

Think Tanks & Civil Societies Program
The Lauder Institute
The University of Pennsylvania




**2014 Global Go To Think Tank
Index Report**

January 22, 2015

James G. McGann, Ph.D.
Director
Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program
The Lauder Institute
University of Pennsylvania

Philadelphia, PA USA



Think Tanks & Civil Societies Program
The Lauder Institute
The University of Pennsylvania

“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
6,500 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

2015 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.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I want to express my deep appreciation to the 3,572 plus university faculty and administrators, journalists, policymakers, think tank scholars and executives, and donors from every region of the world that participated in the 2014 Global Go To Think Tank Index (GGTTI). I would like to thank the over 1,950 functional area and regional specialists who served as expert panelists and provided valuable insights and assistance as I compiled the report.

Thank you also to my research interns Jennifer Crino, Yusi Du, and Coco Wang for their help in compiling and analyzing the data for the 2014 Index. I would like to extend a special thank you to the project lead for the 2014 GGTTI, William Nathaniel Rose, who assembled and edited this year's report. In addition, a word of thanks to the current and former interns who gave up several nights and weekends to help edit the report, conduct the data analysis, and enhance the graphics for this year's report. In this regard special thanks goes out to Travis Taylor, Andrew Metrick, and Jillian Rafferty. They, in conjunction with the research team, put in long hours to help improve the Index's quality and appearance.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the United Nations and the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs for hosting the panel discussion and global launch of the 2014 Global Go To Think Tank Index in New York, and to the Center for International and Strategic Studies for hosting the Washington, D.C. panel discussion and launch and the over 60 institutions around the world that have agreed to host think tank events in 55 cities.

Thank you for helping the TTCSP highlight the important role think tanks play in civil societies and governments around the world.

James G. McGann
Senior Lecturer, International Studies
Director Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program
Lauder Institute
University of Pennsylvania



TTCSP
THINK TANKS AND CIVIL SOCIETIES PROGRAM
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA



The Lauder Institute
Wharton · Arts & Sciences
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA



Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Global Trends and Transitions in Think Tanks and Policy Advice	6
Overview of Modifications and Enhancements to the Global Go To Think Tank Index	42
Methodology and Timeline	48
2014 Think Tank Statistics	53
2014 Ranking Categories	59
2014 Global Go To Rankings Results	61
Top Think Tanks in the World	62
Top Think Tanks by Region	69
Top Think Tanks by Area of Research	88
Top Think Tanks by Special Achievement	111
Appendices	150
Background on the Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program	161
The Research Team	163

Introduction

The 2014 Global Go To Think Tank Index (GGTTI) marks the eighth year of continued efforts by the Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program (TTCSP) at the University of Pennsylvania to acknowledge the important contributions and emerging global trends of think tanks worldwide. Our initial effort to generate a ranking of the world's leading think tanks in 2006 was a response to a series of requests from donors, government officials, journalists, and scholars to produce regional and international rankings of the world's preeminent think tanks. Since its inception, our ongoing objective for the GGTTI report is to gain understanding of the role think tanks play in governments and civil societies. Using this knowledge, we hope to assist in improving the capacity and performance of think tanks around the world.

Since 2006, the ranking process has been refined and streamlined, and the number and scope of the institutions and individuals involved has steadily grown – though the number of think tanks worldwide has declined since last year's report was issued. The process, as in past years, relies on a shared definition of public policy research, analysis, and engagement organizations, a detailed set of selection criteria, and an increasingly open and transparent nominations and selection process. As part of the nominations process, all 6,618 think tanks catalogued in the TTCSP's Global Think Tank Database were contacted and encouraged to participate, in addition to over 20,000 journalists, policymakers, public and private donors, think tanks, and functional and regional area specialists. This group of peers and experts was surveyed to both nominate and rank public policy research centers of distinction for 2014.

To refine and validate the generated ranking lists, TTCSP assembled Expert Panels comprised of hundreds of members from a wide variety of backgrounds and disciplines. Additionally, new media – the website and social media presence – helped us communicate and disseminate information about criteria for this year's Index to a wider audience (please see “Methodology and Timeline” for the complete set of nomination and ranking criteria, and “Appendices” for a detailed explication of the ranking process). Given the rigor and scope of the nomination and selection processes, the rankings produced thus far have been described as the insider's guide to the global marketplace of ideas.

As a final note, we would like to remind you that the data collection, research, and analysis for this project, as in previous years, were conducted without the benefit of field research, a budget, or staff. We are confident that the peer nomination and selection process, as well as the work of the international Expert Panels, have enabled us to create the most authoritative list of high performance think tanks in the world. Still, efforts to streamline and perfect the process are ongoing. We are continually seeking ways to enhance the process and welcome your comments and suggestions. We further encourage you to provide the names and contact information for prospective expert panelists for functional and regional areas covered by the Index.

Thank you for your continued support of the TTCSP and of the annual Global Go To Think Tank Index. We hope our efforts to highlight the important contributions and emerging global trends of think tanks worldwide will foster insightful discussions and debates on the present and future roles of these vital institutions.

Global Trends and Transitions in Think Tanks and Policy Advice

Introduction and Summary

Throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, overall growth in think tanks has been nothing short of explosive. There are many key influences that drove this growth: the information and technological revolution, the decline of governmental monopolies on information, the increasing complexity and technical nature of policy issues, the increasing size and scope of governments, the crisis of confidence in elected governmental officials, increased globalization and the growth of state non-state actors, and the need for timely and concise information and analysis.¹ But in recent years, there has also been decline in the rate establishment of new think tanks. While there are many contributing factors to this decline, there are certain key elements: increased political and regulatory hostility toward think tanks and NGOs in many countries, decreased funding for policy research by public and private donors, the increased tendency to fund short-term projects as opposed to institutional contributions, underdeveloped institutional capacity and the inability to adapt, increased competition from advocacy organizations, for-profit consulting firms, law firms, and electronic media, and, finally, the fact that institutions have served their purpose and discontinued their operations.

Despite this depreciation, think tanks continue to expand their role and influence in countries around the world. Across both developed and developing countries, governments and individual policymakers face the common problem of bringing expert knowledge to bear in government decision-making. Policymakers need reliable, accessible, and useful information about the societies they govern. They also need to know how current policies are working, as well as possible alternatives and their likely costs and consequences. Although this need has long been an inherent dynamic of the policymaking process, the forces of globalization have accelerated the growth of independent think tanks given their unique ability to strengthen the research-policy bridge and increase the quality and effectiveness of policymaking. This expanding need has fostered the growth of independent public policy research organizations in 182 countries around the world.²

Even as the scope and impact of think tanks' work have expanded, their potential to support and sustain democratic governments and civil societies is far from exhausted. The challenge for the new millennium is to harness the vast reservoir of knowledge, information, and associational energy that exist in public policy research organizations to support self-sustaining economic, social, and political progress.

The goal of this report is to highlight some critical threats and opportunities facing think tanks globally. These threats are best expressed by the so-called "four mores": more issues, more

¹ See James McGann 2007

² See James G. McGann, "2013 Global Go To Think Tanks Index Report," Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program, University of Pennsylvania.

actors, more competition, and more conflict. These result in challenges that all think tanks will face: competitive challenges, resource challenges, technological challenges, and policy challenges. And ultimately, effective responses to these threats and opportunities should focus on the “four M’s”: mission, market, manpower, and money. In the global market place of ideas, think tanks need to develop national, regional and global partnerships while creating new and innovative platforms to deliver their products and services to an ever-expanding audience of citizens, policymakers, and businesses around the world. The following is a list of the current trends and emerging issues facing think tanks.

Current Trends in Think Tanks

1. Globalization
2. Growth of international actors
3. Democratization
4. Demands for independent information and analysis
5. Big data and supercomputers
6. Increased complexity of policy issues
7. The Information Age and the rate of technological change
8. Increasingly open debate about government decision making
9. Global “hacktivist”, anarchist, and populist movements
10. Global structural adjustment
11. Economic crisis and political paralysis
12. Policy tsunamis
13. Increasing political polarization
14. Short termism

Emerging Issues Facing Think Tanks

1. Dramatic shifts in funding patterns
2. Increased specialization
3. Increased competition
4. Influence and independence
5. Outputs vs. inputs
6. Phantom NGO think tanks
7. Hybrid organizations
8. Impact of the internet, new media, social networking, and the Cloud
9. Action vs. ideas
10. Greater emphasis on external relations and marketing strategies
11. Going global
12. Leadership and managing tensions
13. Decentralization of power
14. Blurring of the lines between think tanks and journalism
15. Global Gridlock
16. Crisis Fatigue

Conclusions

The ongoing challenge for think tanks is to produce timely and accessible policy-oriented research that effectively engages policymakers, the press, and the public on the critical issues facing a country. Gone are the days when a think tank could operate with the motto “research it, write it and they will find it.” Today, think tanks must be lean, mean, policy machines. *The Economist* described “good think tanks” as those organizations that are able to combine “intellectual depth, political influence, and flair for publicity, comfortable surroundings, and a streak of eccentricity.” Those who fail to organize and integrate new technology and communication strategies are destined to be known for their “pedantry” – and little else.

For the reasons outlined in this report, the role and importance of independent think tanks will continue to grow. Clearly there is no shortage of policy challenges at the national, regional, and

global levels. Over the last 10 to 15 years, governments and civil society groups have come to rely on think tanks for ideas and advice, and I am confident that this trend will continue well into the future.

Think Tanks and the Transnationalization of Ideas and Influence

The growth of public policy research organizations, or think tanks, has been nothing less than explosive over the last few decades. These organizations have increased and expanded dramatically, with approximately 6,618 think tanks currently operating all around the world.³ And the scope and impact of their work has expanded in kind. This past decade, however, has shown the first marked decrease in the growth rate of new think tanks. Despite this recent trend, think tanks continue to increase their role and influence in countries around the world, serving as a bridge between policy and academic communities, while also bridging citizens and their respective governments.

The breadth and scope of this reservoir has expanded considerably since the 1990s, as think tanks have responded to the need of policymakers and the general public for information that is useful, reliable, and accessible. Although this need has been an inherent dynamic of the policy-making process, the forces of globalization have markedly accelerated the growth of independent think tanks due to their unique ability to strengthen the research-policy bridge, and thus increase the quality and effectiveness of the policy-making process. As a result, think tanks can now be found in 182 countries of the world⁴. By developing and strengthening ties with other nongovernmental and research organizations via state, regional, and international networks, think tanks have solidified their position as integral contributors to the policymaking process.

This report focuses on the role of these institutions as well as their role in regional and global networks to illustrate the value and utility of think tanks to policymakers and the public at regional and global levels. This focus is in recognition of the increased role, number, and position of think tanks, along with the fact that think tanks have received less attention from scholars relative to environment, development, education, and social service-oriented NGOs. In addition, the report will explore the major challenges facing this group of policy-oriented non-governmental organizations.

What is a Think Tank?

Think tanks are public-policy research analysis and engagement organizations that generate policy-oriented research, analysis, and advice on domestic and international issues, thereby enabling policymakers and the public to make informed decisions about public policy. Think tanks may be affiliated or independent institutions that are structured as permanent bodies, not ad hoc commissions. These institutions often act as a bridge between the academic and policymaking communities and between states and civil society, serving in the public interest as

³ McGann, James G. "2013 Global Go to Think Tanks Index Report." (2013). page 7

⁴ Ibid., page 12.

independent voices that translate applied and basic research into a language that is understandable, reliable, and accessible for policymakers and the public (Think Tanks and Policy Advice in the US, Routledge 2007 and in The Fifth Estate: The Role of Think Tanks in Domestic and Foreign Policy in the US forthcoming University of Pennsylvania Press).

In an effort to bridge these conceptual problems and create a typology that takes into consideration the comparative differences in political systems and civil societies, we have developed a number of categories for think tanks. Think tanks may perform many roles in their host societies – there is, in fact, wide variation among think tanks in the work they do and the extent to which they do it. Over the last 85 years, several distinct organizational forms of think tanks have emerged that differentiate themselves in terms of their operating styles, patterns of recruitment, and aspirations to academic standards of objectivity and completeness in research. It should be noted that alternate typologies of think tanks have been offered by other analysts.⁵ In the global context, most think tanks tend to fall into the broad categories outlined below.

⁵ Another typology distinguishes between three types of think tanks: “universities without students,” contract researchers and advocacy tanks. Weaver (1989).

Figure 1: Categories of Think Tank Affiliations

CATEGORY	DEFINITION
AUTONOMOUS AND INDEPENDENT	Significant independence from any one interest group or donor and autonomous in its operation and funding from government.
QUASI INDEPENDENT	Autonomous from government but controlled by an interest group, donor, or contracting agency that provides a majority of the funding and has significant influence over operations of the think tank.
GOVERNMENT AFFILIATED	A part of the formal structure of government.
QUASI GOVERNMENTAL	Funded exclusively by government grants and contracts but not a part of the formal structure of government.
UNIVERSITY AFFILIATED	A policy research center at a university.
POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATED	Formally affiliated with a political party.
CORPORATE (FOR PROFIT)	A for-profit public policy research organization, affiliated with a corporation or merely operating on a for-profit basis

North America and Europe

- ♦ There are 1989 think tanks in North America (Mexico, Canada and US) of which 1830 are in the United States
- ♦ There are 1822 think tanks in Europe
- ♦ Close to 60 percent of all think tanks are in North America and Europe
- ♦ 90.5 percent of think tanks were created since 1951
- ♦ The number of think tanks in the US has more than doubled since 1980
- ♦ 31 percent of think tanks were created between 1981 to 1990
- ♦ The End of Post WWII consensus & Challenge to the Welfare State contributed to the growth of think tanks on the left and the right of the political spectrum
- ♦ Most of the think tanks that have come into existence in the United States since the 1970s are specialized for a particular regional or functional area
- ♦ About one quarter of U.S. think tanks (approximately 400 institutions) are located in Washington, DC
- ♦ More than half the think tanks are university affiliated
- ♦ The rate of establishment of think tanks has declined over the last 11 years in the United States and Europe

Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East

- ♦ Asia, Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and North Africa continue to see an expansion in the number and type of think tanks established
- ♦ Asia has experienced a dramatic growth in think tanks since the mid-2000's
- ♦ Many think tanks in these regions continue to be dependent on government funding along with gifts, grants, and contracts from international public and private donors
- ♦ University, government affiliated, or funded think tanks remain the dominate model for think tanks in these regions
- ♦ There is increasing diversity among think tanks in these regions with independent, political party affiliated, and corporate/business sector think tanks that are being created with greater frequency
- ♦ In an effort to diversify their funding base, think tanks have targeted businesses and wealthy individuals to support their core operations and programs

Reasons for the Growth of Think Tanks in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries

- ♦ Information and technological revolution
- ♦ End of national governments' monopoly on information
- ♦ Increasing complexity and technical nature of policy problems
- ♦ Increasing size of government
- ♦ Crisis of confidence in governments and elected officials
- ♦ Globalization and the growth of state and non-state actors
- ♦ Need for timely and concise information and analysis that is "in the right form, in the right hands, at the right time"⁶

Reasons for the Recent Decline in Number of Think Tanks Established Worldwide

- ♦ Political and regulatory environment growing hostile to think tanks and NGOs in many countries
- ♦ Decreasing funding for policy research by public and private donors
- ♦ Public and private donors tendency toward short-term, project-specific funding instead of investing in ideas and institutions
- ♦ Underdeveloped institutional capacity and the inability to adapt to change
- ♦ Increased competition from advocacy organizations, for-profit consulting firms, law firms, and 24/7 electronic media
- ♦ Institutions having served their purpose and discontinued their operations

When I helped organize the first international meeting of think tanks, one of the major debates at the meeting was the contention that the term "think tank" doesn't travel well across borders and cultures. That is clearly no longer the case, as the term is now widely accepted around the globe

⁶ McGann, James G., ed. *Think tanks and policy advice in the US: Academics, advisors and advocates*. Routledge, 2007.

to describe “public-policy research analysis and engagement organizations that generate policy-oriented research, analysis, and advice on domestic and international issues, which enable policymakers and the public to make informed decisions about public policy issues.”⁷

And increasingly, think tanks are a global phenomenon because they play a critical role for governments and civil societies around the world by acting as bridges between knowledge (academia) and power (politicians and policymakers).

Governments and individual policymakers, throughout the developed and developing world, face the common problem of bringing expert knowledge to bear in government decision-making. Policymakers need understandable, reliable, accessible, and useful information about the societies they govern. They also need to know how current policies are working, as well as to set out possible alternatives and their likely costs and consequences. This expanding need has fostered the growth of independent public policy research organization: the think tank community, as we know it.

Think tanks have increased in number, but also the scope and impact of their work have expanded dramatically as well. Still, the potential of think tanks to support and sustain democratic governments and civil societies around the world is far from exhausted. The challenge for the new millennium is to harness the vast reservoir of knowledge, information, and associational energy that exist in public policy research organizations so that it supports self-sustaining economic, social, and political progress in every region of the world for public good.

Part of the goal of this report is to raise some of the critical threats and opportunities that face the think tank community globally. These threats are best expressed by what I call the “four mores”:

- ♦ More Issues
- ♦ More Actors
- ♦ More Competition
- ♦ More Conflict

These threats create a set of challenges that confront all think tanks:

- ♦ Competitive challenges
- ♦ Resource challenges
- ♦ Technological challenges
- ♦ Policy Challenges

To effectively respond to the threats and opportunities posed by this new and challenging environment, think tank need to focus on the “four M’s”:

- ♦ Mission
- ♦ Market
- ♦ Manpower
- ♦ Money

⁷ McGann, 2007.

Finally, in a global market place of ideas, think tanks need to develop national, regional, and global partnerships while creating new and innovative platforms to deliver their products and services to an ever-expanding audience of citizens, policymakers, and businesses around the world.

2014 Trends in Think Tanks and Policy Advice

Major Findings

Think tanks have become more active players in domestic and foreign policy in the last two decades and are now present in 182 countries. While think tanks continue to be concentrated in the United States and Western Europe, several factors are driving the growth of think tanks in other areas of the world.

Mega Trends

I. Globalization: Knowledge is increasingly an international commodity that spans physical and metaphysical boundaries. Globalization is unquestionably one of the most profound and powerful trends that continually shapes and drives the flow of technology, resources, knowledge, people, values, and ideas. The growth of the knowledge-based economy has led to competition among such knowledge-based institutions worldwide for the best ideas and people. New technologies have leveled the global playing field in a way that challenges established powers and elite institutions around the world. There are now 2 billion people who have access to the Internet in every region of the world, and the number of Internet users and mobile phone subscribers is growing steadily across all regions.⁸ While the Internet facilitates the dissemination of information (thereby allowing more competition among think tanks), the sheer increase in the volume of knowledge can at times make it more difficult to find verified, high-quality information.

