Welcome to Cert007 - Your Ultimate IT Certification Partner

- Real Exam Questions
- Free Updates
- Expert Support
- Instant Access
- Money-Back Guarantee

Visit us at **https://www.cert007.com/** for more information

Exam : **C_ACT**

Title : SAP Certified - Project Manager - SAP Activate

Version : DEMO

1.A regional packaged-goods supplier is preparing a first-wave SAP Activate release in a mixed deployment landscape. The sponsor wants the approved go-live date preserved and expects one concise steering recommendation. In the web-based project plan, a country-level operational-readiness review cannot proceed at full depth because the same local business lead is also needed for a parallel validation checkpoint during the same week.
The release manager suggests shortening the country review to a brief status confirmation. The change lead warns that this country is also the only one still carrying a temporary coexistence responsibility with an on-premise process after go-live. The project manager must protect the milestone if possible, but also avoid giving steering a weak readiness signal for the country most exposed to hybrid operational risk.
Which planning response is the best choice?
A. Replace the full country review with a short overall confirmation, because preserving the milestone matters more than retaining review depth so late in the release.
B. Delay the whole steering recommendation until the country can hold a full review, because any partial checkpoint would make the shared release decision unreliable.
C. Re-scope the country review to cover only release-critical and coexistence-sensitive decisions, and govern lower-impact topics through tracked follow-up actions.
D. Remove the country’s remaining issues from the formal release discussion, because the dependency is local and should not affect the broader first-wave decision.
Answer: C
Explanation:
Feedback:
Why Re-scope the country review to cover only release-critical and coexistence-sensitive decisions, and govern lower-impact topics through tracked follow-up actions works:
This is the strongest proportional response. It preserves the milestone while ensuring the most decision-relevant evidence remains inside the formal checkpoint. Because this country still carries a coexistence dependency, release-critical and coexistence-sensitive topics must remain governed, while less important matters can be moved to follow-up.

2.A beverage manufacturer is managing an SAP Activate program in a mixed deployment environment. The first release will move sales reporting to a cloud-centered target, while one connected on-premise settlement activity remains in place for a later transition wave. In the web-based project workspace, the design team has marked its deliverables complete, and the training team has already scheduled business enablement sessions.
However, the data lead has just confirmed that a key reference structure used in reporting examples will be slightly different in the first release than originally assumed. The training lead says the sessions can proceed with the old examples and be corrected later if needed. The sponsor wants no additional steering escalation and expects the release milestone to remain stable. The project manager must decide how to handle the issue without opening a full redesign cycle.
What is the best next action?
A. Continue with the current training plan, and ask support teams to explain the updated structure after go-live if users become confused.
B. Pause all release preparation activities until every downstream artifact is fully revalidated across all workstreams.
C. Run a targeted cross-workstream impact review, then update only the release-critical enablement

content before business sessions begin.
D. Let the data team publish the new structure separately, because downstream workstreams should adapt locally without central coordination.
Answer: C
Explanation:
Feedback:
Why Run a targeted cross-workstream impact review, then update only the release-critical enablement content before business sessions begin works:
This is the most proportionate orchestration response. The issue is not broad enough to justify a full redesign, but it is important enough to affect downstream readiness. A targeted impact review aligns design, data, and enablement at the correct coordination layer and protects release-critical training quality.

3.A specialty medical products distributor is transitioning to a cloud-led operating model using SAP Activate. In the first release, returns authorization moves to the target environment, while one on-premise dispute-escalation step remains active for eight weeks. In SAP Cloud ALM, the project manager can show all transition activities in one board, but business leaders are reading the same board in conflicting ways.
Some leaders interpret every open transition item as a first-wave blocker. Others treat the remaining on-premise step as harmless because it already has a retirement target date. The sponsor wants one steering recommendation and does not want a second board or another governance forum. The project manager must improve interpretation without hiding the coexistence plan or weakening modernization tracking.
What is the best reporting adjustment?
A. Keep the current board unchanged, and rely on the transition lead to explain verbally which items are blockers and which are planned coexistence conditions.
B. Reclassify board items within the same view as immediate blockers, approved temporary coexistence conditions, and future retirement obligations.
C. Remove all future retirement obligations from the main board so leaders can focus only on the current release decision.
D. Promote the remaining on-premise step to automatic blocker status, because a cloud-led first release should never proceed with residual coexistence.
Answer: B
Explanation:
Feedback:
Why Reclassify board items within the same view as immediate blockers, approved temporary coexistence conditions, and future retirement obligations works:
This improves steering clarity without increasing governance overhead. It keeps one reporting path, preserves visibility into temporary coexistence and later retirement, and makes the weighting of immediate versus managed transition items explicit. That is the most sustainable choice for a phased modernization program.

4.A household chemicals supplier is coordinating an SAP Activate release across design, testing, business enablement, integration, and cutover planning in a mixed deployment landscape. In the web-

based project environment, the integration workstream confirms that a release-approved sequence change will alter when one operational confirmation step occurs during the first-wave process. The testing workstream has already prepared execution packs, and the enablement workstream has already scheduled super-user briefings based on the earlier sequence.
The sponsor does not want a milestone shift and does not want a broad design reset. The enablement lead says the difference can be explained during workshops. The cutover lead warns that if test evidence, workshop guidance, and handover timing reflect different sequences, early support decisions may become inconsistent. The project manager must act before validation workshops begin.
What is the best next action?
A. Keep all current artifacts unchanged, and rely on workshop facilitators to explain the approved sequence change verbally during training.
B. Reopen the complete release baseline, because any approved sequence change requires total cross-workstream reapproval before go-live.
C. Launch a focused cross-workstream impact review and align only the release-critical testing, enablement, and handover artifacts affected by the approved change.
D. Ask each workstream to handle the effect locally, because the integration change was already approved and should not require central coordination.
Answer: C
Explanation:
Feedback:
Why Launch a focused cross-workstream impact review and align only the release-critical testing, enablement, and handover artifacts affected by the approved change works:
This addresses the issue at the correct orchestration layer. The problem is not the approval of the change itself, but the downstream inconsistency it creates across multiple release-critical artifacts. A focused review is proportionate, protects the milestone, and realigns the dependent workstreams before validation and briefings proceed.

5.A regional healthcare packaging company is preparing a first-wave SAP Activate release in a mixed deployment environment. During final preparation in the web-based project workspace, several local coordinators want temporary authority to attach country-specific decision notes directly to release tasks instead of routing them through the governed decision log. They argue that this will speed up issue handling during the first two weeks after go-live.
The sponsor supports faster stabilization, but only if the project still has one authoritative view of approved operational decisions. The enterprise lead warns that if task-level notes become the real source of truth, later rollout waves may inherit inconsistent decision history and unclear ownership. Clean core discipline remains part of the operating model, but the sponsor does not want a solution that slows local response unnecessarily.
What is the best recommendation for the project manager?
A. Allow country-specific decision notes directly on tasks, provided each coordinator adds an expiry date and weekly summary for central visibility.
B. Prohibit all local decision notes until after stabilization, because governance control should outweigh first-wave operational speed.
C. Let each country manage local notes independently, and consolidate them into the central project record after the first month of production use.

D. Keep task-level visibility, but require that approved operational decisions be created and owned in the governed decision path before they can be referenced in local release tasks.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

Why Keep task-level visibility, but require that approved operational decisions be created and owned in the governed decision path before they can be referenced in local release tasks works:

This supports fast local visibility without fragmenting governance. Teams can still see relevant decisions in their task context, but approval, ownership, and lifecycle control remain in one governed record. That aligns with clean core-oriented discipline and protects later-wave maintainability.