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2014 EUROPEAN THINK TANK
SUMMIT REPORT

Emerging from the Crisis:
The Role of Think Tanks on the Road Ahead

Barcelona, Spain

March 11-12, 2014
The European Think Tank Summit Brought Together Leading Institutions to Discuss Key Institutional Challenges amidst Past and Present Regional Crises

Many parts of the world are undergoing unprecedented political changes, and Europe is no exception to this phenomenon. With the need to address increasingly changing fiscal and political environments throughout the continent, the European Think Tank Summit set out to assess the role of think tanks in addressing emerging crises. The summit, focusing on the financial crisis, gained additional relevance when days before the conference political landscape changed in Easter Europe, as Russia occupied the Crimean peninsula, resulting in a political crisis that echoed across the globe.

The financial crisis of 2008 had a marked impact on European states—an effect that trickled down to think tanks across the continent. Adequate funding is a constant challenge for think tanks and sharply affects the work they produce; thus, in the shadow of the fiscal crisis, many think tanks have begun to consider their role, relevance, and impact in the coming years. “Emerging from the Crisis: The Role of Think Tanks on the Road Ahead” was therefore an appropriate title for the conference.

This backdrop was sharply colored by the events in Crimea. Like many new crises, the turmoil between Russia and Ukraine forced think tanks to evaluate their influence and effectiveness in reaching policymakers. For example, as many government officials were surprised by the events in Crimea, one representative at the summit stated that there had been warning signals leading up to the conflict. The representative claimed that the evidence was present, research has been conducted, and possible predictions could have been made, but the lack of discourse between policymakers and researchers obstructed preventive action. While in-depth knowledge due to extensive research and the relevance of the research to the real world is the purview of think tanks, the application of such knowledge is in the hands of policy makers. Bridging the gap between the two groups is a recurring problem.

Think tanks are partnerships between academia and policy, however, there is only so much they can do with the information they provide given that policy application is in the hands of policymakers. European think tanks face an additional challenge of operating within a second “middle ground,” between their home countries and the EU community. This adds a second level of complexity when trying to communicate research findings to an appropriate audience.

All of these issues were discussed in the context of the recent financial crisis, events in Crimea, and political issues throughout Europe. The representatives present at the summit called for more concrete and timely changes to the framework within which they operate as well as productive partnerships to further research on a supranational level. Participants convened for a day and a half in six roundtable discussions, all centered on tackling major institutional challenges.
Problems discussed included: the legacy of the financial crisis, the audience of European think tanks, European think tanks’ role nationally and at the EU level, and collaboration at an international level.

The conference proceeded under Chatham House rules in order to encourage free and productive discussion. This report is written under those same rules, in order to represent the conference’s themes and ideas. The report details the substance of the conference under five major topic headings: funding, audience, impact, relevance, and networks.
Think tanks have the unique capacity to serve as a bridge between researchers and policymakers—a collaboration that may lead to more informed, effective policy choices. As a result of recent fiscal and political crises enveloping Europe, the institutional capacities of think tanks have been stretched, and European think tanks are facing growing challenges to remaining financially stable, independent and relevant. In light of these challenges, several areas of interest have been discussed during the summit: securing core funding; engaging social media and reaching out to diverse audiences; maximizing impact; maintaining relevance; and building regional and global networks.

FUNDING

The title of the conference, *Emerging from the Crisis*, reflected enduring effects of the 2008 fiscal crisis on the European countries as well as think tanks within. The crisis caused many European think tanks to lose large portions of their core funding. Moreover, one participant commented that it was nearly impossible to find a think tank whose financial situation improved in the last five years; thus, financial concerns were a recurring topic throughout the summit sessions.

**Focusing the Discourse on Long-term Projects**

While funding has always been a source of concern for think tanks, European think tanks found their situation more difficult since 2008. Because funding traditionally falls into two categories: long-term or core funding and short term or project-based funding—as a result of the financial crisis, many think tanks have found donors moving away from the former and towards the latter. Think tanks have been forced to become “supply driven” institutions, meaning the scope of think tank research is limited by the financial support available and the research commissioned. Such projects often take the form of short-term contracts, less than one or two years in length, and prioritize current events issues.

Focus on short-term projects tends to limit independent, long-term agenda setting possibilities for researchers, raising questions of intellectual integrity and credibility. In order to uphold rigorous academic standards, researchers require sufficient amount of time and funds to provide accurate information and analysis. Moreover, predictive qualities of research require intensive, in-depth studies which are often forgone by donors in favor of dealing with emerging crises. Long-term research, however, has the potential to identify future crisis areas and influence preventive policies, thus think tanks and donors can reframe the discourse from current events oriented to the one which anticipates problem areas through independent research. The security that comes with core funding can increase relevance, value, and intellectual integrity of the work produced by think tanks.

