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Overview of Latin America

After suffering from intense economic and political turmoil through much of the 1980s and 1990s, the Latin American region has managed to reverse the tide in the last decade. Since the start of the 21st century, the region has experienced dramatic economic, political and social progress. Due in part to the commodity export bonanza, the region has made great strides in economic growth. The economic improvement, in combination with low unemployment and falling income-inequality, led to a 50% increase in the number of middle-class people. Now, 30% of the region’s population are considered middle class. Along the same lines, the region has also lifted 80 million people out of poverty.

Notwithstanding the positive developments, the region faces several challenges ahead. First, economic growth has slowed down and is forecasted to continue down this path. The low GDP growth prospect are partly a result of declining commodity prices, China’s lowering demand for Latin America’s exports, and poor productivity rates. In addition, while the region has witnessed increased enrolment rates in education, the quality remains very poor. Equally worrisome is the wave of crime and violence affecting many Latin American countries, which puts in peril much of the progress of the last decades.

The region now finds itself at a crossroads. The years of high growth are gone, and the only way the region will be able to move forward is by addressing these long-standing and pressing issues. Given the urgency, governments will be forced to take action in order to tackle these long-standing problems. While this landscape represents a unique opportunity for think tanks to shape the path of the region, reaching and influencing policy-makers has been a constant challenge in past years.

It is against background that thirty-five representatives from twenty-six think tanks in eighteen countries gathered for the 2nd Latin American Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Participants convened for two days to discuss major institutional challenges. Issues addressed included: the role of think tanks in the economic, political and social development of the region, best practices for resource mobilization, the window of opportunity created by presidential electoral processes, the relationship between transparency and impact, and effective strategies to reach and influence policy-makers.

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. Under the broad heading of institutional challenges, the report details the substance of the conference through five major themes: funding, impact relevance, networks and capitalizing on presidential electoral periods. It concludes with a list of the ten most pertinent recommendations for Latin American think tanks.
**Regional Variations**

Argentina is a home to the largest number of think tanks in Latin America. Argentina’s first think tanks, founded after World War II, focused on domestic and international economic issues and were predominantly government and university affiliated. A trend starting in the 90’s and continuing into the present day shows that “nonprofit private research centers have largely displaced public universities and achieved leadership sometimes bordering on monopoly in social research”. Research areas tackled by Argentine think tanks tend to focus on economic policy, democratization and human rights.

Brazil is the main regional power in Latin America given its population, territory, GDP, and military power. Membership in MERCOSUR and IBSA reinforce Brazil’s influence in the region and prominence across the globe. Unlike think tanks in lesser-developed Latin American countries, Brazil’s think tanks are diverse in their areas of research, reflecting Brazil’s rise as a geopolitical force in both the regional and international arenas. Even though Brazil is the only Latin American country to see an increase in the growth rate of think tanks this past decade, it still has a comparatively small number of think tanks—just eighty-one. The two biggest areas of research are economics and politics, followed by social development and the environment.

Cuba, a communist state, is the largest and most populous island nation in the Caribbean and the first socialist country in the Americas. Cuba’s think tanks are mostly controlled by the state and focus exclusively on issues that are sanctioned by the government. The majority of Cuban think tanks focus on the environment, followed by social policy, economics and science and technology.

Chile is one of the most prosperous Latin American states with a high GDP and a stable government; it is the only Latin American country included in OECD. Since 1990, Chile has transitioned smoothly to a democracy, and currently has trade agreements with many countries throughout the world. The vast majority of think tanks consider themselves independent and autonomous, a sharp contrast from countries like Mexico, where many think tanks are affiliated with the government. The main area of research interest among Chile’s think tanks is domestic economy, followed by social policy.

Mexico is the most populous Spanish-speaking country in the world, and the fifth largest country in the Western Hemisphere. It followed the region’s trend of democratization after 71-year-long one-party rule. In comparison to other Latin American states, however, the growth and development of think tanks in the country has lagged behind. Think tanks in Mexico concentrate on two main areas of research: democracy and domestic economy. Mexico’s think tanks use their research to increase political participation.