While globalization has increased competition, it has also broken down cultural barriers. Trade, technology, finance, and the media make globalization possible – the so-called “knitting needles” of globalization, given their unique capacity to enable and propel that process. The imperative that drives globalization is the need that all states have to create new markets, secure critical resources, acquire new information and technology, and address critical transnational threats. As Martell notes, “National differences have become less marked as people consume culture from around the world rather than being so dependent on that of their own nation. This is facilitated [...] by global electronic communications such as the internet, globalized TV broadcasts, migration, and tourism.”⁹

⁸ Khaltarkhuu, Buyant E., and Frederico Escaler. "The Fast Changing World of Information and Communications Technology." Open Data. June 27, 2013. Accessed October 18, 2013. <http://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/fast-changing-world-information-and-communications-technology>.

⁹ Martell, Luke. "The third wave in globalization theory." *International Studies Review* 9, no. 2 (2007): 173-196.

Globalization has, in turn, “transnationalized” think tanks. An integral part of this process is the manipulation of these organizations to project national interests abroad. European and North American foundations and development agencies have “exported” Western think tank models abroad and have become an object of American- or Western-style development policies.¹⁰ While this trend reveals a Western tilt, the think tank network is not simply a Western phenomenon. Indeed, the think tank network around the world seems to represent one group of actors in a greater global civil society. Think tanks have established their own transnational networks and use these links to collaborate, share, and open dialogues about policy solutions.¹¹ Through these networks, think tanks are able to create cross-national policy transfers that extend beyond detached policy analysis. Thus, with these new networks, scholars advocate for the spread of policy ideas and practices in a broader scope.¹² The globalization of think tanks is the act of forging bridges across national borders and developing a consistent exchange of ideas among scholars, thereby influencing the spread of policy ideas.

II. Growth of International Actors: The proliferation of state and non-state actors, such as nation states, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), transnational corporations (TNCs), and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), has helped create a demand and provided the support and space for the establishment of think tanks around the world. The Union of International Organizations maintains that there are as many as 66,000 international organizations worldwide, with 1,200 added to its database annually.¹³ There are now 193 member states in the United Nations up from the 51 founding members in 1945. In addition there has been a dramatic growth in the number of non-state actors – transnational or multi-national corporations and nongovernmental organizations – that have increasing power and influence. More and more, it seems that “the formation of an organized actor indicates strength and stability, and therefore a basis for power. The potency of an actor is reflected in a number of characteristics, such as unity, level of institutionalization, legitimacy, media control and others.”¹⁴

There is a running debate about how to properly measure the impact of think tanks in promoting policy. This challenge is certainly not unique to think tanks. However, it is easier to link an IGO resolution to domestic legislation than to do the same for the report or policy recommendations of an individual think tank, because many other civil society actors are involved in the policy formulation process.

¹⁰ Stone, Diane. "Globalisation and the Transnationalisation of Think Tanks." *Globalisation and the Transnationalisation of Think Tanks*. August 31, 2005. Accessed May 18, 2014.

<http://www.adbi.org/discussion-paper/2005/09/09/1356.think.tanks/globalisation.and.the.transnationalisation.of.think.tanks/> Also see McGann, James. “Global Think Tanks Policy Networks and Governance”. Routledge, 2011.

¹¹ Stone, "Globalisation and the Transnationalisation of Think Tanks."

¹² Ladi, Stella. *Globalisation, policy transfer and policy research institutes*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2005.

¹³ Union of International Organizations. "The Yearbook of International Organizations." *UIA.org*. Brill, n.d. Web. 18 Oct. 2013.

¹⁴ Mishali-Ram, Meirav. "Powerful actors make a difference: theorizing power attributes of nonstate actors." *International Journal of Peace Studies* 14, no. 2 (2009): 55-82.

III. Political and Economic Development: The crisis of credibility and confidence in governments and elected officials and the rise of democratic movements around the world have helped fuel the demand for independent analysis of public policy and the creation of a new set of non-governmental think tanks. According to Freedom House, the number of electoral democracies worldwide has risen from 69 in 1989 to 122 in 2014, accounting for 61 percent of today's states.¹⁵ As Thomas Friedman explains, this trend towards increased political participation is closely tied to globalization: "countries that are globalizing sensibly but steadily are also the ones that are becoming politically more open, with more opportunities for their people, and with a young generation more interested in joining the world system."¹⁶ The KOF Index of Globalization measures the relative degree of globalization in countries around the world using three main dimensions of globalization: economic, social, and political. In addition to three indices measuring these dimensions, we calculate an overall index of globalization and sub-indices referring to actual economic flows, economic restrictions, data on information flows, data on personal contact, and data on cultural proximity.¹⁷

The globalization process has proven to lead to the improvement of democratic concepts (e.g., fair elections, citizen participation, and electoral oversight in Mozambique, equality among legislative houses with concurrent powers in South Africa, the formation of regional governments and creation of Articles relating to the federal, state, and federal/state concurrent powers for spending and taxation in Ethiopia, accountability of authorities in Ghana, and legal ratification for lack of service delivery and accountability in Kenya).¹⁸ These democratic affairs arise due to the fact that "individuals who have greater access to...offices related to decentralization...are [also] more likely to participate in user groups created by state officials"¹⁹, reflecting upon the openness involved in the globalization process.

Still, many countries that have recently made the transition authoritarianism to democracy continue to face serious challenges consolidating democratic institutions and promoting economic and social development. Think tanks in these countries must contend with a range of complex social and economic issues and publics that are generally skeptical toward civil engagement. This is further complicated by underdeveloped legal and institutional frameworks for philanthropic giving. In the aggregate, all of this makes it difficult to recruit expert staff members and create an environment that encourages and sustains rigorous social science research. As Rose notes, "the longer a regime uses free elections as a facade while those inside government use elected office to enrich themselves, the greater the divergence will become

¹⁵ Freedom House. "Freedom in the World – Electoral Democracies." *2014 Freedom in the World*. Freedom House, n.d. Web. 18 Oct. 2013.

¹⁶ Friedman, Thomas L. "Globalization, Alive and Well." *The New York Times*. The New York Times, 22 Sept. 2002. Web. 25 Oct. 2013.

¹⁷ The report is produced by the ETH Zürich, Switzerland KOF Konjunkturforschungsstelle Florian Hälg, <http://globalization.kof.ethz.ch/>

¹⁸ Summary given under "Political Decentralization" in *Popular Participation & Decentralization in Africa: Economic Commission for Africa Report*. Also see McGann, James. "Democratization and Market Reform in Developing and Transitional Countries: Think Tanks as Catalysts." Routledge, 2010. And Johnson, Erik and McGann, James. *Comparative Think Tanks, Politics and Public Policy*, Edward Elgar, 2005.

¹⁹ Agrawal & Gupta 2005, *Decentralization and participation: The Governance of Common Pool Resources in Nepal's Terai*.

between those countries making progress toward the completion of democracy and those going nowhere. Moreover, the longer corruption persists at the elite level, the greater the likelihood that the mass of the electorate will become indifferent to dishonesty.”²⁰ What’s more, think tanks often face political environments that lack transparency. With that in mind, think tanks therefore have the potential to play an important role in the dissemination of information and meet the public’s growing appetite for accurate information and rigorous analysis.

IV. Demands for Independent Information and Analysis: Over the last 15 years, the state’s monopoly and control of information has rapidly diminished due to technological advances, globalization, and democratic movements. With the emergence of the so-called “Data Revolution,” there is a new need for governments, NGOs, and research institutes to collaborate in sharing data and closing data gaps.²¹ These trends have created a space for knowledge-based institutions like think tanks to provide independent information and analysis. In other words, “big data is the oil of the information economy that needs to be treated as an economic asset. If not, actors are doomed to the old witticism of knowing the price of everything and the value of nothing”.²²

The World Bank has called for a Global Partnership for the Data Revolution to help think tanks collaborate in sharing data. Involving a wide variety of agencies, the collaboration would focus on developing and sharing relevant information. Think tanks will play a crucial role in the process, furthering existing efforts for greater independent analysis and information. However, the high number of think tanks and other institutions working to meet the demand for information means that the quality of information could potentially suffer.

V. Big Data and Supercomputers: Big data, which involves the collection and analysis of massive amounts of information to pinpoint critical data points and trends, may render think tanks and their staffs superfluous.²³ This new analytic capability is made possible by supercomputers, which may become the think tanks of the future. And increasingly, economically developing nations are playing a role: in 1997 none of the world’s fastest 100 supercomputers was found in one of the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India, and China). Today, six from that list are in use in China, including the Tianhe-2, the world’s fastest computer, and six others can be found in the remaining BRIC nations.²⁴ The technological development of the BRIC countries is the start of technological revolutions in many developing countries – but these tech adjustments are often made in environments without privacy laws or regulations systems in place to check big data gathering. As of 2013, just 40 of the 101 countries

²⁰ Rose, R. ‘How people view democracy: A diverging Europe’, *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 12, pp. 93-106. 105. 2001.

²¹ Cameron, Grant. "What Would a Global Partnership for a Data Revolution Look Like?" *WorldBank.org*. World Bank Data Blog, 8 Oct. 2013. Web. 18 Oct. 2013.

²² Charles Chase, “Using Big Data to Enhance Demand-Driven Forecasting and Planning”, *The Journal of Business Forecasting*, Vol. 32, No. 2, 2013

²³ Maniyka, James, et al. *Big Data: The next Frontier for Innovation, Competition, and Productivity*. Rep. McKinsey & Company, May 2011. Web. 21 Oct. 2013.

²⁴ See Note 10.

with data privacy laws or bills in place were in the developing world.²⁵ Regardless, big data and high-level technology will only play a growing role in an increasingly interconnected world.

Think tanks can carve a niche in these environments. As developing countries adopt technological practices, think tanks can provide the necessary consulting and policy advice to recommend adequate privacy laws and regulations to accompany these advancements, simultaneously providing information to the public about the changing technological and policy environment.

VI. Increased Complexity of Policy Issues: Governments are faced with a range of highly technical and complex problems that require a high degree of expertise, requiring policymakers to seek outside advice. At the same time, governments are under increased pressure to improve economic and bureaucratic performance. The complexity of these policy issues also arises from our current globalized context. In today's world, policy formation is no longer under the sole control of the state, issues are not fully domestic or foreign, and the international system is anything but simple and straightforward. As Robert Jervis said in his book, *System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life*, "we can never do merely one thing".²⁶ Complex problems are often distributed among different actors and manifest themselves in different ways. Instead of one organization being completely in control of accomplishing a particular task, the assignment may rely on the collaboration of various institutions. Jones adds additional insight: "Agencies must approach the delivery of their mandate with a networked approach to policy and governance. Accountability structures can usefully focus on holding units accountable for their mission or role description. Relationship management concern and participatory processes should be central focuses."²⁷ Historically, governments have turned to think tanks for evidence and advice on these matters – but that may be changing.

VII. The Information Age and the Rate of Technological Change: Better, cheaper, and faster technology has made it much easier for individuals and small organizations to operate and publicize their work. Internet, social networks, the cloud, and handheld computers have also made it easier for individuals and organizations with limited financial resources to conduct research and disseminate their findings globally.

All of this has allowed organizations to use websites and social networks to share their agendas and findings. Many of these approaches operate outside of the traditional academic review process, peer-reviewed publications, and communications channels. These changes have dramatically increased the timeliness, reach, and impact of research and commentary that are conducted by individuals and social movements – not just by established institutions. The combination of globalization and constant technological innovation has empowered these

²⁵ Provost, Claire. "Poorer Countries Need Privacy Laws as They Adopt New Technologies." *Theguardian.com*. Guardian News and Media, 04 Dec. 2013. Web. 9 Jan. 2014. <<http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2013/dec/04/poorer-countries-privacy-laws-new-technology>>.

²⁶ Jervis, Robert. *System effects: Complexity in political and social life*. Princeton University Press, 1998. Page 10

²⁷ Harry Jones, "Taking responsibility for complexity: How implementation can achieve results in the face of complex problems." Overseas Development Institute. 2007.

individuals in a way that poses a major challenge to established knowledge-based institutions like universities and think tanks. Manuel Castells has termed this force “the network society” – a new social structure that utilizes Information-Age technologies to endlessly expand, reconfigure, and overcome the limitations of traditional networks.²⁸

Individuals are now empowered by the Internet and social networks, which can create loose organizations and networks that effectively challenge the state. For example, Twitter jumped from 1.6 million users in 2008 to 32.1 million a year later;²⁹ Twitter users currently count an estimated 500 million.³⁰ The accessibility and broad permeability of such social media allow individual users to wield enormous influence, particularly in creating movements with wide appeal. This trend is reflected in supercharged individuals like Osama Bin Laden, Julian Assange, Mohammed Bouazizi in Tunisia, and Wael Ghonim in Egypt, who shape and influence national and global politics.

The challenges extend beyond these individuals and movements, too. Because of the tech revolution, advocacy think tanks are now facing competition from intellectual entrepreneurs who publish online publications and aggregate content. Think tanks need to develop relationships with such aggregators to effectively communicate their advocacy efforts and promote research to a larger audience.

VIII. Increasingly Open Debate about Government Decision-Making: Interest groups and public citizens are less deferential to government monopolies on decision making, which has put a premium on more open discussion of issues and policy options. Key players are less likely to accept government information and rationales, creating a demand for more independent sources of analysis. Global policy and advocacy networks have increased the power and influence of these organizations.

It’s possible that the cause of this political opening is not so much technical advancement and rather is the result of events in the international system that contributed to: (1) the downfall of right-wing authoritarian regimes in Southern Europe in the mid-1970s; (2) the replacement of military dictatorships by elected civilian governments across Latin America from the late 1970s through the late 1980s; (3) the decline of authoritarian rule in parts of East and South Asia starting in the mid-1980s; (4) the collapse of communist regimes in Eastern Europe at the end of the 1980s; (5) the breakup of the Soviet Union and the establishment of 15 post-Soviet republics in 1991; (6) the decline of one-party regimes in many parts of sub-Saharan Africa in the first half of the 1990s; and, (7) a weak but recognizable liberalizing trend in some Middle Eastern countries in the 1990s and 2000s. These events, termed by Samuel Huntington as “the third wave of democracy,” could also be partly responsible for increasing open political debate.³¹ More compelling today is the power and ubiquity of the internet, social media, and mobile devices.

²⁸ Castells, Manuel. *The rise of the network society: The information age: Economy, society, and culture*. Vol. 1. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

²⁹ Vascellaro, Jessica E. "Twitter Trips on Its Rapid Growth." *WSJ.com*. Dow Jones and Company, Inc., 26 May 2009. Web. 25 Oct. 2013.

³⁰ Holt, Richard. "Twitter in Numbers." *TheTelegraph.co.uk*. Telegraph Media Group Limited, 21 Mar. 2013. Web. 25 Oct. 2013.

³¹ Carothers, Thomas. "The end of the transition paradigm." *Journal of Democracy* 13, no. 1 (2002): 5-21.

Another contributing factor to the increase in open debate regarding think tanks is the growing distrust and skepticism towards government decision-making. Interest groups and public citizens are gradually becoming less deferential to governments' monopoly on decision-making and are increasingly apt to trust the ideas, advice, and scholarship of independent think tanks. Just 40 percent of the richest countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) expressed confidence in their national governments in 2012, 5 percentage points less than 2007.³² The drop in confidence is most significant in countries hardest hit by recession, such as Greece.³³ The depleted faith in governments around the world opens a crucial place in policymaking for think tanks to influence and impact society at large.

The digital revolution has allowed the public to voice their commitment to transparency, participation, and collaboration. Governments are therefore pressured to respond and adapt to the changing dynamics surrounding the decision-making process. The latest news about government security measures has also pushed firms in the private sector to call for more transparency regarding government decision-making. Tech giants like Google, Facebook, and Microsoft have all called for the government to reveal data requests made by security agencies.

IX. Global “Hacktivist,” Anarchist, and Populist Movements: Within the last 18 months, a seemingly unrelated set of movements have sprung up across the globe that have one thing in common: they all, at their core, are anti-establishment in nature. The groups have emerged in countries as diverse as India, Greece, Egypt, Tunisia, China, Bahrain, Chile, the United States, and Turkey. This new wave of global populism has gathered the young, unemployed, underemployed, and disaffected into mass movements, often leader-less, aimed at challenging the established political and economic order. Fueled by the economic crisis, political paralysis, and policy gridlock of many regional and national governments, these popular movements have surfaced to give voice to the public dissatisfaction with corruption, the abuse of civil liberties, and the general ineffectiveness and indecisiveness of their leaders. It is also in response to a credibility and representation gap where citizens feel that they have been marginalized and that they have elected leaders that are out of touch with their needs and interests.

Finally, what Wikileaks, the Arab Awakening, Take Back America, the Tea Party, the Jasmine Revolution, anti-immigrant groups in France, ISIL/ISIS, and anti-corruption groups in China and India have in common is that they are enhanced and enabled by a brand of ‘60s-style community organizing techniques that are coupled with powerful new technologies: social networks (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube), cell phones, handheld computers, and new media (Al Jazeera, the Huffington Post). These technologies have made spreading images or videos of police or government brutality unprecedentedly easy, rendering regimes much less able to quell such protests by force without arousing further mobilization. In a world of such social mobilization, there are questions as to how activists, bound together by technology rather than clear leadership,

³² OECD, “Ireland Country Fact Sheet” *Government at a Glance 2013*.
http://www.oecd.org/gov/GAAG2013_CFS_IRE.pdf

³³ “Eroding Trust in Government: Confidence Crumbles,” *The Economist*, 16 November 2013, accessed 5 January 2014, <http://www.economist.com/news/international/21589902-confidence-crumbles>.

will develop consensus and reconcile their diverse interests.³⁴ For example, anti-government protesters in Ukraine demonstrating against former pro-Russia Ukrainian president Viktor Yanukovich used Facebook and the Internet to gain information about the movement's developments. The protesters claimed that such sources provided more reliable information than state television. In short, social media and other websites play a major role in disseminating information, motivating and framing citizens during national uprisings and protest movements.

The emergence of new platforms for channeling information, such as various social networks, have made information much more accessible and convenient. Still, such platforms also encourage "Hactivist" activities, such as Edward Snowden's leak of classified NSA information in 2013. Coalfire, an independent information technology governance, risk, and compliance services firm, predicted that in 2014 a "significant security breach"³⁵ would occur at a cloud service provider that holds "sensitive information on tens if not hundreds of thousands of individuals".³⁶ This statement depicts an accurate description of the recent activities regarding the major hacks taken place at big retail companies and even big banks like JP Morgan. With the rise of the "hactivist" mentality and the expanded dissemination of information, particularly sensitive information will become more prominent and accessible. Moreover, with increased reliance on the internet, advances in information and computer technology and the rise of transnational criminal networks are creating more opportunities for criminals, hackavists and governments to engage in criminal activities and cyber warfare which is resulting in greater information leakage.³⁷

X. Global Structural Adjustment: There is a major global structural adjustment turning the world upside down. The economically developed countries are now in crisis, while many developing countries are experiencing real and sustained economic growth. The primary risks to the global economy, and in particular developed countries, are a stalling of progress on the Euro Area, debt and fiscal issues in the United States resulting from the 2008 Recession, a disruption in global oil supplies and prices, and a slowing of Chinese investment.³⁸ Emerging-market share of world GDP has risen from approximately 37 percent in 2000 to 50 percent in 2012.³⁹ Intense competition from developing countries and emerging economies has put intense pressures on the manufacturing, service, and high tech sectors traditionally dominated by the countries in the

³⁴ The Economist. "Internet Protests: The Digital Demo." The Economist 29 June 2013: n. pag. Economist.com. Web. 18 Oct. 2013.

