SAP S/4HANA SD

10 Issue & Resolution Scenarios

MASTER DATA • O2C • SHIPPING • BILLING • TRANSPORTATION

Sample Copy

10 real-world troubleshooting scenarios selected from the five attached SAP SD Issue & Resolution repositories.

Sample Copy

SAMPLE COVERAGE

AREA	ISSUES	FOCUS
Master Data & Pricing	2	Route determination • Manual discount
Sales Order to Cash	2	Scheduling • PO date validation
Shipping & Deliveries	2	Delivery split • HUM packing
Billing & Invoicing	2	Drop-ship billing • Down payment
Transportation	2	Route zone • Factory calendar

Format note: The issue titles, interview questions, scenarios, troubleshooting logic, final resolutions, key learnings and strong interview endings are retained from the attached source material; only the layout and visual formatting are newly designed.

Sample Co

ISSUE 1 • MASTER DATA & PRICING

Route Determination Failed – Transportation Group Missing

IF THE INTERVIEWER ASKS

“How did you troubleshoot a scenario where the Route field remained blank in a sales order even though the customer and material master data looked correct?”

BUSINESS SCENARIO

A new customer placed an order for a standard product. The sales order was created successfully, but the Route field remained blank. Because of this, transit time could not be calculated and delivery scheduling was impacted.

Because of this:

- ✓ Transit time could not be calculated.
- ✓ Automated freight pricing was also affected.

TROUBLESHOOTING

STEP 1: VERIFY ROUTE DETERMINATION

Checked in: VA03 -> Item -> Shipping tab. The Route field was blank.

STEP 2: CHECK ROUTE DETERMINATION CONFIGURATION

Checked in: 0VRF. Verified the determination matrix and found that the required Transportation Group was '0001' for Route 'R00001'.

STEP 3: CHECK MATERIAL MASTER

Checked in: MM02/MM03. Found that the material was missing Transportation Group '0001'.

FINAL RESOLUTION

Updated the Material Master to include Transportation Group '0001'. Re-determined shipping in the sales order. The route 'R00001' populated successfully, and the delivery was created.

KEY LEARNING

Route determination issues usually happen due to missing Transportation Group, missing Shipping Conditions, unassigned Transportation Zones, or missing configuration in 0VRF—not system failure. Validate all four route-determination parameters and ensure master data aligns with the configuration matrix.

STRONG INTERVIEW ENDING

“After analyzing the route determination criteria, I identified that the issue was caused by a missing Transportation Group in the Material Master. Once the material data was enriched, the route determined successfully and the delivery block was resolved.”

SOURCE • Master Data & Pricing file

Sample Copy

ISSUE 2 • MASTER DATA & PRICING

Manual Discount Condition Blocked

IF THE INTERVIEWER ASKS

"How did you troubleshoot a scenario where users cannot enter a manual discount condition in the Sales Order?"

BUSINESS SCENARIO

Sales representatives reported that they were trying to give a special one-time discount (Condition type RA00) to a VIP customer, but the system either greyed out the condition field or threw an error saying 'Manual entry is not permitted.'

Because of this:

- ✓ Sales negotiations were stalled.
- ✓ Customer dissatisfaction occurred due to delayed pricing updates.

TROUBLESHOOTING

STEP 1: VERIFY SALES ORDER PRICING

Checked in: VA01 / VA02. Added condition RA00 manually in the item conditions tab. The system rejected the manual entry.

STEP 2: CHECK PRICING PROCEDURE CONFIGURATION

Checked in: V/08. Verified Condition Type RA00 was in the procedure and the 'Manual' flag was ticked, meaning the pricing procedure should allow manual entry.

STEP 3: CHECK CONDITION TYPE CONFIGURATION

Checked in: V/06. Verified Condition Type RA00 and the 'Manual entries' field (T685A-KMANU). Found the field was set to 'D' (Not possible to process manually).

FINAL RESOLUTION

Discussed with business leads to confirm if RA00 should be manually editable. Changed the setting in V/06 to 'C' (Manual entry has priority) or 'blank' (No limitations). The sales team was then able to manually enter the RA00 discount successfully.

KEY LEARNING

Manual pricing entry issues usually happen due to conflicts between V/08 and V/06 settings, authorization issues (SU53), or condition records overriding manual inputs—not system failure.