**Diversifying Funding: East and West European Models**
Think tanks across the globe receive different types of funding, from public to private. This is true within Europe as well. A participant made the observation that European think tanks are much more dependent on government funding than US think tanks, and the think tank markets are much smaller than those of the United States. Another participant elaborated further by saying that although the previous statement is true for Western European think tanks, Eastern European think tanks are established on the US model with limited to no state support, which translates, in many cases, to no core funding. Moreover, the differences between the East and West in terms of their ideological frameworks also affect their funding. The West operates under an idealist and welfare ideology, while the East follows a neoliberal ideology and, as such, is dependent on foreign governments’ continued interest in their research.

Due to the economic downturn, public funds within European states have been cut dramatically. Many institutions struggled to replace national funds with European public funds, which increased competition beyond national borders. European funds, however, come with positive as well as negative aspects. The positives include fostering of international collaboration and networking between think tanks, but the danger lies in networking becoming an end in itself. There has been a push to encourage these European funds to fund projects that are forward looking and focus on long-term trends. The other important factor regarding EU funding is that much of the funding for the humanities and social sciences has been under threat, given a push towards more technical research. This is problematic for think tanks throughout Europe whose research often, if not primarily, falls under the former category.

When asked to make recommendations to donors, participants repeatedly called for donors to trust the value of in-depth analysis. Participants insisted that the end result is worth the time and funding, although the immediate return may not be obvious. They also called for simpler and faster application procedure for grants as well as greater transparency for desired output. It was suggested that multi-year funding (greater than two years) and/or uncommitted funding also be an option for think tanks. To produce the most effective policy recommendations, it was suggested that there be an increase of funds for travelling, which would result in invaluable on-the-ground experience for the researchers and thus more accurately informing their research.

**AUDIENCE**

European think tanks operate within a unique framework which results in a complex relationship with their multiple audiences. European think tanks have both national and international audiences as a consequence of their home countries being members of the EU; the public is the third level of audience. Think tanks must direct their research towards a specific level of policy making and a particular audience, thus they tailor each project accordingly. European think tanks must decide who their intended audience should be. The prevalence of internet and easy accessibility to information adds a new dimension to think tank publications. Given that, a think tank is only as good as its ability to reach its audience, the ability to effectively use multiple media platforms is an important requirement in today’s world.

**Collaborating with Governments**
Think tanks are often viewed as independent and credible sources of information. Given that many governments are increasingly finding themselves under greater scrutiny, they are more interested in working with think tanks. In addition to providing expert advice, think tanks can play a role in overcoming credibility issues. Government officials, especially council commissioners, look to think tanks for the long term perspective and out of the box solutions to numerous problems.

**Balancing Donor Demands and Academic Freedom**

In order to be successful, think tanks must find a balance between academia and politics given that tanks face the danger of falling into the “academic trap.” Think tanks are committed to producing high quality product which requires time and which many donors feel is archaic. As a result, civil society donors have shifted to corporations and the private sector; moreover, policy makers want immediate results. Think tanks are increasingly feeling the pressure from donors to combine short, sharp policy briefs with the publication of books—which is the meat of their work. Additionally, think tanks are expanding their portfolios to meet the demands of increasingly diverse of media outlets. Think tanks often find their competitive edge with the academic level of quality of their work; however, this edge is lost when the work is presented through social media and blogs.

Professional and academic levels of quality create credibility as well as distinguish think tanks from the rest of the market. The importance of independence in maintaining quality and credibility is particularly relevant for government funded think tanks. In this case, the primary audience is the funding government and as such think tanks have the obligation to deliver analyses on requested topics. If the government says they need a report on topic ‘X,’ then that is what the think tank will produce. The key is maintaining a critical distance from their sponsors so as not to seem partial or partisan.

**Adapting to Changing Environments**

In time of crises, think tanks find their entire agenda shifted to the topic at hand and their informed opinion is in high demand. Think tanks which are not equipped or prepared to change gears as rapidly as the situation calls for find themselves left behind and irrelevant. Additionally, in times of crisis the lines between think tanks and news media become blurred. They are expected to report on the topic at hand in concise sound bites which is contrary to the typical work think tanks produce. Moreover, think tankers are often called on by the media to comment on current events and must have a body of knowledge from which they can produce analysis.

Times of crisis are contrasted with times of peace when the audience changes from public to that of peers. Times of peace serve as chances to test knowledge and exchange ideas. They also offer moments of collaboration and communication within the think tank field.

