

Testpassport**Q&A**



H i g h e r Q u a l i t y

B e t t e r S e r v i c e !

We offer free update service for one year
[Http://www.testpassport.com](http://www.testpassport.com)

Exam : **C_TS452**

Title : SAP Certified - SAP
S/4HANA Cloud Private
Edition, Sourcing and
Procurement
(C_TS452_2601)

Version : DEMO

1.Task Statement: Purchasing Organization Scheduling Agreement Issue

In this assessment, you will review a procurement rollout issue in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. A recently acquired business unit has been assigned a new purchasing organization. Material master data and supplier data have already been loaded, and users are able to create purchase requisitions without issue.

Buyers can also see the purchase requisitions in their processing worklist. However, when buyers attempt to create scheduling agreements for frequently ordered components, the system rejects only the new purchasing organization. The same suppliers and materials work correctly in an existing purchasing organization that is already running in production.

The rollout manager wants a correction that can be reused in future acquisition waves. Temporary processing under the legacy purchasing organization is not allowed because regional ownership and reporting are part of the approved target model.

A. See the complete solution along with all steps and explanation.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Step-by-Step Walkthrough

Step 1: Identify the scope of the failure

Before changing master data or applying a temporary workaround, first determine whether the issue affects all purchasing organizations or only the newly activated purchasing organization.

In this scenario:

Material masters have already been loaded.

Supplier data has already been loaded.

Purchase requisitions can be created successfully.

Buyers can see the requisitions in their processing worklist.

Scheduling agreement creation fails only for the new purchasing organization.

The same suppliers and materials work correctly in an existing purchasing organization.

This indicates that the issue is not most likely caused by a universal supplier or material master data problem.

Visual Exhibit 1: Failure Pattern

- ☐ Purchase requisitions can be created
- ☐ Buyers can see requisitions
- ☐ Existing purchasing organization works
- ☐ New purchasing organization fails for scheduling agreements
- ☐ Failure is selective by purchasing organization

Step 2: Avoid temporary processing through the legacy purchasing organization

The team should not route the components through the existing purchasing organization for the first months.

Although this may allow short-term processing, it violates the approved target model because regional ownership and reporting must remain aligned with the newly acquired business unit.

Using the legacy purchasing organization would also create a rollout pattern that cannot be reused cleanly in future acquisition waves.

Visual Exhibit 2: Incorrect Temporary Workaround

New Business Unit

→ Legacy Purchasing Organization

→ Temporary Processing

→ Misaligned Ownership and Reporting

This approach should be avoided.

Step 3: Do not recreate supplier records as the first action

Recreating supplier records is not the best first action.

The same suppliers already work correctly with the existing purchasing organization. This means the supplier records are not universally unusable.

A scheduling agreement rejection that occurs only for the new purchasing organization points more strongly to organizational structure, assignment, or document-processing scope than to duplicate supplier master data in all cases.

Visual Exhibit 3: Supplier Data Check

Existing Purchasing Organization + Same Supplier + Same Material = Works

New Purchasing Organization + Same Supplier + Same Material = Fails

Conclusion: The failure is linked to the new purchasing organization context, not to the supplier or material globally.

Step 4: Do not create a temporary enhancement to redirect rejected agreement creation

A temporary enhancement that redirects rejected scheduling agreement creation to a shared organizational unit is not the correct first action.

This would hide the underlying configuration or scope issue instead of fixing the organizational foundation. It could also create reporting, ownership, compliance, and future rollout problems.

The requirement is to implement a reusable correction for future acquisition waves, not to bypass the new purchasing organization.

Step 5: Check the procurement structure and document-processing scope

The best first action is to check whether the new purchasing organization is fully integrated into the relevant procurement structure and document-processing scope.

This includes verifying that the new purchasing organization is correctly assigned and enabled for the required procurement processes, including scheduling agreement processing.

The reasoning chain is:

Organizational integration and document scope setup

→ Scheduling agreement eligibility for the new purchasing organization

→ Successful scheduling agreement creation

→ Reusable rollout validation for future acquisition waves

Visual Exhibit 4: Correct Troubleshooting Flow

New Purchasing Organization

→ Check Procurement Structure Integration

→ Check Relevant Document-Processing Scope

→ Validate Scheduling Agreement Creation

→ Reuse Correction in Future Acquisition Waves

Step 6: Confirm the correct first action

Because the failure is selective to the new purchasing organization, the correct first action is to verify the organizational foundation and document-processing readiness of that new purchasing organization.