³⁵ Rick Dakin, "Coalfire's Top Five Information Security and Compliance Predictions for 2014," *Business Wire*, 18 Dec. 2013, accessed 4 January 2014, <http://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20131218005276/en/Coalfire's-Top-Information-Security-Compliance-Predictions-2014>.

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷ Peter W. Singer, "Cybersecurity Threats and Basic Cyber Hygiene," *The Brookings Institution*, 3 January 2014, accessed 4 January 2014, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/interviews/2014/01/03-cybersecurity-threats-basic-cyber-hygiene-solutions-singer>.

³⁸ The World Bank, "WB urges developing countries to safeguard economic growth, as road ahead remains bumpy." Last modified January 14, 2013. Accessed January 7, 2014.

³⁹ The Economist. "When Giants Slow down." *Economist.com*. The Economist Newspaper, 27 July 2013. Web. 25 Oct. 2013.

global North. This economic shift from global North to global South is due, in part, to “favorable demographic shifts, rising investments and increased productivity.”⁴⁰

While the emerging markets of the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) are growing faster than their developed counterparts, they are nearly stagnant in comparison to newly emerging countries like Nigeria, the Philippines, and Mexico. East Asia has, in particular, benefitted from this demographic shift in the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis.⁴¹ Growth in China was hindered by its trade partnership with the United States, but the Chinese economy maintained impressive growth rates throughout the crisis (though projections moving forward are less optimistic).

The current economic crisis is also creating challenges to the liberal economic order even as it has plunged the traditional global economic powers into fiscal and monetary crisis. The continuing crisis and associated fiscal constraints have brought the deep-seated structural and fiscal problems, which policymakers have historically deferred from one administration to the next, into focus. These problems have now begun to surface in the domestic political landscape and the past failures to deal with them 10 or 15 years ago has left policymakers with a host of difficult choices. Making these tough decisions doesn't come easy for politicians who face reelection. The reality is that the standard of living in the global North will likely decline, as entitlements will be cut and taxes will be raised. No politician wants to bring this message to the electorate.

XI. Economic Crisis and Political Paralysis: The dynamic growth and competitive challenge posed by the emerging economies in the Global South requires the countries in the North to trim their budgets and government programs to bring them in line with current global economic competition, changing demographics, mounting sovereign debt, and little or no economic growth. In terms of GDP, growth in the global North has stagnated in recent years. From a ten-year high of 3.4 percent annual GDP growth in 2006, European Union member states witnessed a collective contraction of -4.5 percent in 2009, recovery growth of 2.0 percent in 2010, further decline of -0.4 percent in 2012, followed by another recovery growth to 0.1 percent in 2013.⁴² Similarly, the United States witnessed a contraction of -3.8 percent of annual GDP in 2009, and has attained only a moderate recovery of 2.2 percent growth in 2012, dwindling back down to a growth rate of 1.9 percent.⁴³ The BRIC countries, meanwhile, posted an average growth rate of 4.11 percent from 2011 to 2013, compared to an anemic 1.37 percent in developed countries across the same period.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ “Economic Shift from Global North to South,” A. T. Kearney, accessed 05 January 2014, <http://www.atkearney.com/gbpc/global-business-drivers/economic-shift-from-global-north-to-south>.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Eurostat. Real GDP growth rate- volume. N.d. Raw data. N.p. <<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&plugin=1&language=en&pcode=tec00115>>.

⁴³ World Bank. "GDP Growth (annual %)." *World Bank Data*. The World Bank Group, 2013. Web. 25 Oct. 2013. <<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG>>.

⁴⁴ "BRICS Countries Are an Important Driving Force of Economic Growth - Lukov." *G20.org*. Group of 20, 5 Sept. 2013. Web. 25 Oct. 2013.

Indeed, the only major economies that are expected to increase their share of world GDP over the next decade are the two largest BRIC nations: China and India.⁴⁵ The potential consumer market is expanding within Latin America and Asia due to the rapid development of a strong middle class in countries like Brazil, India, and China, giving way to the leverage of local commodities and development of products for the local market. These products are eventually exported to neighboring markets, thus creating South-South trade.⁴⁶

The economies of North Asia have seen fast growth in terms of exports, and are also enjoying stronger trade development. China will see stronger consumption growth, although North Asia will most likely benefit first because of its penetration into Chinese markets. Conversely, suppliers in Australia and Asia that rely on China's development of infrastructure will most likely suffer from slower trade and export growth.⁴⁷

The inability of the Economically Developed Countries (EDCs) to compete with the low-wages and low-benefit cost in developing and emerging economies will make it difficult for the countries in the global North to emerge from the economic crisis in the short term. Indeed, another milestone has been reached in the transition of economic power to developing countries: the value of exports from developing nations to other developing nations ("South-South" trade) now eclipses the value of trade flowing from developing to richer nations ("South-North" trade).⁴⁸ The prospects for meaningful economic growth even in the long term appear to be dim unless significant structural adjustments occur, new technologies are employed, and productivity gains are realized.

Making budget cuts and strategic investments in sectors like science and technology, infrastructure, strategic resources, and education, which will enable the countries in the North to remain competitive in the global economy, will require deep cuts in military spending and entitlement programs. We are already witnessing Western nations carrying out such shifts: France, particularly hard-hit by the recent recession, plans to cut some 7,500 military jobs in its 2014 budget⁴⁹ - leading to pure outrage and threats of resignation.⁵⁰ Meanwhile, President Hollande is urging French citizens to accept reduced pension and welfare benefits in an effort reinvigorate now-stagnant economic growth.⁵¹ For the most part, however, rather than

⁴⁵ Jorgenson, Dale, and Khuong Vu. *Economic Growth in the G8 and the G20*. *Worldklems.net*. Harvard University and National University of Singapore, n.d. Web. 25 Oct. 2013.

<http://www.worldklems.net/conferences/worldklems2012/worldklems2012_Jorgenson.pdf>.

⁴⁶ Andrea Leonel, "South-South Trade – Rewiring the Global Economy," J. P. Morgan, accessed 5 January 2014, [https://www.jpmorgan.com/tss/General/South-South Trade Rewiring the Global Economy/1320504817166](https://www.jpmorgan.com/tss/General/South-South%20Trade%20Rewiring%20the%20Global%20Economy/1320504817166).

⁴⁷ Bajoria, Rahul, Fernandez, David and Wai Ho, Leong. "Asia Themes 2014: North-South Divide Widening," *The Wall Street Journal: Real Time Economics* (blog), January 01, 2014.

⁴⁸ *The Economist*. "O for a Beaker Full of the Warm South." *Economist.com*. *The Economist Newspaper*, 19 Jan. 2013. Web. 21 Oct. 2013.

⁴⁹ Irish, John, and Emmanuel Jarry. "France Military Eyes 2014 Cuts, Far-right Seeks to Benefit." *Reuters*. Thomson Reuters, 03 Oct. 2013. Web. 25 Oct. 2013.

⁵⁰ Samuel, Henry. "French Military Heads Threaten to Resign over 'grave' Defence Cuts." *The Telegraph*. May 23, 2014. Accessed October 27, 2014.

⁵¹ Viscusi, Gregory. "Hollande Presses French to Embrace Social Revamp to Spur Growth." *Bloomberg.com*. *Bloomberg*, 28 Mar. 2013. Web. 25 Oct. 2013.

developing a plan to deal with these long-term structural problems, politicians in the United States, Europe, and Japan have become mired in partisan politics and policy gridlock.

XII. Challenges to the Post World War II Economic and Security Architecture: As the emerging powers rise they are challenging the economic and security architecture developed by the US and other Western nations at the end of World War II. The Economic Crisis of 2008 provided the context and justification for an all-out assault on the Liberal Economic Order (LEO) which enable many developing and emerging economies to question the efficacy and fairness of the LEO. The institutions of global governance such as the Group of 20 (G20), UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Trade Organization are losing momentum in addition to credibility. “Where this trust deficit exists most notably, and most destructively, is between North and South [...] though the world is experiencing a profound transformation with more wealth and power being transferred to the South – especially to Asia – the North is still in control. However, the North now recognizes that it cannot properly address global challenges without the support and participation of the South.”⁵² Extreme partisanship, and thus political paralysis, combined with the growth of developing nations could also contribute to America's loss of clout in economic IGOs like the WTO. The emerging powers like China, Brazil, India, and others are challenging and reshaping the world economy and the institutions that govern it. The proposed BRICS Bank and the Silk Road Bank are the most demonstrable evidence of this, but whether it’s the Doha Round of the WTO or the policies of the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund, these institutions are under siege from developing countries and the emerging powers.

A similar assault is being made on the institutions charged with maintaining peace and security and managing disputes in the world. So whether it is the United Nations Security Council or NATO or the International Court of Justice the legitimacy of their actions and institutions themselves. Russia’s invasion of Crimea is the clearest example of this since it challenges the established norm of international law in the context of the European Union and NATO. In the post-World War II era and decolonization the number of nation states expanded dramatically. The most dramatic expansion occurred in the South and the East and the impact of these changes became manifest in representative international organizations like the United Nations. Another transformation and surge in the creation of nation states occurred end of the Cold War. This expansion of nation states has been extremely positive overall but it has served to greatly increase the diversity and challenges to the economic and security architecture that was created in the post-World War II era.

XIII. Policy Tsunamis: In modern society, an increasing number of political, natural, and social phenomena surface in one state but grow rapidly and sweep across the globe. As globalization intensifies, these transnational events will grow in their number and intensity and create what I term “policy tsunamis.” These policy problems appear on the policy landscape in one country and then grow in size and complexity as they sweep across the globe with devastating consequences. Globalization, with the help of the Internet, enhances interdependence among nations and people, thereby allowing citizens to demand more from power authorities within and beyond their borders. Yet, such interdependence can cause the spillover of policy problems,

⁵² Lehmann, Jean-Pierre. "Bridging the 21st Century's North-South Divide," The Globalist Perspective (blog), March 12, 2012.

creating contagion across the globe.⁵³ Only those countries that are able to identify, track, and analyze these transnational shock waves will be able to respond to them effectively.

The 2008 economic crisis, the Arab Spring, Wikileaks, and now ISIL/ISIS, caught policymakers and the public off guard. Bolton writes, “Several European governments which co-operated with the US are now predictably running for the tall grass, endangering the continuity of existing programs and damaging prospects for future co-operation.”⁵⁴ The Bradley Manning/WikiLeaks exposure of classified Pentagon and State Department cables is causing Europe to lose its trust in Washington’s ability to protect classified information. There have always been local events with global implications, but what is new is the speed and intensity with which these policy issues travel around the globe and rapidly reach a crisis stage. The key dimension of the policy tsunami is its speed, which will require a new approach to analyzing and responding to policy issues when they arise – perhaps through more proactive, predictive analysis targeting key national, regional, and global trends. The unfortunate new reality is that many think tanks and policy makes will only understand what has happened long after the impact has been realized.

XIV. Increasing Political Polarization: National politics are increasingly polarized in many countries around the globe, a trend that has increased the paralysis and policy gridlock in many legislative bodies. Political battle lines are now drawn between polar opposites: Liberal vs. Conservative, Secular vs. Fundamentalist, Political Reform vs. Tighter Government Control, Reduced Government Spending (Austerity) vs. Increased Government Spending (Stimulus). And while we have always had conflicting priorities and worldviews, they are now more extreme in nature. This increased political polarization has made it difficult – if not impossible – to find common ground or to reach consensus on many of the critical policy issues of our time.

As in the United States, Latin American countries are increasingly politically polarized. Paraguay, El Salvador and Venezuela have deeply polarized political parties, rendering debates about programs and proposed ideas as little more than rhetoric and political posturing.⁵⁵

This growing political polarization manifests itself in the creation of new think tanks, as well. Before World War II, about 45 think tanks existed in the United States, compared to over 1,800 today.⁵⁶ With so many think tanks to compete for funding and public recognition, civil society organizations (CSOs) must distinguish themselves from the rest. “As such distinctions become increasingly narrow, institutions have found that they can stand out by adopting a more strident ideological bent – a practice that had led to think tanks’ increasing politicization.”⁵⁷ The Center

⁵³ Nancy Birdsall, Christian Meyer, and Alexis Sowa, "Global Markets, Global Citizens, and Global Governance in the 21st Century," *CGD Working Paper 329*, Center for Global Development, September 2013, accessed 5 January 2014, <http://www.cgdev.org/publication/global-markets-global-citizens-and-global-governance-21st-century-working-paper-329-0>.

⁵⁴ John Bolton. "Edward Snowden's leaks are a grave threat to US national security." *The Guardian*. June 18, 2013.

⁵⁵ Saalfeld, Peter. "Is the Internet Polarizing Politics?" *Big Think*. Last modified January 02, 2012. Accessed January 7, 2014.

⁵⁶ Chen, Edward. (2008) . "Soros-Funded Democratic Idea Factory Becomes Obama Policy Font ." *Bloomberg.com*. <http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=washingtonstory&sid=aF7fB1PF0NPg>.

⁵⁷ *Ibid*.

for American Progress (CAP), for example, created a 501(c)(4) that acts as a more political arm of the think tank.⁵⁸ However, as think tanks become more polarized, political stalemates can slow innovation of ideas and prevent CSOs from implementing progressive action.

Still, independent, objective think tanks can also help reduce polarization by providing unbiased research. Echt writes: “In polarized contexts research quality and academic rigour need to be emphasized, especially among think tanks that have close ties to different governments. In that way, think tanks contribute to reducing political polarization in the country by addressing structural critical issues and providing rigorous data and analysis. Research quality and good data are critical.”⁵⁹

In “Devaluing the Think Tank,” Tevi Troy succinctly summarizes this politicization: “lose an election, gain a think tank.”⁶⁰ He argues that though think tanks have become more and more influential in policy advocacy, they have concurrently evolved away from their original model as a “university without students.” These “do tanks” – namely those becoming “intellectual echo chambers” rather than “sources of policy analysis and intellectual innovation” – pose challenges and even dangers to our time, in which reliable research and original thinking are needed.⁶¹

As Andrew Rich, author of “Think Tanks, Public Policy, and the Politics of Expertise,” has written, “the known ideological proclivities of many, especially newer think tanks, and their aggressive efforts to obtain high profiles have come to undermine the credibility with which experts and expertise are generally viewed by public officials.”⁶² It is a pervasive worry that serious and original thinking has largely been lost, and while think tanks can continue to play a useful role, the proliferation of more – and more political – organizations, threaten the ability of think tanks to in fact fulfill such roles.⁶³ In several interviews, Tevi has expressed concern that the propagation of politicized think tanks has discounted the credibility of the think tank community as a whole. “To the extent to which people are picking up on that – that certain think tanks have partisan coloring to their approach or they are trying to help partisan efforts,” he observes, people will “discount the work of other think tanks.”⁶⁴

Although pessimistic, many scholars find it difficult to see a way out of this problem. According to Hoover’s director, John Raisian, “If you’re lucky, 20 percent of the time you’re looking at the analysis of the situation and 80 percent [...] at the politics of the situation. [...] This can be discouraging for those of us that are scholars because in the end, raw politics is going to

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Echt, Leandro. “A role for think tanks in polarized societies.” *Politics and Ideas*. Last modified March 09, 2013. Accessed January 7, 2014.

⁶⁰ Troy, Tevi. “Devaluing the Think Tank.” *National Affairs* 2012 (2012): 75-90.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Tevi Troy, *Think Tank Politics*. Washington Post, March 15, 2012 (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/think-tank-politics/2012/03/12/gIQAgrI0ES_story.html>).

⁶³ Robert Joustra, *Have Think Tanks stopped Thinking?* Cardus.ca. Jan. 10, 2012.

(<<http://www.cardus.ca/blog/2012/01/have-think-tanks-stopped-thinking>>).

⁶⁴ Elahe Izadi, *The Political War Over Think Tanks*, NationalJournal.com. May 9, 2013.

(<<http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/the-political-war-over-think-tanks-20130509>>).

determine the outcome.”⁶⁵ This shift is upending the role of think tanks, prompting some researchers to worry it is eroding trust in these institutions. Indeed, it now is difficult to tell the difference between truly objective advice on the one hand, and high-priced advocacy for political or private profit on the other. Some say Washington’s once-heralded “ideas industry” steadily looks like a “think tank-industrial complex.”⁶⁶

XV. Short Termism: Today, many politicians choose to focus on short-term issues and crises rather than addressing the large looming crises that are just ahead. Short-termism is, in part, a result of the culture of Western society. Many politicians are choosing not to face major policy issues like aging or declining populations, climate change, and sovereign debt, among others. These issues put their nations at risk because they would rather dodge and defer the issue in order to ensure their reelections. “Politics, technology, and human nature all militate in favour of kicking the can down the road. The most severe financial and economic crisis in more than half a century has further discouraged policymakers from raising their eyes from the present to the distant horizon.”⁶⁷ Indeed, George Papandreou, former Prime Minister of Greece has stated, “Citizens feel alienated with conventional politics and frustrated by the absence of effective policies that serve societies' needs.”⁶⁸ Think tanks are increasingly viewed as part of the problem in not forcing policymakers to address these issues and in failing to pressure elected leaders to take action.

Think tanks can alter their tendency for short-termism by determining realistic measurable targets for combating long-term transnational problems. In conjunction with NGOs, they can also function as watchdogs and apply more pressure to governments to act in the long term by producing reports that discuss the grave consequences of inaction. IGOs, NGOs, and think tanks can also begin the process of international cooperation by working together to effectively address some of the large looming crises of today, such as the world’s aging population, sustainable growth, ensuring funding for transport and energy infrastructure, and reshaping international institutions to better represent the modern, globalized world.

Emerging Issues and Trends Facing Think Tanks

There are a number of issues/trends facing think tanks that have not received as much attention in comparison to other NGOs. Outlined below are a few potential areas of inquiry that require additional research and debate:

⁶⁵ Hoover: *Challenge for Think Tanks is More Research, Less Politics*. Think Tanked. May 26, 2010. <<http://www.thinktankedblog.com/think-tanked/2010/05/hoover-challenge-for-think-tanks-is-more-research-less-politics.html>>).

⁶⁶ By Bryan Bender, Many D.C. think tanks now players in partisan wars, *The Boston Globe*, August 11, 2013, <http://www.bostonglobe.com/news/nation/2013/08/10/brain-trust-for-sale-the-growing-footprint-washington-think-tank-industrial-complex/7ZifHfrLPlbz0bSeVOZHdI/story.html>

⁶⁷ Anderson, Victor. "Addressing short-termism in government and politics." *The Guardian*. Last modified March 02, 2011. Accessed January 7, 2014.

⁶⁸ Papandreou, George. "Rediscover the Lost Art of Democracy." *CNN*. Cable News Network, 20 Oct. 2013. Web. 25 Oct. 2013.