**Paying Attention to Audiences**

In the globalized world, think tanks’ audience has become vastly diverse. Furthermore, the general public has become more informed and involved in public policy, and they too have begun to pay attention to think tanks. This trend increases the need for think tanks to remain
critically distant from their funders so as not to seem a mere extension. European think tanks must continue to pay close attention to their varied audiences and engage in appropriate means of communication. Representatives at this summit were asked to give advice to policymakers, the primary audience of think tanks. The most common suggestions included bringing think tanks into policy planning process in a more systematic and structured fashion and engaging on a regular basis with think tanks in policy debates. They also called for specific channels for think tanks to communicate with policymakers, as it is unclear which information is heard and which is not.

IMPACT

In a summit session, one think tank representative posed a very important set of questions: How does one measure the impact of a think tank? How does one convey to a donor the level of impact your institution has in a meaningful and fruitful way? As was mentioned previously, a think tank is only as good as its ability to reach its audience. For European think tanks, which often have more than one audience, the problem is even more complex. The variety of media also affects how a think tank is able to communicate with its audience as well as complicates how the communication is measured.

An important aspect of a think tank’s impact is the unique position it holds. Think tanks are closer to academics than policymakers and closer to government than civil society. This creates an important niche through which think tanks can operate and within which their impact is greatest.

Measuring Think Tank Contribution

Impact is particularly important when interacting with donors. A think tank being able to quantify or qualify its impact is a valuable tool for measurement and comparison against other think tanks. It creates a standard by which think tanks can argue their influence and their strength in their field. An important distinction was made between superficial and real impact. This distinction was made in particular reference to social media. Does the number of likes, followers, and retweets signal true impact? In regards to this, a comment was made stating, “I never saw the core of a message understood by a vast majority of the public who simply “like” or “share” it [the message] on Facebook.” The participant urged think tanks not to move away from traditional avenues and still work with politicians to make changes in policy direction.

Maximizing Impact

To maximize impact of think tanks, it was suggested that there should be a push for the creation, at a European level, of a formal legal framework within which think tanks could operate. This would more precisely define the identity of think tanks and offer protection and stability. Think tanks in Europe are only successful until they displease their government too much. A legal framework would protect think tanks in all political climates. A legal framework would also be the first step in measuring a think tank’s impact. Additionally, the distinction between NGOs and think tanks should be made clear to donors and the audiences of these organizations and
institutions. The lack of clarity causes a breakdown in think tanks’ effectiveness in reaching their audience and defining their role in civil society.

**Identifying Best Practices**

To understand exactly what a think tank does is the first step to assessing their work and its impact. European think tanks felt their impact was less than that of their American counterparts at the policy making level. The “revolving door” practice of American think tanks was felt as an effective means of connecting policy makers with think tanks, thereby creating relationships which allowed think tanks greater impact in American policy making. It was felt that the “revolving door” policy was uniquely and deeply tied to American political culture and it was difficult to imagine an equivalent for European think tanks. The need for greater communication and cooperation between think tanks and policy makers was agreed upon. The possibility of greater impact through such relationships was not lost on participants, and suggestions were made for the inclusion of policy makers at similar events such as the summit to build relationships between the two groups.

**RELEVANCE**

Since their inception, think tanks have straddled two worlds. They are not fully a policy making entity nor purely an academic institution. Due to this dual identity, maintaining their position is a constant battle. Relevance is an issue for think tanks on multiple fronts. They must adapt new forms of media and communication tools to maintain a visible presence. In addition, the continued attraction of qualified young minds to the field of think tanks is an important means of remaining current. The most fundamental issue facing think tanks regarding their continued relevance is the “think tank” as an institution itself. The basic structure of a think tank was called into question and it was suggested that the model has become antiquated and no longer fits the goals of the institutions calling themselves as such.

**Alternative Means of Expression**

There is a recognition of the limitations of the think tank as an institution and in response there has been an increase in variations of the think tank model including: think and do tanks, do tanks, talk tanks, and others. These institutions use different methods to translate their message to their audiences or promote policy recommendations. The introduction of these institutions offer alternatives and create new possibilities for think tanks to expand their capabilities as well.

**Recruiting Young Professionals**

A prevalent issue for think thanks is the lack of young professionals in the field. The introduction of new minds keeps the institutions current as well as ensures their continued survival. There was the question of elitism and whether this was something to be avoided. There were two prevailing points of view: the first that all institutions are becoming increasingly elitist and this creates a rise in caliber of researchers as well as higher quality materials produced, and the second that an internal culture of investing in young researchers will help think tanks avoid elitism, as elitist institutions risk alienating the general public. For some, this is not important as their desired
audience is another sector of society, however, this raises issues for those who feel their strength comes from the public at large.

