

EDITORIAL

Inspectors, assessors, counselors, supervisors, etc.

For years, everyone has been complaining about the poor activity relative to attracting European funds in all areas. Comparisons with other countries are made, statistics by domains and subdomains are considered, random issues are being analyzed, but in the end, things hardly change, almost not at all. Since I am involved in implementation of European research projects, I thought I should state my opinion, too, even if some of my colleagues tell me it's a waste of time.



Ph.D.Eng. Petrin DRUMEA
MANAGING EDITOR

That's right, but rather than writing an editorial about winter holidays, which would also require some talent, it's better to talk as .. an intellectual about some of our daily troubles.

Early since launching this kind of programmes so many conditions are imposed and so many unnecessary things are required that you often give up projects even though you have the desire and the ability to implement them, and there is also a social need for them. When you go to writing the project proposal, you have to face insignificant requests, unnecessary details and many things that are repeated in other words, or sometimes in the same words, so that the project proposal gets extremely large in volume. In the assessment phase, there is a grid which often requires for things other than what was required in the guidelines according to which the project proposal has been elaborated.

When you get into the assessor's hands, there are great chances for you to come across someone who did not understand the meaning of that type of project and, for instance, he / she scores primarily the scientific papers to be delivered in a project with physical achievements and technology transfer. It is quite interesting that persons who have never implemented projects themselves have been appointed as counselors and supervisors; instead, they are full of knowledge, eagerness, and especially intransigency. Lacking better ideas to increase absorption of funds, the pays for these "specialists" have been raised, which made them even more intransigent and more aggressive, without improving their professional level in the field, and especially without actually supporting the process which they are part of.

If I take into account the complication of the system through which we are transmitted the idea that it does not matter the subject of the project but how wide and redundant the project proposal is, I would say that these moderators, counselors are victims themselves, but when I see how aggressive and often malicious they are, I think they actually have a problem understanding their part in this such important activity.

Why do we feel the need for unnecessary complications? Why do we wonder that interest in this kind of projects is diminishing? I'd say we shall think it over. At the root of all these troubles, I think there is the inability of those I am targeting here, coupled with non-liability, to which we must add a misunderstanding of the seriousness of action. It is good to meet the European requirements; it is good to promote serious, enforceable projects, but the EU's bureaucracy, already quite dense, must not be doubled or tenfold increased.

I still hope for a rethinking of the whole system. If we cannot do it by ourselves, we shall take over the ideas of those who are more active than us and just as good Europeans.

Happy New Year!