Final Solution:

Check whether the new purchasing organization is fully integrated into the relevant procurement structure and document-processing scope.

This is the correct upstream correction because it addresses the root cause pattern without using temporary workarounds, unnecessary supplier recreation, or custom redirection.

2.Task Statement: Post-Approval Buyer Processing for a New Procurement Category

In this assessment, you will review a release-based purchase requisition processing issue in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. A home-appliances company is validating a newly introduced indirect procurement category.

End users can create purchase requisitions in SAP Fiori, and the documents are submitted successfully. For most procurement categories, approved requisitions appear in the buyer conversion queue and are processed into purchase orders. However, requisitions from the new category remain in approved status and do not become available for the expected downstream buyer step.

The document data is complete, and the approval logs show that approval was completed successfully. The project lead wants the issue corrected before user acceptance testing expands to more departments. The team must preserve the standard approval-to-procurement flow, avoid manual reassignment of approved requisitions, and stay within clean core controls because the same process design will be reused for later categories.

A. See the complete solution along with all steps and explanation.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Step-by-Step Walkthrough

Step 1: Confirm that requisition creation is not the issue

First, verify whether the purchase requisitions are created successfully.

In this scenario:

End users can create requisitions in SAP Fiori.

The documents are submitted successfully.

The document data is complete.

The issue does not occur during initial requisition creation.

This means the problem is not primarily related to missing document data or failed requisition entry.

Visual Exhibit 1: Requisition Creation Check

☐ Users can create requisitions in SAP Fiori

☐ Documents are submitted successfully

☐ Document data is complete

☐ Requisition creation is not the failing step

Step 2: Confirm that approval processing is not the issue

Next, check whether the release or approval process completed correctly.

In this scenario:

Approval logs show successful completion.

The requisitions reach approved status.

The issue happens after approval, not before approval.

Because the approval process is completed successfully, rebuilding the approval sequence is not the correct first action.

Visual Exhibit 2: Approval Flow Check

Purchase Requisition Created

→ Submitted for Approval

→ Approval Completed Successfully

→ Requisition Remains in Approved Status

Conclusion: The failure occurs after approval completion.

Step 3: Identify the selective failure pattern

The problem does not affect all procurement categories.

For most categories:

Approved requisitions appear in the buyer conversion queue.

Buyers can process them into purchase orders.

For the new indirect procurement category:

Approved requisitions remain in approved status.

They do not become available for the downstream buyer step.

This selective behavior points to a category-dependent determination or assignment issue.

Visual Exhibit 3: Category Comparison

Existing Categories

→ Approved

→ Buyer Conversion Queue

→ Purchase Order Processing

New Indirect Procurement Category

→ Approved

→ Not Available for Expected Buyer Step

→ No Buyer Conversion Visibility

Step 4: Avoid manual buyer processing as a workaround

Buyers should not be asked to search for and process the approved requisitions manually until all categories are stabilized.

Manual handling may temporarily move documents forward, but it does not fix the process design. It also violates the requirement to preserve the standard approval-to-procurement flow.

Because the same process design will be reused for later categories, the correction must address the reusable process logic rather than rely on manual reassignment.

Visual Exhibit 4: Incorrect Manual Workaround

Approved Requisition

→ Buyer Searches Manually

→ Manual Processing

→ Inconsistent Process Flow

→ Not Reusable for Later Categories

This approach should be avoided.

Step 5: Do not broaden buyer access as the first correction

Granting broader buyer access is not the best first action.

The issue is not described as a general authorization problem. Buyers can already process approved requisitions for most categories. The missing visibility occurs only for requisitions from the new category.

This means the more likely issue is not that buyers lack broad access, but that the new category is not correctly included in the downstream buyer-processing determination after approval.

Visual Exhibit 5: Buyer Visibility Pattern

Most Categories + Existing Buyer Access = Visible in Conversion Queue

New Category + Existing Buyer Access = Not Visible in Expected Buyer Step

Conclusion: The issue is tied to the new category's processing determination, not general buyer access.

Step 6: Check downstream buyer-processing determination for the new category

The consultant should first review whether the new procurement category is correctly included in the downstream buyer-processing determination after approval.

The dependency chain is:

Category configuration and processing determination

→ Post-approval routing or binding

→ Buyer conversion visibility

→ Purchase order execution

If the new category is not correctly bound to the downstream buyer-processing step, the requisition can be created and approved successfully but still fail to appear where buyers expect to convert it into a purchase order.

