailed scheduling capability to the bottleneck for finite, resource-aware scheduling

Answer: D

Explanation:

A bottleneck with sequence-dependent setup and limited resource availability needs finite, resource-aware detailed scheduling, which the embedded advanced planning capability provides. Applying it only to the constrained item fixes the unrealistic dates without disturbing the rest.

Question: 19

A discrete automotive-components manufacturer is preparing master data on SAP S/4HANA before its first planning cycle. A subassembly is meant to be produced in-house, and demand for it clearly exists from the finished products that consume it. After the planning run, however, the subassembly receives a purchase requisition rather than a planned order for in-house production, while comparable in-house items on the same bill of material correctly receive planned orders. The consultant confirms the bill of material is complete, the routing exists, and the work centers are set up. Its peers on the same bill of material plan correctly and its routing and work centers are complete, so the team must determine why this one item is not being planned for in-house production. The team needs the first cycle to reflect the real sourcing intent and must avoid simply accepting the purchase requisition, because the part is genuinely manufactured in-house and no supplier is set up for it. The correction must make planning propose in-house production for the subassembly while leaving the correctly-planned peers untouched, and the result must be reproducible into later systems.

Which correction makes planning propose in-house production for the subassembly?

- A. Extend the bill of material with more components so planning recognises the part as in-house
- B. Increase the planning horizon so the subassembly is included on a later planning pass
- C. Correct the subassembly's procurement type so the system treats it as produced in-house, then re-run planning for it
- D. Accept the purchase requisition and quickly create a supplier so the part can be procured externally instead, even though no supplier exists and the part is genuinely manufactured in-house

Answer: C

Explanation:

Peers on the same bill of material plan correctly, so the run is sound; the subassembly's procurement type is what makes the system buy rather than make it. Correcting that procurement type makes planning propose in-house production, and re-running confirms it at the right layer.

Question: 20

A pharmaceutical manufacturer on SAP S/4HANA produces two kinds of output: a standard over-the-counter product with steady, forecastable demand sold through retail, and a specialised preparation made to specific clinic orders with low predictability and order-specific characteristics. The planning team initially set both to the same strategy for simplicity, but the specialised preparation has been accumulating finished stock that clinics do not order in that exact form, while the standard product occasionally runs short. Demand for the standard product is steady across the retail calendar, whereas clinic orders for the specialised preparation arrive irregularly and in specific forms. The consultant must assign each product the planning strategy that fits its demand. The standard product's steady, forecastable demand suits building to a forecast and holding stock, while the specialised preparation's order-specific, low-predictability nature suits producing against actual clinic orders rather than to forecast. The correction must stop the specialised preparation being built to stock it cannot sell as-is, and keep the standard product available for its predictable retail demand, by matching strategy to each product's pattern rather than applying one uniform approach.

Which strategy assignment fits the two products' demand patterns?

- A. Keep both on one identical strategy, because a uniform approach is simpler to configure and maintain over time
- B. Make both products to stock, since holding finished inventory keeps everything available for customers at all times
- C. Make the standard product to stock and the specialised, order-specific preparation to order, matching each pattern
- D. Make both products to order, so nothing is ever built before a confirmed order exists for it

Answer: C

Explanation:

The standard product's predictable demand suits make-to-stock, and the specialised, order-specific preparation suits make-to-order; matching each product to its pattern stops the unsellable stock and keeps the standard product available.

Question: 21

A building-materials manufacturer on SAP S/4HANA reviews the result of its latest planning run. A finished product carries an exception message indicating that its demand cannot be covered within the requested dates. A junior planner suggests treating all exception messages as background noise and ignoring them, so the team can release what is already planned and move on. The exception names a specific finished product whose demand cannot be covered within the requested dates, and nothing about the planning run itself has been shown to be faulty. Other team members are unsure how to respond: some would delete the product's demand so the message simply disappears, others would switch the plant to a different planning method in the hope of removing such messages, and others suspect the exception points to a genuine shortfall that needs looking into. The consultant must decide how to treat this exception before the plan is committed, weighing whether dismissing or suppressing it could let a real coverage problem reach the shopfloor against the effort of investigating its cause in timing, supply, or capacity.

How should the team treat the coverage exception on the finished product?

- A. Investigate it as a real coverage signal, since it flags demand that cannot be met within the requested dates
- B. Switch the plant to a different planning method on the assumption it will stop generating exception messages
- C. Ignore all exception messages as background noise and release whatever is already planned without investigating them
- D. Delete the finished product's demand so the exception message disappears from the planning result entirely

Answer: A

Explanation:

An exception that says coverage cannot be met within the requested dates is actionable, so investigating its cause — timing, supply, or capacity — lets the team resolve the shortfall before it reaches execution.

Question: 22

An industrial-pump manufacturer running SAP S/4HANA has completed a planning run for a busy assembly line. One work center is shared between two product families, and the planner is concerned it may be overloaded once the planned orders are scheduled. Leadership wants committed delivery dates by the end of the day, but the planner does not yet know whether the planned load at that work center exceeds its available capacity. The team considers several approaches: releasing all planned orders immediately and reacting to any shopfloor delays, raising the work center's available capacity on the assumption it will be tight, or cutting order quantities so the load is certainly low. The planner wants to base the commitment on what the planning result actually shows about load versus available capacity at that work center, rather than discovering an overload during execution or changing the plant without evidence. The decision must give pre-commitment visibility of the load so the team can judge whether any levelling is genuinely needed before dates are promised to customers.

Which action gives the planner pre-commitment visibility of load versus available capacity?

- A. Reduce the order quantities across the line so the planned load is certainly below available capacity
- B. Release all planned orders immediately and react to whatever delays appear on the shopfloor during execution, instead of measuring the load before the dates are committed
- C. Use capacity evaluation to compare the planned load against the work center's available capacity before committing dates
- D. Raise the work center's available capacity now, assuming the shared resource will be too tight once orders run

Answer: C

Explanation:

Capacity evaluation shows planned load against available capacity at the work center, which is exactly the pre-commitment visibility needed to judge whether levelling is required before dates are promised.

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-ts422>