I. Dramatic Shifts in Funding Patterns: National, regional, and local governments have cut their funding for public policy research while corporations and private foundations have limited their grant-making to project-specific support. The 2008 economic crisis sparked a considerable shift in sources of think-tank funding. According to Alejandro Chafuen's "Think Tanks for Freedom: A Snapshot of the U.S. Market," foundations served as the largest source of support to think tanks until 2011. Throughout the last three years, however, donations made by individuals have replaced foundations as the most prominent source of funding. On average, corporations contribute approximately 10 percent of the revenue granted to the institutes that participated within Chafuen's sample. This is down from 18 percent since 2000. Roughly half of the organizations reported that individual donors are the largest source of support. Just 2 percent of institutional funding can be attributed to sources other than individuals (48 percent) and foundations (40 percent), most of which are magazine subscriptions to think tank publications.⁶⁹ Decreased funding and operating support has put think tanks at risk of supporting the status quo in policy debate, rather than providing alternatives.⁷⁰ Nobel laureates Professor James Rothman of Yale University, Professor Randy Sheckman of the University of California, Berkeley, and Professor Thomas Suedhof of Stanford University say that government budget cuts threaten research and undermine the overall outcomes of the institutions' research.⁷¹ Think tanks in Central America, Central and South Asia, Sub-Saharan African and Central and Eastern Europe have been particularly hard-hit by the economic downturn, both for economic reasons and because many of these countries lack the local funding options available to think tanks elsewhere because of a weaker culture of philanthropy.⁷²

Although diminished funding may perhaps jeopardize innovation with respect to policy research and prescriptions, it is equally important to recognize that funding of any amount tends to influence the particular research agenda that a think tank pursues. It is, therefore, critical that policy institutes implement the systems and procedures necessary to safeguard the integrity and independence of the work they produce. In addition to such internal measures, it is suggested that think tanks maintain a wide variety and a large number of donors, so as to further avoid a situation in which those whom comprise these policy institutes feel beholden to government or other narrow special interests.⁷³ Think tanks are often viewed as non-partisan, non-biased sources, though the sources of funding can influence a think tank's focus. Kathleen Clark, a professor at Washington University and political ethics expert said, "If you're a lobbyist, whatever you say is heavily discounted. If a think tank is saying it, it obviously sounds a lot

⁶⁹ Alejandro Chafuen, Think Tanks For Freedom: A Snapshot Of The U.S. Market. Forbes. Feb. 2, 2013. <<http://www.forbes.com/sites/alejandrochafuen/2013/02/13/think-tanks-for-freedom-a-snapshot-of-the-u-s-market/>>

⁷⁰ Euro Think Tank Summit Report, from Regional and International of 20 November 2012.

⁷¹ Elizabeth Lopatto, "American Nobel Winners Say Research Threatened by Cuts," *Bloomberg*, 8 October 2013, accessed 5 January 2014, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-10-08/american-nobel-winners-fear-for-research-as-funding-cut.html>.

⁷² Makoni, Munyaradzi. "African Think Tanks Feel Funding Pinch." *ResearchResearch.com*. ResearchResearch Limited, 28 Jan. 2013. Web. 25 Oct. 2013.

⁷³ McGann, James. "Think Tanks: Catalyst for Ideas and Action." *Diplomatic Courier*.

better. Maybe think tanks aren't aware of how useful that makes them to private interests. On the other hand, maybe it's part of their revenue model."⁷⁴

Keeping donors happy is more important now than ever, for if an organization's backers do not see desirable results, they have an increasingly vast array of alternative organizations to support. One particular negative outcome of this trend is the potential for political donor pressure to lead to self-censorship among both individual scholars and think tanks as institutions. A researcher may be unlikely to write an essay or publish a study that he knows will upset a boss or donor. For instance, the American Security Project's Michael Cohen noted last June in the *New Republic* that the Center for American Progress's Wonk Room blog had not run a single story about the Afghanistan war in the prior five months. During the Bush years, CAP had frequently taken up the war and been an vocal critic of the administration's policies; once Obama more or less continued those policies, however, CAP fell silent.⁷⁵ Experiences such as the one at CAP demonstrates that funders may have the capacity to shape and influence projects pursued and opinions espoused by research institutions, which could potentially harm their long-run objectivity.

In response to the steady decrease in think tank funding, and the increasing politicization such has caused, Enrique Mendizabal suggests transforming funding into organizational development grants, which would hypothetically support three specific areas: (1) quality control of research products; (2) increased communications and advocacy capacity; and, (3) internal institutional development and governance. This change, he argues, will "turn our core grants into development vehicles."⁷⁶

II. Increased Specialization: Specialized institutions and programs are attractive to funders who want to target their dollars at specific problems or issues. In fact, the increasingly desperate demand for funding may arguably be the most prominent factor facilitating the specialization of think tanks. This trend toward increased specialization has had a direct impact on the programs, constituencies, and funding sources of multi-purpose policy organizations, thereby increasing competition among think tanks. It has become increasingly difficult for think tanks to convince prospective funders that their programs are worthy of support. Moreover, increased specialization discourages interdisciplinary responses to complex issues and limits the creativity of scholars.⁷⁷ As think tanks become more specialized, they tend to focus their research according to topic. Organizations such as the National Taxpayers Union or the Health Care Cost Institute are single-focus think tanks. Others focus on a small number of issues, like the Pacific

⁷⁴ Silverstein, Ken. "The Secret Donors Behind the Center for American Progress and Other Think Tanks [Updated on 5/24]." *The Nation*. <http://www.thenation.com/article/174437/secret-donors-behind-center-american-progress-and-other-think-tanks-updated-524>

⁷⁵ Tevi Troy, "Devaluing the Think Tank" *National Affairs*, Issue No. 10 (Winter 2012), accessed 18 May 2014, <http://www.nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/devaluing-the-think-tank>.

⁷⁶ Enrique Mendizabal, *Supporting think tanks series: From core and institutional support to organizational development grants*. Onthinktanks.org. June 3, 2013, <http://onthinktanks.org/2013/06/03/supporting-think-tanks-series-from-core-and-institutional-support-to-organizational-development-grants/>.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

Research Institute (education, technology, and healthcare) or the Employment Policies Institute (health insurance and labor compensation).

Similarly, some think tanks take on a particular regional focus. Institutions such as the Middle East Forum, the National Bureau of Asian Research, and the large number of state-based think tanks in the United States narrow their research scope according to issues pertinent to a given geographic area of focus. And finally, a third way in which think tanks have become increasingly specialized is according to political ideologies: libertarian, left-liberal, conservative, and religiously-based are a few examples.⁷⁸ Notably, the increased specialization of think tanks often results in greater funding confidence that donors' money is directed toward issues they support.

One negative outcome of specialization is blindness to the interdisciplinary methods for solving issues from a multiplicity of angles. Think tanks are “embracing specialization as a means of distinguishing themselves from the competition”⁷⁹ – but specialization, while providing think tanks with an edge in particular areas and fields, discourages interdisciplinary responses. Globalization not only enhances interdependence among countries, it also intensifies interdisciplinary approaches to global issues. For example, the study of “south-south” cooperation and transfer is “an interdisciplinary undertaking.”⁸⁰ To render complex issues, adopting interdisciplinary approaches would align with the complex nature of these issues. Specialization limits the exhaustion of possible policy suggestions of scholars, making these suggestions less applicable and practical.

III. Increased Competition: Think tanks have embraced specialization as a means of distinguishing themselves from the competition. Not only has the increase in think tanks resulted in greater competition, but also the influence of organizations such as consulting and law firms have heightened the competition in kind. By distinguishing an organization and developing a specific niche, a think tank proves its legitimacy in the policy dialogue. This branding has taken the form of functional, political, and issue specialization that helps market these institutions to donors who are increasingly providing project-specific support to policymakers and to the public, who are trying to make sense of the crowded marketplace of ideas and institutions. To really strengthen competitiveness, think tanks could diversify “across many specializations.”⁸¹ By diversifying and expanding their niches, think tanks can provide suggestions from a more holistic and well-rounded approach. Approaching or employing fewer think tanks for policy advice and consultation would be more convenient and cost efficient for policymakers to draft

⁷⁸ Edward Lopez, “Ranking Think Tanks: The Challenge of Specialization.” *Political Entrepreneurs*, 19 Mar. 2013, accessed 18 May 2014, <http://politicalentrepreneurs.com/ranking-think-tanks-the-challenge-of-specialization/>.

⁷⁹ McGann, James “Think Tank Challenge: Surviving the Competition,” *Asia Pathways*, Asian Development Bank Institute, 20 August 2013, accessed 6 January 2014, <http://www.asiapathways-adbi.org/2013/08/think-tank-challenge-surviving-the-competition/>.

⁸⁰ Tavis D. Jules and Michelle Morais De Sá E Silva, “How Different Disciplines Have Approached South-South Cooperation and Transfer,” *Society for International Education Journal*, Vol. 5, Issue 1 (2008): 45, accessed 6 January 2014, http://www.tc.columbia.edu/sie/journal/Volume_5/jules.pdf.

⁸¹ Jeremy D. Taylor, “The Dilemma of Specialization vs. Diversification,” *Western Independent Bankers*, issue no. 67 (January 2013), accessed 6 January 2014, http://www.wib.org/publications_resources/directors_resources/directors_digest/jan13/taylor.html.

policies with external help. Moreover, most policies require interdisciplinary responses, and there is a surplus of specialized think tanks.⁸² Merging, acquisition, or collaboration of think tanks is one possible way forward.

Despite the interdisciplinary nature of policy, the vast majority of the think tanks that have come into existence in the last 30 years have been focused on a single issue or area of policy research. More recently, think tanks have faced a new competitive threat from consulting firms, law firms, advocacy groups, and cable news networks that now directly compete with think tanks for gifts, grants, and contracts. Similarly, many colleges and universities are encouraging the growth of policy and research centers, which further heighten competition for conventional think tanks.⁸³

IV. Influence and Independence: As think tanks become more visible and influential, some organizations appear to be losing their voice and independence along the way. Managing the tensions associated with relevance, influence, and independence is a delicate balancing act that must be carefully finessed if think tanks are to maintain their credibility with policymakers and the public. Of particular hindrance is the fact that think tanks seldom publish critiques or objective studies on their own work.⁸⁴ Evaluating success and overall impact is another great challenge for think tanks. Dr. Andrew Selee, Executive Vice President at the Wilson Center in Washington D.C., notes that the evaluation of success through tracking outputs, such as data on publications, media citations, and speeches, is an essential component to directing and focusing research and policy initiatives. With collected evidence of outcomes, a think tank must look specifically at the original goals and mission of the project and organization as a whole; however, given the ever-shifting terrain of policymaking, it is crucial for think tanks to be nimble and adapt to this changing landscape.⁸⁵ Thus, by consistently evaluating and reevaluating an organization's impact, scholars and leaders in the organization can develop an open dialogue over the organizations' successes and failures and better anticipate the shifting tides of policymaking and advocacy.

V. Outputs vs. Impact: Historically, think tanks have placed a focus on output over impact. How do think tanks measure their impact? For many institutions, it is limited to the number of books and policy briefs produced rather than providing the impetus for new legislation or changes in policy.⁸⁶ This issue is further complicated by donors, who are increasingly interested in supporting "high impact organizations" and want think tanks to demonstrate their impact on public policy. "High impact" aims often result in high pressure environments in which scholars feel that their success rests on the capacity to alter policy or seriously impact the policy-decision making process. Dr. Andrew Selee of the Wilson Center argues that think tanks, like

⁸² "A Q&A With Dr. McGann on the 2012 Go To Report and Chinese Think Tanks," Think Tanks & Civil Societies Program, 18 July 2013, accessed 6 January 2014, <http://gotothinktank.com/a-qa-with-dr-mcgann-on-the-2012-go-to-report-and-chinese-think-tanks/>

⁸³ Chafuen, Alejandro. "Think Tanks In America: Occupying A Unique Space." *Forbes*. Forbes Magazine, 10 Apr. 2013. Web. 21 Oct. 2013.

⁸⁴ Ibid

⁸⁵ Andrew Selee, "Can Think Tanks Influence Public Opinion and Improve Policy?" *The World Financial Review*, 13 July 2013, accessed 15 July 2014, <http://www.worldfinancialreview.com/?p=696>.

⁸⁶ Chafuen, Alejandro. "15 Ways Of Measuring Think Tank Policy Outcomes." *Forbes*. Forbes Magazine, 24 Apr. 2013. Web. 21 Oct. 2013.

corporations and non-profits, need to develop methods of success evaluation that provide constructive learning experiences for their scholars. He argues that measurement is quite difficult given the desire to succeed in high-impact circumstances. It is crucial to view success through various lenses and look at impact on relative, not absolute, grounds.⁸⁷ Limiting the pressure to have “high impact” in all outcomes and evaluating impact through a variety of mechanisms and measurements will ultimately foster a more open research environment. Moreover, by mitigating pressure from donors, think tank scholars have more breadth to research and collaborate.

One effective measurement tool is to look at impact indicators through a moderated “intermediate” lens. Many of the “impact indicators” are more focused on intermediate outcomes, such as the “number of citations,” rather than ultimate outcomes, such as the “number of people helped by a new policy.”⁸⁸ This trend toward intermediate measures is one method to effectively measure impact in smaller, short-term circumstances. The majority of the potential readers prefer quantitative monitoring and evaluation (M&E) because it is a “practical translation of a focus on outcomes,” while the quantitative M&E cannot capture “all the nuances of a policy effort.”⁸⁹

VI. Phantom NGO Think Tanks: Governments are creating think tanks designed to appear to be non-governmental organizations, but are in fact arms of the government. Likewise, corporations and individuals have established think tanks to promote their special interests. This trend raises concerns about a lack of transparency and private interests masquerading as public interest. In Britain, the Guardian’s combative George Montbiot has written a number of pieces warning “secretive think tanks are crushing our democracy” by engaging in “secret corporate lobbying.”⁹⁰ And this is not a concern to which the United States is immune. In fact, Washington, D.C. is becoming a hotbed for such think tanks: those that act more like lobbying and public relations bodies than sources of independent ideas or policy critique.⁹¹ Moreover, the overlap between think tanks and Washington’s political realm demonstrates the pervasive influence of partisanship into scholarship. For example, former Republican Senator Jim DeMint’s appointment as president of the Heritage Foundation in 2013 provoked questions about the Foundation’s overt politicization and its failure to “separate intellectual inquiry from raw partisan politics.”⁹²

Many think tanks in the United States that are tax-exempt under their 501(c)(3) status now feature affiliated, non-tax-exempt lobbying arms.⁹³ It ought not to come as a surprise, then, that

⁸⁷ Andrew Selee, "Can Think Tanks Influence Public Opinion and Improve Policy?"

⁸⁸ “Helping Think Tanks Measure Impact,” Redstone Strategy Group, 15 September 2013, accessed 6 January 2014, <http://www.redstonestrategy.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/2013-09-30-IDRC-Helping-think-tanks-measure-impact.pdf>.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Montbiot, George. 2006. Who’s Paying? <http://bit.ly/LcQnKC>.)

⁹¹ Bartlett, Bruce. "The Alarming Corruption of the Think Tanks." *TheFiscalTimes.com*. The Fiscal Times, 14 Dec. 2012. Web. 21 Oct. 2013.

⁹² Jennifer Rubin, "Jim DeMint’s Destruction of the Heritage Foundation," *The Washington Post*, 21 October 2011, accessed 6 January 2014, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/right-turn/wp/2013/10/21/jim-demints-destruction-of-the-heritage-foundation/>.

⁹³ Ibid

“calls for more think tank transparency grew louder in the US” in late 2013, echoing Nobel Prize winner Paul Krugman and “a broad range of other commentators from across the political spectrum” who “have long called on think tanks to reveal their funders.”⁹⁴ Although this public criticism led the Center for American Progress to release a list of its funders, other organizations such as the Heartland Institute argued for “continued opacity,” citing “donors’ right to privacy.”⁹⁵ Yet these latter organizations are not to be perceived as the exception, as Harvard University’s Brooke Williams has recently found that one-third of America’s top 50 think tanks do not disclose their donors.

More critics of think tanks question the motivations behind their policy research. Dr. Gerry Hassan, a research fellow at the University of the West of Scotland argues that an outright analysis of the audience think tanks are serving would highlight that think tanks have a vested interest in catering to corporate interests, accountancy firms, and lobbyists. He critiques that few of the policies supported by think tanks have aided the general populace.⁹⁶ Hassan’s criticism highlights a general skepticism around the objectivity of think tanks due to their donor’s influence; however, given the vast array of donors, it would be impossible to tailor research and advocacy to the demands of all donors.

VII. Hybrid Organization: As think tanks have faced new challenges in the societies in which they operate, they have adapted and created hybrid institutions. Think tanks inherently occupy “an intermediate structural position” between academic, political, economic, and media outlets, and this overlap has often made their precise definition difficult.⁹⁷ More and more think tanks are a blend of organizational types (academic research center, consulting group, marketing firm, and media outlet) and the roles of key staff have changed as well. The staff of think tank institutions is “comprised of multifaceted individuals who are part scholar, journalist, marketing executive, and policy entrepreneur.”⁹⁸ Think tank budgets and staffing patterns now place as much emphasis on policy research as they do on promoting it and the scholars who conduct it. In fact, the functions that think tanks now assume have become so multi-faceted and heterogeneous that scholars Donald E. Abelson and Christine M. Carberry note that aside from “acknowledge[ing] that think tanks are nonprofit, nonpartisan organizations engaged in the study of public policy, few scholars have outlined other criteria which would allow them to distinguish think tanks from other types of non-governmental organizations.”⁹⁹

⁹⁴ Krugman, Paul. 2005. Think Tank Transparency. New York Times. <http://nyti.ms/1eKJIAw>.

⁹⁵ Yeager, Holly. 2013. Center for American Progress releases donor list. The Washington Post. <http://wapo.st/1dnECHU>; Heartland Institute. 2013. Reply to our Critics. The Heartland Institute. <http://bit.ly/11BSbdF>

⁹⁶ Gerry Hassan, "The Limits of the 'Think Tank' Revolution," *Open Democracy*, 8 Sept. 2008, accessed 18 May 2014, <http://www.opendemocracy.net/article/yes/the-limits-of-the-think-tank-revolution>.

⁹⁷ Medvetz, Tom. "Think Tanks as an Emergent Field." (2008): n. pag. Social Science Research Council. Web. 23 Oct. 2013.

⁹⁸ McGann, James “Shanghai and Beijing, China August 2013,” *Global Trends and Transitions in Think Tanks and Policy Advice*, Think Tanks & Civil Societies Program, accessed 6 January 2014.

⁹⁹ Abelson, Donald E., and Christine M. Carberry. 1998. “Following Suit or Falling Behind? A Comparative Analysis of Think Tanks in Canada and the United States.” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 31.3: 525-55. Web.)