Visual Exhibit 6: Correct Troubleshooting Flow

New Procurement Category

→ Check Category Configuration

→ Check Downstream Buyer-Processing Determination

→ Validate Post-Approval Routing or Binding

→ Confirm Buyer Conversion Queue Visibility

→ Proceed to Purchase Order Execution

Step 7: Confirm the correct first action

Because requisition creation and approval are both working, and because the failure affects only the new category after approval, the correct first action is to check the downstream buyer-processing determination for that category.

Final Solution:

Review whether the new procurement category is correctly included in the downstream buyer-processing determination after approval.

This is the correct upstream correction because it preserves the standard approval-to-procurement flow, avoids manual reassignment, stays within clean core controls, and supports reuse for later procurement categories.

3.Task Statement: Service Purchase Order Conversion and Account Assignment

In this assessment, you will review a service procurement issue in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition.

A facilities-services company is validating service procurement for a new maintenance category.

Requesters can create service purchase requisitions in SAP Fiori, and the requisitions pass release successfully. Buyers can open the approved documents in their worklist and begin conversion. However, when buyers attempt to create purchase orders for one service category, the system stops processing because the follow-on document cannot complete the required account-assignment step.

A comparable service category in the same company structure converts without issue. The affected requisitions already show approved status and valid requester data.

The project lead wants the team to correct the issue without using manual free-text purchase orders. The fix must stay within standard configuration and support automated test execution for later rollout waves.

A. See the complete solution along with all steps and explanation.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Step-by-Step Walkthrough

Step 1: Confirm that service requisition creation is working

First, verify whether the service purchase requisitions can be created successfully.

In this scenario:

Requesters can create service purchase requisitions in SAP Fiori.

The affected requisitions contain valid requester data.

The issue does not occur during initial requisition creation.

This means the problem is not primarily caused by failed requester entry or missing requester information.

Visual Exhibit 1: Requisition Creation Check

☐ Service purchase requisitions can be created in SAP Fiori

☐ Requester data is valid

☐ The issue does not occur at requisition creation

☐ Upstream requester entry is functioning

Step 2: Confirm that release processing is working

Next, confirm whether the requisitions pass release successfully.

In this scenario:

The requisitions pass release.

The affected documents already show approved status.

Buyers can open the approved documents in their worklist.

This means the release workflow is not the failing layer.

Rebuilding the release workflow is not the correct first action because approval has already completed successfully.

Visual Exhibit 2: Release Flow Check

Service Purchase Requisition Created

→ Release Process Completed

→ Approved Status Reached

→ Buyer Can Open Document in Worklist

Conclusion: The failure occurs after release completion.

Step 3: Identify where the process breaks

The issue appears during follow-on purchase order conversion.

Buyers can begin conversion, but the system stops when the follow-on document cannot complete the required account-assignment step.

This means the break occurs during downstream purchasing execution, not during requisition creation or approval.

Visual Exhibit 3: Process Breakpoint

Approved Service Purchase Requisition

→ Buyer Opens Document

→ Buyer Begins PO Conversion

→ Required Account-Assignment Step Fails

→ Purchase Order Cannot Be Completed

Step 4: Compare the affected service category with a working category

A comparable service category in the same company structure converts without issue.

This comparison is important because it shows that the company structure and general service

procurement process are not universally broken.

The issue is selective to one service category. That points to a configuration or determination dependency connected to that affected service category.

Visual Exhibit 4: Category Comparison

Comparable Service Category

→ Approved Requisition

→ PO Conversion Works

Affected Maintenance Service Category

→ Approved Requisition

→ PO Conversion Starts

→ Account-Assignment Step Fails

Conclusion: The issue is category-specific.

Step 5: Avoid manual free-text purchase orders

Buyers should not create manual service purchase orders as a workaround.

Manual free-text purchase orders may temporarily allow procurement to continue, but they bypass the standard configured process. They also do not support the requirement for automated test execution in later rollout waves.

The project needs a standard, reusable correction, not a manual processing workaround.

Visual Exhibit 5: Incorrect Manual Workaround

Approved Service Requisition

→ Manual Free-Text Purchase Order

→ Process Bypass

→ Weak Automation Support

→ Not Reusable for Later Rollout Waves

This approach should be avoided.

Step 6: Do not broaden buyer authorization to bypass the account-assignment step

Granting broader buyer authorization is not the correct first action.

