



University of Pennsylvania  
**ScholarlyCommons**

---

TTCSP Global and Regional Think Tank Summit Reports TTCSP Global and Regional Think Tank Summit Reports

---

2014

## 2014 North America Think Tank Summit Report

James G. McGann

University of Pennsylvania, [jmcgann@sas.upenn.edu](mailto:jmcgann@sas.upenn.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://repository.upenn.edu/ttcsp\\_summitreports](https://repository.upenn.edu/ttcsp_summitreports)

 Part of the [Other International and Area Studies Commons](#)

---

McGann, James G., "2014 North America Think Tank Summit Report" (2014). *TTCSP Global and Regional Think Tank Summit Reports*. 5.

[https://repository.upenn.edu/ttcsp\\_summitreports/5](https://repository.upenn.edu/ttcsp_summitreports/5)

All requests, questions, and comments should be directed to:

James G. McGann, Ph.D.

Senior Lecturer, International Studies Director Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program

The Lauder Institute

University of Pennsylvania

Telephone: (215) 746-2928

Email: [jmcgann@wharton.upenn.edu](mailto:jmcgann@wharton.upenn.edu)

2014 Copyright: All rights reserved. No part of this report may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the University of Pennsylvania, Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. [https://repository.upenn.edu/ttcsp\\_summitreports/5](https://repository.upenn.edu/ttcsp_summitreports/5)

For more information, please contact [repository@pobox.upenn.edu](mailto:repository@pobox.upenn.edu).

---

## 2014 North America Think Tank Summit Report

### Disciplines

Other International and Area Studies

### Comments

All requests, questions, and comments should be directed to:

James G. McGann, Ph.D.  
Senior Lecturer, International Studies Director Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program  
The Lauder Institute  
University of Pennsylvania  
Telephone: (215) 746-2928  
Email: [jmcgann@wharton.upenn.edu](mailto:jmcgann@wharton.upenn.edu)

2014 Copyright: All rights reserved. No part of this report may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the University of Pennsylvania, Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program.

THINK TANK SUMMIT REPORT



THINK TANKS & CIVIL SOCIETIES PROGRAM

The Lauder Institute  
The University of Pennsylvania



# NORTH AMERICA SUMMIT

---

April 16-17, 2014

# Think Tanks & Civil Societies Program

*“Helping to bridge the gap between knowledge and policy”*

Researching the trends and challenges facing think tanks, policymakers, and policy-oriented civil society groups...

Sustaining, strengthening, and building capacity for think tanks around the world...

Maintaining the largest, most comprehensive database of over 7,000 think tanks...

All requests, questions, and comments should be directed to:

**James G. McGann, Ph.D.**

Senior Lecturer, International Studies

Director

Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program

The Lauder Institute

University of Pennsylvania

Telephone: (215) 746-2928

Email: [jmcgann@wharton.upenn.edu](mailto:jmcgann@wharton.upenn.edu)

2014 Copyright: All rights reserved. No part of this report may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the University of Pennsylvania, Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program.

# 2014 NORTH AMERICA THINK TANK SUMMIT REPORT

Washington D.C., United States of America

April 16-17, 2014

# Introduction

North American countries are facing a wide range of political, economic, and social issues. A brief overview of Canada, Mexico and the United States highlights some similarities and differences in governance, political shifts, and main policy interests. Literature on Canada shows that domestically it is facing challenges with raising the quality of education, health care, economic competitiveness and social services and environmental standards. Within its borders, Quebec is pushing for greater autonomy, while internationally, Canada has ongoing territorial disputes with the United States at the Dixon Entrance, Beaufort Sea, Strait of Juan de Fuca, and the Gulf of Maine. Despite these issues Canada and the US work closely in monitoring and controlling illegal passage of people and commodities across their common border. Like the US and Mexico, Canada is dealing with the production and consumption of cannabis, ecstasy, and other drugs which are sold domestically as well as exported to neighboring countries. In 1994 Canada joined the North American Free Trade Agreement together with the United States and Mexico, which has dramatically increased trading with the US, who is their primary trading partner. Canada remains the largest foreign supplier of energy (gas, oil, uranium and electric power) to the US, and thus continues to hold a substantial trade surplus.

