Boost up Your Certification Score

SAP
C_JSD_2610
SAP Certified - Joule Studio Developer

Exams Boost
Boost Up Your Career

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.

Visit us at: https://www.examsboost.com/test/c-jsd-2610

Latest Version: 4.0

Topic: 1
Unified Scenario Simulation
Lanna Linen Services: Extending a Billing Agent With Joule Studio
Business Context
Lanna Linen Services is a commercial laundry and linen-rental company headquartered in Chiang Mai, Thailand. It serves about 140 hotels and resorts across the northern provinces and nine public and private hospitals in Chiang Mai and Lampang. Linen is rented, never sold: every sheet, towel, gown, and theatre drape carries an RFID tag, and customers pay a replacement fee when tagged items fail to return within the contract window. Loss charges are a small share of revenue but a large share of customer service effort, because most invoice disputes concern them.
System Landscape
Billing, contracts, and customer master data run in the company's SAP system. Customer service staff already answer invoice questions through Joule Work, supported by a standard SAP-delivered agent for billing inquiries that the company adopted last year. Item scan data sits in a third-party RFID tracking platform that the billing system does not read directly. A four-person development team has started using Joule Studio this year; until now it has built only one proof-of-concept agent, which never went live.
Contract Context
The hospital contracts renewed last quarter include a clause the hotel contracts do not. Linen a hospital withdraws under its infection-control procedure, such as items soiled with blood or bagged from isolation wards and destroyed on site, must not be billed as loss, provided the hospital records the withdrawal. The billing inquiry agent knows nothing of this clause, so it explains hospital loss charges as valid, and the hospital account manager, Nattaya Srisuk, corrects them by hand. Two hospitals now expect written answers to disputes within two working days.
Implementation Progress
Kittipong Charoen, the development lead, proposed two deliverables for the quarter. The first is an extension of the billing inquiry agent that applies the hospital clause. The second is an n8n workflow that each week compares RFID return scans with the loss charges about to be invoiced, as part of the weekly billing cycle. Kittipong wrote the extension intent himself and ran it through Quick Create to keep pace with the contract timeline. The generated requirements document was ready the same afternoon.
Testing Progress
In the first round of extension testing, a few disputed hospital charges never reached the account manager's follow-up list, although the agent's replies to them were correct. When Kittipong later widened the intent to use further extension points, the regenerated requirements noted that the agent's support for one of them was unconfirmed. Kittipong has since wondered aloud whether a custom agent for hospital disputes would be simpler.
Governance Context
Anucha Pimsorn, who leads IT security, wants any agent that touches billing to hold no more access than its task needs and to have a named owner before production. Wichai Thongdee, the billing supervisor, would rather the extension issue credit notes for exempt hospital items directly, so corrections meet the two-day commitment without extra steps. Supaporn Wongsakul, the operations director, wants both deliverables live before the next month-end billing run, three weeks away. She has also asked how the extension will keep working when SAP updates the standard agent.
Release Planning

Visit us at: https://www.examsboost.com/test/c-jsd-2610

The RFID workflow passed its automated tests on the first run. Kittipong would like to deploy it on the Friday before month-end, so that the first real run checks the coming invoices.

Your Assignment

You are a Joule Studio developer on the Lanna Linen Services project team, working in a mentored role under the development lead, Kittipong Charoen. The company wants an extension of its SAP-delivered billing inquiry agent that applies a hospital contract clause on infection-control linen, and an n8n workflow that flags loss charges contradicted by RFID return scans before invoices are sent. Your stakeholders are the hospital account manager (Nattaya Srisuk), the billing supervisor (Wichai Thongdee), the IT security lead (Anucha Pimsorn), and the operations director (Supaporn Wongsakul). The month-end billing run is three weeks away. You are asked to advise on requirements, extension design, and production readiness, and to justify each recommendation against the stakeholders' goals and constraints

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Turning the Hospital Linen-Loss Clause Into Reviewed Requirements

• Assess whether the hospital-clause intent is clear enough for the development approach that was used, and recommend how the requirement should proceed.