The issue is not described as a buyer access problem. Buyers can open the approved documents in their worklist and begin conversion. The failure happens when the required account-assignment step must be completed.

The goal is not to bypass account assignment. The goal is to ensure that the affected service category is correctly connected to the required account-assignment and follow-on purchasing determination.

Visual Exhibit 6: Authorization Pattern

Buyer Can Open Approved Document

→ Buyer Can Begin Conversion

→ Account-Assignment Handling Fails

Conclusion: The issue is not general buyer visibility or access.

Step 7: Check service-category account-assignment and purchasing determination

The consultant should first verify whether the affected service category is correctly linked to the required account-assignment settings and follow-on purchasing determination.

The dependency chain is:

Service-category configuration

→ Account-assignment and purchasing determination binding

→ Purchase order conversion execution

→ Validation outcome

If the affected service category is not correctly linked to the required downstream account-assignment behavior, the requisition can be created and approved successfully but still fail during purchase order creation.

Visual Exhibit 7: Correct Troubleshooting Flow

Affected Service Category

- Check Service-Category Configuration
- Check Required Account-Assignment Settings
- Check Follow-On Purchasing Determination
- Validate PO Conversion
- Confirm Automated Test Execution

Step 8: Confirm the correct first action

Because requisition creation, release processing, and buyer worklist access are all functioning, and because the failure occurs during PO conversion for one service category at the account-assignment step, the correct first action is to check the category's account-assignment and follow-on purchasing determination setup.

Final Solution:

Verify whether the affected service category is correctly linked to the required account-assignment settings and follow-on purchasing determination.

This is the correct upstream correction because it addresses the category-specific downstream dependency, avoids manual free-text purchase orders, stays within standard configuration, and supports automated validation for later rollout waves.

4.Task Statement: Physical Inventory Final Difference Posting in a Migrated Warehouse

In this assessment, you will review a physical-inventory completion issue in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. A biotechnology distributor is migrating a regional warehouse from a standalone stock-control tool into the shared inventory template.

Inventory documents can be created, count entry works, and variance review completes for most storage zones. However, for one controlled-reagent group in the migrated warehouse, the inventory document remains in a review-finished state and the system blocks the final difference posting.

The same reagent group completes correctly in an already stabilized warehouse, and other groups in the migrated warehouse post without issue.

The migration lead wants the defect corrected before mock cutover. Manual stock correction is not allowed, and the warehouse process must remain standard because the same migration template will be reused for additional sites.

A. See the complete solution along with all steps and explanation.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Step-by-Step Walkthrough

Step 1: Confirm that inventory document creation is working

First, verify whether the physical inventory documents can be created successfully.

In this scenario:

Inventory documents can be created.

The issue does not occur at document creation.

The process starts correctly in the migrated warehouse.

This means the problem is not primarily caused by a failure to create the physical inventory document.

Visual Exhibit 1: Inventory Document Creation Check

- ☐ Inventory documents can be created
- ☐ The migrated warehouse can start the physical inventory process
- ☐ The issue does not occur at document creation
- ☐ Initial inventory processing is functioning

Step 2: Confirm that count entry and variance review are working

Next, check whether the count and review steps are completed.

In this scenario:

Count entry works.

Variance review completes for most storage zones.

The affected document reaches a review-finished state.

This means the earlier physical-inventory steps are functioning. Recreating the inventory documents is not the best first action because the issue appears after counting and variance review, not at the count-entry stage.

Visual Exhibit 2: Physical Inventory Progress Check

Inventory Document Created

- Count Entry Completed
- Variance Review Completed
- Review-Finished State Reached
- Final Difference Posting Blocked

Conclusion: The break occurs at the final posting transition.

Step 3: Identify the selective failure pattern

The issue is not universal across all warehouses or all item groups.

In this scenario:

The same reagent group completes correctly in an already stabilized warehouse.

Other groups in the migrated warehouse post without issue.

Only one controlled-reagent group in the migrated warehouse is blocked.

This selective pattern points to a warehouse-specific and item-group-specific control or status dependency.

Visual Exhibit 3: Failure Pattern Comparison

Stabilized Warehouse + Same Reagent Group

- Final Difference Posting Completes

Migrated Warehouse + Other Groups

- Final Difference Posting Completes

Migrated Warehouse + Controlled-Reagent Group

- Review-Finished State
- Final Difference Posting Blocked

Conclusion: The issue is tied to the migrated warehouse and the controlled-reagent group combination.