Venezuela is an oil rich country and is one of the founding members of OPEC. Its dependence on resource wealth has led to growing income inequalities. Venezuela adopted socialist policies, including universal education and healthcare; however, poverty and violent crime remain, leading to political unrest. Think tanks in Venezuela work to influence public policy and political participation. Some of the most prominent think tanks in the country focus on topics such as the
development of private enterprise, free-market principles, and participation of the private sector in the political process.
Funding

Some significant challenges confronting the operations of think tanks arise from a core need, funding. In the region, obtaining private, long-term and core funding has been quite difficult. Instead, short-term, project-based funding, and often with strings attached, has increasingly become the norm, putting limitations to the mission and work of think tanks. Beyond the scarcity of flexible funding, think tanks must deal with some adverse effects from financial transparency that put in peril the security of the institution.

Funding models and methods

To fund their activities, think tanks have relied on a number of approaches. One of the models discussed placed all responsibility on the researchers. This decentralized model requires researchers to seek out their own funding resources with limited or no help at all from the think tank’s institutional staff. Some participants voiced concern over this model, underscoring that it might create tensions between those who are successful at attracting resources and those who are not. Additionally, they argued that this type of approach usually lends itself well to project-based funding, but not so much to long-term or core funding, which is essential for identifying future crisis and influence preventive policies.

Another model proposed focused on leveraging political events and anniversaries to garner visibility among society, policy-makers and potential donors. Participants acknowledged that being aware of and using opportunities in the political context is an approach that should be capitalized on more often.

Seeking the diaspora, leveraging the network of think tanks and highlighting tax breaks when reaching out to potential donors were also mentioned as strategies to generate funding. Beyond these models and strategies, a number of participants called attention to how investing in institutional consolidation can strengthen the capacity of think tanks to attract new sources of funding. Lastly, participants emphasized the importance of communicating to donors the need for core funding, as it allows think tanks to set long-term research agendas and raises their intellectual integrity and credibility.

Keeping Independence of Thought

Keeping independence of thought can be challenging for think tanks. At times, sources of funding have certain expectations about the work of think tanks. Participants acknowledged that donors believe that the funding they provide allows them to shape the research agenda of think tanks. Given the limits donors can place on the work of think tanks, participants stressed the
importance of keeping a healthy distance from them and having different sources of funding so as to increase their flexibility and intellectual integrity.

Opportunities and Risks of Financial Transparency

High levels of transparency possess several advantages, but can also pose problems for think tanks. On the one hand, full disclosure of funding sources increases the credibility and integrity of the material produced by think tanks. These transparency strengths, in turn, affect the ability of think tanks to have an impact in policy and increase the opportunities of collaborating with other groups of society. Additionally, transparency is a useful component to fend off the attacks of groups looking to tarnish the reputation of think tanks. On the other hand, full transparency can jeopardize the security of the institution and researchers and the privacy of donors who prefer to stay anonymous.

Participants put forward a few recommendations to seize the advantages of transparency and mitigate its risks. Proposals included embedding principles and policies that protect the independence of the institution, assessing transparency both qualitatively and quantitatively as a way to capture every aspect of funding, and sharing best practices and experiences with each other.

Impact

Think tanks in the region are aware that a gap currently exists between policy makers and their products and capabilities. Not only are policy-makers difficult to reach, but other actors are competing for a similar influence, as well. The lackluster results in policy influence is a worrisome development for think tanks, as a number of donors put significant emphasis on this type of impact. It has become pertinent, then, to find ways to increase the likelihood of policy impact and measure the multiple ways impact can manifest itself.

Meeting the Needs of Policy Makers
Maintaining a close relationship with policy-makers is crucial to understand their needs and hence produce knowledge that is useful to them. Participants also lay emphasis on carrying out research on trends and issues that policy-makers might find relevant in the short and long-term. Overall, having readily available data on issues of national importance constitutes one of the most effective approaches to improve the likelihood of impact.

**Turning Competing Forces into Collaborating Ones**

Think tanks are not the only non-governmental actor seeking to influence policy-makers. NGOs, media outlets and international organizations, such as the World Bank or the Inter-American Development Bank, also have resources and incentives to shape policy. While these players constitute a threat to the work of think tanks, participants argued that efforts should be undertaken to turn them into collaborating forces.