STRONG INTERVIEW ENDING

"After checking both the pricing procedure and the condition type, I found that V/08 allowed manual entry but V/06 explicitly prohibited it. Correcting the condition-type setting resolved the issue without changing the pricing procedure."

SOURCE • Master Data & Pricing file

Sample Copy

ISSUE 3 • SALES ORDER TO CASH

Forward Scheduling Triggered Instead of Backward

IF THE INTERVIEWER ASKS

"How did you explain to the business why an order scheduled delivery for next week, even though the customer requested it for tomorrow?"

BUSINESS SCENARIO

A sales rep escalated a ticket. They entered an order on Thursday, with the 'Requested Delivery Date' explicitly set for Friday (tomorrow). The stock was available. However, SAP confirmed the delivery for next Tuesday. The rep thought the scheduling engine was broken.

Because of this:

✓ Sales reps were losing trust in the system's ability to meet customer deadlines.

TROUBLESHOOTING

STEP 1: VERIFY SCHEDULING DATES & LEAD TIMES

Checked in: VA03 -> Item -> Schedule Lines -> Shipping icon. Verified Transit Time = 2 days, Pick/Pack Time = 1 day, Total lead time = 3 days.

STEP 2: ANALYZE BACKWARD SCHEDULING

Customer wants Friday. Friday minus 2 days transit = Wednesday (Goods Issue). Wednesday minus 1 day Pick/Pack = Tuesday (Material Availability Date). The order was entered on Thursday, so the calculated Material Availability Date was already in the past.

STEP 3: ANALYZE FORWARD SCHEDULING

Standard SAP logic flips to Forward Scheduling when backward scheduling reaches a past date. It starts from Thursday, adds pick/pack time and transit time, and—because the carrier calendar does not work weekends—confirms Tuesday next week.

FINAL RESOLUTION

This was not a system defect; SAP was executing the scheduling math based on physical constraints. I organized a brief training session with the sales team and explained Pick/Pack and Transit lead times. If delivery tomorrow is required, an expedited route and prioritized picking must be used.

KEY LEARNING

Scheduling date pushbacks usually happen because the requested delivery date falls inside the standard lead-time window and SAP correctly executes Forward Scheduling when Backward Scheduling falls in the past.

STRONG INTERVIEW ENDING

"The sales team thought the scheduling engine was broken. By breaking down the pick, pack, and transit times, I proved that backward scheduling resulted in a date in the past, forcing SAP into forward scheduling. Training the users on how lead times physically constrain system dates resolved the confusion."

SOURCE • Sales Order to Cash file

Sample Copy

ISSUE 4 • SALES ORDER TO CASH

PO Date in Future Causing Warning/Error

IF THE INTERVIEWER ASKS

"How did you troubleshoot a scenario where a sales order was blocked because the customer's Purchase Order date was in the future?"

BUSINESS SCENARIO

A customer in Australia, where it is already Tuesday, emailed a PO to the US data entry team, where it is still Monday. The PO date was listed as Tuesday. When the US user typed the PO date into SAP, the system threw a hard error: 'Purchase Order Date lies in the future,' blocking the order.

Because of this:

- ✓ Global orders processed across time zones were being delayed by 24 hours.
- ✓ Data entry teams were falsifying the PO date to Monday just to bypass the system.

TROUBLESHOOTING

STEP 1: VERIFY SALES ORDER ENTRY

Checked in: VA01. Document Date = Monday; PO Date = Tuesday. SAP threw error message V1 210: 'PO Date lies in the future.'

STEP 2: CHECK SYSTEM MESSAGE CONFIGURATION

Standard SAP compares the PO date (BSTDK) against the system date (SY-DATUM). Checked in: OVAH, Application Area V1, Message 210. The message category was set to 'E' (Error).

FINAL RESOLUTION

Discussed with the Global Order Management Lead. Changed the message category for V1 210 from 'E' (Error) to 'W' (Warning). The US user could then enter the Australian PO date, receive a warning, press Enter, and save the order.

KEY LEARNING

Future-date blocks usually happen because OVAH message configuration is too strict ('E' instead of 'W') or custom validation logic such as USEREXIT_SAVE_DOCUMENT_PREPARE is enforcing the rule.