Step 4: Avoid processing through the stabilized warehouse

Warehouse users should not process the controlled reagents through the already stabilized warehouse until migration is complete.

Although this may appear to be a temporary workaround, it does not correct the migrated warehouse

template. It also breaks the intended warehouse process and does not support reuse for additional migration sites.

The goal is to validate and stabilize the migrated warehouse under the shared inventory template.

Visual Exhibit 4: Incorrect Warehouse Workaround

Controlled-Reagent Group

- Process Through Stabilized Warehouse
- Avoid Migrated Warehouse Issue
- Template Defect Remains
- Not Reusable for Additional Sites

This approach should be avoided.

Step 5: Do not use manual stock correction

Manual stock correction is not allowed.

Manual correction may bypass the blocked final difference posting, but it would not resolve the underlying process or configuration dependency. It would also weaken mock cutover validation because the standard physical-inventory completion flow would not be proven.

The process must remain standard and repeatable for later site migrations.

Visual Exhibit 5: Incorrect Manual Correction

Review-Finished Document

- Manual Stock Correction
- Posting Block Bypassed
- Standard Process Not Validated
- Migration Template Still Unproven

This approach should be avoided.

Step 6: Do not broaden authorization to force posting

Granting broader warehouse authorization is not the correct first action.

The issue is not described as a general user-access problem. Other groups in the migrated warehouse can post successfully, and the same reagent group can complete in another warehouse.

The system is blocking final difference posting for a specific warehouse and item-group context. That points more strongly to status or control settings than to insufficient user authorization.

Visual Exhibit 6: Authorization Pattern Check

Other Groups in Migrated Warehouse

- Posting Works

Same Reagent Group in Stabilized Warehouse

- Posting Works

Controlled-Reagent Group in Migrated Warehouse

- Posting Blocked

Conclusion: The issue is not a broad authorization problem.

Step 7: Check warehouse and reagent-group-specific control settings

The most appropriate first action is to check whether the migrated warehouse has reagent-group-specific status or control settings preventing the transition from reviewed variance to final difference posting.

The dependency chain is:

Warehouse and item-group control settings

- Eligibility for final difference posting
- Posting execution

→ Cutover validation outcome

If the migrated warehouse has a control, status, or process setting that affects the controlled-reagent group, the document can be created, counted, and reviewed successfully but still fail at final difference posting.

Visual Exhibit 7: Correct Troubleshooting Flow

Migrated Warehouse

- Controlled-Reagent Group
- Check Warehouse-Specific Control Settings
- Check Item-Group-Specific Status Settings
- Validate Transition from Reviewed Variance to Final Posting
- Confirm Mock Cutover Readiness

Step 8: Confirm the correct first action

Because the issue is selective by warehouse and item group, and because earlier inventory steps complete successfully, the correct first action is to investigate the control or status settings that govern final difference posting for the affected combination.

Final Solution:

Check whether the migrated warehouse has reagent-group-specific status or control settings preventing the transition from reviewed variance to final difference posting.

This is the correct upstream correction because it addresses the selective warehouse and item-group dependency, avoids manual stock correction, keeps the warehouse process standard, and supports reuse of the migration template for additional sites.

5.Task Statement: Purchase Order Rejection for a Newly Activated Plant

In this assessment, you will review an integrated purchasing issue in SAP S/4HANA Cloud Private Edition. A company is preparing its first integrated purchasing test after loading procurement master data for a newly activated plant.

Users can create material master records and supplier-related purchasing data. Purchase requisitions can also be entered without error. However, when buyers attempt to create purchase orders for the new plant, the system rejects the documents for that plant only.

The same purchasing process works correctly in an already-live plant within the same company structure.

The implementation lead wants a correction that is transportable and suitable for rollout governance. The team must not create plant-specific custom logic or temporary exceptions because the design is intended to scale to additional plants in later phases.

A. See the complete solution along with all steps and explanation.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Step-by-Step Walkthrough

Step 1: Confirm that procurement master data creation is working

First, verify whether the basic procurement master data has been created successfully.

In this scenario:

Material master records can be created.

Supplier-related purchasing data has been loaded.

Purchase requisitions can be entered without error.

This means the issue is not primarily occurring during master data creation or requisition entry.