**Greater Involvement in Policymaking**

To remain relevant, think tanks must compete with one another for donors, projects, and researchers. Not only do think tanks face competition from their peer institutions, but also external competitors. Law firms, consulting agencies and even academic institutions have become viable alternatives to the think tank model and product. As a result of this competition, think tanks are expected to be as fast as the media but also to the point like consultants. Think tanks can differentiate themselves in the quality of their publications, and while academia can be a trap, it can be avoided by diversifying the activities of the institution, i.e. think and do tank. It can also be avoided by translating an academic response into a publicly accessible language thus making think tank research applicable to a wider audience. In the public sector, think tanks must capitalize on the new trend of governments cutting back on their own research teams by influencing policy through involvement. In the private sector, the goal is to show that the work of a think tank is relevant to the corporate sector, and yet maintain independence.

**NETWORKS**

Think tanks each have their own research agendas, target audience, and donors. It is common for think tanks to find themselves in competition for audience as well as funding. The creation of formalized think tank networks would provide opportunities for collaboration and sharing of knowledge and ideas. The European Union inherently creates a framework for collaboration between international think tanks on EU issues. Each think tank would provide their own national perspective in the international setting of the EU, creating a more holistic output. Although seemingly simple, think tank networks come with a host of complications and can take a variety of forms and as such are controversial. Think tank networks were described as analogous to EU integration; some sovereignty (independence) must be forgone, and it is the little states (think tanks) that are the greatest supporters of said networks while the big states (think tanks) do not benefit as much from the partnership.

**Evaluating Think Tank Networks**

There is a variety of ways to evaluate think tank networks, which institutions are included, how think tanks are formed, or why they are formed. The most effective way for describing the many types of networks is by their desired outcome, or the reason for their formation. Think tank networks are either donor driven, ideologically driven, short-term issue based, or discipline based. For example, short-term issue based, also known as ‘Ad-Hoc’ arrangements, are short lived and formed to react quickly to a crisis or unexpected issue/event. Once the collective opinion is given the arrangement breaks apart. The reason for its formation, its mandate, is a specific one that does not preclude long-term collaboration. Conversely, donor driven networks are created at the behest of the funding body—and the networks are required for the funding to be received.
Ensuring the Best Outcomes

In addition to the many types of think tank networks that exist, further options were suggested. A network or association of think tanks could act as a kind of lobby to communicate on behalf of the institutions with the European Commission. This would be a network that would benefit more than just those involved. Even though there were many opinions regarding think tank networks, there were a few points of agreement. One was that international think tank networks made more sense than national ones, as competition is greatest at the national level among European think tanks. A second point of agreement was that networking must not become an end, but rather remain a means to a goal. Networking requires resources, and such events take funding from research. The final point of agreement was that the benefits must be higher than the transaction costs, otherwise the networks were not worth implementing.

Prerequisites for a Successful Network

Before a network could be formed, six questions must be satisfactorily answered to promote a successful collaboration. First, how prepared are the institutions to work together and share knowledge throughout the process? Second, who leads and how willing are the other institutions to be led? Third, how does an institution build ownership when it is not leading the collaboration? Fourth, how is fair participation ensured as well as suitable rewards? Fifth, necessity is the mother of intention in ad-hoc committees that are forced together, how is this demand to be created artificially? Finally, since all think tanks are in competition with one another for funding, impact, or visibility, how are the institutions to overcome that reality to successfully collaborate? These questions remain largely unanswered and are the key to successful collaboration between think tanks.
The European Think Tank Summit provided a platform for constructive discourse among the participants concerned with the future of think tanks in a continent emerging from fiscal and political crises. In closing, participants noted that the questions posed throughout the summit could not be resolved with simple answers, and pointed to the need for continuous communication and collaboration; a more effective way of managing long-term and short-term needs; and appropriate audience outreach. The audience of think tanks is slowly shifting towards a more pluralistic base as the general public becomes more informed. It is critical that think tanks not lose their voice among this new base by producing pertinent research formats that are accessible to the public. Along with reaching a new public audience, it is crucial that think tanks continue to produce policy-relevant research for the policy-makers in their respective countries. Thus the audience for think tanks follows two critical paths: the general public and media and the policy-makers.