In Mexico the determining factor in the development of democracy and political institutions, especially since the year 2000, has been the transition from the 71 year-old one-party rule system dominated by the Institutional Revolutionary Party. PRI elites stayed in power “using vote buying, fraud, clientelistic policies, and selective repression”. Despite these dirty tactics, one-party rule in Mexico was legitimized due to continued economic growth, which the country experienced between the 1940s and 1960s, leading to the tripling of GDP growth in what came to be known as the “Mexican Miracle”. However, the economic crises in the 1980s substantially limited the party’s grip on power, thus once the economy spiraled downward, PRI’s coercive system of financial repression collapsed.

The shift to democracy in Mexico also signified a shift in the relationship between politicians and the citizenry. The onset of democracy encouraged Mexican presidents to implement policy that would garner support from the electorate, a feature that was not present during the semi-autocratic PRI regime. The new government focused on two of the biggest problems facing Mexico—corruption and crime, which are heavily linked to drug cartels. This has inadvertently led to an escalation in violence, murders and disappearances. Between 2006 and 2011, deaths related to drug trafficking skyrocketed to 60,000 and kidnapping and extortion rates more than doubled. As a result of staggering drug trafficking and security problems as well as worsening economic conditions, in 2012 PRI has seen its return to power. Corruption, organized crime and lagging economic performance remain some of the biggest issues facing Mexico.

In the United States, the political climate tends to be hyper partisan. Domestic and international policy is hotly debated, with the most prevalent concerns being national security, terrorism, immigration, economics, education and a myriad of social issues. In addition to its active

domestic undertakings, the US is very involved abroad having a strong diplomatic, military, and aid presence. Being the largest economy in the world, it is a member of various trade agreements, and the economy is a major domestic policy issue. Within its borders, it battles issues of crime, poverty, income inequality, insufficient healthcare, energy insecurity and environmental degradation. All these issues create a space for specialized policy institutions, liken think tanks, to inform policy with rigorous, quality research in domestic and international affairs.

## North American Think Tanks

Throughout North America, governments play a fundamental role in the lives of think tanks. Affiliation between think tanks and governments varies greatly among the three North American countries. In Canada think tanks are generally dependent on the government for both funding and research agenda. Dependence on government grants and support has played a monumental role in the establishment and break down of Canadian think tanks throughout their history. Canadian think tanks vary in size, budget, research area, funding and publications, and recent trends show that they are gradually moving away from publishing longer books and articles towards shorter reports to appeal to the public and politicians. Additionally, there are less think tanks that support high level research, but instead focus on the immediate more than long-term prospects of a specific public policy. Moreover, since they are so closely tied to the government, Canadian think tanks are facing political economic constraints coming from the government, especially in times of economic downturns.

In Mexico, recent political changes created opportunities for think tanks to emerge. For over half a century the hegemonic Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) ruled Mexico. It was not until the 1980s that their power began to decline, which led to the growth of democracy and political institutions. Thus, despite having only sixty identified think tanks, think tanks have been influential in the political reforms occurring in Mexico. Think tanks in Mexico are concentrating on two main areas—democracy and domestic economics. Much research is being done towards educating the public about the government and political participation; however, the improvement has been slow in the rural areas due to the lack of think tanks concentrating on these areas. Economic research is very important for think tanks in Mexico given the staggering poverty nationwide. Independent research institutions often rely on funding from other nonprofit foundations; and more than half of think tanks in Mexico are autonomous and independent (thirty-two). Lack of consistent funding coupled with government reliance on technocrats and exclusion of civil society input as well as PRI's recent return to power threaten the influence and success of Mexico's think tanks.

The United States has the largest amount of think tanks in the world. Major think tank hubs are located in Washington D.C., Massachusetts, California, New York and Virginia and function as political, economic, and social epicenters throughout the country. Think tanks within the United States enjoy an unprecedented importance within society; their role is institutionalized in the political realm; and they are a part of the architecture of the government. US think tanks have many channels through which they influence policy. Some of the main factors that make US think tanks successful include engagement with civil society, direct access to policymakers, and

large networks of contacts. US think tanks are diverse, ranging from politically affiliated, nonpartisan and bipartisan institutions to advocacy driven organizations; they also focus on domestic and foreign policy issues. Given the large amount of institutions throughout the US, think tanks tend to compete with each other for funding, resources and influence.

Despite fundamental differences among the three countries, Canadian think tanks being most affiliated with the government, United States thinks enjoying the most political influence and Mexican think tanks fighting for survival, North American think tanks face very similar issues and challenges including, lack of funding and resources, maintenance of bipartisanship, credibility, independence from donors, transparency and objectivity. North American think tanks must approach these challenges in a manner that works best within their respective political environments.





