SAP
C_IEE2E_2608
SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - End-to-End Business Processes for SAP Business Suite

Latest Version: 4.0

1. Unified Scenario Simulation
2. Micro Skill Drill Exam

Topic: 1
Unified Scenario Simulation
Hydronova Pumps Multi-Plant Production Cutover Rehearsal
Business Context
Hydronova Fluid Systems is an industrial manufacturer of centrifugal pumps and control valves supplying water-treatment, chemical, and energy customers. The group runs a single company code and operates three manufacturing plants — a cast-and-machine plant, an assembly-and-test plant, and a spares-and-refurbishment plant — that share products, engineering data, and demand. The board has committed to running its core business processes on the cloud ERP edition adopted under a fit-to-standard program, and the production and finance streams are the last to move.
Program Setup
The program is in its cutover rehearsal window — a full dress rehearsal executed against a copy of the target productive tenant before the real go-live. The intent is to prove that a demand signal can flow all the way through planning, production, and period-end settlement without manual intervention, and that the numbers land correctly in Finance. Master data has been loaded from the legacy system, best-practice production processes have been activated, and the rehearsal team is executing a scripted week of business days compressed into the rehearsal calendar.
System Landscape
Products are modeled once and used across all three plants, with plant-specific extensions where a material behaves differently at a given location. Bills of material and routings were migrated for the cast-and-machine and assembly plants; the spares plant reuses several of the same finished products but assembles from a narrower component set. Overhead is planned and actual through cost centers aligned to the work centers, and the finished-pump cost estimates were run so that standard prices exist before the rehearsal transactions begin.
Planning Context
The rehearsal opens with the demand plan being handed to operational planning, after which the planning run is expected to net requirements against stock and open receipts and propose supply. On the first rehearsal day the planners at the assembly plant observe that several finished pumps generate procurement proposals for components rather than production proposals for the pumps themselves, while the same products at the cast-and-machine plant plan as expected. The planners note the difference and continue converting whatever proposals the run produces so the downstream steps can be exercised.
Order Handoff
As converted orders reach the shop floor, the assembly team reports that a batch of production orders cannot be released. The material availability check flags missing components that the warehouse insists are physically on hand and were counted during the load. A second cluster of orders releases cleanly but, once confirmations are posted, the goods receipt for the finished pump does not update inventory value the way the finance observer expected. The team records both observations and keeps executing the script to preserve the rehearsal timeline.
Costing Observations
At the assembly plant, several finished pumps were given a manually keyed standard price during the load because their cost estimates had not finished running when the price list was frozen. Those pumps

now carry a standard that does not match the summed cost of their components and operations. The controlling observer notices that confirmations on these products are posting activity quantities but the values look thin, and asks whether the rehearsal should pause to rerun costing or continue and settle whatever accumulates.

Close Preparation

The rehearsal calendar reaches its compressed period-end. The controlling team begins the closing sequence for production: overhead is to be applied to the orders, work in process is to be calculated for orders still open, variances are to be computed for orders that finished, and the results are to be settled. The finance observer wants confirmation that once settlement runs, the postings reconcile to the general ledger and that no order is left carrying a balance that should have cleared. The team is unsure which orders are eligible for which step given the mixed release and confirmation states across the three plants.

Governance Context

Program governance has set two firm expectations for sign-off. First, the rehearsal must demonstrate the end-to-end chain on standard configuration — the sponsors will not accept a green result achieved by manually forcing prices, forcing availability, or hand-posting to the ledger, because those manual acts cannot be repeated at productive scale. Second, the close must be defensible: every value that lands in Finance must trace back to a production event, and the three plants must close on a consistent basis even though they were loaded and are executing at slightly different maturity levels. The cutover lead has to decide which anomalies are true configuration or data defects to fix before go-live and which are merely rehearsal-sequencing artifacts, and record that judgment for the go/no-go review.

