SAP

C_S4CFI_2608

SAP Certified - Implementation Consultant - SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, Financial Accounting

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
Helvio Chemicals First Close Readiness in S/4HANA Cloud
Business Context
Helvio Speciality Chemicals Group is a global manufacturer of performance coatings and specialty intermediates, headquartered near Ludwigshafen and operating a large production and sales entity in São Paulo. The group employs roughly six thousand people across research, manufacturing, and commercial functions. After running fragmented legacy finance systems for two decades, Helvio is completing a greenfield implementation of SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition, with Financial Accounting as the lead workstream that other process areas depend on for their go-live alignment.
Program Scope
The finance team has configured the solution through fit-to-standard workshops and a business-driven configuration approach, capturing organizational structure, ledger settings, and product-specific values centrally. Two company codes are live in scope: the German entity reporting under local statutory rules and the group consolidation principle, and the Brazilian entity reporting under its own local rules and the same group principle. The program is now rehearsing the first month-end close end to end, several weeks ahead of the planned go-live, so that the close calendar and its dependencies can be proven before production data flows in.
Close Preparation
During the rehearsal, the controllers run the close calendar for the German entity first. Sub-ledger activities for payables and receivables are completed, foreign-currency valuation is scheduled, and the team attempts the general-ledger close steps in the configured sequence. The Brazilian entity follows the same template but on a slightly different timeline because its sub-ledger reconciliations finish later. The close lead has asked each principle to be closed only once its own valuation postings are confirmed, rather than closing both principles together in a single pass.
Parallel Valuation Context
Helvio maintains the two accounting principles through ledgers, with a standard ledger carrying the leading valuation and an additional ledger construct used for adjustment and valuation entries that apply to only one principle. The group-principle adjustments for inventory revaluation and certain provisions differ from the local-principle figures, and several rehearsal postings were entered against the wrong scope, so a number of valuation entries that should have affected only one principle appear in both. The controllers notice that the trial balances for the two principles diverge by amounts that do not reconcile to the documented adjustment list.
Reconciliation Observation
A second observation surfaces while reconciling sub-ledgers to the Universal Journal. Payables and receivables balances tie to their reconciliation accounts for the German entity, but for the Brazilian entity a set of open items posted during the rehearsal does not appear under open-item management, so the team cannot clear them individually or produce a clean aged analysis. The reconciliation accounts themselves balance, yet the line-item view behaves inconsistently between the two entities for accounts that were expected to be configured identically.
Document Setup Context

Investigating the line-item behavior, the team finds that the document types and number ranges used for the rehearsal postings were not applied uniformly across the two company codes. One entity used a number range that overlapped with manually entered opening balances, and a few document types intended for recurring valuation entries were posted with a type configured without the expected field control. The close lead is reluctant to simply repost, because the rehearsal is meant to validate the configuration itself, not to mask configuration gaps with manual corrections.

Reporting Readiness

With go-live approaching, the reporting team begins assembling the first statutory and management outputs. The financial statement version intended for the balance sheet and income statement was built early, but several newly used general-ledger accounts are not yet assigned to it, and a subset of accounts carry semantic tags that do not match their balance-sheet role. As a result, the drafted balance sheet does not tie to the trial balance, and the indirect cash-flow output cannot be produced reliably because the underlying tagging is incomplete.

Governance Context

The program steering board has set a firm expectation that the close must run on standard configuration, with extensions limited to governed approaches and no modification of the core. The controllers face competing pressures: the German statutory team wants the local-principle balance sheet signed off first, the group reporting team wants both principles reconciled before any sign-off, and the Brazilian team needs its later-finishing sub-ledgers respected in the calendar. The close lead must decide how to sequence and correct the rehearsal so the first real close is defensible.

Decision Horizon

Leadership has framed the rehearsal as the gate for go-live readiness. The finance organization must demonstrate that the close sequence holds, that parallel valuation produces the right figures per principle, that sub-ledgers reconcile to the Universal Journal cleanly, and that the financial statement version is ready to render statutory and management reporting. How the team resolves these interlocking conditions will determine whether the first production close can be trusted.