# Institutional Challenges

## Funding

### Long-Term Funding and Projects

One of the biggest challenges for North American think tanks is the lack of consistent core funding. Given that a large amount of funding for think tanks tends to be short-term, focusing on narrow projects, think tanks are in danger of becoming supply-driven institutions. Moreover, focus on short-term projects tends to limit independent, long-term agenda setting possibilities for researchers, raising questions of intellectual integrity and credibility. Think tanks are the leading go-to institutions for information and advice in times of crisis; their expertise and credibility depend on rigorous scholarly standards which require sufficient amount of time and funds to provide accurate information and analysis. More importantly, predictive qualities of research require intensive, in-depth studies which are often forgone by donors in favor of dealing with emerging crises.

Limited funding creates several problems for think tanks. For example, by giving \$50K towards a project that costs \$150K, with the assumption that either the organization or other donors should fund the remainder, perpetuates a fallacy that a think tank has additional resources to apply to the specific project area; it creates inefficiencies as organizations struggle to find money for the remainder; and it creates a cycle of impoverishment that keeps many organizations more financially weak and unsustainable than they otherwise would be. Donors should be more familiar with the wide range of time and trade-offs associated with the development of an idea, research and publication, and policy impact. Some efforts, such as research about climate change or nuclear proliferation, are best evaluated over the course of decades, not quarters.

Secure funding for long-term projects, i.e. up to 5 years, will yield several benefits. It will uphold the high standard of research, intellectual integrity and credibility, given that the predictive qualities of research require in-depth, time-consuming studies. More importantly, long-term research, has the potential to identify future crisis areas and influence preventive policies. Thus, think tanks and donors should reframe the discourse from current events oriented to the one which anticipates problem areas through independent research. Additionally, secure funding can attract the brightest talent—and it is talent and sustainability that allow think tanks to do game-changing work and have the most impact. The security that comes with core funding can increase relevance, value, and intellectual integrity of the work produced by think tanks.

### Unrestricted and Transparent Funding

Unrestricted grants to high-impact think tanks provide excellent opportunities for conducting research that is not commissioned but is equally important. Donors can identify institutions that they believe are making a critical contribution to society, and make flexible or unrestricted gifts that will guarantee academic freedom for think tank researchers. Additionally, donors should have confidence in researchers and be flexible with, and refrain from micromanaging the objectives, expected outcomes, and implementations of the projects they support. Donations without “strings” increase the potential impact of the research by reinforcing researchers’ independence and academic integrity. To ensure trust and effective partnership between donors and think tanks, transparency in use of funds and sources of funding is essential.

## **Donor Contribution to Research**

There are several ways that donors can, and do, contribute to research at think tanks. Since donors provide funding for projects, they support some of the most important issues that are discussed within a civil society and among policymakers, thus contributing new knowledge to public debate. Donors often have the clout to press public authorities to sponsor and take into account independent research before major decisions, and can vouch for the credibility of research and institutions they support. Additionally, donors have the capacity to support policy entrepreneurs who bring fresh, innovative ideas to persistent policy issues. Lastly, donors and think tanks are partners—and as with all successful partnerships, understanding what each party brings to the table is crucial. Realistic expectations and understanding from both donors and think tanks can yield a fruitful, long lasting, impactful collaboration.

## **Impact**

### **Means of Measuring Impact**

Think tanks hold a unique position within the political realm—they 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.

Scholars and donors agree that measuring and defining the influence of think tanks is difficult. Quantitative measures of impact such as report downloads, website hits, and media presence are just one metric of impact—and often the less significant one. Yet, qualitative measures such as anecdotes about the role a project played in the policy process are rarely conclusive and often merely suggestive, but can be much more insightful. Thus, quantitative and qualitative factors may allow us to adequately measure public perception of think tank credibility and identity, but none alone are good determinants of influence.

In order to most accurately measure think tanks’ influence it is important to understand that there are various ways in which think tanks make an impact; the influence of a think tank varies with regard to the type of work it does and cannot always be generalized. For example, highly specialized institutions may influence specific policies, i.e. education or the environment, whereas more comprehensive institutions may reach out to, and help mobilize, the civil society and thus influence social change. It is also important to note that think tanks with heavy media citations do not always have the most impact and tend to be closer to politics and messaging than

to policy research. Simple policy sound-bites often fail to capture the richness of complex issues and can do a disservice to advancing the policy process.