Your assignment

You are working in the rehearsal tenant of an industrial pump and valve manufacturer that runs one company code across three manufacturing plants. Best-practice production processes are active and finished-product cost estimates have been run. You are executing a scripted end-to-end run — demand to planning to production to period-end settlement — and validating that each step produces the expected system evidence and that production values reconcile to Finance. Use only standard configuration; do not force prices, availability, or manual ledger postings. Work per plant where behavior differs, and record observable completion evidence at each checkpoint

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Planning Run Handoff Across Multiple Plants

• Hand the demand plan to operational planning and execute the planning run for the affected finished pumps at each plant.

• For a finished pump that generates a procurement proposal at the assembly plant but a production proposal at the cast-and-machine plant, inspect the plant-level product master and the supply-steering settings that determine whether the run proposes in-house production or external procurement.

• Confirm the requirement is netted against existing stock and open receipts before any proposal is accepted, and convert proposals to the appropriate supply element only after the proposal type is correct.

Checkpoints

• The same finished pump proposes in-house production consistently across plants where it is manufactured, not procurement of its components.

• Requirements reconcile to demand net of stock and open receipts at each plant.

• No proposal is converted while its supply type is still wrong.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Production Order Release And Component Availability

• Attempt release of the blocked assembly orders and read the material availability result rather than overriding it.

• Reconcile the components the check reports as missing against the storage location, plant assignment, and stock type of the physically counted inventory.

• Establish why on-hand stock is not evaluated by the check before deciding on any release action, and re-run the check after the underlying data is corrected.

Checkpoints

• The availability check confirms components once the stock is visible in the correct plant, storage location, and unrestricted stock type.
• Release proceeds without a manual override of the availability result.
• Goods issue subsequently consumes the intended components against the order.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Finished-Product Cost Estimate And Standard Price Integrity

• Identify finished pumps whose standard price was keyed manually during the load rather than set by a released cost estimate.
• Rerun the finished-product cost estimate so the standard reflects the rolled-up component and activity cost, and release it before further confirmations post value.
• Verify that goods receipts value the finished pump at the released standard and that resulting variances measure real deviation, not a difference caused by the manual price.

Checkpoints

• The released standard equals the summed component and operation cost for the finished pump.
• Goods receipt for the finished pump posts inventory value at the released standard.
• Confirmation values reflect actual activity consumption, not a thin manual baseline.

4. CHALLENGE 4 — Period-End Settlement And Reconciliation To Finance

• Run the production closing steps in sequence: apply overhead to orders, calculate work in process for orders still open, calculate variances for orders that are technically complete, then settle.
• Determine each order's eligibility for work-in-process versus variance treatment from its status, and settle so results post to the correct receivers in Finance.
• After settlement, reconcile the postings to the general ledger and confirm no order retains a balance that should have cleared.

Checkpoints

• Open orders carry work in process; finished orders carry variances; each posts to the correct Finance receiver.
• After settlement every settled order shows a cleared balance with no residual left on the order.
• Every value in the ledger traces to an originating production event, consistently across all three plants.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Planning Run Handoff Across Multiple Plants

The same finished pump proposes in-house production at the cast-and-machine plant but procurement of its components at the assembly plant after the planning run.
What is the most likely root cause of the difference in proposal type between the two plants?

A. The demand plan was released only to the cast-and-machine plant, so the assembly plant received no requirement of its own and simply defaulted to a procurement proposal for the components
B. The finished pump has no bill of material at either plant, so the run cannot resolve a production path and therefore procures the pump everywhere
C. The planning run was executed before any stock and open receipts existed, so every plant temporarily proposed procurement until fresh inventory posted against it
D. The plant-level supply-steering setting on the assembly plant's product master is set to external procurement, so the run proposes procurement there instead of production

Answer: D

Explanation:
Whether the run proposes in-house production or external procurement is steered by the plant-level settings on the product master, so a difference in behavior for the same product across two plants points to a plant-specific procurement-type setting. Correcting that setting at the assembly plant makes the pump plan for production consistently.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Planning Run Handoff Across Multiple Plants

Planners continue converting whatever proposals the run produced to keep the rehearsal script moving, including the procurement proposals at the assembly plant.
What is the most appropriate action before converting the assembly plant's proposals?