**Different communication methods for different audiences**

Think tanks usually target more than one audience when disseminating their work. They not only aim to influence policy-makers, but they also seek to inform citizens and keep or gain the financial support of donors. As such, to achieve these multiple goals, think tanks need to stay up-to-date with how their audiences consume information and adapt how they disseminate their research accordingly. Participants concurred that investing on a strong communications team could greatly facilitate those efforts.

**Measuring Impact**

Measuring the impact of research and projects is an essential, but challenging task. Donors are usually mainly interested in the immediate impact of research at influencing policy, whereas think tanks also pay attention to its media and institutional impact. Overall, participants agreed on the importance of understanding and communicating the many forms impact can take.

**Relevance**

Across the region, think tanks have struggled to find a stable position within their respective political context. They not only have to compete for similar influence with other non-governmental actors, but they usually face insulated political parties, as well. Given these obstacles, participants insisted that think tanks should seek to differentiate themselves by leveraging their strength and innovating as a way to attract the attention of policy-makers.

**Leveraging the Strengths**

As think tanks compete with other actors in their attempt to influence policy and obtain funding, participants stressed the need to clearly communicate their strengths to stakeholders. Some of the characteristics that provide them with an edge over other players included plurality, state-of-the-art research documents, financial and ideological transparency, and independence of thought. These characteristics make think tanks a unique and legitimate source of information.
Traditional vs. Innovative Role

All agreed that think tanks need to preserve their traditional role of facilitating dialogue among stakeholders and carrying out basic and applied research on issues of national relevance. These traditional activities, however, need to be complemented with new and innovative approaches aimed at increasing the impact of their work. Referred as Think Tank 5.0, this new role entails partnering with new actors such as hackers and journalists to leverage big data, capitalizing on electoral periods to influence policy-makers, and targeting smaller cities and local officials as a stepping stone for attaining impact at the national level. Across the board, participants asserted that embracing innovation constitutes a key component to remain relevant in the eyes of policy makers.

Leveraging Networks for Learning

While think tanks can learn valuable lessons from each other’s experiences, information-sharing efforts have thus fallen short in the region. Participants concurred that strengthening and creating new networks where the work of think tanks in the region and those of other regions can be accessed represents an opportunity to learn from each other successes and failures. Beyond this learning aspect, participants suggested using networks with the purpose of increasing their funding opportunities.

Capitalizing on presidential electoral periods

While Latin American countries have consolidated the electoral process, the majority of political parties stay away from programmatic politics, avoiding to formulate or put forth their policy platform. Against this context, in recent years, several think tanks in the region have undertaken year-long projects to (1) influence the policy agendas of the candidates competing for the Presidency, (2) redirect the focus of the public debate to issues of national importance, (3) increase visibility of the candidates’ political platforms, and (4) encourage a more informed vote. The electoral period represents an opportune occasion for think tanks as the future president is in the process of setting his/her agenda. To achieve these multiple goals, think tanks have employed a number of strategies, including creating policy briefs and organizing televised political debates among the candidates. The presidential project can be divided into 4 stages.

Developing the Policy Briefs

The first step in the process of the project is the development of policy briefs. These are state-of-the-art documents that include policy proposals aimed at solving issues of national importance. A number of think tanks sought out the collaboration of other actors, particularly academics, think tanks and NGOs. Participants concurred that collaborating with other actors renders the endeavor more legitimate and credible.
Reviewing their experiences, think tanks voiced some recommendations in this front. To increase the effectiveness of the briefs, think tanks should only focus on a limited number of issues that are highly relevant to society and policy makers, avoid prescriptive policy proposals, and use an accessible and straight forward format.

**Dialogue between Researchers and Presidential Candidates**

In this stage of the project, the authors of the briefs sought out to meet with the technical teams of each presidential candidate. Given how little time candidates and their respective teams usually have, participants underscored the need for short and easily readable policy briefs. In addition, to increase the likelihood of the meetings, participants recommended establishing linkages with the team of the presidential candidates well in advance of the elections.

