SFIA 8 Update Webinar Q&A

Kevin Tibbs:
Q: When would you anticipate Partner tool providers getting hold of V8 content in good time?
A: SFIA 8 will be visible as it is being built – so you'll see what the changes are likely to be throughout. We will release a Beta prior to the final release as that was well liked from SFIA 7. for SFIA 7 – This is likely to be around mid 2021. As we now also translate into 12 languages, we are also looking to do a continuous translation activity so as to reduce the time between the English release and the other 12 languages.

Andy Taylor:
Q: One of the major issues for people managers (particularly in IT departments) is matrix management. Will that be addressed in SFIA 8?
A: Thanks Andy – We will look to ensure that is addressed in the theme of People Management.

Kenneth Nidiffer:
Q: How does one get involved
A: Simply email any of the panel with your interests and offer of help.

Angelica Papadam:
Q: Thank you very much for the overview. I have to leave to another meeting, but would be happy if you could e-mail this presentation.
A: The Webinar will be sent to attendees, along with slides and the Q&A,

Dan Martland:
Q: Is it possible for the slides to be shared please? Some of my other colleagues would also be very interested
A: Yes we will circulate slides and the Q&A to all

Kevin Streater:
Q: It would be good to have the people skills focused on those areas that relate specifically to IT people management. There are plenty of competency frameworks for generic people management (CIPD etc.)
A: Thanks Kevin, yes indeed. We are not competing with CIPD and do not just want to repeat what they have done. But SFIA is very broad in its scope and with a huge global reach so we want to put into SFIA what makes sense for the users of SFIA.

Carol Long:
Q: peope management - CIPD have a professional frame work too. Have we engaged them in the People Management discussions? (I'm not convinced it is broad enough for our purposes but it is a start - APS seem to have a good handle on the broader behaviour matters)
A: We have looked at several source and you are right we have had some fantastic input from Australia which we plan to bring into SFIA.

Paul Willockx:
Q: English is not my native language - could you explain the difference between 'competence' and 'competency' - both words/concepts are being mixed world-wide.
A1: Thanks Paul, you are not alone. There are a lot of words that the industry uses interchangeably. I think with regards to competence and competency consider them the same in general. English has many different ways of saying the same thing. As SFIA has grown and been created by many authors including many not native English speakers we perhaps have some refinement necessary – part of readability review. We do differentiate between knowledge, skill and competence though …
A2: (Peter Leeson) The Oxford dictionary has competence as a noun – The ability to do something successfully or efficiently. In contrast a competency is usually described as an action – a behaviour, skill or use of knowledge. So competence is a state – the successful achievement of one or more competencies.

Clare Thornley:
Q: Could you say a bit more re integrating ethics into levels of responsibility?
A: Thanks Clare, this first came up in the SFIA 7 update and we discussed ethics and where we should address this, it was felt the LoRs were the right place but apart from some minor changes at that time it was not fully worked though. With SFIA 8 and in particular the CRs around this topic we have a bit more time to get this properly sorted for SFIA 8.

Peter Leeson:
Q: The GDPR contact point's skills need to be included
A1: Thanks Peter, let's make sure there is a CR to cover this. Both security and privacy are currently explicitly and implicitly addressed in SFIA but part of the SFIA 8 update is to review this yet again and we must ensure this is not lost. As Peter said we are working out what our security review and thinking leads to in terms of specific changes so please keep watching and ensure we address your point.
A2: (Andy Thomson) Thanks Peter. We will look at that.

Peter Leeson:
Q: Has a lexicon been considered to avoid having to explain concepts repeatedly (e.g. predictive vs reactive)?
A: Not so far ... perhaps this should be considered.

Peter Leeson:
Q: Is this an opportunity to update the abbreviations to something that is more relevant and international?
A1: (Andy Thomson) Do you mean S.F.I.A. or the skills codes? I was interested to see that the SFIA website doesn't anywhere expand the name to its original full form!
A2: (Ian Seward) I think he means the Skill Codes – but SFIA is really the 'brand' and to a large extent most people just talk about SFIA (pronounced Sophia) but it is worth reflecting that 'sofia' (σοφία)... is Greek for wisdom ... so I like to think SFIA is the source of wisdom in skills and competency ...