A. Convert the procurement proposals now and raise a change request to fix the supply type after go-live, since keeping to the rehearsal timeline is the immediate priority here
B. Correct the plant-level supply-steering setting so the pump proposes in-house production, then re-run and convert the corrected production proposals
C. Manually create production orders for the pumps and delete the procurement proposals, leaving the plant-level product master unchanged
D. Convert the proposals as they are but tag them clearly so Finance can reclassify the resulting postings later during period-end settlement

Answer: B

Explanation:
The defect is in the plant-level master data steering supply, and the rehearsal must prove the chain on standard configuration; correcting the setting and re-running produces the right proposal type so the downstream production and costing steps execute as they will at go-live.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 1 — Planning Run Handoff Across Multiple Plants

Before accepting any proposal, the planner must confirm the run netted requirements correctly at the plant.
Which evidence best confirms the planning run handoff behaved correctly at a plant?

A. Every finished pump ends up with at least one converted order at the plant regardless of what its current on-hand stock position happens to be
B. The proposal quantity generated at the plant equals the full gross demand with no reduction at all for existing stock or open receipts

C. The requirement is netted against on-hand stock and open receipts, and the resulting proposal is of the correct supply type for that plant
D. Procurement proposals and production proposals turn out to appear in roughly equal numbers across all three of the plants once the planning run has fully completed

Answer: C

Explanation:
A correct handoff both nets demand against existing stock and open receipts and generates the appropriate supply element, so the netted quantity and the correct proposal type together are the evidence that planning behaved as designed.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 1 — Planning Run Handoff Across Multiple Plants

The spares plant reuses several of the same finished pumps but assembles them from a narrower component set than the assembly plant.
How should the planning run resolve requirements for a shared pump that is built differently at the spares plant?

A. The run should resolve each plant's requirement against that plant's own production master data, so the spares plant plans its narrower component set independently
B. The run should apply the assembly plant's full component set to the spares plant as well, on the basis that the pump is the same central product across every plant
C. The run should simply procure the finished pump for the spares plant in order to avoid maintaining two separate component sets for a single product
D. The run should merge both plants' requirements together into one single proposal at whichever plant happens to have available capacity first

Answer: A

Explanation:
A shared product carries plant-specific production master data where it is built differently, so the run must net and resolve each plant's requirement against that plant's own bill of material and routing; the spares plant then plans its narrower component set correctly and independently.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 2 — Production Order Release And Component Availability

Assembly orders fail release because the material availability check reports components missing, yet the warehouse counted those components as physically on hand during the load.
What is the most likely reason the check does not see the stock?

A. The physical stock exists but sits in a plant, storage location, or stock type that the availability check does not evaluate for that order
B. The availability check is disabled entirely in standard configuration, so it reports every component as missing on every single order
C. The finished pump has no released standard price yet, so the check cannot value the components and therefore reports them as missing
D. The components were already fully consumed by an earlier confirmation posting, so no unrestricted stock now remains for any of the blocked orders

Answer: A

Explanation:
When a physical count shows stock but the check reports it missing, the stock almost always exists in a location, plant, or stock type the check does not include — for example the wrong storage location or a non-unrestricted stock type — so the visibility, not the quantity, is the defect. Placing the stock where the check evaluates it lets release proceed.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 2 — Production Order Release And Component Availability

The rehearsal script is under time pressure and the team is tempted to override the availability result to release the blocked orders.
Which action best satisfies both the timeline and the sponsors' standard-configuration expectation?

