Dear Reader,

After a long period of scattered national bids for research funding, in part coincident with the complex and time consuming evaluation process of all the Portuguese research centres carried out by the FCT, suddenly, over the last couple of months, a rather unusual succession of research tenders opened in Portugal within the framework of the so-called P2020 Programme, the COMPETE programme or the N2020 Programme, in this last case only for the Northern Region.

As anyone can imagine, the preparation of several research proposals in a relatively short period of time (3-4 months) have been overloading the current agenda of our research centre and, certainly, of most other research centres in Portugal. In any case, our complaining tone may sound unfair and strange to some readers less familiar with Portuguese research policies and politics. After all, it seems we are complaining about the very existence of too many funding opportunities! It seems a paradox to say the least.

I'll try to briefly explain our position. First, apart from two genuine new tenders, one for the N2020 intended to fund the research centres in line with the Smart Specialization Strategy for the Northern Region, and the other the so-called PAC – Common Action Programmes, designed to encourage the engagement of different Portuguese research centres in common research programmes, all other tenders, particularly in the Portuguese Cohesion Regions, which is our case, represent no more than resubmissions of proposals, previously submitted to the FCT, and in due time positively evaluated and recommended for funding. From an FCT point of view, the rational is, clearly, to take advantage of some new financial opportunities open by the new Framework Programme, alleviating, in this way, the national research budget.

However, from the R&D centres’ perspective, this practice raises a number of doubts and criticisms. The resubmission process is not automatic neither it is carried out, internally, by the FCT as, in principle, it should be. Indeed, it is exported to the universities and research centres representing an additional burden, quite time consuming and confusing in practice. The new application forms operating on unfriendly electronic platforms designed for sectorial programmes intended to cover small and medium size firms and other private and public institutions, can hardly accommodate the specificities of the universities and research centres.

Instead of being the FCT the national entity responsible for funding the research centres, it is now on the contrary, on the very shoulders of these research centres, the responsibility to support the FCT to find its own financial means.

In practice, all the efforts to sustain funding are duplicated, in particular in the R&D centres located in Cohesion Regions, exactly the ones that should be positively discriminated by Regional Policies. On the contrary, this practice enables a flat redistribution of financial resources across the country, violating regional policies, and, to make things worse, objectively benefitting the R&D centres located outside Cohesion Regions. These are not only exempted from the laborious duplication of submissions, as well as exempted from the complex budgetary rules, procedures and controls common to EU funding programmes, but also can start their research projects soon after the FCT approval, because they are directly financed by the national budget. This way, they can open the recruitment processes for junior and senior researchers well before the other centres, being able to capture, in principle, the best ones in the country. It’s all very well to introduce competitive policies in an activity such as research; however, these policies have to be accompanied by effective rules, able to guarantee equal access and fairness in the competition, which is clearly not the case at present.

Once again, profound changes are needed in our national research policies. Let’s wait and see what the new government is up to!

Paulo Pinho
The Urban Planning and Housing group (RG2) looks at a post carbon city as a socially sensitive and inclusive city in which social and spatial divides should be addressed through responsive and transformative urban and housing policies. Research will be developed with two general objectives: i) to develop a critical analysis of the transformative capacity of urban policies in complex contexts, by identifying and discussing the dilemmas and conflicts which are present in current initiatives and practices; ii) to explore the conditions for transformative innovation in urban policies, understood as the capacities to influence structural and strategic changes.

Regarding these objectives, the research group has the following priorities in the near future:

(a) To develop and deepen analysis on local knowledge production in spatial policies and on spatial data processing tools directed to producing, influencing and boosting collective capacities, taking into account learning processes related with local knowledge and opportunities for interaction in urban policies;

(b) To address the debate on the relationship between changes in housing policy and changes in welfare systems, with a special attention to the interplay between local and national dimensions. We argue that local housing programmes (or strategies, or plans) can be an interesting object of analysis, both of the differentiation of housing and welfare outcomes, and of the processes of construction and change of housing policies.

c) To address the issues of planning in the face of austerity, identifying the distinctive nature of their impacts on Portuguese cities and, on the other hand, analysing the ways in which spatial planning has been transformed by austerity and the tools that can be used to address its challenges.

d) To analyse the relationship between creativity, innovation and territory by focusing on the metropolitan governance reform and the fabric of the creative metropolis, and on inclusive urban regeneration and cultural policies.

e) To develop innovative planning tools that support the economic and financial sustainability of urbanisation and infrastructure provision, measuring surplus-values that accrue from planning decisions, and pointing out alternatives to socially assign them.

To meet these priorities, the RG 2 includes at present 9 senior researchers, with specific and convergent interests.

Isabel Breda Vázquez