Peter Leeson:
Q: I mean the codes. Some of them have very little relationship to their name, when translated, they have no relationship whatsoever to the name in French, German...
A1: (Andy Thomson) Ah, yes. We were discussing this only the other day! Personally I'd like to have meaningful codes but others noted codes like HCEV and USUP that don't even match the English. I take your point and I'd be interested in Ian's view on this. I think the codes must be constant, regardless of language. But does a skills code need to be meaningful in itself - and should that be in English? (I suppose Im repeating your own question rhetorically!)
A2: (Ian Seward). Like many, I would like to see meaningful skill codes. We have discussed this but over time the names of skills change, and people are happy with that, but the skills codes have not generally changed. Organisations with a long investment in SFIA and SFIA Consultants and Tool Providers are more attached to the Skill Codes and see it as more disruptive. But we should continually review this.

Peter Leeson:
Q: Regarding codes - I would lean towards structured codes (A.10.c)
A1: (Andy Thomson) A structured code like that would indeed be neutral and aligned to any western language. I can see merit in having a meaningless code for each skill in addition to the familiar 4-letter codes but the 4-letter SFIA codes are too deeply embedded to move away from any time soon.
A2 (Ian Seward) I would add that there are problems with structured codes too ... as it is likely that any structure would look odd when skills are presented in different views ... perhaps we just need a good discussion on this first

Mohamed Taibah:
Q: I've seen some of the early views and it listed the skills in a block diagram of the area. I believe that presentation is extremely useful. Is that something that SFIA may go back to doing?

A: They still exist in that format but different views have been created for different topics and some topics present themselves in different ways - we have not yet established a completely consistent manner of presenting Views – we will be working more on views too.

Anders Søgaard
Q: Will you discuss the future use of the different "Views" in SFIA 8, like for example the DevOps view etc.?
A: There is much more in the future for Views. The SFIA framework is incredibly powerful, part of why it is useful and so widely used. The Views have been very well liked by the global user base and we recognise the need to do more in this area. We have to develop the Views more in parallel to delivering SFIA 8. Sometimes we hear "SFIA doesn't do ..." but invariably it does once you actually look within the framework, so the Views are a way to bring SFIA to life for those, often in what they consider special domains, to find that not only does SFIA cover the breadth of the industry but also the specifics of their needs. So expect more on Views.

MICHELLE PILLON:
Q: I am interested in collaborating on the approach for skills and competencies - the soft skills competencies collaboration effort. Please reach out to me.
A: Michelle, We'll follow up after this webinar

Anders Søgaard:
Q: Can you comment briefly on any future "cooperation" with the EU ICT framework and how you see that the EU ICT framework complements SFIA or vice versa?
A: We collaborate, and share what we are doing, with several frameworks (both generic and for specialisms) for the good of the global community and this includes the EU ICT Framework and the EU ICT Roles. Our position means that many frameworks do come to us and want to collaborate which we are very happy to do (EU, Japan, Singapore and others). We have created SFIA versions of the EU ICT Roles to enable them to be used with a SFIA mindset – this is key for the SFIA user base in EU countries. We took this route because it is often difficult to compare different frameworks for equivalence and this seemed a pragmatic solution to collaboration.

Eiji Hayashiguchi:
Q: Thank you. Recording and slides are very useful too.
A: Thanks Eiji-san, we plan to send these out, and glad to have you from Japan, speak soon.

Paul Collins:
Q: Not a question, but thank you guys for a great overview
A: Thanks for the comment, hope things are good in Australia.

Jorge Murillo:
Q: Great presentation! I'll be in contact. Thank you guys for all these effort. Very glad to be part of this initiative.
A: Great to have you involved from Costa Rica

Bashir Fancy:
Q: Impressive presentation. To your colleagues Andy, Peter and Grant ... you did a fabulous job.
A: Thanks Bashir, glad to have your organisation involved in Canada

Susan McCarthy:
Q: Thanks Everyone - very helpful update.
A: Glad you found it helpful.

Sarah Prestt:
Q: Thank you all - I need to drop now but it was a very useful update
A: Thanks Sarah, glad you found it useful.

Andy Andrews:
Q: Thank you very much everyone, very informative webinar!

Wanda Saabeel:
Q: Thank you for this interesting presentation!

Joya Snowden:
Q: Thank you all - very interesting and thought provoking.

Carol Long:
Q: Thank you all - really interesting demo and update

Zeshan Sattar:
Q: Thank you ever so much for today's session. Very insightful but now need to jump on my next call.
A: Thanks, Zeshan