Your assignment

You are acting as the implementation consultant supporting Helvio Speciality Chemicals Group during the first month-end close rehearsal of its greenfield SAP S/4HANA Cloud Public Edition Financial Accounting solution. Two company codes are in scope, each reporting under a local accounting principle and a shared group principle, maintained through ledgers. Work in the configured solution using standard configuration only; do not introduce core modifications. For each challenge below, perform the configuration, master-data, posting, and validation activities described, and confirm the stated completion evidence. Use the assigned entity scope where indicated, and keep parameter and scope choices internally consistent across the close

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Sequencing the First Close Across Two Entities and Principles

- Establish the close calendar for both company codes, scheduling sub-ledger close activities for payables and receivables ahead of the general-ledger close steps.
- Confirm that payables and receivables reconciliation to the reconciliation accounts is complete for an entity before its currency and valuation postings are scheduled.
- Run foreign-currency valuation for the in-scope entity and verify that its postings are recorded before the general-ledger close step is attempted.
- Where the two entities finish sub-ledger work on different timelines, sequence each entity's general-ledger close to start only after that entity's own prerequisites are confirmed, rather than forcing a single combined pass.
- Close each accounting principle only once its own valuation postings are confirmed, recording which principle is being closed at each step.

Checkpoints

• Evidence that sub-ledger reconciliation completed before the dependent valuation and close steps ran for each entity.
• Confirmation that currency and valuation postings exist before the general-ledger close step for the same entity and principle.
• A close log showing each entity and principle closed in an order consistent with its confirmed prerequisites.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Aligning Parallel Valuation Postings to the Correct Principle

• For each rehearsal valuation and adjustment entry, determine whether it applies to all accounting principles or to a single principle, and post it with the corresponding ledger scope.
• Re-examine the inventory revaluation and provision adjustments that currently appear in both principles, and identify which were intended for a single principle only.
• Correct any entry whose ledger scope does not match its intended principle, so that single-principle valuations affect only their target principle.
• Reconcile the resulting per-principle trial balances against the documented adjustment list, confirming that differences between principles equal the intended adjustments.
• Record the ledger scope used for each corrected entry so the per-principle result can be traced.

Checkpoints

• Per-principle trial balances reconcile to the documented adjustment list with no unexplained divergence.
• Single-principle valuation entries are confirmed to affect only their intended principle.
• A traceable record of ledger scope exists for each valuation and adjustment posting.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Restoring Open-Item Behavior and Document Control Across Company Codes

• Compare the document types, number ranges, and field control applied to the rehearsal postings across both company codes, and identify where they diverge from the intended uniform design.
• Identify reconciliation and general-ledger accounts where open items were posted but open-item management is not active, and determine the correct configuration state before any postings exist on those accounts.
• Resolve the number-range overlap with the manually entered opening balances so that rehearsal documents and opening entries do not collide.
• Bring document type and field control into alignment so recurring valuation entries use a type with the expected field control across both entities.
• Re-validate line-item and clearing behavior for the affected accounts in both company codes after correcting the configuration.

Checkpoints

• Line-item and individual clearing behavior is identical across both entities for accounts designed to match.
• Open items posted during the rehearsal can be displayed and cleared individually and produce a clean aged analysis.
• Document numbering no longer overlaps with opening-balance entries, and recurring valuation entries carry the intended field control.

4. CHALLENGE 4 — Readying the Financial Statement Version for First Reporting

• Review the financial statement version against the current chart of accounts and identify newly used general-ledger accounts that are not yet assigned to it.
• Assign every unassigned in-use account to its correct position in the financial statement version.
• Verify that semantic tags on the assigned accounts match their balance-sheet and income-statement role, and correct any tag that contradicts an account's role.
• Confirm that the balance-sheet, income-statement, and indirect cash-flow outputs render and tie to the trial balance after the assignments and tags are corrected.

• Document any account whose role required a tagging decision so reporting logic is traceable.
Checkpoints
• The financial statement version contains every in-use account with no unassigned in-use account remaining.
• Semantic tags are consistent with each account's balance-sheet or income-statement role.
• Balance-sheet, income-statement, and indirect cash-flow outputs reconcile to the trial balance.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Sequencing the First Close Across Two Entities and Principles

During the rehearsal, the German entity's general-ledger close step was started while its foreign-currency valuation postings were still pending.
What is the most appropriate corrective action for the close sequence?

A. Reverse the premature general-ledger close step, complete and confirm the foreign-currency valuation postings, then re-run the general-ledger close so it operates on valuated figures.
B. Keep the general-ledger close as posted and schedule the foreign-currency valuation into the following period, accepting that the current period reflects pre-valuation figures and will be adjusted retrospectively.
C. Leave the close in place and add a manual adjustment for the missing valuation amount, treating the manual entry as equivalent to the scheduled valuation run.
D. Re-run only the foreign-currency valuation after the close and rely on the reconciliation accounts to absorb any difference between the two figures.