• Recommend who must review and confirm the PRD before the technical specification is generated, and explain the role of each reviewer.

• Draft or select an intent statement for the RFID workflow that gives Joule Studio a sound starting point.

Checkpoints

• Your recommendation accounts for the open contract points raised by the account manager.

• The PRD review you propose confirms the clause against the contract before technical work begins.

• The intent you select states the problem, the beneficiaries, and the expected value without prescribing the design.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Extending the Standard Billing Inquiry Agent Without Altering It

• Respond to the development lead's suggestion of a custom agent for hospital disputes, and recommend a direction.

• Explain the incomplete recording of disputed charges in the first test round and recommend a correction.

• Recommend a complete, correctly ordered working sequence for future extensions of the standard agent.

• Recommend an access and approval design that addresses both the billing supervisor's and the IT security lead's positions.

Checkpoints

• Your direction preserves the standard agent's behavior and keeps customer-specific logic in a separate artifact.

• Your correction makes the recording step reliable rather than more likely.

• Your design keeps access to what the task needs and leaves every billing change traceable to a person.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Readying the RFID Discrepancy Workflow and Extension for Production

• Advise what must happen before the RFID workflow is treated as ready to deploy.

• Diagnose why the expanded hospital tests miss charges that the contract clause excludes, and recommend a correction.

• Recommend how the extension should be maintained when SAP updates the standard billing inquiry agent.

• Advise on the planned Friday deployment given that production approval and ownership are not yet in place.

Checkpoints

• Your readiness advice is supported by evidence the business would accept.

Visit us at: https://www.examsboost.com/test/c-jsd-2610

• Your diagnosis locates the cause at the stage where it entered the workflow.
• Your lifecycle recommendation includes a concrete check after each standard-agent update.
• Your month-end plan protects the coming invoices and holds up to the IT security lead's scrutiny.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Turning the Hospital Linen-Loss Clause Into Reviewed Requirements
Nattaya has now read the requirements that Quick Create produced for the hospital clause. She points out that the contracts themselves leave several points open: which soiled categories qualify, whether linen bagged in isolation wards counts when the hospital records it a day late, and who confirms that a withdrawal record is valid.
Kittipong asks how the requirement should proceed. What should you recommend?

A. Keep the Quick Create requirements and have Nattaya log the open points as assumptions, so the specification proceeds while the hospitals confirm them.
B. Restart in Quick Create with a longer intent that states the team's best reading of each open point, so the requirements reflect it from the start.
C. Move to the iterative track and resolve its clarification questions with Nattaya and the hospitals, so the PRD rests on agreed rules, not readings.
D. Move to the iterative track and have Kittipong answer its questions from the contract text, so Nattaya only needs to review the PRD that results.

Answer: C

Explanation:
The clause still has unresolved points, which is when the iterative track fits: targeted clarification questions surface requirements and constraints before implementation. Resolving them with Nattaya and the hospitals, who own the open terms, means the PRD and the specification derived from it rest on agreed rules rather than guesses.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Turning the Hospital Linen-Loss Clause Into Reviewed Requirements
The regenerated PRD now captures the hospital clause. Anucha suggests that his security review should be the approval gate because the extension touches billing data, while Nattaya says the clause is a contract commitment her team owns.
Which review approach best fits the PRD stage?

A. Have Nattaya and Wichai confirm the requirements and success criteria against the contract, with Anucha reviewing access needs in the same pass.
B. Have Anucha approve the PRD as the single gate, since security sign-off covers billing data access, and have Nattaya check the solution after build.
C. Have Nattaya and Wichai approve the PRD now, and record Anucha's security review as a condition to clear just before the extension is deployed.
D. Have the developers check the PRD for feasibility, then have Nattaya and Anucha review the generated technical specification as the business gate.