**Dissemination Strategies**

Think tanks employed a number of dissemination tools in order to meet the needs and preferences of their diverse audience. For future initiatives, participants agreed that a larger effort should be undertaken to engage other civil society groups—and society in general—when disseminating their materials. These actors usually have access to and the attention of new audiences and provide legitimacy to the goal of the project.

**Presidential candidates’ debate**

As in Latin America the public debate is usually centered on the personality of the presidential candidates and their vague promises, the televised presidential debate among the candidates represents a unique opportunity that pushes them to reveal their policy agenda to society. Notwithstanding the benefits of the televised debate, participants agreed that bringing the candidates together was one of the most challenging parts of the initiative. In many countries, candidates leading the polls opt out of the debate for fear of exposing themselves to the scrutiny of society and hence losing popularity. Given this hurdle, participants suggested the idea of making no-participation costly, though no concrete measure was proposed.

**Results: Impact of the Project**

Across the board, think tanks voiced high levels of satisfaction with the project. A few think tanks in the region managed to influence the policy agenda of the future president, organize the debate with all candidates and, in one case, transfer staff members to the presidential cabinet. Beyond these particular successes, all think tanks agreed that the initiative enriches the institution, strengthens linkages with political parties, elevates their profile in the eyes of society, donors and politicians, and serves as a highly valuable lesson for future undertakings.
Conclusions:

The second Latin American Summit was a fruitful forum for think tanks to openly discuss major institutional challenges in a continent that is in dire need of reform. A main concern debated at the Summit was funding, a core institutional need to run their operations. For the majority of think tanks, funding has mostly been short-term and project-based, which compromises the credibility and integrity of think tanks. It is therefore cardinal for think tanks to communicate clearly to donors the linkage between core funding and institutional stability and growth. In addition, while full disclosure of the sources of funding raises their legitimacy, a few think tanks revealed that it puts in peril the security of the researchers. Against this, participants suggested finding mechanisms to protect researchers.

Other interrelated key concerns discussed were the impact and relevance of think tanks in the policy realm. Across the region, think tanks confront two major challenges: competition for influence and insulated political parties. Against these obstacles, it has become pertinent for think tanks to leverage their strengths, find new and innovative ways to reach the party in power, and narrow their research to meet and anticipate the needs of policy-makers.

Last but not least, the Summit dedicated significant time to deliberate about the opportunities arising from presidential electoral processes. Many think tanks in the region have taken advantage of presidential elections to influence the policy agenda of the future president, as he/she still does not have a defined and elaborate agenda. While think tanks succeeded in many aspects, much progress can still be made, particularly in influencing future policy.

In closing, participants voiced gratitude and satisfaction for the work of the Summit organizers, Fundação Getúlio Vargas in Brazil, the Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program of the University of Pennsylvania in the United States. The group also expressed appreciation to the Development Bank of Latin America (CAF), which co-sponsored the event. Given the productivity of the meeting, participants expressed a high interest in coming together again next year.

Participants concluded with eleven recommendations focused on strengthening the institutional and influence capabilities of think tanks and making the future summit even better.
**Recommendations:**

1. Increase monitoring and evaluation activities of initiatives to strengthen their impact capabilities.
2. Increase information-sharing and linkages among think tanks in the region in order to learn from each other’s experiences, best practices, successes, and mistakes.
3. Diversify the sources of funding to improve the intellectual integrity and institutional stability.
4. Develop a set of standardized guidelines that ensures the independence and freedom of institutions.
5. To render future summits more efficient and productive, participants voiced a number of recommendations.
   a. Set a common theme for future meetings and come prepared with background papers. Security, youth, social media, and technology were the main topics suggested.
   b. Discuss in-depth the economic, political, and social region in the short- and long-term.
   c. Divide future meetings into two broad areas: one of analysis and another one of strategies.
   d. Divide into groups in order to maximize time and productivity.
   e. Invite staff from think tanks located in other regions of the world to not only learn from them, but also to obtain an outsider perspective about the region.
   f. Set aside a part of the summit to talk to the main “consumers” of think tanks: the media and policy-makers.
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- James McGann, Director, Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program (TTCSP), University of Pennsylvania, EE.UU.