### **Monitoring Progress**

A think tank's ability 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. In order to monitor progress, think tanks should focus on intangible contribution, i.e. "safe space" for policy discussion, as well as more directly measurable outcomes such as the number of publications. They should also create benchmarks to measure success: are policymakers influenced by the research; are the donations producing new ideas and influence; are researchers engaged in senate testimony, sought out by policy makers, appearing regularly on serious media? Comprehensive measurements of success are important to keep an organization on track, relevant and competitive, but they should not require resources that would otherwise be spent on executing effective programing.

### **Long-term Planning for Success**

A think tank's impact rests on its reputation for credibility and independence—factors which attract policymakers in need of sound research and advice on pressing issues. Thus, donors should take into account institutional variations in organizations and projects that they support when planning strategies for success. They should also be prepared to invest in long-term agendas in order to assure the quality and credibility of research they support. Additionally, donors should seek out and provide funding to organizations that go beyond producing innovative research and actively reach out to policymakers and the civil society with the aim to influence policy with new knowledge. Effective communication of ideas influences policy.

### **Relevance**

#### **Alternative Means of Expression**

As the foremost institutions bridging academics and policymakers, think tanks provide opportunities for new research to reach policymakers and civil societies, and thus influence public policy. Maintaining a strong presence, therefore, is necessary for think tanks' relevance. Quality scholarship, research dissemination, effective collaboration with policymakers and engagement with emerging technologies are some of the major steps that think tanks take in order to remain successful. There also has been an increase in variations of think tank models including: think and do tanks, do tanks, talk tanks, and others. These institutions use different methods to translate their message to their audiences and promote policy recommendations. The introduction of these institutions offer alternatives and create new possibilities for think tanks to expand their capabilities.

#### **Which Organizations Should Donors Fund?**

Given the diversification of think tanks into research focused as well as more activist institutions, researchers and donors now have access to a greater variety of institutions that influence policymaking in unique ways. With this in mind, it is important to consider well-known, historic think tanks for their connections, credibility and influence as well as smaller, highly specialized and innovative institutions that bring new insights or activism into the policymaking process. More importantly, donors should seek out and provide funding to organizations that find an appropriate balance between vision, idealism and pragmatism. Think tanks should not zigzag between trendy topics, but maintain focus on long-term issues and fund initiatives that are of current and future importance.

### **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 by diversifying the activities of the institution, i.e. think *and* do tank. 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, while maintaining independence.

### **Recruiting Young Professionals**

Think tanks rely on the expertise of experienced researchers and staff who uphold the quality of work. Placing young, bright talent in such environments yields many benefits for institutions and the fields they operate in. Young people bring fresh ideas, creativity and energy to established workplaces. Moreover, while working closely with experts in various subject areas, young professionals are exposed to the best practices in research, networking and administrative affairs which will translate in greater success for think tanks as these professionals take on more responsibilities. A lack of incentives for young professionals may lead to brain drain and jeopardize long-term sustainability and relevance of think tanks. To remain relevant and ensure survival, donors and think tanks have to make meaningful commitments to diversity in terms of age, gender and race. Public policy institutions should reflect the diversity and interests of the public they serve.

### **Competing with Universities**

Within the United States there is a growing trend of the encroachment of universities into the realm of think tanks and even think tanks encroaching into the realm of universities. The defining line between think tanks and universities and also their role in society is beginning to blur. This can be illustrated by the changing role of universities in the political realm, as well as universities establishing their own think tanks. This trend is most evident in Massachusetts where the most influential think tanks are primarily affiliated with universities. However, some think

tanks are taking on the role of universities, i.e. the RAND Corporation has their own graduate school for their employees. The role of think tanks and universities in relation to one another will continue to be a defining issue in the future.

## **Audience**

### **Paying Attention to Audiences**

In the technologically advanced world, think tanks' audience has become vastly diverse ranging from civil societies to donors and policymakers. The growth of social media and the spread of internet access worldwide has created many more outlets through which think tanks can reach their audiences. Additionally, the general public has become more informed and involved in public policy, and it has begun paying attention to think tanks. This trend increased the need for think tanks to remain critically distant from their funders in order to maintain independence and credibility as well as produce visible results.