Answer: A

Explanation:
The close dependency requires sub-ledger reconciliation and valuation postings to be confirmed before the general-ledger close step runs for that entity. Reversing the premature step, completing valuation, and re-running the close makes the period reflect valuated figures and restores the documented sequence.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Sequencing the First Close Across Two Entities and Principles

The Brazilian entity's sub-ledger reconciliations finish later than the German entity's, but group reporting wants both principles reconciled before any sign-off.
How should the close be sequenced to satisfy both the dependency logic and the governance expectation?

A. Force a single combined close pass for both entities on the German timeline so that group sign-off can occur on the earlier date regardless of whether the Brazilian sub-ledgers have finished reconciling.
B. Sign off the German principles first and treat the Brazilian entity as a late adjustment to be folded into the group result after the fact.

C. Sequence each entity's general-ledger close to begin only after its own prerequisites are confirmed, and hold group-level sign-off until both entities' principles have reconciled.
D. Close both entities together but defer the Brazilian sub-ledger reconciliation to after the general-ledger close to keep the calendar aligned.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Each entity's general-ledger close must wait for its own confirmed prerequisites, so the entities can close on different timelines while group sign-off is held until both principles have reconciled. This honors the dependency order and the group governance expectation simultaneously.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 1 — Sequencing the First Close Across Two Entities and Principles

The close lead asks for evidence that the rehearsal sequence was valid before the first production close is approved.
Which validation evidence best confirms the close sequence held?

A. A statement that all postings for the period exist in the Universal Journal, regardless of the order in which the close steps were performed.
B. A close log showing, per entity and principle, that sub-ledger reconciliation and valuation postings completed before the dependent general-ledger close step ran.
C. A reconciliation-account balance summary showing the accounts net to the expected totals, used as the sole evidence of sequence validity for both entities and principles.
D. A confirmation that the general-ledger close steps completed without technical errors, taken on its own as proof that the sequence was valid.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Sequence validity is proven by evidence that each prerequisite completed before the dependent step ran, per entity and principle. A close log capturing that ordering directly demonstrates the dependency was honored.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 1 — Sequencing the First Close Across Two Entities and Principles

A controller proposes closing both principles of the German entity together in one pass to save time, even though the group-principle valuation postings are not yet confirmed.
What is the most appropriate response within the configured close design?

A. Combine both principles into a single close step permanently to simplify the calendar, removing the per-principle confirmation requirement.

B. Close the group principle first because it drives consolidation, and let the local principle follow on whatever timeline is convenient.
C. Close both principles together immediately and post the group-principle valuation afterward, accepting a brief inconsistency between the two principles until the valuation is recorded.
D. Close each principle only after its own valuation postings are confirmed, so the local principle may close while the group principle waits for its pending valuation.

Answer: D

Explanation:
The configured design closes each principle only once its own valuation postings are confirmed, so the local principle can close while the group principle waits for its pending valuation. This keeps each principle's closed figures valid.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 2 — Aligning Parallel Valuation Postings to the Correct Principle

An inventory revaluation intended only for the group principle was posted so that it affected both principles, causing the two trial balances to diverge from the adjustment list.
What is the correct way to align the entry to its intended principle?

A. Reverse the entry in both principles and re-post it to all principles again, relying on later consolidation to remove the local-principle impact once the group result is assembled.
B. Post a compensating entry in the local principle to offset the revaluation amount, leaving the original all-principle posting in place.
C. Reverse the incorrectly scoped entry and repost the revaluation with the ledger scope limited to the group principle, then reconcile both trial balances to the adjustment list.
D. Leave both principles affected and update the adjustment list to match, treating the posted result as the new baseline.

Answer: C

Explanation:
A single-principle valuation must carry the ledger scope of that principle only. Reversing the wrongly scoped entry and reposting it scoped to the group principle, then reconciling to the adjustment list, restores correct per-principle figures.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 2 — Aligning Parallel Valuation Postings to the Correct Principle

Before reposting, the consultant must decide which adjustments belong to a single principle and which apply to all principles.
How should the scope of each valuation entry be determined?