VIII. Impact of the Internet, New Media, Social Networking, and the Cloud: Information no longer translates into power unless it is in the right form at the right time, and in the right hands. The globalization, internet, 24/7 cable news networks and social are redefining how think tanks operate. In the past think tanks would come up with grand strategies and big ideas and policy makers would beat a path to their door. Today in information rich environment think tanks must develop effective dissemination and external relations strategies for their research and analysis to policymakers and the public. This task is made even more difficult by the fact that busy policymakers, on average, only have 30 minutes a day to read which precludes reading books, journal articles and detailed white papers. Add the increasing reliance on mobile devices into this mix and you begin to understand how profoundly the world of ideas and think tanks has changed. A recent report by the World Bank underscores this issue when it revealed that Nearly one-third of their PDF reports had never been downloaded, not even once. Another 40 percent of their reports had been downloaded fewer than 100 times. Only 13 percent had seen more than 250 downloads in their lifetimes.¹⁰⁰ Add the increasing reliance on mobile devices into this mix and you begin to understand how profoundly the world of think tanks has changed. Heritage Foundation was way ahead of the curve on this when they proposed the Reagan International Airport to Capitol Hill and the briefcase test. This time and length requirement was applied by Heritage to all of its policy products. Every product must be able to fit into a briefcase and be able to be read and digested on the trip from the airport to Capitol Hill. Most think tanks now have websites and conduct policy debates via the Internet. Yet this digital development has not been without challenges, also described as “digital disruption.”¹⁰¹ Among the host of challenges now faced by think tanks is the pressure to increase the speed of searching for, and disseminating, information, the rising levels of global competition, and the elevated difficulty in sustaining internal communications.

A Pew Research Center poll found that 70% of people in the United States use the Internet for news.¹⁰² The Internet, traditional & new media, and social networking sites are increasingly being used by the public to obtain daily news. The reality is that more and more people get their information from the Internet, traditional and new media, and through social networking sites. This reality requires that organizations reexamine how they create, disseminate, and discuss public policy issues. Organizations must also reconsider the methods they use to reach the constituents they represent and/or the clients they serve as well as produce academic-quality research that is understandable and accessible to policymakers and to the public. Mendizabal contends that devising a digital strategy is not only pertinent to communication, but to research and management as well. He notes “Twitter can be used to find information (research), disseminate it (communication), and keep team members connected and informed of a project’s

¹⁰⁰ Doemeland, Doerte; Trevino, James. 2014. *Which World Bank reports are widely read ?*. Policy Research working paper ; no. WPS 6851. Washington, DC: World Bank Group. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2014/05/19456376/world-bank-reports-widely-read-world-bank-reports-widely-read>.

¹⁰¹ *Topic Page: Digital strategy and tools for think tanks*. Onthinktanks.org. March 27, 2012 < <http://onthinktanks.org/2012/03/27/digital-disruption-the-internet-is-changing-how-we-search-for-information/>>.

¹⁰² Pew Research Center. "Do you ever get news online or not?" *Poll.orspub.com*. Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, 8 Aug. 2013. Web. 23 Oct. 2013.

activities (management).”¹⁰³ In order to maximize the potential that could be realized with respect to increased capacity, efficiency, and dissemination, Mendizabal adds, think tanks ought to tailor their engagement with contextually specific types of digital strategies.¹⁰⁴ The power of a well-constructed digital strategy, Nick Scott agrees, can “improve agility, buy time for under-resourced staff and provide additional opportunities for collaboration.”¹⁰⁵

This new reliance on the Internet also raises questions about the difference between visibility and influence for think tanks; often a think tank’s popularity on the Web does not translate into an ability to effect change.¹⁰⁶ These dramatic changes have transformed how public policies are analyzed and debated, and forced think tanks to keep pace with these changes or risk being buried by them. When considering how to increase the overall impact of an organization, the creation of accessible and comprehensible information is absolutely essential. Grupo FARO, a think tank in Ecuador, observes that the “gathering of evidence is not enough.” Findings and arguments need “to be communicated in a way that speaks to politicians and policy advisors (the top-down view of policy process) as well as to journalists and ordinary citizens (the bottom-up view).”¹⁰⁷ Evidence and in-depth research must evolve into narratives that can captivate and relate to a broader audience on a personal level. Social media and technology married with succinct and accessible analyses will ultimately foster knowledge sharing.

IX. Action vs. Ideas: Non-partisan, multi-purpose organizations are forced to abandon traditional methods of operation, such as dialogue and debate, and consider new methods as funders and other stakeholders in the policy process have grown impatient with conferences, forums, and seminars on public policy issues. This trend owes significantly to the influence of donors who now prefer operational, advocacy-oriented programs and institutions over conferences, forums, and seminars. Subrat Das, leader of the India-based Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability, spoke of the need for advocacy in effecting change: “If we want to achieve results or some impact...for that we need to reach out to the relevant stakeholders. We might do excellent quality research, and we might disseminate our research findings through our publications...and yet those might not reach out to the relevant stakeholders.”¹⁰⁸ One new method to reach out to these relevant stakeholders is through employing elements of games and applying them to another setting, such as funding. This process of “gamification,” currently being employed in business models in order to gauge funders and other stakeholders in the

¹⁰³ Enrique Mendizabal, Digital Think Tanks. *Onthinktanks.org*. June 14, 2012. <<http://onthinktanks.org/2012/06/14/digital-think-tanks/>>

¹⁰⁴ Enrique Mendizabal, Digital Think Tanks. *Onthinktanks.org*. June 14, 2012. <<http://onthinktanks.org/2012/06/14/digital-think-tanks/>>).

¹⁰⁵ Nick Scott. *Digital strategy can support communications in think tanks. But can it also improve their research and management too?* *Onthinktanks.org*. June 15, 2012.

¹⁰⁶ McNutt, Kathleen, and Gregory Marchildon. "Think Tanks and the Web: Measuring Visibility and Influence." *Canadian Public Policy* 35.2 (2009): 219-36. *Project MUSE*. Web. 20 Oct. 2013.

¹⁰⁷ Sami Atallah and Orazio Bellettini Cedeño, “Democracy Think Tanks in Action: Translating Research into Policy in Young and Emerging Democracies,” forum, Network of Democracy Research Institutes from National Endowment for Democracy, Washington D.C., 13 June 2013, accessed 15 July 2014, <http://www.ned.org/events/democracy-think-tanks-in-action-translating-research-into-policy-in-young-and-emerging-democr>.

¹⁰⁸ Das, Subrat. "Balancing Research and Advocacy: Subrat Das." Interview. *OnThinkTanks.org*. N.p., 3 Oct. 2013. Web. 24 Oct. 2013. <<http://onthinktanks.org/?s=advocacy>>.

policy process, could be an effective tool to increase involvement of funding partners and other key stakeholders in think tanks.¹⁰⁹ New policy-oriented institutions have out-marketed traditional policy research establishments that fail to understand and respond to the fundamental changes that have taken place in Washington and other capitals around the world.

X. Greater Emphasis on External Relations and Marketing Strategies: The rise of special interests and a need for a quick response to complex policy problems have created a greater demand for policy research and has fostered the growth of specialized public policy think tanks. This trend has placed greater emphasis on marketing strategies and external relations that effectively target key constituencies and donors. Think tanks must now develop strategies for “flexible output,” whereby they produce daily or weekly short form content, such as blog posts and social media updates, in addition to less frequent long form reports.¹¹⁰ Think tanks are forced to redesign their “products” so they can be disseminated to a number of strategically selected target audiences for the greatest impact.

In this new world, pithy, punchy policy briefs replace books, journals, and white papers in order to meet the time constraints of policymakers and the demand for a quick response to policy issues and problems. Four hundred-page books and reports now are reduced to a few pages or words if the material is disseminated as a text message or blog. These new realities pose immense challenges for think tanks that must adapt to these changes while not losing the quality and integrity of their research.

Additionally, some think tanks are becoming less involved in the creation of new knowledge and more concerned with “selling” their news.¹¹¹ For example, in 2008, the Center for American Progress used about half of its budget for communication and public outreach – that’s approximately eight times more than similar policy organizations spent.¹¹² With the creation of new knowledge being bested by the desire for think tanks to sell their “product,” research and policy initiatives that benefit civil society become less important. Furthermore, as more think tanks emerge in civil society, CSOs must increasingly compete through marketing strategies to obtain funding and public support.¹¹³

XI. Going Global: Think tanks are increasingly adopting a global presence, perspective and audience. The economist Joseph Stiglitz commented that think tanks must “scan globally and reinvent locally” if they are to be effective in today’s policy environment.¹¹⁴ This trend is driven, in part, by transnational issues such as global warming, proliferation of weapons of mass

¹⁰⁹ Natasha Singer, "You've Won a Badge (and Now We Know All About You)," *The New York Times*, 4 February 2012, accessed 4 January 2014, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/05/business/employers-and-brands-use-gaming-to-gauge-engagement.html?_r=0

¹¹⁰ Knezovich, Jeff, and Melissa Julian. "Taking Think Tank Communications to the next Level: Determining What Goes Where." *OnThinkTanks.org*. N.p., 8 Oct. 2013. Web. 24 Oct. 2013.

¹¹¹ See note 5.

¹¹² See note 11.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Stiglitz, Joseph. "Scan Globally, Reinvent Locally: Knowledge Infrastructure and the Localization of Knowledge." In *Banking on Knowledge: The Genesis of the Global Development Network*, 24-43. Ed. Diane Stone. London: Routledge, 2000.

destruction, pandemics, and terrorism. In recent years, a number of global think tanks (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the International Crisis Group, for example) have emerged in order to address global issues and serve a global audience of policymakers.

Additionally, there is an ever-increasing presence of newly founded think tanks in emerging markets.¹¹⁵ African think tanks are becoming more numerous, for example, though this is not to say that they are free of challenges. Many do not have a platform to set their own agenda. They are usually funded by foreign and international agencies and lack adequate funding to engage in long-term research programs, which effectively impinges upon their capacity to provide long-term policy prescriptions. Scholar Hussein Elkamel also underscores the difficulties experienced by African think tanks with respect to capacity building and independence, as well as challenges that result from being established within a fragile marketplace.¹¹⁶ In light of these challenges, many suggest that think tanks throughout Africa ought to aim to establish domestic funding, as well as to invest in communication strategies in order to more efficiently articulate research findings to policymakers. It is also important, many scholars contend, that such think tanks collaborate and build alliances with other think tanks – in the global North and South – in order to share best practices. Digital communication strategies are likely to facilitate and proliferate this spirit of cooperation and partnership.¹¹⁷

Numerous think tanks are trying to cultivate stronger ties to counterpart organizations within their region and around the world. The emergence of regional economic alliances – largely the result of global interdependence – has created a new network of regionally-oriented policy institutions. But these organizations tend to be the same ones that find it difficult to compete with the highly specialized organizations with a clear market niche and constituency.

XII. Leadership and Managing Tensions: An unprecedented number of think tank executives are retiring or stepping down. Many of these leaders founded and/or led the think tanks for many years, so the impact and transitions are likely to be problematic. Leadership in a non-profit think tank is different from ownership of a for-profit organization. There are no actual shares or stakeholders. When that happens they become known as quasi owners, or “spiritual owners.” The degree of ownership is in relation to the amount contributed, which incurs the problem of how to retain the talents and resources through a leadership transition. Often high-profile, well-respected leaders “outperform their own organizations” in readership: Augustin Etchebarne, leader of an Argentinian think tank, has 33,000 Twitter followers, while his think tank has only 8,000.¹¹⁸ The loss of such prolific leaders could reduce the audience that think tanks are able to reach. Key institutions like RAND, Peterson Institute for International Economics, Urban Institute, and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars have all seen leadership changes in recent

¹¹⁵ The Economist. "Emerging Markets: The Rise of Emerging-market Think-tanks." *Economist.com*. The Economist Newspaper, 26 Jan. 2011. Web. 21 Oct. 2013.

¹¹⁶ Hussein Elkamel, A presentation on Nov. 2010.

<http://www.thinktanking.idsc.gov.eg/InternatioanlConf/Opening%20Session/Session%201/Elkamel/Information%20Report_Ambassador%20Elkamel%20final.pdf>).

¹¹⁷ Enrique Mendizabal, *How a digital strategy can enhance think tank management, research and communication?* Onthinktanks.org. June 21, 2012 <<http://onthinktanks.org/2012/06/21/how-a-digital-strategy-can-enhance-think-tank-management-research-and-communication/>>

¹¹⁸ See Note 6

months, and others like the Heritage Foundation and the Brookings Institute are planning for a transition to new leadership. The issue is more severe in Africa and Eastern and Central Europe where the senior staffs are very small. Transitions there can have a far greater impact on the organizations at hand.

The success of later generations of leadership – whether of governments or other institutions – is never easy, but it is nonetheless essential. One bad hire or a rocky transition can cripple an organization for years. Even when the search for an executive is successful, the institution will face a range of challenges that will require careful management by the governing board. New leaders will face new challenges. As scholar Andrea Moncada notes, “Increased competition, donor expectations, the 24-hour news cycle and the expectation to respond to politics” will place a strain on think tanks, particularly those with new directors who “do not have the same relationship with donors as their predecessors did.” In this situation, Moncada continues, research produced may be “in danger of being dictated by politics,” as new leadership will not maintain the leverage necessary to resist donor requests.¹¹⁹

Thus, such think tanks will be required to deal with the continuing challenge of managing the tensions between influence and independence, rigor and relevance, degree of specialization, breadth, and depth in the range of issues they seek to address between continuity and change in pursuing those issues, and ultimately, having an impact on policy and the lives of the people in the countries in which they operate.

XIII. Decentralization of Power: The decentralization of power has served to engage average citizens in a range of political and social movements, in turn transforming national and global politics. States no longer have a monopoly on power. The knitting needles of globalization – trade, finance, technology, and traditional and new media – are inexorable forces that go beyond the control of any state, leading to the decentralization of power.

Although it’s often positively associated, the decentralization of power can be an issue for think tanks. “While information wants to be free, knowledge is much ‘stickier’-harder to communicate, more subjective, less easy to define.”¹²⁰ This leads to complications within the consistency, value, and seriousness of information. Not only that, but the constant access to public information that is used within the political sphere enables the increased actions taken by terrorist and demagogues. Globalization caused terrorism to change the nature of time in this changing world¹²¹, especially after the Cold War marked a shift in international arrangements. Direct action against this requires “a multilateral response, which further solidifies all centralized organizations and results in a more centralized international system to combat the threat from decentralized and autonomous networks of disaffected individuals”.¹²² Since the global political

¹¹⁹ Andrea Moncada, New blood means new challenges for U.S. think tanks. Onthintanks.org. June 12, 2012.

<<http://onthintanks.org/2012/06/12/new-blood-means-new-challenges-for-u-s-think-tanks/>>).

¹²⁰ Gates, B. (2006) ‘The Road Ahead’. Newsweek Jan 25.2006

¹²¹ *Terrorism in The Context of Globalization*: Web URL: zmne.hu/aarms/docs/Volume9/Issue1/pdf/01.pdf

¹²² Hamilton & Gray 2012, *Decentralized Terrorism: Ramifications for a Centralized International System*, Global Security Studies, Spring 2012, Volume 3, Issue 2.

realm is becoming more decentralized, centralization efforts that battle terrorism are few and far between. These are some of the issues think tanks battle with the decentralization of power.

XIV. Blurring of the Lines between Think Tanks and Journalism. Recently, a combination of circumstances has led to increasing blurring of the lines between think tanks and journalism. A perfect example that reflects this emerging issue of global journalistic think tanks is the “Thinking about Think Tanks” event located in the Fletcher School at Tufts University that took place on October 14, 2014. The conference was organized and chaired by Brooke Williams, who, according to the conference schedule, is a member of Harvard University’s Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics. However, a quick search indicates that Brooke Williams is also an award winning investigative reporter¹²³ who plans to investigate think tanks during her fellowship at Harvard.

This severe blurring of the lines occurs between journalist and scholars. And though “journalists [...] are not traditionally valued in think tanks, [...] think tanks are in journalism more to promote ideas than to inform the public or expose wrongdoing”.¹²⁴ Still, these odd and potentially troubling developments can increase the difficulties of keeping journalism and think tanks in their separate lanes, particularly when conflicts-of-interest may arise.

How can this occurrence be seen any different than when Doug Brandow, who in 2005 was also represented and introduced as a scholar from Cato, attended an event for scholars but ended up involving corporate beneficiaries within his testimony? The essence of using a scholarly event to perform lobbying activities is, therefore, a re-occurring event that deserves attention and classification as an emerging issue for think tanks.

There is no grudge or prejudice involved within the writings of this trend; we all have our own variety of affiliations. However, there is something troubling about this specific trend. The existence of another dimension to the current crisis we are now experiencing certainly needs to be addressed for further exploration, for “a relationship that used to be symbiotic [...] is becoming competitive.”¹²⁵ “Think tanks are doing journalism [...] deskbound journalists, meanwhile, are embracing data and spreadsheets. [...] Think tank journalism comes closest to the traditional sort when it is in the field...spend[ing] their days crunching data and attending meetings.”¹²⁶ By using methods dedicated and devoted to think tanks, the lines between journalism and think tanks become blurred, leading to damaging consequences.

There is a reason why certain journalists try to imitate and mimic the think tank methods and infiltrate into the true scholarly world. Journalists sense their job opportunities starting to shrivel

¹²³ Brooke Williams." Brooke Williams. Accessed October 27, 2014.

<http://ethics.harvard.edu/people/brooke-williams>.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ “Making the Headlines." The Economist. September 20, 2014. Accessed October 27, 2014.

<http://www.economist.com/news/international/21618824-divide-between-having-ideas-and-reporting-them-dissolving-making-headlines>

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

in the traditional media, while new media is starting to take the forefront in journalism.¹²⁷ “For politicians, policymakers, and readers, more journalism means more information and choice. Inaccuracies can be quickly challenged and there is always a second opinion. For journalists, the news is not so good. Twitter, blogs, and newsletters can get a think tank’s ideas to its audience direct,”¹²⁸ cutting out the middleman and endangering the jobs for journalists.

Additionally, there is other competition with think tanks, making this issue such an important one. In addition to competing with one another, think tanks are now also competing with large law firms, consulting firms, and advocacy groups who are trying to diversify and increase their market share in non-traditional markets. They are all blurring the lines so they can compete head-to-head with think tanks for the same audience and scarce resources. This think-tank issue endangers the specification of think tanks by the blurring of the lines, which can lead to further negativities in regards to methods, opportunities, and other elements that are involved with think tanks.

XVI. Global Gridlock: In regards to political actions, major global issues that need to be addressed are being politically avoided via escape routes. These escape routes disconnect politicians from addressing long-term issues, establishing gridlock at the national and global levels. Popular examples of current global gridlocks are those of the economy, the environment, and security¹²⁹. The increasing multipolarity and differences that are refused to be put aside in a political setting turns into a classic definition of a stalemate where either insignificant actions are taken by leading powers amidst long term issues, or no actions at all. In regards to world powers that have become unable to make big decisions, “its incentive to invest in international institutions and other global public goods is smaller when it can’t easily set the agenda and reap the largest benefits”, exemplifying how the multipolarity can lead to smaller care in investing in global institutions. That is one of the major consequences of global gridlock, with its most predominant reason polarization. Although this is visible for the untrained eye, as the Republican sweep in November can be regarded as an action by the untrained individuals to break the gridlock by making one party a majority in both houses, there are also additional causes that lay under the surface and are not as easy to spot. Such issues differ per situation and legislative system per nation, but a few examples of continuing political gridlock could be “institutional inertia,” the complexity of resolving problems intertwined with domestic policies instead of clear, federal regulations, and the rapid increase of different institutions with each its different voice spreading out the issues resulting into partial answers, but no complete one.¹³⁰

An example of gridlock on a global level is the attempt of targeting global climate change and the ineffectiveness to address this issue, also popularly known to researchers as the “super-

¹²⁷ Related to point no. 8 in the Merging Issues Section of this piece.

