

SAP S/4HANA MM

5 Issue Resolution Samples

Practical Troubleshooting • Business Scenarios • Resolution • Key Learning

CBP • ESM • Inventory Management • LIV • Purchasing / P2P

Sample extracted from the attached SAP MM Issue Resolution materials

01 | CONSUMPTION-BASED PLANNING

MRP Type VB Ignoring Sales Orders

INTERVIEW EXPLANATION How did you troubleshoot a scenario where the MRP run failed to generate a Purchase Requisition even though a massive Sales Order exceeded the available stock?

BUSINESS SCENARIO: A material was configured for Consumption-Based Planning with current stock of 500 units and a Reorder Point of 400 units. An emergency Sales Order for 300 units reduced the theoretically available stock to 200 units. However, MRP generated zero Purchase Requisitions.

TROUBLESHOOTING APPROACH

STEP 1 — VERIFY STOCK/REQUIREMENTS — MD04 I checked the Stock/Requirements List in MD04. Current stock was 500, the Sales Order was -300, and available quantity was 200. The Sales Order was visible, so the issue was why MRP ignored the calculation.

STEP 2 — ANALYZE MRP TYPE — MM03 I checked MM03 → MRP 1 View and found MRP Type VB — Manual Reorder Point Planning.

SAP LOGIC MRP Type VB is backward-looking. It does not consider future requirements such as Sales Orders or dependent reservations. It triggers replenishment based primarily on physical stock and firm receipts. Since physical stock was 500 and the reorder point was 400, the VB engine did not trigger procurement.

RESOLUTION The business needed Sales Orders to influence replenishment. I explained the limitation of VB and changed the MRP Type in MM02 → MRP 1 from VB to V1. V2 could alternatively be used where external requirements within replenishment lead time should be considered.

FINAL RESOLUTION After the MRP run in MD01N, the system considered the Sales Order and generated the required Purchase Requisition.

KEY LEARNING VB is generally blind to future demand. If Sales Orders or other external requirements need to influence replenishment, use the appropriate V1/V2 variant.

02 | EXTERNAL SERVICES MANAGEMENT

Lean Service Cannot Be Processed in ML81N

INTERVIEW EXPLANATION How did you troubleshoot a scenario where ML81N displayed "Transaction not supported" or "Not a classic service" when creating a Service Entry Sheet?

BUSINESS SCENARIO: A buyer created a Purchase Order for external IT consulting. When the project manager attempted to create the Service Entry Sheet using ML81N, SAP indicated that the PO item was not a classic service and the vendor payment process was blocked.

TROUBLESHOOTING APPROACH

STEP 1 — VERIFY PO ITEM CATEGORY — ME23N I checked ME23N → Item Details. The PO had a standard item category while the service material was configured with Product Type Group 2.

STEP 2 — ANALYZE S/4HANA SERVICE ARCHITECTURE Classic services use Item Category D, Service Master and ML81N. S/4HANA Lean Services use Product Type Group 2 and the modern Fiori service-entry process.

SAP LOGIC In classic services, Item Category D is used with ML81N. In S/4HANA Lean Services, services are treated more like materials, Product Type Group 2 identifies the service, and the process uses the Fiori service-entry process.

RESOLUTION I redirected the user from ML81N to the Fiori application Manage Service Entry Sheets — Lean Services. The user referenced the PO, entered performance dates and quantity, and submitted the SES for approval. I also verified the Flexible Workflow and confirmed the SES reached My Inbox.

FINAL RESOLUTION The Lean Service Entry Sheet was successfully created and approved, allowing the subsequent invoice process to continue.

KEY LEARNING Item Category D = Classic Service = ML81N, while Product Type Group 2 = Lean Service = Fiori Service Entry Sheet process.

03 | INVENTORY MANAGEMENT

MIGO 102 Blocked by Deficit of GR Quantity

INTERVIEW EXPLANATION How did you troubleshoot a "Deficit of PU GR quantity" error when reversing a Goods Receipt even though sufficient stock appeared to exist?

BUSINESS SCENARIO: A warehouse received 100 laptops using MIGO Movement Type 101. Later, the IT department consumed 20 laptops using Movement Type 201. When the warehouse attempted to reverse the original 100-unit Goods Receipt using Movement Type 102, SAP returned a deficit error.

TROUBLESHOOTING APPROACH

STEP 1 — ANALYZE MIGO 102 REVERSAL LOGIC SAP cancellation attempts to reverse the original Goods Receipt quantity from the relevant logistical chain. It does not simply look at total plant stock.

STEP 2 — CHECK PO HISTORY AND MATERIAL DOCUMENTS I checked ME23N → PO History and MB51 → Material Document List. The original GR was 100 EA and the subsequent GI was -20 EA. Therefore, 20 units had already been consumed.