### **Balancing Donor Demands and Academic Freedom**

Think tanks are committed to producing high quality product that requires time—which many donors find archaic—thus, 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 the work. A think tank's credibility rests on the high level of disinterested, quality research which distinguishes it from the rest of the market; as such, donors must recognize if they want quality outcomes they must support long-term, independent projects. 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.

### **Regarding Partisanship**

Credible think tanks need to maintain a balance between academia and politics. Donors should leave their politics out of the equation—and if it is politics that they want promoted, they should support political operations, advocacy organizations or NGOs. Donors should be somewhat circumspect about their particular policy concerns in order to protect the think tanks that they fund from charges of “capture” or falling under undue influence. Partisan advocacy should not be hidden behind claims of impartiality, thus think tanks should clearly demonstrate how and why they are not biased, i.e. by being forthcoming about their agenda, showing the actual actions and staff working on programs. The role and impact of think tanks will be enhanced by taking into account different views and reaching out to a diverse range of policymakers, not just those who align with particular political views.

## Engaging in Active Research Dissemination

A think tank is only as good as its ability to reach its audience. With policymakers, donors and the public counting on think tanks' work, think tanks must prioritize their audiences and address each appropriately. By translating academic research into publicly accessible language, think tanks can reach a wider audience, thus garnering policy support from the civil society. Research dissemination must move beyond PDFs and emails and include engagement with social media, contributions in the form of op eds, and TV appearances, but it should not come at a cost of quality research. Sound-bites and tweets do not convey the complexity of issues studied by policymakers, but they reach wide audiences and generate more interest in and greater familiarity with what think tanks do. Thus, funding for projects should include a thorough communications plan to expand dissemination of research results.

## Networks

### Think Tank Networks

Think tanks have their own research agendas, target audience and donors, and 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, instead of competition. Think tank networks tend to be either donor driven, ideologically driven, short-term issue based, or discipline based. 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.

### 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 are the key to successful collaboration between think tanks.

## Interdisciplinary Approaches to Problem Solving

Several scholars have voiced their concerns over the issue that interdisciplinary studies are not encouraged in the academy. Moreover, interdisciplinary/mutually enriching approach to problem solving is not encouraged by donors. Thus, a think tank asked to do “risk assessment” for a corporate donor is expected to ground recommendations in security and political factors, but not equally important cultural and historic factors. Think tanks should encourage interdisciplinary cooperation and build a network of experts who examine similar issues from a variety of disciplines. They should also engage donors and policymakers in collaborative strategic planning regarding future priorities and interest. This latter concern must be done in a manner that protects all parties from jeopardizing independence of policy or practice. Finally, policy analysts and donors should promote their messages, findings, and recommendations among diverse networks in order to diffuse new knowledge, connect with new partners and ensure impact.





# Conclusion

North American think tanks face many challenges which were addressed throughout the summit. Funding and resources continue to be the most important and fundamental challenge facing all the think tanks. United States think tanks are competing among one another for funding and resources to increase their impact and influence. Canadian think tanks are competing for funding and resources in a country where a strong entrepreneurial base is not as apparent as in the United States. Additionally, they compete for government funding without long-term promises of resources. Mexican think tanks are facing competition amongst themselves for very limited funding from the entrepreneurial class, and no funding from the government. The search for funding and resources continues to be a defining issue across North American think tanks, but the approaches differ fundamentally among the three countries.

Additional challenges include generating impact, maintaining relevance, paying attention to the audiences, and creating collaborative networks. Defining and measuring impact has been a long-lasting concern for think tanks. Creating comprehensive criteria is important to attract donors and monitor success. Keeping in mind the diversity of institutions and the various forms of impact they produce is essential for a holistic analysis of think tank work. Maintaining relevance is equally important in generating impact and requires quality research, recruitment of young talented professionals, and engagement with social media and evolving technologies. Through technology and social media think tank can reach a much wider audience, thus disseminating knowledge, engaging the civil society and gathering support for their policy recommendations. Through networking and interdisciplinary cooperation think tanks can function as knowledge hubs bringing together scholars, policy analysts and policymakers from various disciplines, creating more effective, informed policy.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is important to remember that building sound policy and garnering impact takes a long time and a lot of planning
2. Donors and think tanks should increase emphasis on longer-term issues rather than current policy issues
3. Make multi-year contributions that are sufficient to allow your favorite organization to hire top talent. It is talent and sustainability that allows think tanks to do game-changing work
4. Invest in support for core operating expenses and not just project-based funding; build institutional infrastructure, not just research
5. Support events and outreach by think tanks
6. Investing in people should be of highest priority
7. Unrestricted funding and transparency of financial transactions is essential for building trust and effective partnerships between donors and institutions
8. Think tanks and donors should agree on clear expectations during the grant process