¹²⁸ “Making the Headlines.” The Economist. September 20, 2014. Accessed October 27, 2014. <http://www.economist.com/news/international/21618824-divide-between-having-ideas-and-reporting-them-dissolving-making-headlines>

¹²⁹ Victor, David G. "Gridlock: Why Global Cooperation Is Failing when We Need It Most. By Hale Thomas, Held David, and Young Kevin. Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2013. 368

¹³⁰ Ibid.

wicked problem.”¹³¹ The polarization on this issue can be shown via the amount of mentions of climate change as an important issue: in a research made by the Sunlight Foundation showed that “...almost three-fourths of climate change mentions-74 percent-were by members of the democratic caucus.”¹³² The polarization long national and international gridlocks have caused lack of leading powers to take actions amidst long-term crises.

However, as of November 12, a major U.S.-China climate agreement has been made seeming to end one particular aspect of global gridlock. But this agreement, which is supposed to control the pollution, is also forged in a political gridlock, as this agreement doesn't require Beijing to restrict its carbon emissions for 16 years.¹³³ Therefore, it cannot be considered a unanimous agreement, but a gridlocked compromise.

XVII. Crisis Fatigue: Like global gridlock, crisis fatigue installs itself via the costs, fatigue, and political issues that create the lack of leading powers to take actions amidst crises. Although global gridlock focuses on long-term issues, crisis fatigue is centered on the aspect of short-term issues.

Crisis fatigue occurs when a clash, which has to be resolved swiftly, oversteps its timely boundaries and makes things longer than they should take. This leads to a sort of fatigue, which drops faith and moral in the cause. The continuation of continuing to affect the crisis needs re-encouragement, as Sec. of State John Kerry tried to do with the fight in Syria: “We know that after a decade of conflict, the American people are tired of war. Believe me, I am, too. But fatigue does not resolve us of our responsibility.”¹³⁴ The supposed factors that can lead to a crisis fatigue is of course the time itself, but also the costs and political issues associated with the fatigue. The costs related to Syria can be a critical factor to crisis fatigue. The USAID, which is focused solely on bringing aid to those that become wounded and is therefore only one of major factors within the Syrian crisis, has given the humanitarian response \$1,739, 769,523 from the USA only. These extraordinary numbers become tiring to look at, and can become a major factor in regards to crisis fatigue in Syria. The political issues of crisis fatigue can relate to policy uncertainty regarding Syria, as no clear and good answer has come out of political debates and meetings. It is therefore a vital issue for political leaders to rid their uncertainty and indecisiveness regarding Syria. However, as described earlier, polarization leaves any clear answer to battle this uncertainty and indecisiveness out of the debate.

Conclusions

¹³¹ Hale, Thomas, David Held, and Kevin Young. *Gridlock: why global cooperation is failing when we need it most*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013. pg.92

¹³² Enten, Harry. "The Political Rhetoric Around Climate Change ... Er, Global Warming." DataLab. June 4, 2014. Accessed November 12, 2014. <http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/the-political-rhetoric-around-climate-change-er-global-warming/>.

¹³³ Volcovici, Valerie, and David Lawder. "Republicans Vow EPA Fight as Obama Touts China Climate Deal." Reuters. November 12, 2014. Accessed November 12, 2014.

¹³⁴ Baker, Peter, and Michael Gordon. "Kerry Becomes Chief Advocate for U.S. Attack." The New York Times. August 30, 2013. Accessed November 12, 2014.

The ongoing challenge for think tanks is to produce timely and accessible policy-oriented research that effectively engages policymakers, the press and the public on the critical issues facing a country. Gone are the days when a think tank could operate with the motto “research it, write it and they will find it.” Today, think tanks must be lean, mean, policy machines. *The Economist* described “good think tanks” as those organizations that are able to combine “intellectual depth, political influence, and flair for publicity, comfortable surroundings, and a streak of eccentricity.” New technologies are being created every day and at an accelerated pace that will continually force think tanks to identify new and faster ways to collect, sort, and analyze data and then communicate their findings to a highly segmented target audience using a variety of communication tools. Those who fail to organize and integrate these qualities into their think tank will become known for their “pedantry, irrelevance, obscurity, poverty and conventionality.” Many think tanks have already successfully met this challenge and are now playing a critical role in bridging the divide between the academic and policy communities and policymakers and the public.

For all the reasons outlined in this report, the role and importance of independent think tanks will continue to grow. Clearly there is no shortage of policy challenges at the national, regional, and global levels. Over the last 10-15 years, governments and civil society groups have come to rely on think tanks for ideas and advice, and I am confident that this trend will continue well into the future.

The challenge for all think tanks is to understand these trends and then reengineer their think organizations to respond to these challenges. Those that failed to understand their waves of technological, political and social change will be swept away by them. The reality is that most think tanks have what policymakers and the public desperate need: high quality research and analysis it just has to be put in the right form and delivered in a timely manner.

Overview of Modifications and Enhancements to the Global Go To Think Tanks Index

Each year we attempt to respond systematically to comments and suggestions to improve the nomination and ranking process for the Global Go To Think Tank Index (GGTTI). Since the inaugural report in 2006, the nomination and selection processes have changed significantly. While the Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program (TTCSP) continually seeks to improve the nomination and selection process, several things should be kept in mind. First, although we do our best to catch and eliminate as many mistakes as possible, we do not claim that the annual rankings are error-free. As with many ranking systems, the GGTTI has its fair share of limitations, which we continually seek to overcome. Second, critiques highlighting the rankings' comprehensiveness fail to understand our commitment to studying the contributions and impact of think tanks worldwide. The Index's aim is to produce an inclusive and far-reaching report of international think tanks. Moreover, we hope to extend the Index to include even more think tanks around the world.

Recent Years' Modifications

TTCSP is committed to increasing the quality and representativeness of the Index every year we conduct the survey. Since 2010, hundreds of expert panelists have participated in an evaluation of the ranking criteria and nominations and indexing processes. As a result, the Index has undergone a number of major changes designed to limit bias, expand the rankings' representativeness, and improve the overall quality and integrity of the nomination process. The following modifications have been made to the Index over the last several years:

2010

- In 2010, a ranking list for think tanks with an annual budget of less than five million U.S. dollars was created. This category helps to recognize the work of smaller think tanks that produce influential research, but might otherwise be edged out in the rankings by think tanks with larger budgets and greater manpower.
- American think tanks were removed from the global ranking in an effort to improve the visibility of global organizations, and recognize the inherent advantages of American think tanks.
- The methodology was revamped to encompass an open nominations process in which all 6,480 think tanks identified by the TTCSP at that time were invited to submit nominations. This replaced a system where the Expert Panels developed the initial slate of institutions. The change dramatically increased the levels of participation, and greatly improved the quality and representativeness of nominated institutions.
- An outreach effort was launched in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) to improve the Index's inclusivity.

2011

- The Latin America category was restructured into two categories: “Top Think Tanks in Mexico, Canada, and the Caribbean” and “Top Think Tanks in Central and South America.”

2012

- The Latin America categories were further refined into: “Top Think Tanks in Mexico and Canada” and “Top Think Tanks in Central and South America.”
- The Asia category underwent revisions in order to prevent the group’s domination by China, India, Japan, and the Republic of Korea. The Asia section was divided into two categories: “Top Think Tanks in China, India, Japan, and the Republic of Korea” and “Top Think Tanks in Asia (excluding China, India, Japan, and the Republic of Korea).”
- Five new special achievement categories were created: “Best Advocacy Campaign,” “Best Policy Produced by a Think Tank 2011-2012,” “Best For-Profit Think Tanks,” “Top Energy and Resource Policy Think Tank,” and “Top Education Policy Think Tanks.” These categories recognize both special achievements and excellence in particular areas of study. This expansion aimed to better recognize the diverse range of issues think tanks address, and the new organizational types that have emerged over the past five years.
- The “Best New Think Tanks” category examined organizations founded over the past 24 months instead of the past 18.

2013

- To increase inclusivity, the Asia categories were further subdivided into three categories: “Top Think Tanks in Asia and the Pacific (Excluding China, India, Japan, and the Republic of Korea),” “Top Think Tanks in China, India, Japan, and the Republic of Korea,” and “Top Think Tanks in Central Asia.”
- The “Top Security and International Affairs Think Tanks” category was divided into “Top Defense and National Security Think Tanks” and “Top Foreign Policy and International Affairs Think Tanks.”
- Eight new special achievement categories were added: “Think Tank to Watch,” “Best Use of Social Networks,” “Best Institutional Collaboration Involving Two or More Think Tanks,” “Best Think Tank Network,” “Best Think Tank Conference,” “Best Managed Think Tank,” “Best New Idea or Paradigm Developed by a Think Tank,” and “Best Transdisciplinary Research Program at a Think Tank.”
- 2014 (see details below)

2014 Process and Methodology

As in past years, this year's Index relied on an open nominations process, followed by Expert Panel reviews of the nominations. There were also several important modifications made in order to improve the quality of the report and increase its clarity. Chief among these was a reorganization of some of the regional categories (discussed further below) and a division of the Health category into "Top Global Health Policy Think Tanks" and "Top Domestic Healthy Policy Think Tanks," which are defined below. Also, the parameters for the "Best New Think Tank" category were once again modified. The length of time was extended to include any think tanks founded within the last 48 months, or since January 2011.

Geographic Classification Adjustments

In response to feedback on past year's reports and in an effort to further improve the quality of the Global Go To Index by providing clarity and transparency, the rules governing the geographic regions in the report have been updated.

Unfortunately, not all the continents have clearly defined geographic borders, which makes the task of delineating regional boundaries an act of interpretation. As of yet, there is no clear international consensus about where to place countries that straddle the line between regions. The United Nations includes Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Georgia, and Turkey in Western Asia and places Russia in Eastern Europe.¹³⁵ Meanwhile, the International Monetary Fund includes Cyprus and Turkey in Europe along with Russia.¹³⁶ To judge from the European Union, Turkey – in membership negotiations since 2005 – can be potentially considered a part of Europe, but Russia cannot. Even within the United States government, there is no agreement on regional borders. The U.S. State Department's Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs includes Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Georgia, Russia, and Turkey with all of the European nations westward to Iceland. However, the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, places only Cyprus in Europe, relegates Russia to Central Asia, and situates Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Turkey in the Middle East.¹³⁷

To attempt to classify countries by means of political and cultural connections leaves the problem similarly unsolved and even more open to subjective interpretation. Where, for instance, would one place a vast, multiethnic country such as Russia? The suggestion to create a category for European Union think tanks would likewise present a problem by leaving Swiss, Norwegian, and Balkan think tanks without a proper spot.

As we are unable to turn to classifications already established by leading governmental organizations and we are unwilling to make politically or culturally based classifications, the

¹³⁵ *World Population Prospects*. New York: United Nations Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 2012. <http://esa.un.org/wpp/excel-Data/country-Classification.pdf>.

¹³⁶ "The IMF and Europe," <http://www.imf.org/external/region/eur/index.aspx>.

¹³⁷ *The World Factbook*. Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency. Continually updated. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/>.

remaining and most logical course of action is to divide the world into regions based on geography. For this reason, the Central and Eastern Europe category will remain – despite objections from some that it unjustly separates countries of the former Soviet bloc from their neighbors to the west. Given the advanced state of civil society in Europe and the great number of think tanks on that continent, the Central and Eastern Europe category allows for a greater representation of European think tanks than would be possible if there was only one regional category for all of Europe.

This year’s report also corrects anomalies that have appeared in past regional rankings. Confusingly, in the 2013 Global Go To Index, think tanks from Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia were included among the list of the Top Think Tanks in Central and Eastern Europe and also in the list of Top Think Tanks in Central Asia. In this and future reports, think tanks from these countries instead appear only in the list of Top Think Tanks in Central Asia.

In another oversight, in the 2013 Global Go To Index think tanks from Bangladesh, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, and Uzbekistan were included in both the list of Top Think Tanks in Central Asia and the list of Top Think Tanks in Asia and the Pacific (Excluding China, India, Japan, and the Republic of Korea). In this and future reports, Bangladeshi and Pakistani think tanks will be exclusively ranked regionally in Asia and the Pacific, while Kyrgyz and Uzbek think tanks will only be ranked regionally in Central Asia. Furthermore, think tanks from Bhutan and Nepal, which were previously in the Central Asia category, will be moved to the Asia and the Pacific category.

Russia presents perhaps the thorniest case of all, since geographically it could conceivably belong to the Central and Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and Asia and the Pacific categories. In order to avoid confusion and to respect the fact that the majority of Russian think tanks lie in the extreme west of the country, Russia will remain in the Central and Eastern Europe category.

To state clearly in conclusion, the Central Asia category will consist only of think tanks from Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. Turkish think tanks will remain in the Middle East and North Africa category, as will Cypriot ones – despite Cyprus’ status as an EU member state. Think tanks from Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, and Pakistan will be ranked in the Asia and the Pacific category. The Central and Eastern Europe category will include Russian think tanks and also think tanks from those countries that lie between Turkey and Russia in the east and Sweden, Germany, Austria, and Italy in the west.

Health Category Divisions

The “Top Health Policy Think Tanks” category was subdivided into the “Top Global Health Policy Think Tanks” and “Top Domestic Health Policy Think Tanks” categories so as to better reflect the fact that there are two distinct areas of focus in the field of health policy. Think tanks that focus on domestic health center their research on solutions to improve healthcare systems within particular countries or regions, and are often focused on the political as well as scientific aspects of healthcare. Global health think tanks, on the other hand, often focus internationally on

improving the quality of care and access to it, particularly in developing countries. They may also study the process of preventing and mitigating the spread disease on the international level – a particularly timely topic given the Ebola crisis in West Africa.

Though this year’s process has enjoyed the improvements outlined above, we would be remiss if we were to fail to mention a few qualifications. Despite efforts to improve the Index’s inclusivity, especially within the “Top Think Tanks – Worldwide” category, certain regions continue to be underrepresented. Ongoing obstacles to increasing representation of developing regions in the Index are likely related to the relatively small number of think tanks in developing countries and the manifold challenges these institutions face. The continued dominance of think tanks in Europe and North America in the rankings is a function of several factors, including: the reality that more than sixty percent of the world’s think tanks are based in Europe and North America; the funding and resources available to these organizations; the historically dominant role these regions have played in world politics, and the influence they traditionally exert over international political, economic, and social thinking.

That being said, we would like to direct your attention to the regional, functional, and special achievement categories, which together might provide a more thorough picture of the work of think tanks globally. We hope to better enable the inclusion of underrepresented regions in the Index through the following enhancements: dramatically increasing the number of listings in each category; dividing Asia into three distinct categories; creating a separate category for Mexico and Canada; and creating a category recognizing organizations with a budget of less than five million U.S. dollars. We would also like to highlight the exclusion of think tanks based in the United States from the principal global ranking. In so doing, the rankings are able to highlight lesser-known think tanks in regions outside of the United States. Given the extraordinary worldwide prominence and preeminence of U.S. think tanks, including them in the principal global rankings would likely distort the results excessively in their favor.

Each year our best efforts have gone into generating a rigorous, inclusive, and objective process. However, we recognize the impossibility of entirely ridding the Index from bias. Inevitably, personal, ideological, disciplinary, and regional biases of those consulted throughout the process may have influenced the rankings. While some have suggested that we move to a small group or panel of experts and journalists to make the selections, we are unwavering in our commitment to an open and democratic process. Given the safeguards in place – the transparent process, the provisions set by the detailed nomination and selection criteria, and the annually increasing participation of think tanks and experts from every region of the world – we are confident in the quality and integrity of the Index. Additionally, with the growing involvement of the expert panelists, the nomination and ranking process has also been dramatically improved. Together, we believe these measures insulate the nomination and selection process from any significant charges of bias and misrepresentation.

Finally, we would like to underscore that the GGTTI is but one measure of a think tank’s performance and impact, and has been designed for use in conjunction with other metrics to help identify and evaluate public policy research organizations around the world. An organization’s inclusion within the Index does not indicate a seal of approval or endorsement for the institution, its publications, or its programs by the TTCSP. Conversely, an organization’s exclusion from the

rankings does not necessarily indicate poor quality, effectiveness, or performance. There are 6,618 think tanks around the world completing exceptional work to help bridge the gap between knowledge and policy. This report is no more than one effort to highlight some of the world's leading think tanks.

Methodology and Timeline

Before beginning the 2014 nomination and selection process, the team conducted extensive research in order to update and verify the Think Tank and Civil Societies Program's (TTCSP) Global Think Tank Database. Through this process many additional think tanks were identified for possible inclusion in this year's study. A month in advance of the 2014 nomination and selection process launch, a letter announcing the commencement of the 2014 Global Go To Think Tank Index (GGTTI) was sent to all catalogued organizations. Think tanks were asked to make recommendations for improving the nomination and selection process, in addition to potential Expert Panel nominees. A letter requesting evaluations of the efficacy and validity of the 2014 Rankings criteria, and nomination and selection process, was also sent to expert panelists from previous years.

Timeline of the Nomination and Ranking Process

Nominations: Expert Panel – March 15 to May 31, 2014

In preparation for the 2014 Global Go To Think Tank Indexing process, a call for nominations was issued for qualified individuals to serve on the Regional, Functional, and Special Areas of Distinction Panels.

Round I: Nominations – August 1 to September 30, 2014

A call for Nominations was sent to over 6,500 think tanks and approximately 7,500 plus journalists, public and private donors, and policy-makers from around the world. These nominations were tabulated and institutes with 10 or more nominations were included in the next step of the 2014 Think Tank Indexing process. All of the top ranked think tanks from 2013 were automatically included in the 2014 ranking ballot.

Round II: Peer/Expert Rankings – October 1 to November 1, 2014

Think tanks with 10 or more nominations were placed in an electronic ranking survey. A letter announcing the second round was emailed to all the think tanks, journalists, public and private donors, and policy maker groups who agreed to participate in the process. The rankings were tabulated and the list of finalists was generated for the Expert Panel to review and make final selections. This year, Regional and Functional Expert Panels were created for every category. These specialists were consulted to help assure the quality and accuracy of the nominations before they were placed on the final rankings survey.

Round III: Expert Panel Selects 2014 Go To Think Tanks – November 1 to December 2014

The members of the Expert Panel received information packets by email in order to facilitate the final selection process. Individuals who served on last year's Expert Panel as well as those who were nominated this year were invited to serve on the 2014 Expert Panel. Experts from every region and functional area were represented on the Expert Panel. Panelists submitted their rankings and recommendations by Friday, November 15, 2014.