SAP LOGIC Movement 102 is a cancellation of the original document and expects the original quantity. The subsequent Goods Issue had consumed 20 units, creating the deficit.

RESOLUTION Preferred option: reverse the 20-unit Goods Issue using Movement Type 202, restore stock to 100 units, and execute Movement Type 102. If the 20 units cannot be returned to stock, use Return Delivery Movement Type 122 and return only the remaining 80 units.

FINAL RESOLUTION The appropriate reversal/return process removed the deficit and correctly updated the Purchase Order history.

KEY LEARNING Movement 102 cancels the original document and expects the original quantity. Movement 122 allows a partial return.

04 | LOGISTICS INVOICE VERIFICATION

MIRO Payment Block "R"

INTERVIEW EXPLANATION How did you troubleshoot a scenario where a MIRO invoice was successfully posted but later remained unpaid with an "R" payment block?

BUSINESS SCENARIO: The PO price was 100 laptops at \$1,000 each, while the vendor invoice was 100 laptops at \$1,050 each. MIRO successfully posted the invoice, but the F110 payment run skipped it and the FI document showed Payment Block R — Invoice Verification.

TROUBLESHOOTING APPROACH

STEP 1 — VERIFY THE INVOICE BLOCK — MRBR I checked MRBR — Release Blocked Invoices. The invoice showed a Price Variance block.

STEP 2 — CHECK TOLERANCE CONFIGURATION — OMR6 I checked OMR6 — Tolerance Limits for Invoice Verification. Tolerance Key PP — Price Variance had an upper tolerance of \$50 or 2%. The invoice variance exceeded the tolerance.

SAP LOGIC SAP can allow the invoice to post so the financial liability is captured, while simultaneously applying an R payment block to prevent payment until the variance is reviewed.

RESOLUTION I did not recommend bypassing the control. I explained the price variance to AP, asked the authorized AP Manager to review it, and, if approved, the manager released the invoice through MRBR.

FINAL RESOLUTION After release in MRBR, the R block was removed and the invoice was picked up by the next F110 payment run.

KEY LEARNING An "R" block can be a successful business control triggered by MM-IV tolerance settings.

05 | PURCHASING / PROCURE TO PAY

Flexible Workflow Fails to Trigger for PO

INTERVIEW EXPLANATION How did you troubleshoot a scenario where a Purchase Order was created in S/4HANA, but Flexible Workflow failed to route the PO to an approver?

BUSINESS SCENARIO: A buyer created a high-value PO worth \$100,000 using the Fiori Manage Purchase Orders application. The PO showed an approval-related status, but no manager received a task in My Inbox, blocking procurement.

TROUBLESHOOTING APPROACH

STEP 1 — VERIFY WORKFLOW ACTIVATION I checked the Flexible Workflow configuration for Purchase Orders in SPRO. The relevant PO document type had Flexible Workflow activated.

STEP 2 — ANALYZE WORKFLOW LOG I checked Fiori Workflow Administration and SWIA. The workflow instance existed but stopped during Agent Determination with the message: No agent could be determined.

STEP 3 — CHECK MANAGE WORKFLOWS I reviewed Manage Workflows for Purchase Orders. The workflow was configured to determine the approver as the Manager of the Workflow Initiator, but the buyer's organizational structure did not contain a valid manager or the manager's SAP user was missing/locked.

SAP LOGIC Flexible Workflow knew that approval was required but could not identify the recipient because agent determination could not find a valid approver.

RESOLUTION I corrected the buyer's organizational assignment through the appropriate HR/Basis process, added a Fallback Agent such as the Workflow Administrator or Purchasing Director, and used Administrator Forwarding / SWIA to forward the existing stuck work item.

FINAL RESOLUTION The manager received the task in My Inbox, approved the PO, and the PO status changed to Released, allowing it to be transmitted to the vendor.

KEY LEARNING Flexible Workflow depends heavily on accurate organizational master data and agent determination. A fallback agent should be configured to prevent approval tasks from becoming orphaned.

Sample Coverage

#	SAP MM Area	Issue	Key Transactions / Tools
01	Consumption-Based Planning	VB ignoring Sales Orders	MD04, MM03, MM02, MD01N
02	External Services Management	Lean Service / ML81N mismatch	ME23N, Fiori SES, My Inbox
03	Inventory Management	MIGO 102 quantity deficit	MIGO, ME23N, MB51
04	Logistics Invoice Verification	MIRO "R" payment block	MIRO, MRBR, OMR6, F110
05	Purchasing / P2P	Flexible Workflow agent failure	SPRO, SWIA, Manage Workflows, My Inbox

SAMPLE PURPOSE These five issue resolutions represent different SAP MM troubleshooting patterns: planning configuration, S/4HANA service architecture, sequential inventory postings, FI-MM invoice controls, and workflow/organizational master data.