Visit us at: https://www.examsboost.com/test/c-jsd-2610

Answer: A

Explanation:
The PRD is where business stakeholders confirm that the requirements match the intended functionality before technical work begins. The clause is Nattaya's contract commitment and Wichai's team acts on it, so they must validate it; folding Anucha's access review into the same pass brings governance in at design time without making it the only gate.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 2 — Extending the Standard Billing Inquiry Agent Without Altering It
After the first test round, Kittipong suggests that a custom agent for hospital disputes might be simpler than the extension. Customer service staff would keep using the standard agent in Joule Work for hotel customers either way.
Which direction should you recommend for applying the hospital clause?

A. Build a custom agent for hospital disputes, so the team owns its full logic and can tune its behavior without depending on the standard agent at all.
B. Keep extending the standard agent, so the hospital rule is added on top of it and SAP can go on updating the agent that staff already use.
C. Build an n8n workflow that intercepts hospital disputes before the agent replies, so the clause is applied without any extension of the agent.
D. Extend the standard agent with the exemption for every customer, so one rule set covers hotels and hospitals and stays simpler to maintain.

Answer: B

Explanation:
The standard agent already handles billing inquiries, so the clean-core path is to extend it: the extension is a separate artifact that adds the hospital rule while SAP's agent stays unchanged and keeps receiving updates. The first-round recording gap is an extension-design question, not a reason to change direction.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 2 — Extending the Standard Billing Inquiry Agent Without Altering It
In the first test round, an instruction in the extension told the agent to record every disputed hospital charge above the agreed value on the follow-up list after replying. Seventeen of twenty test disputes were recorded; the other three received correct replies but never reached the list. The list connection worked whenever the agent used it.
What is the most likely cause, and the best correction?

A. The instruction is worded too softly; rewrite it in firmer terms and repeat it near the top of the instructions, so the agent treats it as mandatory.

B. The agent's reply flow varies between runs; add a fixed reply template to the instructions that ends with the recording step, so every reply includes it.
C. Recording is left to the agent's reasoning; move it into a post-execution hook, so it takes place after each reply whatever the agent decides.
D. Recording relies on the agent alone; keep the instruction and add a weekly workflow that compares disputes with the list, so missed records are added.

Answer: C

Explanation:
Instructions shape how the agent reasons, so a step placed there is followed most of the time but not guaranteed. A step that must happen after every qualifying reply is hook-shaped: a post-execution hook runs deterministically, which is why the misses persisted despite correct replies. Hook support for this agent must be confirmed in its catalog entry.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 3 — Readying the RFID Discrepancy Workflow and Extension for Production
Kittipong considers the RFID workflow ready because all of its automated tests passed. Looking at the test set, you see that every case used a complete weekly scan file from one hotel customer.
What should happen before the team treats the workflow as ready to deploy?

A. Extend the tests with complete files from several hotel customers over several weeks, so the pass result reflects more than one customer's scan data.
B. Add hospital files, missing tags, and duplicate scans to the tests, and deploy once the workflow completes every run in the set without any errors.
C. Have Nattaya and Wichai review a sample of the flags from the hotel test run, so the business owners confirm the output is right before deployment.
D. Add hospital files, missing tags, and duplicate scans, and confirm with Wichai that each flag raised is one his team would act on before go-live.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Readiness means validating the full flow against the exceptions the business actually sees and evaluating whether the workflow's output meets the success criteria in the requirements. Adding the edge cases exposes the flow to realistic input; confirming the flags with the people who act on them shows it reaches the right answer, and failures are fixed and re-tested before deployment.
Topic: 2
Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 6

Tasman Dairy Co-operative collects milk from 640 farms across New Zealand's Waikato region. A developer on its IT team built an agent in Joule Studio that helps collection planners reschedule tanker

runs when a farm reports a breakdown or a road closure. The agent has passed its tests and is ready for deployment.
The planning manager wants all 18 planners using it from next month. To save time, the IT lead proposes giving every planner a Joule Studio account so they can open the agent's solution and run it there. The security officer objects: planners should hold no access to the development environment, and every agent action must run under production security controls and be traceable to the planner who triggered it. The planners have no development background, but they reviewed the requirements document and gave feedback on early previews.
The IT lead has asked you, as the agent's developer, for a recommendation.
Which recommendation best meets the planning manager's goal and the security officer's conditions?