Launch: 2014 Global Go-To Think Tank Rankings Announced January 2015

The 2014 Global Go-To Think Tank Rankings were announced at the United Nations in New York, at the Center for International and Strategic Studies in Washington D.C., and at selected organizations in every region of the world.

2014 Global Go To Think Tank Index Nomination and Ranking Criteria

The peers and experts who participated in the indexing process were encouraged to employ the following criteria when considering nominations and rankings. The 2014 GGTTI Nomination and Ranking Criteria include, but are not limited to the following criteria:

- The quality and commitment of the think tank's leadership (chief executive and governing body). This involves effectively managing the mission and programs of the think tank, mobilizing the financial and human resources necessary to fulfill the mission and monitoring the quality, independence and impact of the think tank;
- The quality and reputation of the think tank's staff. Ability to assemble a critical mass of highly skilled, experienced and productive scholars and analysts who are recognized as either emerging or established experts in their respective area of research;
- The quality and reputation of the research and analysis produced. The ability to produce high quality, rigorous, policy oriented research that is accessible to policymakers, media and the public;
- Ability to recruit and retain elite scholars and analysts;
- Academic performance and reputation. This involves the academic rigor associated with the research conducted. This includes formal accreditation of a think tank's scholars and analysts, the number and type of scholarly publications produced such as: books, journals and conference papers and the number of presentations delivered at scholarly and other professional meeting and the number and type of citations of the think tanks scholars' research in scholarly publications produced by other scholars;
- The quality, number, and reach of its publications;
- The impact of a think tank's research and programs on policymakers and other policy actors. Policy recommendations considered or actually adopted by policymakers, civil society or policy actors;
- Reputation with policymakers (name recognition associated with specific issues or programs, number of briefings and official appointments, number of policy briefs and white papers produced, legislative testimony delivered);
- A demonstrated commitment to producing independent research and analysis. This involves standards and policies for producing rigorous evidence based research and analysis that are posted and monitored by the organization, research teams and individual

researchers. This includes disclosure of conflict of interest (financial, institutional or personal) and a commitment to nonpartisanship and established professional standards for research in the social sciences;

- Access to key institutions. The ability to reach and connect with key audiences and personnel such as government officials (elected and appointed), civil society, traditional and new media, and academia;
- Ability to convene key policy actors and to develop effective networks and partnerships with other think tanks and policy actors;
- Overall output of the organization (policy proposals, web visits, briefings, publications, interviews, conferences, staff nominated to official posts);
- Utilization of research, policy proposal and other products. The effective transmission and utilization of policy briefs, reports, policy recommendations and other products by policymakers and the policy community, number of current and former staff serving in advisory roles to policymakers, advisory commissions, etc., awards given to scholars for scholarly achievement or public service;
- Usefulness of organization's information in public engagement, advocacy work, preparing legislation or testimony, preparing academic papers or presentations, conducting research or teaching;
- Ability to use electronic, print and the new media to communicate research and reach key audiences;
- Media reputation (number of media appearances, interviews and citations);
- Ability to use the Internet including social media tools, to engage with policymakers, journalists and the public;
- Web Site and Digital presence. The quality, accessibility, effective maintenance of the organization's web presence, as well as, the quality and level of digital traffic and engagement (quality, accessibility and navigability of web site, number of website visitors, page views, time spent on pages, "likes" or followers);
- Level, diversity and stability of funding. The ability of an organization to mobilize the necessary financial resources to support and sustain the think tank over time (endowment, membership fees, annual donations, government and private contracts, earned income);
- Effective management and allocation of financial and human resources. The ability of a think tank to effectively manage its money and people so that they produce high quality outputs that achieve maximum impact;

- Ability of the organization to effectively fulfill the terms of the gifts, grants and contracts from government(s), individuals, corporations and foundations who have provided the financial support to the think tank (financial stewardship);
- The organization's ability to produce new knowledge, innovative policy proposals or alternative ideas on policy;
- Ability to bridge the gap between the academic and policymaking communities;
- Ability to bridge the gap between policymakers and the public;
- Ability to include new voices in the policymaking process;
- Ability of organization to be inscribed within issue and policy networks;
- Success in challenging the traditional wisdom of policymakers and in generating innovative policy ideas and programs; and,
- The impact on society. Direct relationship between the organization's efforts in a particular area to a positive change in societal values such as significant changes in the quality of life within respective country (amounts of goods and services available to citizens, state of physical and mental health, quality of environment, quality of political rights, access to institutions).

Think Tank Impact Assessment Tool

Clearly, assessing the impact of think tanks is not an easy endeavor to undertake given the various and conflicting actors, events, and politics involved in the policy making process. Despite the significant challenges in establishing a causal relationship between knowledge and policy, it is necessary for think tanks to understand and effectively respond to the growing chorus of questions being raised by donors, journalists, and the public about the role and influence of think tanks in civil societies and governments around the world.

Think tanks can employ a variety of metrics to assess their impact, including such measures as an increase in research and analysis they produce as well as to account for their contributions to the policymaking environment and civil society. McGann's recent (2008) research has focused on developing a comprehensive assessment tool for evaluating a think tank's impact. The impetus for this research, in part, was the apparent confusion that exists about the differences between outputs and impacts. In various studies and surveys that McGann has conducted over the years, researchers and think tanks responded curiously when asked about impact on public policy and how they measure it. The overwhelming response was to provide a list of research outputs (number of books published, conference held, web hits, media appearances, etc.). Outputs, however, are not the only way to measure impact.

The metric provided below is designed to serve as a catalyst for a discussion on how to effectively measure the impact of think tanks. It is provided here as background for the think tank ranking process in the hopes that it will help clarify the distinction between outputs and impacts. We ask that you consider the following indicators when contemplating the impact of think tanks:

- **Resource indicators:** Ability to recruit and retain leading scholars and analysts; the level, quality, and stability of financial support; proximity and access to decision-makers and other policy elites; a staff with the ability to conduct rigorous research and produce timely and incisive analysis; institutional currency; quality and reliability of networks; and key contacts in the policy academic communities, and the media.
- **Utilization indicators:** Reputation as a “go-to” organization by media and policy elites in the country; quantity and quality of media appearances and citations, web hits, testimony before legislative and executive bodies; briefings, official appointments, consultation by officials or departments/agencies; books sold; reports distributed; references made to research and analysis in scholarly and popular publications and attendees at conferences and seminars organized.
- **Output indicators:** Number and quality of: policy proposals and ideas generated; publications produced (books, journal articles, policy briefs, etc.); news interviews conducted; briefings, conferences, and seminars organized; and staff who are nominated to advisory and government posts.
- **Impact indicators:** Recommendations considered or adopted by policymakers and civil society organizations; issue network centrality; advisory role to political parties, candidates, transition teams; awards granted; publication in or citation of publications in academic journals, public testimony and the media that influences the policy debate and decision-making; listserv and web site dominance; and success in challenging the conventional wisdom and standard operating procedures of bureaucrats and elected officials in the country.


Beyond this qualitative assessment, an effective evaluation of impact should also involve NGOs, as well as members of the government and policymakers, to ascertain the degree to which they have utilized the grantee’s research output. This participation can be obtained through interviews, surveys, questionnaires, and focus group meetings, utilizing the Outcome Mapping which “moves away from assessing the products of an activity or a program to focus on changes in behaviors and relationships (outcomes) which can lead to changes.” Impact can be viewed as positive if it “changes the behavior, relationships, activities, or actions of the people, groups, and organizations with whom a program works directly.”

Although this qualitative assessment is essential because it recognizes that policy impact can be successfully achieved even if policy prescriptions are not directly translated into actual policy, we recommend that this assessment should be translated into numerical rankings, thereby allowing comparisons with baseline data for effective monitoring and evaluation in the future.

2014 Think Tank Statistics


Number of Think Tanks in the World in 2014

Number of Think Tanks in the World in 2014



This chart reflects the number of think tanks in 2014 based on data collected as of December, 2014.

Global Distribution of Think Tanks by Region



Countries with the Largest Number of Think Tanks¹³⁸

Rank	Country	Number of Think Tanks
1	United States	1830
2	China	429
3	United Kingdom	287
4	Germany	194
5	India	192
6	France	177
7	Argentina	137
8	Russia	122
9	Japan	108
10	Canada	99
11	Italy	92
12	South Africa	87
13	Brazil	82
14	Sweden	77
15	Switzerland	71
16	Mexico	60
17	Egypt	57
17	Netherlands	57
18	Israel	56
19	Spain	55
20	Romania	54
21	Belgium	52
21	Taiwan	52
22	Bolivia	50
23	Ukraine	47
24	Nigeria	46
25	Palestine	44

¹³⁸ We have not been able to identify any think tanks in operation in the following countries: the Comoros, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, Sao Tome and Principe, the Solomon Islands, Tonga, and Tuvalu.

Global Distribution of Think Tanks by Country

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA		ASIA		CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE		WESTERN EUROPE	
Angola	4	Afghanistan	6	Albania	10	Andorra	1
Benin	10	Armenia	14	Belarus	12	Austria	40
Botswana	9	Azerbaijan	14	Bosnia and Herzegovina	13	Belgium	52
Burkina Faso	14	Bangladesh	23	Bulgaria	33	Denmark	34
Burundi	2	Bhutan	1	Croatia	10	France	177
Cameroon	21	Brunei	1	Czech Republic	27	Germany	194
Cape Verde	2	Cambodia	10	Estonia	17	Greece	35
Central African Republic	2	China	429	Finland	28	Iceland	7
Chad	3	Georgia	14	Hungary	41	Ireland	14
Congo	3	Hong Kong	30	Kosovo	3	Italy	92
Congo, Democratic Republic of	7	India	192	Latvia	11	Liechtenstein	2
Cote d'Ivoire	12	Indonesia	27	Lithuania	19	Luxembourg	6
Eritrea	5	Japan	108	Macedonia	16	Malta	4
Ethiopia	13	Kazakhstan	7	Moldova	9	Monaco	1
Gabon	2	Kyrgyzstan	8	Montenegro	4	Netherlands	57
Gambia	6	Laos	3	Poland	41	Norway	15
Ghana	37	Macao	1	Romania	54	Portugal	21
Guinea	2	Malaysia	18	Russia	122	San Marino	1
Guinea-Bissau	1	Maldives	6	Serbia	24	Spain	55
Kenya	23	Mongolia	7	Slovakia	18	Sweden	77
Lesotho	2	Nepal	8	Slovenia	19	Switzerland	71
Liberia	3	North Korea	2	Ukraine	47	United Kingdom	287
Madagascar	5	Pakistan	19			Vatican City	1
Malawi	15	Philippines	20				
Mali	9	Singapore	6				
Mauritania	2	South Korea	35				
Mauritius	9	Sri Lanka	14				
Mozambique	4	Taiwan	52				
Namibia	11	Tajikistan	4				
Niger	4	Thailand	8				
Nigeria	46	Turkmenistan	1				
Rwanda	4	Uzbekistan	8				
Senegal	16	Vietnam	10				
Seychelles	3						
Sierra Leone	1						
Somalia	6						
South Africa	87						
South Sudan	2						
Swaziland	4						
Tanzania	4						
Togo	4						
Uganda	11						
Zambia	9						
Zimbabwe	24						

CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA		MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA		NORTH AMERICA		OCEANIA	
Anguilla	1	Algeria	12	Canada	99	Australia	29
Antigua and Barbuda	2	Bahrain	7	Mexico	60	Fiji	1
Argentina	137	Cyprus	11	United States	1830	New Zealand	5
Aruba	1	Egypt	57			Papua New Guinea	2
Bahamas	2	Iran	34			Samoa	1
Barbados	9	Iraq	42			Vanuatu	1
Belize	4	Israel	56				
Bermuda	3	Jordan	40				
Bolivia	50	Kuwait	11				
Brazil	82	Lebanon	27				
British Virgin Islands	1	Libya	4				
Cayman Islands	1	Morocco	33				
Chile	42	Oman	3				
Colombia	40	Palestine	44				
Costa Rica	37	Qatar	9				
Cuba	18	Saudi Arabia	7				
Dominica	3	Sudan	5				
Dominican Republic	29	Syria	6				
Ecuador	18	Tunisia	38				
El Salvador	14	Turkey	31				
French Guiana	1	United Arab Emirates	14				
Grenada	1	Yemen	30				
Guadeloupe	4						
Guatemala	12						
Guyana	3						
Haiti	2						
Honduras	10						
Jamaica	6						
Martinique	2						
Montserrat	1						
Nicaragua	10						
Panama	12						
Paraguay	27						
Peru	32						
Puerto Rico	5						
St. Kitts and Nevis	1						
St. Lucia	2						
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	1						
Suriname	2						
Trinidad and Tobago	10						
Turks and Caicos Islands	1						
United States Virgin Islands	1						
Uruguay	17						
Venezuela	17						

U.S. Think Tanks by State

State	Number of Think Tanks
D.C.	396
Massachusetts	176
California	173
New York	146
Virginia	105
Illinois	55
Maryland	50
Texas	47
Connecticut	45
Pennsylvania	42
New Jersey	35
Colorado	31
Florida	31
Michigan	31
Georgia	29
Ohio	25
Minnesota	24
North Carolina	23
Washington	23
Wisconsin	22
Arizona	21
Indiana	21
Maine	20
Rhode Island	20
Tennessee	19
Missouri	18
Alabama	16
Kansas	16
Oregon	16
New Hampshire	13
Hawaii	12
Kentucky	11
Oklahoma	11
Iowa	10
Louisiana	10
Mississippi	10

Arkansas	8
Montana	8
Nebraska	7
New Mexico	7
Utah	7
South Carolina	6
West Virginia	6
South Dakota	5
Vermont	5
Idaho	4
Nevada	4
North Dakota	4
Alaska	3
Delaware	3
Total	1830

2014 Ranking Categories

- **Top Think Tanks in the World**
 - Think Tank of the Year 2014 – Top Think Tank in the World
 - Top Think Tanks Worldwide – (Non-U.S.)
 - Top Think Tanks Worldwide – (U.S. and non-U.S.)
- **Top Think Tanks by Region**
 - Top Think Tanks in Sub-Saharan Africa
 - Top Think Tanks in Canada and Mexico
 - Top Think Tanks in Central and South America
 - Top Think Tanks in the United States
 - Top Think Tanks in Central Asia
 - Top Think Tanks in China, India, Japan, and the Republic of Korea
 - Top Think Tanks in Southeast Asia and the Pacific
 - Top Think Tanks in Central and Eastern Europe
 - Top Think Tanks in Western Europe
 - Top Think Tanks in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA)
- **Top Think Tanks by Area of Research**
 - Top Defense and National Security Think Tanks
 - Top Domestic Economic Policy Think Tanks
 - Top Education Policy Think Tanks
 - Top Energy and Resource Policy Think Tanks
 - Top Environment Think Tanks
 - Top Foreign Policy and International Affairs Think Tanks
 - Top Domestic Health Policy Think Tanks
 - Top Global Health Policy Think Tanks
 - Top International Development Think Tanks
 - Top International Economic Policy Think Tanks
 - Top Science and Technology Think Tanks
 - Top Social Policy Think Tanks
 - Top Transparency and Good Governance Think Tanks
- **Top Think Tanks by Special Achievement**
 - Best Advocacy Campaign
 - Best For-Profit Think Tanks
 - Best Government Affiliated Think Tanks
 - Best Institutional Collaboration Involving Two or More Think Tanks
 - Best Managed Think Tank
 - Best New Idea or Paradigm Developed by a Think Tank
 - Best New Think Tanks (Unranked)
 - Best Policy Study/Report Produced by a Think Tank 2013-2014

- Best Think Tank Conference
- Best Think Tank Network
- Best Think Tanks with Political Party Affiliation
- Best Transdisciplinary Research Program at a Think Tank
- Best University Affiliated Think Tanks
- Best Use of Social Networks
- Think Tank to Watch
- Think Tanks with the Best External Relations/Public Engagement Programs
- Think Tanks with the Best Use of the Internet
- Think Tanks with the Best Use of the Media (Print or Electronic)
- Think Tanks with the Most Innovative Policy Ideas/Proposals
- Think Tanks with the Most Significant Impact on Public Policy
- Think Tanks with Outstanding Policy-Oriented Public Programs
- Top Think Tanks with Annual Operating Budgets of Less Than \$5 Million USD

2014 Global Go To Rankings Results

In advance of presenting this year’s results, I would like to stress that the inclusion of an institution in the universe of leading think tanks does not indicate a seal of approval or endorsement of the institution, its publications, or its programs on the part of the Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program. Likewise, a failure to be nominated does not necessarily indicate a lack of quality and effectiveness or poor performance. There are 6,618 think tanks that are doing exceptional work to help bridge the gap between knowledge and policy. This report is no more than an effort to highlight some of the leading think tanks worldwide.

With that, it gives me great satisfaction and pleasure to present the results of the 2014 rankings process below.



Top Think Tank in the World for 2014

Think Tank of the Year 2014 – Top Think Tank in the World Table 1
1. Brookings Institution (United States)

Top Think Tanks Worldwide (Non-U.S.)