09:15 - 12:00
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- Keynote Speaker: Geert Bouckaert, Presidente, International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS)
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- Iliana Carrasco, Oficial de Relaciones Institucionales y Comunicaciones, CIES, Peru
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Debate
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- Leandro Damasio, Presidente, Instituto Publca, Brasil
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- James McGann, Director, TTCSP, University of Pennsylvania, EE.UU
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<th>Last Name</th>
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## Chile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Muñoz</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Carlos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe (CEPAL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Biography**

Guatemala

Institucion: Asociación de Investigación y Estudios Sociales (AVIS)

Biografía:


Brasil

Institucion: Fundação Getulio Vargas (FGV) - Brasil

Biografía:


México

Institucion: Banco de Desarrollo de América Latina

Biografía:


Brasil

Institucion: Fundação Getulio Vargas (FGV) - Brasil

Biografía:
Director General del Consejo Mexicano de Asuntos Internacionales desde 2011 y Fundador de Mujeres Construyendo (mujeresconstruyendo.com), primera plataforma para bloguear en América Latina y que promovió el empoderamiento de las mujeres a través de la Tecnología de la Información y Comunicación (TIC). Tiene más de 18 años de experiencia en el sector público tanto en el ámbito federal como legislativo. Ha trabajado en diversas dependencias entre las que destacan el Senado de la República, Gobierno del Distrito Federal, la Secretaría de Gobierno y la Presidencia de la República. En esta última, estuvo a cargo de la Dirección General de Información Nacional y de la Dirección General de Actividades Internacionales y Gabinete. En 2007, ha sido consultor para la ONU, la Agencia de Desarrollo (UNDP) y la Administración Federal de Finanzas (AFN) a los gobiernos de Brasil y México. Ha sido catedrático en diversas universidades mexicanas y ha participado en varios proyectos relacionados con la Universidad Iberoamericana (UAI), Universidad de las Américas UDLAP, Instituto de Ciencias de México, el Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, la Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro, el Centro de Estudios de la Función y la Función. Actualmente, es el investigador en instituciones con el impacto de la tecnología de la información en las relaciones internacionales en la democracia así como emprendedor digital participando en foros nacionales e internacionales relacionados con esta cuestión. Recientemente fue nombrado uno de los más influyentes del mundo en redes sociales en el mundo y fue invadido en la Universidad de Geografía. En los últimos años ha sido protagonista de temas relacionados con el conocimiento y las redes sociales en las relaciones internacionales y en la democracia así como emprendedor digital participando en foros nacionales e internacionales relacionados con esta cuestión. Recientemente fue nombrado uno de las más influyentes en México. Colabora frecuentemente en medios de comunicación y es bloguera de Animal Político.


Brasil

Institucion: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance

Biografía:
Director Regional para América Latina y el Caribe de IDEA Internacional (desde 1997). Tiene un doctorado en Derecho Internacional y una Maestría en Derechos Humanos (Universidad Complutense); un doctorado en Administración Pública y Desarrollo Económico (Universidad de Harvard). Ha sido invitado al Programa de Gestión de Alto Nivel (NGCA, Costa Rica), un título de licenciado en Ciencias Políticas y Relaciones Internacionales (Universidad Católica de Córdoba) y en Derecho (Universidad de Córdoba). Ocupo cargos de gerencia y director en más de 25 años y tiene una extensa experiencia en negociaciones políticas y gestión de recursos electorales y financieros.


Brasil

Institucion: Fundação Getulio Vargas (FGV) - Brasil

Biografía:

Argentina

José Luis Ledón es Secretario Adjunto del Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI). Es licenciado por la Facultad de Derecho de la Universidad de Buenos Aires y M.A. en relaciones internacionales por la School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) de la Johns Hopkins University. Fue Secretario de Producción para la Defensa y Secretario de Jefatura del Ministerio de Defensa de la República Argentina durante las presidencias de Raúl Alfonsín y Fernando De la Rúa.