A. Keep the agent in Joule Studio and have the developer run planners' requests through its test facility, forwarding each result to the planner who asked.
B. Deploy the agent to the managed runtime and have planners use it in Joule Work through one shared team login, so access is set up once for all 18.
C. Give planners read-only Joule Studio access to the agent's solution, so they can run it there without being able to edit any of its generated artifacts.
D. Deploy the agent to the managed runtime and have each planner use it in Joule Work with their own login, so their requests run in production.

Answer: D

Explanation:
Joule Studio is where developers build and extend agents; business users consume them in Joule Work. Deploying the tested agent to the SAP-managed runtime runs it with enterprise identity, security and operational controls, and each planner reaches it in Joule Work with their own login, so every action is traceable to the planner who triggered it. Planners keep their part in the work through reviewing requirements and previews, and none of them needs development access.

Question: 7

Wisła Freight runs 420 trucks between Poland and Germany. Its dispatch lead asked IT for "an agent that helps dispatchers handle delays better". A developer typed that sentence into Joule Studio, used Quick Create to save time, and had a working agent within a day.
At the first preview, the three dispatch supervisors disagreed about what the agent should do. One expected it to re-plan routes, another to notify customers of late arrivals, and the third to rank which delayed loads carry contractual penalties. None of these appears in the generated requirements document, which describes a general delay summary.
The dispatch lead wants a version the supervisors agree on within three weeks and does not want another round of rework after the next preview. Each supervisor has set aside two hours a week to answer questions about the work.
As the developer, you now decide the next step.
Which approach best gets the team to an agent the supervisors will accept?

A. Rewrite the intent with the data sources and integrations the agent should use and run Quick Create again, so the generated requirements are more precise.

B. Add the three expectations to the technical specification and regenerate the implementation, so the agent covers all of them at the next preview.
C. Switch to the iterative track, so clarification questions settle the supervisors' differing expectations in the requirements before any specification exists.
D. Keep the generated agent and edit its source code to add route re-planning, customer notices and penalty ranking, so supervisors see all three at the next preview.

Answer: C

Explanation:
The intent was a one-line request whose meaning the supervisors did not share, so the requirements were never settled; Quick Create suits requirements that are already clear and skips the clarification questions. The iterative track asks targeted clarification questions that surface the three expectations as explicit requirements or scope decisions, and the supervisors then review the resulting requirements document before the technical specification is generated from it. The agent is built on agreed requirements instead of being reworked after each preview.

Question: 8

Alpenmed Logistik distributes medicines to 1,900 pharmacies in Switzerland. A developer built an agent in Joule Studio that answers pharmacists' order-status questions and, when a delivery arrives damaged, opens a return request through a tool connected to the warehouse system. The requirements document sets two success criteria: status answers must match the warehouse record, and the agent must open a return only when the pharmacist confirms the damage. Pharmacies send around 300 status questions a day, and a wrongly opened return blocks the affected stock for a week.
The generated code builds and runs without errors, and the developer wants to deploy the agent to the managed runtime this week. The quality manager, who is accountable for anything that touches medicine returns, will approve deployment only once the agent has been tested against both success criteria and every failure found has been fixed.
The pre-deployment test plan is yours to prepare.
Which set of steps is the minimal complete plan that meets the quality manager's condition before deployment?

A. Run end-to-end validation through the warehouse tool; evaluate the agent's behavior on typical status questions only; fix any failing component and re-test.
B. Test the warehouse tool's interface on its own; evaluate the agent's behavior on typical status questions only; fix any failing component and re-test.
C. Run end-to-end validation through the warehouse tool; confirm the generated code builds without warnings; fix any failing component and re-test.
D. Run end-to-end validation through the warehouse tool; evaluate the agent against the status and return criteria; fix any failing component and re-test.