9. Donors should be clearer about inputs, outputs, and outcomes as well as the measurements that various think tanks use to gauge progress on all three
10. Grants should not be so narrowly written that they would require strict compliance at the expense of the quality of research. Grants should be capacious around a theme, allowing an organization to leverage its natural advantages to produce good outcomes and outputs
11. Both donors and think tanks should be clear about their agenda
12. For measuring impact, comprehensive quantitative and qualitative measures are necessary
13. Build a culture of accountability and adherence to the evaluation process
14. Understand that think tanks are not the same, some are research focused while others are advocacy oriented
15. Different organization setups produce different results, which have to be considered in the impact evaluation process
16. Seek out and provide funding to organizations that go beyond innovative and interesting research and produce tangible results
17. Focus on evaluating effective communication of ideas as opposed to simply their production
18. Engage in collaborative work through creation of professional networks among think tanks, policymakers and experts from other disciplines
19. Develop a strategic plan for dissemination of research, tailoring language to the appropriate audiences
20. Engage with social and television media, move beyond the PDF
21. Demand follow-up for research, i.e. whether it was picked up, what impact did it have, what were its practical policy implications
22. Do not support partisan policy, make sure think tanks show their bipartisanship and objectivity
23. Seek out and provide funding to organizations that find an appropriate balance between vision/idealism and pragmatism
24. In Canada, individuals who have been serious investigative journalists or commentators should be actively involved with think tanks; CEOs of the major media companies should start supporting or in engaging think tank research
25. The operating gap between think tanks and universities remains problematic. All Canadian universities are public, and a few are slowly recognizing the importance of policy-relevant work which is not given much support in the tenure-track and promotion process. This means that a huge opportunity of leveraging collaborative participation is missed
26. Mexico's think tanks can really benefit from cooperation among themselves as well as advocacy institutions and NGOs, given that private institutions tend to engage in more independent work and public institutions have a greater access to policymakers.

# Summit Participants

Participant Name	Participant Title	Organization	Country
Allison, Graham	Director of Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs	Harvard Kennedy School	USA
Allison, John	President	CATO Institute	USA
Anrig, Greg	Vice President of Policy	Century Foundation	USA
Benitez, Raul	President	Colectivo de Análisis de la Seguridad con Democracia, A.C.	Mexico
Bennett, Steven	Vice President and Chief Operating Officer	Brookings Institution	USA
Birdsall, Nancy	President	Center for Global Development	USA
Boaz, David	Executive Vice President	CATO Institute	USA
Calvin-Venero, Claudia	Director General	Mexican Council on Foreign Relations	Mexico
Carver, Thomas	Vice President for Communications and Strategy	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace	USA
Clancy, Alisha	Manager of the Global Economy Program	Centre for International Governance Innovation	Canada
Clemens, Jason	Executive Vice President	Fraser Institute	Canada
Clyne, Mallory	Communications Manager	The North-South Institute	Canada
Cooke, Colin	President and CEO	The North-South Institute	Canada
Cordeau, Jeff	Director of Operations	Peterson Institute for International Economics	USA
Cowan, Jon	President	Third Way	USA
Daalder, Ivo	President	Chicago Council on Global Affairs	USA
Dewitt, David	Vice President of Programs	Centre for International Governance Innovation	Canada