STRONG INTERVIEW ENDING

"After replicating the time-zone date conflict, I identified that the standard SAP system message V1 210 had been overly restricted to a hard error. By downgrading the message in OVAH to a Warning, I allowed global teams to process cross-timezone POs without falsifying audit data."

SOURCE • Sales Order to Cash file

Sample Copy

ISSUE 5 • SHIPPING & DELIVERIES

Delivery Split by Incoterms

IF THE INTERVIEWER ASKS

"How did you troubleshoot an unwanted delivery split caused by an Incoterms mismatch?"

BUSINESS SCENARIO

An export customer placed an order for 10 line items. The background delivery job generated two deliveries: one containing 9 items, and a second delivery containing only 1 item. All items were shipping from the same plant, on the same date, to the same address.

Because of this:

- ✓ Customs documentation had to be duplicated.
- ✓ Shipping costs increased due to fragmented paperwork.

TROUBLESHOOTING

STEP 1: VERIFY DELIVERY SPLIT ANALYSIS

Checked in: VL03N -> Header -> Edit -> Split Analysis. The split analysis pointed to a difference in Incoterms.

STEP 2: CHECK SALES ORDER ITEM DATA

Checked in: VA03 -> Item -> Billing tab. Items 10-90 had Incoterms = FOB / Shanghai Port. Item 100 had Incoterms = EXW / Shanghai Port.

FINAL RESOLUTION

Confirmed the correct legal term for the entire shipment. The CSR updated line 100 to FOB in VA02, deleted the split deliveries, and re-ran VL01N. All 10 items were consolidated into a single outbound delivery.

KEY LEARNING

Incoterm delivery splits usually happen due to manual user overrides at item level or differing CMIR records—not system failure. Incoterms are a header-level field in the Delivery document, so discrepancies at the sales-order item level force a hard split.

STRONG INTERVIEW ENDING

"Using the delivery split analysis, I traced the fragmentation back to an Incoterms mismatch on a single line item in the sales order. Because standard SAP legally requires a single Incoterm per shipment, updating the outlier line item to match the rest of the order instantly resolved the split."

SOURCE • Shipping & Deliveries file

Sample Copy

ISSUE 6 • SHIPPING & DELIVERIES

Handling Unit (HU) / Packing Error

IF THE INTERVIEWER ASKS

"How did you troubleshoot a scenario where the warehouse could not pack materials into a shipping carton, receiving a 'Material not assigned to packaging type' error?"

BUSINESS SCENARIO

The warehouse uses SAP Handling Unit Management (HUM) to pack goods into pallets and cartons before PGI. While processing a delivery in VL02N, the user selected a standard cardboard box and tried to pack a new retail product inside it. SAP threw an error: 'Material X may not be packed in packaging material Y.'

Because of this:

- ✓ The delivery could not be packed or shipped.
- ✓ A backlog of unpacked goods cluttered the staging area.

TROUBLESHOOTING

STEP 1: VERIFY PACKING ACTION

Checked in: VL02N -> Pack icon (Shift+F6). Product A and Box B were selected, but SAP rejected the combination.

STEP 2: CHECK MATERIAL MASTER (PACKAGING DATA)

Checked in: MM03 -> Sales: General/Plant Data. Product A had Material Group for Packaging Materials 'ELEC'; Box B had Packaging Material Type 'CART'.

STEP 3: CHECK PACKAGING ALLOWANCE CONFIGURATION

Checked in: VHAR or SPRO -> Handling Unit Management -> Allowed Packaging Materials. The mapping between Packaging Material Type 'CART' and Material Group 'ELEC' was missing.

FINAL RESOLUTION

Added a new entry mapping Packaging Material Type 'CART' to Material Group 'ELEC'. The warehouse user returned to VL02N; SAP accepted the combination, generated a Handling Unit (HU) number, and allowed packing to complete.

KEY LEARNING

Packing errors usually happen due to missing allowed packaging-material mappings, missing Material Group for Packaging Materials, or weight/volume limits—not system failure.