A. Override the availability check so as to release the blocked orders right now, and then reconcile the underlying stock records only after the rehearsal window has fully ended
B. Reduce the component quantities keyed on each of the blocked orders so that the check passes against the limited stock it currently evaluates
C. Move or correct the stock into the plant, storage location, and unrestricted stock type the check evaluates, then re-run the check and release without an override
D. Release the blocked orders without running the availability check at all and rely on the later confirmation step to flag any real component shortage

Answer: C

Explanation:
Correcting the stock visibility so the check confirms components addresses the actual defect and lets release proceed on standard configuration without a manual override, which is exactly what the sponsors require and what will be repeatable at go-live.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 2 — Production Order Release And Component Availability

After the underlying data is corrected, the team must confirm the order handoff to the shop floor is sound.
Which observable evidence confirms the release and consumption step is now correct?

A. The order still releases only once a manual availability override is applied afresh on each and every occasion that release is attempted
B. The availability check confirms components, the order releases without an override, and goods issue consumes the intended components against the order
C. The order releases and then immediately posts a goods receipt for the finished pump even before any component goods issue has been recorded against it at all
D. The order releases and the missing components are then backflushed automatically from a different plant's unrestricted stock

Answer: B

Explanation:
A correct handoff is evidenced by the check confirming components, release occurring without a manual override, and goods issue consuming the intended components against the order — the full sequence that proves stock visibility and consumption work on standard configuration.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 3 — Finished-Product Cost Estimate And Standard Price Integrity

Several finished pumps at the assembly plant carry a manually keyed standard price that does not equal the summed cost of their components and operations.
What is the primary risk of confirming and receiving these pumps against the manual standard?

A. Confirmations on these pumps will be rejected outright because a manually keyed standard price cannot value the activity consumption posted on the order
B. The planning run will regenerate procurement proposals for these pumps on the grounds that their manual standard price is internally inconsistent
C. The pumps will be excluded from period-end settlement automatically until a fresh cost estimate has been released for each of them
D. Goods receipt will value inventory at a wrong standard and settlement will report variances that reflect the price error rather than real production deviation

Answer: D

Explanation:
When the standard does not equal the rolled-up cost, goods receipt values inventory at that wrong standard and the variance at settlement measures the gap between the wrong standard and actuals, so the reported variance reflects the price error rather than genuine production deviation. That undermines both valuation and the defensibility of the close.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 3 — Finished-Product Cost Estimate And Standard Price Integrity

The controlling observer asks whether to pause and correct the standard or continue and settle whatever accumulates.
What is the most appropriate action to protect valuation integrity?

A. Continue and settle against the manual standard for the time being, then post a manual Finance adjustment afterward to correct the resulting inventory value
B. Rerun the finished-product cost estimate and release it so the standard reflects rolled-up cost, before further confirmations and receipts post value
C. Keep the manual standard in place for now but exclude these pumps from the variance calculation so the close still appears to balance
D. Lower the confirmation quantities posted on these pumps so the accumulated value matches the manual standard price they currently carry

Answer: B

Explanation:
Rerunning and releasing the cost estimate restores a standard equal to the rolled-up component and activity cost, so subsequent receipts value inventory correctly and variances measure real deviation — the standard-configuration fix that keeps the close defensible.

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 3 — Finished-Product Cost Estimate And Standard Price Integrity

After the estimate is rerun and released, the team validates the correction.
Which evidence confirms the standard-price integrity is restored?

A. The released standard equals the summed component and operation cost, and goods receipt values the finished pump at that released standard
B. The manual standard remains completely unchanged, but the variances on these pumps are now suppressed at settlement so that the close still balances
C. The pumps no longer appear in the planning run at the assembly plant simply because their standard cost has now been corrected
D. The standard price is now set to the arithmetic average of the old manual value and the newly estimated value for each pump

Answer: A

Explanation:
Integrity is restored when the released standard equals the rolled-up component and operation cost and goods receipt values the finished pump at that released standard, which is the observable evidence that valuation and downstream variance are now based on a correct baseline.

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