Additionally, participants agreed that the availability of core funding is paramount to effective, relevant research. Today’s funding follows a short-term, project-specific framework, which, in turn has placed increasing pressure on think tanks to research according to funder’s demands. Think tank representatives highlighted the need to balance the demands of these donors with academic and research integrity that maintains to the high research standards and produces quality, objective work. Think tank independence remains of the utmost importance, and the maintenance of this independence requires creating a certain amount of distance between the funds and the research outcomes, so as to remain non-partisan and unbiased.

Another key concern was think tank credibility, based on rigorous, independent research, is essential for think tanks to stay competitive in the research marketplace. Strategies for maintaining this place in the marketplace are recruiting young professionals, presenting their research in new formats, and reaching out to new audiences. Think tankers noted that there are many areas in which significant gains can be made, including the emerging role think tanks can play in overcoming national interest divergences, their ability to expand social media for think tank purposes, in creating more open dialogues with donors, and in building a stronger network through diverse partnerships.

Overall, the concept of impact shaped the conference. The general consensus seems to be that impact is slowly changing to a diverse image that incorporates diverse donor bases, increased policy impact, deeper social relevance, and increased media presence. Thus, as think tanks continue to evolve, it is crucial that they evaluate their work in relation to these multiple factors.
CHALLENGES

1. How to approach the short-termism in funding and research horizons and a lack of long-term continuity. Also the fragmentation of work into smaller projects limits the scope of the agenda.
2. How to diversify funding sources between public and private funding.
3. How to balance donor demands with academic freedom and generating professional and academic levels of quality to distinguish think tanks for the rest of the market.
4. How to adapt to the changing think tank environment and handling the rapidly changing agendas with policy and media.
5. How to expand and engage more effectively with a wider audience and how to make the think tanks’ work relevant
6. How to measure think tank contribution through quantified and qualified outcomes
7. How to maximize impact of think tanks and establishing a clear distinction between think tanks and NGOs to better define think tanks’ role in society
8. How to identify best practices to understand effective strategies and the need for greater communication and cooperation between think tanks and policy makers.
9. How to use alternative methods to transmit think tank messages to audiences through new mediums
10. How to recruit young professionals to the think tank field
11. How to remain relevant in the increasingly competitive policymaking field.
12. How to evaluate think tank networks and describe them based on their desired outcome
13. How to ensure the best outcomes within think tank networks and foster collaboration and resource sharing
14. How to establish certain prerequisites for a successful think tank network, such as willingness to share knowledge, willingness to lead the sharing of information, establishing how to handle “ownership” of knowledge, how to ensure fair participation, and how to create demand for collaboration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. An increase in long-term (multi-year) funding to allow for in-depth research.
2. Simple and transparent channels of communication between institutions and donors. Participants stressed that donors should grant more freedom for developing long-term projects by truly investing in think tanks, rather than individual short-term projects.
3. A continued commitment to quality of research despite increasing non-academic channels of communication. Do not produce research for researchers; rather incorporate products to suit policymakers and opinion leaders.
4. A quantifiable or qualifiable definition of the “impact” of a think tank, which could be communicated to donors in a meaningful and fruitful method.
5. Increased communication between policy makers and think tanks through attendance of conferences, or a European equivalent of the “revolving door” policy.
6. A codified legal framework under which think tanks could operate and which would offer stability and protection. Producing a legitimate definition of a think tank in Europe and its role and standards of transparency, legitimacy, and behaviors would help think tanks.
7. Greater inclusion of young researchers in the think tank field to combat elitism and ensure the survival of the institutions.

8. Successful think tank networks, which would help achieve research goals and not be an end in themselves. Increasing the network and partnerships among think tanks would pool resources between think tanks and would also function as a path to create a set of industry standards.

9. Greater international cooperation between think tanks catalyzed by funding which requires such collaboration.
2014 Europe Summit Agenda

MONDAY, MARCH 10

20.00 Welcome Dinner and Panel Discussion
Perspectives on the Current Economic, Political and Security Crisis in Ukraine
Chair: Carmen Claudín, Barcelona Centre for International Affairs
Panel Members: Yuri Yakymenko, Razumkov Center, Thomas Gomart, Institut Français des Relations Internationales (IFRI) and Nadia Arbatova, Institute of World Economy and International Relations
Dinner has been sponsored by the Lauder Program at the University of Pennsylvania

TUESDAY, MARCH 11

Venue: Sant Pau Art Nouveau Site. Room Domènech i Montaner. (Carrer Sant Antoni Maria Claret, 167) (video on conference venue http://m.youtube.com/watch?feature=youtu.be&v=Y5kcuTFgwMI)
ID card or passport is required to enter Sant Pau

09.00 Registration

09.30 Opening Session
Antoni Vives, Barcelona City Council
Carles A. Gasòliba, Chairman, CIDOB
James McGann, Director, TTCSP, University of Pennsylvania

10.00 Key-note Speech: Think Tanks and the Future of Europe after the Crisis
Javier Solana, Honorary Chairman of CIDOB and Former EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy

10.30 Session 1 - EUROPEAN THINK TANKS AND LONG-TERM ISSUES
Think tanks conduct regular research on policies that have already been implemented and events that have already occurred; however, there is an opportunity for think tanks to focus on longer-term problems and provide solutions and preventive measures that other types of institutions cannot.