Answer: D

Explanation:

End-to-end validation exercises the full execution flow, including the tool that opens return requests in the warehouse system. Agent evaluation judges the agent's behavior against the two success criteria: status answers that match the warehouse record and returns opened only on confirmed damage. Fixing the failing component and re-testing closes the loop before deployment. Nothing required is missing and nothing unnecessary is added.

Question: 9

Prairie Line Utilities supplies electricity to 210,000 customers in Saskatchewan, Canada. Its accounts-payable team asked for an n8n workflow in Joule Studio that reads incoming supplier emails, classifies each one as invoice, credit note, dispute or other, and routes it to the matching queue. The team receives about 1,200 such emails a week. A developer built it through the Idea Board stages and, in the solution stage, copied the LLM configuration from an earlier workflow that drafts marketing text.
Testing shows a pattern: when the same email is run five times, it receives the same category only three or four times. Reviewers agree the system prompt defines each category clearly with examples, and most labels are correct. The accounts-payable manager needs the same email to land in the same queue every time, because disputes carry a ten-day response deadline.
You are the developer asked to correct the workflow before deployment.
Which change best resolves the inconsistent classification?

A. Lower the temperature in the workflow's LLM configuration, so the classification step favours the same label for the same email rather than varying.
B. Switch the workflow's LLM configuration to a larger model, so the classification step has more capacity to tell invoices, credit notes and disputes apart.
C. Add a branch on the canvas that runs the classification three times and keeps the majority label, so a single varied result no longer decides the queue.
D. Add more example emails for each category to the system prompt, so the classification step has more guidance when choosing between similar categories.

Answer: A

Explanation:
The pattern points to sampling variation rather than weak guidance: reviewers agree the prompt defines each category clearly and most labels are right, yet reruns of the same email differ. The configuration was copied from a workflow that drafts marketing text, where variety is useful. Lowering the temperature favours consistent, repeatable output, so the classification step settles on the same label for the same email and disputes reach their queue reliably.

Question: 10

Kaveri Textiles, a cotton yarn and fabric maker in Tamil Nadu, India, uses an SAP-delivered agent to recommend suppliers for new raw-material requests. A new buyer-protection policy requires that every supplier recommendation the agent produces is written to the company's compliance register, with no exceptions, so auditors can trace each recommendation later. Last year's audit flagged two supplier choices that nobody could trace.

Visit us at: https://www.examsboost.com/test/c-jsd-2610

The Agent Catalog shows that this agent supports instructions, tools and hooks as extension points, and the compliance register already exposes an API. The procurement head wants the policy met before next month's audit, does not want the agent's standard recommendation behavior changed, and wants the company to keep receiving SAP's improvements to the agent.
A colleague proposes adding an instruction that tells the agent to record each recommendation in the register. The extension design falls to you.
Which extension design best meets the policy and the procurement head's conditions?

A. Build a new custom agent that reproduces the delivered agent's recommendations and writes each to the register, so logging is under your control.
B. Add the register's API as a tool through MCP, so the agent can write each recommendation to the register as part of producing its answer.
C. Add a post-execution hook that writes each recommendation to the register, so the step runs on every execution rather than when the model chooses.
D. Add an instruction telling the agent to record every recommendation in the register, so the policy becomes one of the business rules the agent follows.

Answer: C

Explanation:
The requirement is a deterministic step that must run after every recommendation, and a hook is custom logic that runs before or after the agent executes. A post-execution hook writes each recommendation to the register through its API on every execution, independent of the model's reasoning. Built as an extension, a separate artifact, it leaves the standard agent's implementation and recommendation behavior unchanged; when SAP updates the agent, the extension is reviewed for compatibility.

Visit us at: https://www.examsboost.com/test/c-jsd-2610

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