Visual Exhibit 1: Master Data and Requisition Check

- ☐ Material master records can be created
- ☐ Supplier-related purchasing data is available
- ☐ Purchase requisitions can be entered
- ☐ No error occurs during requisition creation
- ☐ The failure appears later in the purchasing process

Step 2: Identify where the purchasing process fails

The break occurs when buyers attempt to create purchase orders for the newly activated plant.

The system rejects purchase orders for the new plant only. The same purchasing process works in an already-live plant within the same company structure. [

This shows that the purchasing process itself is not universally broken.

Visual Exhibit 2: Process Breakpoint

Procurement Master Data Loaded

- Purchase Requisition Entered Successfully
- Buyer Attempts Purchase Order Creation
- New Plant Is Rejected
- Already-Live Plant Works Correctly

Conclusion: The failure occurs at purchase order execution eligibility for the new plant.

Step 3: Compare the new plant with the already-live plant

The same purchasing process works in an already-live plant. This comparison is important because it shows that the supplier data, general purchasing process, and company structure are not failing in every case.

The issue is selective to the newly activated plant.

That strongly points to an organizational assignment or procurement scope issue for the new plant, rather than a universal purchasing failure.

Visual Exhibit 3: Plant Comparison

Already-Live Plant

- Same Purchasing Process
- Purchase Order Creation Works

Newly Activated Plant

- Same Purchasing Process
- Purchase Order Creation Rejected

Conclusion: The issue is plant-specific.

Step 4: Do not process purchase orders under the existing live plant

Buyers should not create purchase orders under the existing live plant and later transfer stock internally after go-live.

Although this may allow temporary processing, it does not correct the new plant's purchasing readiness. It also creates an operational workaround that conflicts with rollout governance.

The requirement is to validate the new plant as part of the intended scalable design.

Visual Exhibit 4: Incorrect Temporary Workaround

New Plant Purchasing Requirement

- Create PO Under Existing Live Plant
- Transfer Stock Later

→ Plant Readiness Not Corrected

→ Rollout Governance Risk

This approach should be avoided.

Step 5: Do not rebuild supplier master data for all plants

Rebuilding supplier master data is not the best first action.

The same purchasing process works in an already-live plant within the same company structure. This means the supplier-related data is not universally unusable.

A rejection that occurs only for the new plant points more strongly to plant assignment, organizational setup, or procurement process scope than to supplier duplication issues.

Visual Exhibit 5: Supplier Data Reasoning

Same Supplier-Related Purchasing Data

☞ Already-Live Plant = Purchase Order Creation Works

Same Purchasing Process

☞ New Plant = Purchase Order Creation Rejected

Conclusion: The failure is linked to the new plant context, not to all supplier data.

Step 6: Do not add plant-specific custom logic

Adding a plant-specific enhancement to redirect purchasing documents to a fallback organizational unit is not the correct first action.

This would hide the underlying organizational or scope problem instead of fixing it. It would also violate the requirement to avoid plant-specific custom logic or temporary exceptions.

Because the design must scale to additional plants in later phases, the correction should be standard, transportable, and reusable.

Visual Exhibit 6: Incorrect Custom Logic Approach

Rejected PO for New Plant

→ Plant-Specific Enhancement

→ Redirect to Fallback Unit

→ Root Cause Hidden

→ Not Suitable for Scalable Rollout

This approach should be avoided.

Step 7: Check plant assignment and purchasing process scope

The best first action is to confirm that the new plant is correctly assigned within the required procurement organizational structure and is usable in the purchasing process scope.

The dependency chain is:

Organizational setup

→ Plant availability within procurement scope

→ Purchase order execution eligibility

→ Process validation

If the plant is not properly integrated into the purchasing structure used for the tested scenario, users may be able to create master data and requisitions, but purchase order creation can still fail for that plant.

Visual Exhibit 7: Correct Troubleshooting Flow

Newly Activated Plant

→ Check Procurement Organizational Assignment

→ Check Plant Availability in Purchasing Process Scope

→ Validate Purchase Order Creation

→ Confirm Rollout Governance Readiness

Step 8: Confirm the correct first action

Because the issue occurs only for the newly activated plant, while the same process works in an already-live plant, the correct first action is to verify the plant's organizational assignment and procurement scope readiness.

Final Solution:

Confirm that the new plant is correctly assigned within the required procurement organizational structure and is usable in the purchasing process scope.

This is the correct upstream correction because it addresses the plant-specific foundation issue, avoids temporary exceptions, avoids unnecessary supplier master data rebuilding, remains suitable for transportable rollout governance, and supports scaling the design to additional plants in later phases.