A. Classify each entry by whether the underlying valuation difference exists only under one principle, posting single-principle differences with that principle's ledger scope and shared movements to all principles.
B. Decide scope by document type alone, assigning all entries of one type to a single principle regardless of the underlying valuation difference or which principle the difference actually belongs to.
C. Post every valuation entry to a single principle and aggregate the principles only at consolidation, avoiding all-principle postings entirely.
D. Post every valuation entry to all principles for consistency, since shared scope is simpler to maintain and any principle-specific effect can be handled later in reporting and disclosure rather than at posting time.

Answer: A

Explanation:
Scope follows the nature of the valuation difference: differences that exist only under one principle are posted with that principle's ledger scope, while movements common to all principles are posted to all. This produces correct per-principle figures by design.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 2 — Aligning Parallel Valuation Postings to the Correct Principle

After corrections, the consultant must confirm that parallel valuation produced the right figures per principle.
Which validation best demonstrates that the principles are correctly valued?

A. The total across both principles matches the sum of all postings, used on its own to confirm that each principle is individually correct.
B. The group principle alone ties to the adjustment list, with the local principle assumed correct because it shares the same source documents and posting references.
C. The additional ledger shows postings exist, taken as sufficient evidence that single-principle scope was applied correctly without reconciling either principle to the documented adjustment list.
D. Per-principle trial balances are reconciled to the documented adjustment list so that the difference between principles equals exactly the intended single-principle adjustments.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Correct parallel valuation is demonstrated when each principle's trial balance reconciles to the adjustment list and the inter-principle difference equals exactly the intended single-principle adjustments. This proves scope was applied per principle, not just in aggregate.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 2 — Aligning Parallel Valuation Postings to the Correct Principle

A team member suggests recording the corrected entries without noting which ledger scope each used, to save effort during the rehearsal.
Why should the ledger scope of each valuation posting be recorded?

A. Recording scope is optional because the system already stores the postings, and any scope question can be answered later by re-deriving the scope from the combined totals across both principles whenever it is needed.
B. A traceable record of ledger scope per entry allows the per-principle result to be reconciled and explained, which is required to prove single-principle valuations affected only their target principle.
C. Scope should be recorded only for all-principle entries, since single-principle entries are self-evident from the additional ledger and need no record of their own during the rehearsal close.
D. Recording scope matters only for the production close, so omitting it during the rehearsal has no effect on validating the configuration or the per-principle valuation result before go-live.

Answer: B

Explanation:
A per-entry record of ledger scope makes the per-principle result reconcilable and explainable, which is exactly what proves that single-principle valuations affected only their intended principle. Without it, the rehearsal cannot evidence correct scoping.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 3 — Restoring Open-Item Behavior and Document Control Across Company Codes

For the Brazilian entity, open items were posted to accounts where open-item management is not active, so the items cannot be cleared individually.
What is the correct way to restore the intended open-item behavior?

A. Activate open-item management on the accounts as they stand, leaving the existing balances in place and expecting the change to apply retroactively to items already posted before the change.
B. Activate open-item management on the affected accounts in the correct configuration state before postings exist on them, reversing and reposting the rehearsal items so they are managed as open items.
C. Leave open-item management inactive and clear the items in bulk at period-end, accepting that individual clearing and aging will not be available for the affected accounts in that entity.
D. Move the affected items to a different account that already has open-item management active, without changing the original account's configuration or restoring its intended behavior for future postings.

Answer: B

Explanation:
Open-item management must be set in the correct state before postings exist on an account, so the fix is to activate it on the affected accounts and reverse and repost the rehearsal items so they become managed open items. This restores individual clearing and a clean aged view.

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 3 — Restoring Open-Item Behavior and Document Control Across Company Codes

The number range used for rehearsal documents in one company code overlaps with the manually entered opening balances.
How should the number-range collision be resolved?

A. Reconfigure the document number ranges so rehearsal documents and opening-balance entries occupy distinct ranges, then reverse and repost the colliding documents under the corrected ranges.
B. Continue posting into the overlapping range and rely on document type to distinguish rehearsal entries from opening balances after the fact during reconciliation and review.
C. Extend the existing range upward so new rehearsal documents avoid the overlap, leaving the already-collided documents as they are without reposting them under a corrected range.
D. Delete the opening-balance entries and re-enter them after the rehearsal so the overlapping range is freed for rehearsal documents only, then reload the opening balances from source once the rehearsal completes.

Answer: A

Explanation:
The ranges must be distinct so the two streams of documents do not collide. Reconfiguring the number ranges and reposting the colliding documents under corrected ranges removes the overlap and restores clean numbering.