STRONG INTERVIEW ENDING

“After reproducing the packing error, I identified a gap between the material master and Handling Unit configuration. The new product’s material group was never mapped to the allowed packaging material type. Creating this mapping instantly allowed the warehouse to generate the Handling Units.”

SOURCE • Shipping & Deliveries file

Sample Copy

ISSUE 7 • **BILLING & INVOICING**

Drop-Ship Order Not Appearing in Billing Due List

IF THE INTERVIEWER ASKS

"How did you troubleshoot an issue where the customer had received a drop-ship order, but the sales order was invisible in VF04?"

BUSINESS SCENARIO

The customer confirmed receipt. However, the AR team complained that the sales order was completely invisible in VF04 and they could not generate the customer invoice.

Because of this:

- ✓ Revenue collection was stalled.
- ✓ Month-end reconciliation was blocked.

TROUBLESHOOTING

STEP 1: VERIFY DOCUMENT FLOW

Checked in: VA03 -> Document Flow. Sales Order and Purchase Order were completed, but there was no Goods Receipt (MIGO) and, more importantly, no Invoice Receipt (MIRO) from the vendor.

STEP 2: CHECK COPY CONTROL (VTFA)

Checked VTFA (Order to Billing copy control) -> Item Category TAS. The Billing Quantity indicator was set to 'F' (Invoice receipt quantity minus already invoiced quantity).

FINAL RESOLUTION

The 'F' rule means SAP waits for Accounts Payable to receive and post the vendor invoice. The AP team found the vendor invoice in their unread emails and processed it via MIRO. The moment MIRO was saved, the SD sales order automatically unlocked, dropped into the VF04 due list, and AR generated the customer invoice.

KEY LEARNING

Drop-ship billing blocks usually happen due to a missing vendor invoice (MIRO) or Billing Quantity set to 'F'—not system failure. Billing Quantity 'F' prevents charging the customer until the vendor invoice is received and posted.

STRONG INTERVIEW ENDING

"When the drop-ship order failed to appear in the billing due list, I checked the copy control and found the Billing Quantity was set to 'F'. This meant SAP was strictly waiting for the Accounts Payable vendor invoice. Coordinating with AP to process the pending MIRO transaction instantly unlocked the SD invoice generation."

SOURCE • Billing & Invoicing file

Sample Copy

ISSUE 8 • **BILLING & INVOICING**

Down Payment Request (FAZ) Missing

IF THE INTERVIEWER ASKS

"How did you troubleshoot a down payment request where the system created a standard invoice instead of a special down payment request?"

BUSINESS SCENARIO

A sales representative created an order requiring a 20% down payment before manufacturing. They ran VF01 to generate the Down Payment Request (Billing Type FAZ). However, instead of creating a Special G/L down payment request, the system generated a standard F2 invoice for the full amount.

Because of this:

- ✓ The customer received a demand for full payment instead of the 20% advance.
- ✓ Down payment tracking in Finance was broken.

TROUBLESHOOTING

STEP 1: VERIFY THE GENERATED DOCUMENT TYPE

Checked in: VF03 -> Header -> Billing Type. Billing type was F2 instead of FAZ; the user selected the wrong billing type on the selection screen.

STEP 2: CHECK SALES ORDER BILLING PLAN

Checked in: VA03 -> Item -> Billing Plan. The 20% milestone existed, but the Date Category was '01' (Milestone billing) instead of '03' (Down payment request).

FINAL RESOLUTION

Went into VA02 -> Item -> Billing Plan and changed the Date Category to '03'. Instructed the AR user to select Billing Type FAZ explicitly on the VF01 selection screen. The system then generated the FAZ document and passed the Special G/L indicator to Finance.

KEY LEARNING

Down payment request failures usually happen due to the Sales Order Billing Plan using Date Category '01' instead of '03', or users selecting F2 instead of FAZ in VF01.

STRONG INTERVIEW ENDING

“After checking both the generated billing type and the billing-plan date category, I identified that the milestone was configured for standard billing. Correcting the date category and selecting FAZ generated the proper down payment request.”

SOURCE • Billing & Invoicing file

Sample Copy

ISSUE 9 • TRANSPORTATION

Transportation Zone Missing in Route

IF THE INTERVIEWER ASKS

"How did you troubleshoot a scenario where a route failed to determine for a brand new customer?"