- How can think tanks add to the conversation of long-term best practices when their research can skew towards studying and evaluating the past?
What is the impact of funding on the ability to address long-term structural issues vs. the political flavor of the week? How can this issue be overcome?
What role can governments and donors play in supporting the highest-caliber research given the reality of limited funds?
Are think tanks better suited than other institutions to prevent crises?

Chair: Adrian Schout, Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations
Kick-off: R. Andreas Kraemer, Ecologic Institute, Nadia Arbatova, Institute of World Economy and International Relations and Asmund Weltzien Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

11.45 Coffee-break. Official photograph of the group

12.00 Session 2 - THE LEGACY OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS FOR EUROPEAN THINK TANKS
  - Funding
  - Have think tanks acquired a new role/focus?
  - What responsibility must/do they bear in the future? How can think tanks play an advisory role? For whom?
  - How can think tanks best influence policy discussions? (New media, etc.)

Chair: Jordi Bacaria, Barcelona Centre for International Affairs
Kick-off: Marek Dabrowski, Center for Social and Economic Research, Tom Arnold, Institute for International and European Affairs and Anna Ganeva, Center for Liberal Strategies

13.15 Lunch offered by DIPLOCAT, Public Diplomacy Council of Catalonia. Address by Mr. Albert Royo, General Secretary

14.45 Session 3 - BALANCING ACTS: THE AUDIENCE OF EUROPEAN THINK TANKS
Think tanks inhabit a space in between politics and academics. They also operate in another middle ground, the one between their home countries and the EU/Europe.
  - Who is their audience, and who should it be?
  - How should European think tanks balance both the need to address pressing short-term policy issues and also long-term structural issues, as well as their function as both research hubs in a specific country and also researchers of Europe as a whole?
  - “Loyalty” and policy recommendations—something can be painful for a country and good for Europe, or vice versa, seen in evaluations of debt crisis resolution measures. How do think tanks balance these concerns
when making policy recommendations? Can they speak for the people when a democratic deficit may be present, and is this their role?

- What role do think tanks play in evaluating the EU?
- Do they provide increased accountability or heighten the risk of superficiality?

Chair: Stefan Friedrich, Konrad Andenauer Foundation
Kick-off: Charles Powell, Real Instituto Elcano, James Nixey, Chatham House and Corinna Horst, German Marshall Fund

16.00 Coffee-break

16.15 Session 4 - KEY ISSUES FOR THINK TANKS ON THE ROAD AHEAD
- What can European Think Tanks do to contribute to the construction of a European public Space and a European public opinion that Europe needs to become Europe?
- What and how Think Tanks can contribute to drive the European Union into becoming a relevant global actor that actively participates in the reconfiguration of the international system that will sooner or later occur following major changes in the distribution of power between actors?

Chair: Thomas Gomart, Institut Français des Relations Internationales (IFRI)
Kick-off: Tamas Schanda, Hungarian Institute of International Affairs, Yuri Yakymenko, Razumkov Center and Fabrizio Tassinari, Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS)

19.30 Reception and cocktail at Barcelona City Hall. Welcome words by Mr. Jordi Marti, member of the City Council of Barcelona.
Venue: Barcelona City Hall, Saló de Cròniques.Plaça Sant Jaume,1)

20.15 Dinner
Greetings: Michael Ehrke, Country Representative, Spain, Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation (FES)
Dinner Speaker: Pere Vilanova Professor of Political Science and Senior Research Fellow Associate, CIDOB. “What Think Tanks Need to Do in Times of Crisis and Calm”
Venue: Restaurant Ávalon. Carrer Via Laietana, 30
Dinner has been sponsored by the Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation (FES)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12

09.00 Key-Note Speech: European Think Tanks in a Global World
James McGann, Director, TTCSP, University of Pennsylvania
A Response and a View From Europe
Giovanni Grevi, Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior (FRIDE) and Jaroslaw Cwiek-Karpowicz, Polish Institute for International Affairs (PISM)

10.00 Session 5 - GLOBAL AND REGIONAL THINK TANKS NETWORKS
Last year’s summit recommendations included the notion that European think tanks have the tendency to “‘widen’ the scope of our work rather than to ‘deepen.’”