Diez-Torres, Fernanda	Director of Institutional Relations	Centro de Estudios Espinosa Yglesias	Mexico
Dimock, Michael	Vice President of Research	Pew Research Center	USA
Edwards, Lee	Distinguished Fellow in Conservative Thought	Heritage Foundation	USA
Fernandez, Marco Antonio	Director of Research	Mexico Evalua	Mexico
Fontaine, Richard	President	Center for a New American Security	USA
Fox, Graham	President and CEO	Institute for Research on Public Policy	Canada
Greenstein, Robert	President	Center on Budget and Policy Priorities	USA
Guillen-Lopez, Tonatiuh	President	El Colegio de la Frontera Norte	Mexico
Haf, Simone	Institutional Development Director	Fundar Centro de Análisis e Investigación	Mexico
Hamre, John	President and CEO, The Pritzker Chair	Center for Strategic and International Studies	USA
Hiday, Jeffrey	Director of Office of Media Relations	RAND Corporation	USA
Hodgson, Glen	Senior Vice-President and Chief Economist	The Conference Board of Canada	Canada
Husock, Howard	Vice President for Policy Research	Manhattan Institute for Policy Research	USA
Jeffs, Jennifer	President	Canadian International Council	Canada
Kempe, Frederick	President and CEO	Atlantic Council	USA
Kirksey, Ryan	Director of Operations and Finance	Rice University's Baker Institute	USA
Kramer, David	President	Freedom House	USA
Litwak, Robert	Vice President for Scholars and Director of International Security Studies	Woodrow Wilson Center	USA
Lowell, Bridget	Vice President for Strategic Communications and Outreach	Urban Institute	USA

Luxenberg, Alan	President	Foreign Policy Research Institute	USA
Macauley, Molly	Vice President for Research and Senior Fellow	Resources for the Future	USA
MacDonald, Lawrence	Vice President of Communications and Policy Outreach	Center for Global Development	USA
Margerum Berg, Amy	Executive Vice President	The Aspen Institute	USA
Mathews, Jessica	President	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace	USA
Matusow, Allen	Director of Academic Affairs	Rice University's Baker Institute	USA
Mauren, Kris	Executive Director / CEO	The Acton Institute	USA
McGann, James	Assistant Director of the International Relations program and Director of TTCSP	Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program of University of Pennsylvania	USA
Mendoza, Vanessa	Executive Vice President	Manhattan Institute for Policy Research	USA
Miller, Joe	Vice President of Communications	The Century Foundation	USA
Molano, Manuel J.	Director General Adjunto	Instituto Mexicano para la Competitividad	Mexico
Nassar, David	VP, Communications	Brookings Institutions	USA
Nittoli, Janice	President	The Century Foundation	USA
Olson, Joy	Executive Director	Washington Office on Latin America	USA
Overton, Spencer	Interim President and CEO	Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies	USA
Papademetriou, Demetrios	President	Migration Policy Institute	USA
Posen, Adam	President	Peterson Institute for International Economics	USA
Poterba, James	President	National Bureau of Economic Research	USA
Prud'homme, Jean-Francois	Vice President of Academic Affairs	El Colegio de Mexico	Mexico

Ries, Charles	Vice President, International	RAND Corporation	USA
Robertson, Colin	Vice President and Fellow	Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute	Canada
Robson, William	President and CEO	C.D. Howe Institute	Canada
Rubio, Luis	Chairman	Center of Research for Development/Wilson Center	USA
Samore, Gary	Executive Director of Research	Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School	USA
Saunders, Paul	Executive Director	Center for National Interest	USA
Schmitt, Mark	Director of Political Reform Program	New America Foundation	USA
Schwanen, Daniel	Assistant Vice President of Research	C.D. Howe Institute	Canada
Schwartz, Andrew	Senior Vice President of External Relations	Center for Strategic and International Studies	USA
Sharp, Phil	President	Resources for the Future	USA
Shifter, Michael	President	Inter-American Dialogue	USA
Slaughter, Anne-Marie	President and CEO	New America Foundation	USA
Smith, Richard	Director of Communications	Wilson Center	USA
Speedie, David	Senior Fellow and Director of U.S. Global Engagement Program	Carnegie Council on Ethics in International Affairs	USA
Stachelberg, Winnie	Executive Vice President of External Affairs	Center for American Progress	USA
Steer, Andrew	President and CEO	World Resources Institute	USA
Talbott, Strobe	President	The Brookings Institution	USA
Tanden, Neera	President	Center for American Progress	USA

Taylor, Bill	Vice President for Middle East and Africa	United States Institute of Peace	USA
Wagner, Bridgett	Director of Coalition Relations	Heritage Foundation	USA
Wartell, Sarah	President	Urban Institute	USA
Weinstein, Kenneth	President and CEO	Hudson Institute	USA
West, Darrell	Vice President	Brookings Institution	USA
Zoric, Iva	Director of Global Communications and Media Relations	Council on Foreign Relations	USA

## ORGANIZERS, HOSTS, AND REGIONAL PARTNERS

# BROOKINGS



## GLOBAL PARTNERS



# BROOKINGS

# About TTCSP

## 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.