BUSINESS SCENARIO

A business expanded operations into a new region in the Midwest. However, every time Customer Service entered an order for a new customer in this region, the Route field remained completely blank.

Because of this:

- ✓ Transit times could not be calculated, causing scheduling errors.
- ✓ Automated freight pricing failed.

TROUBLESHOOTING

STEP 1: VERIFY THE SALES ORDER

Checked in: VA03 -> Item -> Shipping tab. Route was indeed blank.

STEP 2: ANALYZE ROUTE DETERMINATION LOGIC

Reviewed the standard Route Determination matrix (0VRF): Departure Zone (Plant) + Destination Zone (Ship-to) + Shipping Condition (Sold-to) + Transportation Group (Material).

STEP 3: CHECK MASTER DATA PARAMETERS

Validated Departure Zone, Shipping Condition and Transportation Group. Found the Destination Zone was missing because the Ship-to Business Partner's Transportation Zone field was blank.

FINAL RESOLUTION

Contacted the MDM team to update the Ship-to Business Partner. In the BP Address tab they populated the correct Transportation Zone, then shipping was re-determined in the sales order. The route populated instantly, enabling transit scheduling and freight calculation.

KEY LEARNING

Route determination issues for new customers usually happen due to a missing Transportation Zone in the BP Address or missing Shipping Conditions in the Sold-to BP—not system failure. The Transportation Zone comes from the Ship-to party's address because that is the physical destination.

STRONG INTERVIEW ENDING

"When the route failed to determine for new regional customers, I systematically checked the four master-data parameters required for 0VRF. I found that the MDM team had omitted the Transportation Zone in the Ship-to Business Partner address. Populating this single geographical field instantly resolved the route determination."

SOURCE • Transportation file

Sample Copy

ISSUE 10 • TRANSPORTATION

Transit Time Includes Weekends Incorrectly

IF THE INTERVIEWER ASKS

"How did you troubleshoot a delivery where SAP scheduled a truck to arrive at a B2B customer's facility on a Sunday?"

BUSINESS SCENARIO

A B2B distributor shipped goods on a Thursday. The route transit time was 3 days. SAP calculated the delivery date as Sunday. However, both the freight carrier and the receiving customer do not operate on weekends. The carrier charged the company weekend storage fees because they could not unload the truck.

Because of this:

- ✓ Freight costs surged due to weekend holding fees.
- ✓ Customer satisfaction dropped.

TROUBLESHOOTING

STEP 1: VERIFY SCHEDULING TIME SEGMENTS

Checked in: VL03N -> Item -> Dates tab. Goods Issue = Thursday; Delivery Date = Sunday (3 days later). SAP was treating Saturday and Sunday as valid transit days.

STEP 2: CHECK ROUTE CONFIGURATION

Checked in: 0VTC (Define Routes). Transit Time was maintained as 3 days, but the Factory Calendar assigned to the Route was either blank or set to a 7-day/24-hour calendar.

FINAL RESOLUTION

Discussed the carrier's operating days with the Logistics Manager. Updated the Route configuration in 0VTC and assigned a standard Monday-Friday Factory Calendar. The next Thursday shipment added 3 working days, skipping Saturday and Sunday, and accurately calculated the Delivery Date as Tuesday.

KEY LEARNING

Transit-time errors involving weekends usually happen because the route has no appropriate Factory Calendar. Without a Monday-Friday calendar, SAP can treat transit time as continuous calendar days.

STRONG INTERVIEW ENDING

"After confirming the carrier's working calendar, I found that the route was using a continuous calendar. Assigning the correct Monday-Friday Factory Calendar ensured SAP calculated transit time using working days and removed the Sunday delivery date."

SOURCE • Transportation file

Sample Copy

INTERVIEW-READY STRUCTURE

BUSINESS SCENARIO	Start with the real business impact before discussing configuration.
TROUBLESHOOTING	Show the exact transaction, check, finding and root cause.
FINAL RESOLUTION	Explain the controlled correction and how you verified the result.
STRONG INTERVIEW ENDING	Close with a concise consultant-style explanation of what you learned.

End of Sample Copy

Prepared from the five attached SAP S/4HANA SD Issue & Resolution files.

Sample Copy