- Are think tank networks the answer to the dual concerns of widening and deepening the research agenda?
- What potential is there for greater collaboration and partnerships among think tanks in Europe and beyond?
- EU North/South and East/West dynamics have been extensively studied; how do these questions of regional integration affect think tank networks?
- Could think tanks lead the way in European integration through their ability to aggregate research and information in ways that cross borders?
- The analysis of increasingly complex issues is asking for a wide range of different perspectives and different expertise in order to provide accurate answers. In order to be relevant, collective knowledge must be build. Are European think tanks prepared to build alliances stronger than mere networks to tackle the complexity of current challenges?
- Many have lost a degree of faith in the European project as a result of the crisis; does this affect the desire of think tanks to cooperate or the feasibility of such plans?

Chair: Albert Rakipi, Albanian Institute for International Studies

Kick-off: Kai-Olaf Lang, German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP), Lizza Bomassi, Carnegie Europe and Paolo Magri, Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI)

11.15 Coffee-break

11.30 Session 6: POLICY ISSUES AND PRIORITIES: WHAT ROLE SHOULD THINK TANKS PLAY?
- Future of the EU and Unresolved Financial and Structural Issues
- Energy security/EU energy cooperation
- EU foreign policy
- Social and Economic Development in Europe
- Migration, Immigration and Changing Face of Europe
- Black Swains Swimming Just Over Horizon

Chair: Marco Incerti, Center for European Policy Studies (CEPS)
Kick-off: Ettore Greco, Istituto Affari Internazionali, Karen Wilson, Bruegel, Clara Brandi, German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) and Annika Uudelepp, Praxis Center for Policy Studies

12.45 **Wrap-Up Session and Recommendations for Future Steps**

13.45 **Closing Remarks**

Carles A. Gasòliba, Chairman, CIDOB
James McGann, Director, TTCSP, University of Pennsylvania
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Name</th>
<th>Participant Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nadia Arbatova</td>
<td>Head of Department, European Political Studies</td>
<td>Institute of World Economy and International Relations</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Arnold</td>
<td>Director General</td>
<td>Institute of International and European Affairs (IIEA)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordi Bacaria</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Baloue</td>
<td>Transatlantic Fellow</td>
<td>Ecologic Institute</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizza Bomassi</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Carnegie Europe</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara Brandi</td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
<td>German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Carcanague</td>
<td>Research Fellow and Assistant Editor</td>
<td>Institut des Relations Internationales et Strategique (IRIS)</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Carnero</td>
<td>Director Manager</td>
<td>Fundación Alternativas</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Claudin</td>
<td>Senior Research Fellow</td>
<td>Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galina G. Chinarikhina</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Analytical Center for the Government of the Russian Federation</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessandro Colombo</td>
<td>Director of Institutional Relations and Health Care</td>
<td>Éupolis Lombardia</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarosław Cwiek-Karpowicz</td>
<td>Research Director</td>
<td>Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM)</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marek Dabrowski</td>
<td>CASE Fellow</td>
<td>Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE)</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ehrke</td>
<td>International Dialogue Representative in Spain</td>
<td>Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES)</td>
<td>Germany/Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heba El-Kholy</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>UNDP Oslo Governance Centre</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Estrada</td>
<td>Executive Coordinator</td>
<td>Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefan Friedrich</td>
<td>Head of Team Political</td>
<td>Konrad Adenauer Foundation</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Ganeva</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Centre for Liberal Strategies</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carles A. Gasòliba</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Gomart</td>
<td>Vice President of Strategic Development and Director of Russia/NIS Center</td>
<td>Institut Francaise des Relations Internationales (IFRI)</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ettore Greco</td>
<td>Head of Department, Transatlantic Relations</td>
<td>Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Grevi</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kali Hamilton</td>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program (TTCSP), University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinna Horst</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>German Marshall Fund of the US</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriele Iacovino</td>
<td>Analysts Coordinator</td>
<td>Centro Studi Internazionali (CeSI)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Incerti</td>
<td>Head of Communications and Research Fellow</td>
<td>Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS)</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadwa Kingsbury</td>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program (TTCSP), University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Andreas Kraemer</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Ecologic Institute</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai-Olaf Lang</td>
<td>Head of Research Division EU Integration</td>
<td>German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borja Lasheras</td>
<td>Associate Director and Policy Fellow</td>
<td>European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paolo Magri</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Director</td>
<td>Institut fur International Political Studies (ISPI)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Margelleti</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Centro Studi Internazionali (CeSI)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James McGann</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program (TTCSP), University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Nixey</td>
<td>Head of the Russia and Eurasia Programme</td>
<td>Chatham House</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantin Noskov</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Analytical Center for the Government of the Russian Federation</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia Núñez</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Centro de Investigaciones sobre América del Norte-UNAM</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicente Palacio</td>
<td>Director Adjunto del Observatorio de Política Exterior</td>
<td>Fundación Alternativas</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jae-Ha Park</td>
<td>Deputy Dean</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Powell</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Real Instituto Elcano</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Rakipi</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Albanian Institute for International Studies</td>
<td>Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamas Schand</td>
<td>Director of Operations, Coordination and Planning</td>
<td>Hungarian Institute of International Affairs</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Schout</td>
<td>Head of EU Studies</td>
<td>Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Affairs</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena Segre</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivana Smolenova</td>
<td>Communications and Outreach Manager</td>
<td>Prague Security Studies Institute</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Solana</td>
<td>Honorary President</td>
<td>Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduard Soler</td>
<td>Research Coordinator</td>
<td>Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrizio Tassinari</td>
<td>Head of Unit and Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS)</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svetlana Tugan-</td>
<td>Communications Manager</td>
<td>Carnegie Moscow Center</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barsnovskaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elina Viilup</td>
<td>Research Fellow</td>
<td>Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Villafranca</td>
<td>Senior Research Fellow</td>
<td>Institut for International Political Studies (ISPI)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asmund Weltzien</td>
<td>Head of Communications</td>
<td>Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuri Yakymenko</td>
<td>Deputy Director General</td>
<td>Razumkov Center</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Wilson</td>
<td>Senior Fellow</td>
<td>Bruegel</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckart Woertz</td>
<td>Senior Research Fellow</td>
<td>Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THINK TANKS AND CIVIL SOCIETIES PROGRAM

The Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program (TTCSP) of the Lauder Institute at the University of Pennsylvania conducts research on the role policy institutes play in governments and civil societies around the world. Often referred to as the “think tanks’ think tank,” TTCSP examines the evolving role and character of public policy research organizations. Over the last 25 years, the TTCSP has developed and led a series of global initiatives that have helped bridge the gap between knowledge and policy in critical policy areas such as international peace and security, globalization and governance, international economics, environmental issues, information and society, poverty alleviation, and healthcare and global health. These international collaborative efforts are designed to establish regional and international networks of policy institutes and communities that improve policy making while strengthening democratic institutions and civil societies around the world.

The TTCSP works with leading scholars and practitioners from think tanks and universities in a variety of collaborative efforts and programs, and produces the annual Global Go To Think Tank Index that ranks the world’s leading think tanks in a variety of categories. This is achieved with the help of a panel of over 1,900 peer institutions and experts from the print and electronic media, academia, public and private donor institutions, and governments around the world. We have strong relationships with leading think tanks around the world, and our annual Think Tank Index is used by academics, journalists, donors and the public to locate and connect with the leading centers of public policy research around the world. Our goal is to increase the profile and performance of think tanks and raise the public awareness of the important role think tanks play in governments and civil societies around the globe.

Since its inception in 1989, the TTCSP has focused on collecting data and conducting research on think tank trends and the role think tanks play as civil society actors in the policymaking process. In 2007, the TTCSP developed and launched the global index of think tanks, which is designed to identify and recognize centers of excellence in all the major areas of public policy research and in every region of the world. To date TTCSP has provided technical assistance and capacity building programs in 81 countries. We are now working to create regional and global networks of think tanks in an effort to facilitate collaboration and the production of a modest yet achievable set of global public goods. Our goal is to create lasting institutional and state-level partnerships by engaging and mobilizing think tanks that have demonstrated their ability to produce high quality policy research and shape popular and elite opinion and actions for public good.
THE LAUDER INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

The Lauder Institute of Management and International Studies offers an MA in international studies, and conducts fundamental and policy-oriented research on current economic, political, and business issues. It organizes an annual conference that brings academics, practitioners and policy makers together to examine global challenges such as financial risks, sustainability, inequality, and the future of the state.

THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The University of Pennsylvania (Penn) is an Ivy League school with highly selective admissions and a history of innovation in interdisciplinary education and scholarship. A world-class research institution, Penn boasts a picturesque campus in the middle of a dynamic city. Founded by Benjamin Franklin in 1740 and recognized as America’s first university, Penn remains today a world-renowned center for the creation and dissemination of knowledge. It serves as a model for research colleges and universities throughout the world.

The production of this report was made possible by a generous gift of Círculo de Empresarios, a think tank based in Madrid Spain.