Paraguay

Lucio Bermúdez es Economista Principal de la Dirección de Investigaciones Geoeconómicas de CIF, Banco de Desarrollo de América Latina. También es docente en la Universidad Tecnológica de Puebla (México) y es asesor del Instituto de Desarrollo Económico de la Universidad Nacional de Córdoba (UNC, Argentina) y en el Instituto de Economía y Finanzas de la UAC.

José Luis Bermúdez es Economista Principal de la Dirección de Investigaciones Geoeconómicas de CIF, Banco de Desarrollo de América Latina. También es docente en la Universidad Tecnológica de Puebla (México) y es asesor del Instituto de Desarrollo Económico de la Universidad Nacional de Córdoba (UNC, Argentina) y en el Instituto de Economía y Finanzas de la UAC.

Lucio Bermúdez es Economista Principal de la Dirección de Investigaciones Geoeconómicas de CIF, Banco de Desarrollo de América Latina. También es docente en la Universidad Tecnológica de Puebla (México) y es asesor del Instituto de Desarrollo Económico de la Universidad Nacional de Córdoba (UNC, Argentina) y en el Instituto de Economía y Finanzas de la UAC.
**República Dominicana**

**Last Name**: Concepción  
**First Name**: Nathaniel

**Institution**: Fundación Global Democracia y Desarrollo (FUNDUDEC)

**Biography**

Nathaniel, alcalde de la ciudad de Santiago, es considerado un líder estratégico en la promoción de políticas públicas enfocadas en la inclusión social y el desarrollo sostenible. Conformidad y eficiencia son características que distinguen su liderazgo. Nathaniel ha trabajado con diversos países para la promoción de políticas públicas que favorezcan el desarrollo socioeconómico. Ha participado en varios foros internacionales y ha sido invitado a la Fundación Rockefeller como Residente Fellow en el Centro de Políticas Globales.

**Español concentrado**

Nathaniel, alcalde de la ciudad de Santiago, es considerado un líder estratégico en la promoción de políticas públicas enfocadas en la inclusión social y el desarrollo sostenible. Conformidad y eficiencia son características que distinguen su liderazgo. Nathaniel ha trabajado con diversos países para la promoción de políticas públicas que favorezcan el desarrollo socioeconómico. Ha participado en varios foros internacionales y ha sido invitado a la Fundación Rockefeller como Residente Fellow en el Centro de Políticas Globales. Es el primer presidente del Consejo de Viabilidad de las Obras Públicas, miembro del Consejo de la ONU y presidente del Consejo de la ONU, en apoyo a la reducción de la pobreza.
**Argentina**

**Luiz Andreask**

EcoLogic Institute

*Biography*

Activo en el desarrollo sostenible, la política energética y el clima, y líder del grupo de trabajo sobre la invención de la tierra, Don Andreask es la directora del Instituto EcoLogic de Costa Rica desde 1999. En abril de 2008, se convirtió en presidente del Instituto EcoLogic en Washington. Desde 2009, ha desempeñado el mismo cargo en la Universidad de Ohio, incursionando en áreas como la regulación y el medioambiente. Ha trabajado en diversos proyectos relacionados con el clima y la energía renovable. Es miembro del consejo de la Red de Desarrollo Sostenible, la Red de Expertos en Energía y el Foro Económico Mundial, y ha coordinado el Fondo Global de Medio Ambiente Atómico.

**Brazil**

**Ricardo Furtado**

CEBRI - Centro Brasileiro de Relações Internacionais (CERBRI)

*Biography*


**Brazil**

**Lucas Mascia**

IPEA - Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada (IPEA)

*Biography*

Promocionado en 2018 por la Universidad Federal de Río de Janeiro (FURJ), ingresó a la Universidad de Brasilia (UNB) y se doctoró en Economía por la Universidad de Brasilia (UNB) en 2018. Trabajó en la RCC y en la UFRJ en áreas de Educación, Desarrollo, Políticas Públicas y Desarrollo, donde aprendió sobre las áreas de desarrollo, educación, políticas públicas y desigualdad. Actualmente trabaja en el consejo de la Red de Desarrollo Sostenible. Ha trabajado en áreas de economía, como el sector de la economía del Bienestar Social. Ha publicado en revistas de economía y educación.
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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 policymakers 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.