Table 2

1.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
2.	Bruegel (Belgium)
3.	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (Sweden)
4.	International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
5.	Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
6.	French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)
7.	Amnesty International (AI) (United Kingdom)
8.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
9.	Korea Development Institute (KDI) (Republic of Korea)
10.	Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) (Denmark)
11.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
12.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
13.	Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) (Japan)
14.	Carnegie Moscow Center (Russia)
15.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
16.	China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) (China)
17.	German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (Germany)
18.	Center for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) (United Kingdom)
19.	Carnegie Middle East Center (Lebanon)
20.	Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI) (Japan)
21.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
22.	European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR) (United Kingdom)
23.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
24.	Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations (Netherlands)
25.	Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) (United Kingdom)
26.	Human Rights Watch (HRW) (United Kingdom)
27.	German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) (Germany)
28.	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) (China)
29.	Kiel Institute for the World Economy (IfW) (Germany)
30.	Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB) (Spain)
31.	Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA) (India)
32.	African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) (South Africa)
33.	China Institute of International Studies (CIIS) (China)
34.	Lowy Institute for International Policy (Australia)
35.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
36.	Institute of Development Studies (IDS) (United Kingdom)
37.	Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI) (Argentina)
38.	Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI) (Canada)
39.	German Development Institute (DIE) (Germany)
40.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
41.	Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (United Kingdom)
42.	Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV) (Turkey)

43.	Razumkov Centre (Ukraine)
44.	Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC) (Argentina)
45.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)
46.	Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO RAS) (Russia)
47.	Institute for Security Studies (ISS) (South Africa)
48.	Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (Indonesia)
49.	Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP) (Republic of Korea)
50.	Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) (Norway)
51.	Centre for Civil Society (CCS) (India)
52.	Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS) (Singapore)
53.	IDEAS (United Kingdom)
54.	Centre for European Reform (CER) (United Kingdom)
55.	Civitas: Institute for the Study of Civil Society (United Kingdom)
56.	Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) (Norway)
57.	Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM) (Poland)
58.	Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) (Poland)
59.	RAND Europe (United Kingdom)
60.	Center for Policy Studies (CPS) (Hungary)
61.	Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS) (Singapore)
62.	Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC) (China)
63.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)
64.	Shanghai Institutes for International Studies (SIIS) (China)
65.	Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies (ACPSS) (Egypt)
66.	Demos (United Kingdom)
67.	Association for Liberal Thinking (ALT) (Turkey)
68.	IMANI Center for Policy and Education (Ghana)
69.	Adam Smith Institute (ASI) (United Kingdom)
70.	Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC) (Germany)
71.	African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) (Kenya)
72.	Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR) (South Africa)
73.	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) (Costa Rica)
74.	Centro de Divulgacion Conocimiento Economico para la Libertad (CEDICE) (Venezuela)
75.	Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui Cambiamenti Climatici (CMCC) (Italy)
76.	Fundacion para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Dialogo Exterior (FRIDE) (Spain)
77.	Center for Free Enterprise (CFE) (Republic of Korea)
78.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
79.	European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) (France)
80.	European Centre for International Political Economy (ECIPE) (Belgium)
81.	Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) (India)
82.	Observer Research Foundation (ORF) (India)
83.	EGMONT – The Royal Institute for International Relations (Belgium)
84.	East Asia Institute (EAI) (Republic of Korea)
85.	Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO) (Russia)

86.	F.A. Hayek Foundation (Slovakia)
87.	Heinrich Boll Foundation (HBS) (Germany)
88.	Fundacion para el Analisis y los Estudios Sociales (FAES) (Spain)
89.	European Policy Centre (EPC) (Belgium)
90.	Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) (Italy)
91.	African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS) (Kenya)
92.	Centro de Estudios Publicos (CEP) (Chile)
93.	Istituto Bruno Leoni (IBL) (Italy)
94.	Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies (RDCY) (China)
95.	Policy Exchange (United Kingdom)
96.	Institute for National Security Studies (INSS) (Israel)
97.	Libertad y Desarrollo (LyD) (Chile)
98.	Carnegie Europe (Belgium)
99.	Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS) (Bangladesh)
100.	Fundacion Libertad (Argentina)

Top Think Tanks Worldwide (U.S. and non-U.S.)
Table 3

1.	Brookings Institution (United States)
2.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
3.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
4.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
5.	Bruegel (Belgium)
6.	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (Sweden)
7.	Rand Corporation (United States)
8.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
9.	International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
10.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
11.	Amnesty International (AI) (United Kingdom)
12.	Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
13.	Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) (Japan)
14.	German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (Germany)
15.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
16.	Cato Institute (United States)
17.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
18.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
19.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
20.	French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)
21.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
22.	Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) (United Kingdom)
23.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
24.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
25.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
26.	Carnegie Moscow Center (Russia)
27.	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) (China)
28.	Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI) (Japan)
29.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
30.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
31.	European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR) (United Kingdom)
32.	Institute for World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO RAS) (Russia)
33.	German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) (Germany)
34.	Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations (Netherlands)
35.	Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies, FKA Centre for European Studies (Belgium)
36.	China Institute of International Studies (CIIS) (China)
37.	Carnegie Middle East Center (Lebanon)
38.	Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI) (Argentina)
39.	Danish Institute of International Studies (DIIS) (Denmark)
40.	China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) (China)
41.	Kiel Institute for the World Economy (IfW) (Germany)
42.	IDEAS (United Kingdom)

43.	Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI) (Canada)
44.	Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) (United Kingdom)
45.	Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP) (Republic of Korea)
46.	World Economic Forum (WEF) (Switzerland)
47.	Human Rights Watch (HRW) (United Kingdom)
48.	Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC) (China)
49.	Korea Development Institute (KDI) (Republic of Korea)
50.	Centre for Civil Society (CCS) (India)
51.	Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies (ACPSS) (Egypt)
52.	Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) (United Kingdom)
53.	Libertad y Desarrollo (LyD) (Chile)
54.	Lowy Institute for International Policy (Australia)
55.	Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (United Kingdom)
56.	Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) (South Africa)
57.	Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC) (Germany)
58.	Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB) (Spain)
59.	Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) (Norway)
60.	East Asia Institute (EAI) (Republic of Korea)
61.	Institute of International and Strategic Studies (IISS), FKA Center for International and Strategic Studies (China)
62.	African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) (Kenya)
63.	African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) (South Africa)
64.	Razumkov Centre (Ukraine)
65.	RAND Europe (United Kingdom)
66.	Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM) (Poland)
67.	Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) (Poland)
68.	Demos (United Kingdom)
69.	Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (Indonesia)
70.	Centre For European Reform (CER) (United Kingdom)
71.	Shanghai Institutes for International Studies (SIIS) (China)
72.	European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) (France)
73.	Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) (Norway)
74.	Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV) (Turkey)
75.	European Centre for International Political Economy (ECIPE) (Belgium)
76.	Civitas: Institute for the Study of Civil Society (United Kingdom)
77.	Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS) (Republic of Korea)
78.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
79.	Fundacion para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Dialogo Exterior (FRIDE) (Spain)
80.	Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS) (Singapore)
81.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)
82.	German Development Institute (DIE) (Germany)
83.	Fundacion para el Analisis y los Estudios Sociales (FAES) (Spain)
84.	Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR) (South Africa)
85.	Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) (Italy)

86.	Heinrich Boll Foundation (HBS) (Germany)
87.	Association for Liberal Thinking (ALT) (Turkey)
88.	Timbro (Sweden)
89.	Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) (United Kingdom)
90.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
91.	Centro de Estudios Publicos (CEP) (Chile)
92.	Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS) (Singapore)
93.	Institute of Development Studies (IDS) (United Kingdom)
94.	Real Instituto Elcano (Spain)
95.	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) (Costa Rica)
96.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
97.	Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS) (Bangladesh)
98.	Council on Foreign and Defense Policy (SVOP) (Russia)
99.	Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC) (China)
100.	Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA) (India)
101.	Centre for Independent Studies (CIS) (Australia)
102.	Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO) (Russia)
103.	Center for Free Enterprise (CFE) (Republic of Korea)
104.	Institute for National Security Studies (INSS) (Israel)
105.	Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER) (India)
106.	Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies (RDCY) (China)
107.	Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) (India)
108.	Fundacion Libertad (Argentina)
109.	IMANI Center for Policy and Education (Ghana)
110.	Center for Policy Studies (CPS) (Hungary)
111.	Institute for Security Studies (ISS) (South Africa)
112.	Institute for International Policy Studies (IIPS) (Japan)
113.	EGMONT – The Royal Institute for International Relations (Belgium)
114.	Observer Research Foundation (ORF) (India)
115.	European Policy Centre (EPC) (Belgium)
116.	Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK) (Germany)
117.	Fundacao Armando Alvares Penteado (FAAP) (Brazil)
118.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
119.	Free Market Foundation (FMF) (South Africa)
120.	Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) (Senegal)
121.	Lithuanian Free Market Institute (LFMI) (Lithuania)
122.	Istituto Bruno Leoni (IBL) (Italy)
123.	Center for Strategic Studies (SAM) (Azerbaijan)
124.	Instituto Ecuatoriano de Economia Politica (IEEP) (Ecuador)
125.	Gulf Research Center (GRC) (Saudi Arabia)
126.	Institute for Development and Global Governance (DRI) (France)
127.	Regional Centre for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Sri Lanka)
128.	Centro de Divulgacion Conocimiento Economico para la Libertad (CEDICE) (Venezuela)

129.	Development Alternatives (DA) (India)
130.	Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui Cambiamenti Climatici (CMCC) (Italy)
131.	Centro de Estudio de la Realidad Economica y Social (CERES) (Uruguay)
132.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)
133.	National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS) (Japan)
134.	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA) (Kenya)
135.	Economic Policy Research Centre (EPRC) (Uganda)
136.	Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research (Germany)
137.	Institucion Futuro (Spain)
138.	Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA) (Ethiopia)
139.	Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP) (Greece)
140.	Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM) (Italy)
141.	Finnish Institute of International Affairs (FIIA) (Finland)
142.	German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) (United States)
143.	Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Freedom (FNF) (Germany)
144.	Center for Global Development (CGD) (United States)
145.	National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA) (Japan)
146.	Centro de Investigaciones Economicas Nacionales (CIEN) (Guatemala)
147.	Israel-Palestine: Creative Regional Initiatives (IPCRI), FKA Israel-Palestine Center for Research and Information (Israel/Palestine)
148.	Centro Studi Internazionali (Ce.S.I.) (Italy)
149.	Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research (ISSER) (Ghana)
150.	Caucasus Institute for Peace, Democracy and Development (CIPDD) (Georgia)

Top Think Tanks by Region

Top Think Tanks in Sub-Saharan Africa	
Table 4	
1.	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA) (Kenya)
2.	IMANI Center for Policy and Education (Ghana)
3.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)
4.	Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) (Senegal)
5.	Botswana Institute for Development Policy Analysis (BIDPA) (Botswana)
6.	African Center for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) (South Africa)
7.	Institute for Security Studies (ISS) (South Africa)
8.	Africa Institute of South Africa (AISA) (South Africa)
9.	Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR) (South Africa)
10.	Centre for Policy Analysis (CEPA) (Ghana)
11.	African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) (Kenya)
12.	Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD) (Ghana)
13.	Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) (South Africa)
14.	Centre for Development and Enterprise (CDE) (South Africa)
15.	Ethiopian Development Research Institute (EDRI) (Ethiopia)
16.	Economic Policy Research Center (EPRC) (Uganda)
17.	Ethiopian Economics Association (EEA) (Ethiopia)
18.	REPOA, FKA Research on Poverty Alleviation (Tanzania)
19.	Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) (Ghana)
20.	Institute for Global Dialogue (IGD) (South Africa)
21.	Free Market Foundation (FMF) (South Africa)
22.	Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA) (Nigeria)
23.	Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment (ACODE) (Uganda)
24.	African Center for Economic Transformation (ACET) (Ghana)
25.	Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) (Kenya)
26.	South African Institute of Race Relations (IRR) (South Africa)
27.	Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA) (Ethiopia)
28.	Centre Ivoirien de Recherches Economiques et Sociales (CIRES) (Cote d'Ivoire)
29.	Centre for Population and Environmental Development (CPED) (Nigeria)
30.	Centre for Research and Technology Development (RESTECH) (Kenya)
31.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
32.	Initiative for Public Policy Analysis (IPPA) (Nigeria)
33.	Centre for Development Studies (Ghana)
34.	Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research (ISSER) (Ghana)
35.	Rift Valley Institute (RVI) (Kenya)
36.	Centre for the Study of the Economies of Africa (CSEA) (Nigeria)
37.	Makerere Institute of Social Research (MISR) (Uganda)

38.	Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) (Namibia)
39.	Institute for Empirical Research in Political Economy (IERPE) (Benin)
40.	Centre d'Etudes, de Documentation et de Recherche Economiques et Sociales (CEDRES) (Burkina Faso)
41.	Justice and Human Rights Institute (JHRI) (Ghana)
42.	Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF) (Tanzania)
43.	Groupe de Recherche en Economie Appliquee et Theorique (GREAT) (Mali)
44.	Inter-Region Economic Network (IREN) (Kenya)
45.	Strategic Transformation and Policy Centre (STPC) (Zimbabwe)
46.	Centre d'Etudes de Politiques pour le Developpement (CEPOD) (Senegal)
47.	Institute for Public Policy Analysis and Management (IPPAM) (Nigeria)
48.	Programme de Troisieme Cycle Inter-universitaire en Economie (PTCI) (Burkina Faso)
49.	Integrated Social Development Center (ISODEC) (Ghana)
50.	Institute for Peace and Security Studies (IPSS) (Ethiopia)
51.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Tanzania)
52.	Mapungubwe Institute for Strategic Reflection (MISTRA) (South Africa)
53.	Development Research and Projects Centre (dRPC) (Nigeria)
54.	Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (IPAR) (Kenya)
55.	Centre de Recherches, d'Etudes et d'Appui a l'Analyse Economique a Madagascar (CREAM) (Madagascar)
56.	Centre Autonome d'Etudes et de Renforcement des Capacites pour le Developpement au Togo (CADERDT) (Togo)
57.	Nigerian Institute for Social and Economic Research (NISER) (Nigeria)
58.	Macroeconomic and Financial Management Institute of Eastern and Southern Africa (MEFMI) (Zimbabwe)
59.	Mandela Institute for Development Studies (MINDS) (South Africa)
60.	UONGOZI Institute (Tanzania)
61.	Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) (Angola)
62.	Swaziland Economic Policy Analysis and Research Centre (SEPARC) (Swaziland)
63.	Institute for Policy Analysis and Research (IPAR) (Rwanda)
64.	African Institute for Applied Economics (AIAE) (Nigeria)
65.	Development Policy Research Unit (DPRU) (South Africa)

Top Think Tanks in Mexico and Canada
Table 5

1.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
2.	Consejo Mexicano de Asuntos Internacionales (COMEXI) (Mexico)
3.	Fundar, Centro de Analisis e Investigacion (Mexico)
4.	Centro de Investigacion y Docencia Economicas (CIDE) (Mexico)
5.	C.D. Howe Institute (Canada)
6.	Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP) (Canada)
7.	Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI) (Canada)
8.	Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute (CDFAI) (Canada)
9.	Canadian International Council (CIC) (Canada)
10.	Colegio de Mexico (CM) (Mexico)
11.	Macdonald-Laurier Institute (MLI) (Canada)
12.	Atlantic Institute for Market Studies (AIMS) (Canada)
13.	International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) (Canada)
14.	Conference Board of Canada (CBoC) (Canada)
15.	Montreal Economic Institute (MEI) (Canada)
16.	Centro de Investigacion para el Desarrollo (CIDAC) (Mexico)
17.	Centro de Investigaciones Sobre la Libre Empresa (CISLE) (Mexico)
18.	Public Policy Forum (PPF) (Canada)
19.	El Colegio de la Frontera Norte (Colef) (Mexico)
20.	Instituto para la Seguridad y la Democracia (INSYDE) (Mexico)
21.	Instituto Mexicano para la Competividad (IMCO) (Mexico)
22.	Colectivo de Analisis de la Seguridad con Democracia (CASEDE) (Mexico)
23.	Frontier Centre for Public Policy (FCPP) (Canada)
24.	Instituto de Pensamiento Estrategico Agora (IPEA) (Mexico)
25.	Centro de Estudios en Calidad de Vida y Desarrollo Social (CECAVI) (Mexico)
26.	Centre for International and Defence Policy (CIDP), FKA Queen's Centre for International Relations (Canada)
27.	Centro de Estudios Espinosa Yglesias (CEEY) (Mexico)
28.	Institute of Politics (Mexico)
29.	Mexico Evalua Centro de Analisis de Politicas Publicas (Mexico)
30.	Canada 2020 (Canada)

Top Think Tanks in Central and South America
Table 6

1.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
2.	Comision Economica para America Latina (CEPAL) (Chile)
3.	Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC) (Argentina)
4.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
5.	Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI) (Argentina)
6.	Centro de Estudios Publicos (CEP) (Chile)
7.	Centro de Estudio de la Realidad Economica y Social (CERES) (Uruguay)
8.	Fundacion para la Educacion Superior y el Desarrollo (Fedesarrollo) (Colombia)
9.	Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (CLACSO) (Argentina)
10.	Centro de Divulgacion Conocimiento Economico para la Libertad (CEDICE) (Venezuela)
11.	Instituto Fernando Henrique Cardoso (iFHC) (Brazil)
12.	Grupo de Analisis para el Desarrollo (GRADE) (Peru)
13.	Instituto de Pesquisa Economica Aplicada (IPEA) (Brazil)
14.	Corporacion de Estudios para Latinoamerica (CIEPLAN) (Chile)
15.	Fundacion para el Avance de las Reformas y las Oportunidades (Grupo FARO) (Ecuador)
16.	Centro Brasileiro de Analise e Planejamento (CEBRAP) (Brazil)
17.	Centro Latinoamericano de Economia Humana (CLAEH) (Uruguay)
18.	Centro de Analisis y Difusion de la Economia Paraguay (CADEP) (Paraguay)
19.	Fundacion de Investigaciones Economicas Latinoamericanas (FIEL) (Argentina)
20.	Consejo Uruguayo para las Relaciones Internacionales (CURI) (Uruguay)
21.	Fundacion Ideas para la Paz (FIP) (Colombia)
22.	Fundacion Chile 21 (Chile)
23.	Centro de Estudios de Estado y Sociedad (CEDES) (Argentina)
24.	Instituto Libertad y Democracia (ILD) (Peru)
25.	Fundacion Pensar (Argentina)
26.	Centro de Estudios de la Violencia (NEV) (Brazil)
27.	Fundacion Salvadorena para el Desarrollo Economico y Social (FUSADES) (El Salvador)
28.	Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (IEP) (Peru)
29.	Libertad y Desarrollo (Lyd) (Chile)
30.	Instituto Ecuatoriano de Economia Politica (IEEP) (Ecuador)
31.	Foro Social de la Deuda Externa de Honduras y Desarrollo (FOSDEH) (Honduras)
32.	Fundacion Libertad (Argentina)
33.	Instituto Millenium (Brazil)
34.	Fundacion Jaime Guzman (FJG) (Chile)
35.	Instituto de Ciencia Politica (ICP) (Colombia)
36.	Fundacion Dr. Guillermo Manuel Ungo (FUNDAUNGO) (El Salvador)
37.	Centro de Estudios Distributivos, Laborales y Sociales (CEDLAS) (Argentina)
38.	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) (Costa Rica)
39.	Grupo Propuesta Ciudadana (GPC) (Peru)

40.	Instituto de Estudios Avanzados en Desarrollo (INESAD) (Bolivia)
41.	Instituto Desarrollo (Paraguay)
42.	Centro de Investigaciones Economicas Nacionales (CIEN) (Guatemala)
43.	Fundacion Centro de Pensamiento Primero Colombia (FCPPC) (Colombia)
44.	Centro Ecuatoriano de Derecho Ambiental (CEDA) (Guatemala)
45.	Fundacion Milenio (Bolivia)
46.	Asociacion de Investigacion y Estudios Sociales (ASIES) (Guatemala)
47.	Fundacion Global Democracia y Desarrollo (FUNGLODE) (Dominican Republic)
48.	Fundacion ARU (Bolivia)
49.	Fundacion Nicarguense para el Desarrollo Economico y Social (FUNIDES) (Nicaragua)
50.	Nassau Institute (Bahamas)

Top Think Tanks in the United States
Table 7

1.	Brookings Institution (United States)
2.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
3.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
4.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
5.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
6.	RAND Corporation (United States)
7.	Pew Research Center (United States)
8.	Cato Institute (United States)
9.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
10.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
11.	National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) (United States)
12.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
13.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
14.	Center for a New American Security (CNAS) (United States)
15.	World Resources Institute (WRI) (United States)
16.	Atlantic Council (United States)
17.	Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs (United States)
18.	James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy (United States)
19.	Hoover Institution (United States)
20.	Urban Institute (United States)
21.	Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (United States)
22.	United States Institute of Peace (USIP) (United States)
23.	Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) (United States)
24.	Stimson Center (United States)
25.	Center for International Development (CID) (United States)
26.	Freedom House (United States)
27.	Center for Global Development (CGD) (United States)
28.	Human Rights Watch (HRW) (United States)
29.	Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty (United States)
30.	New America Foundation (United States)
31.	Hudson Institute (United States)
32.	German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) (United States)
33.	Foreign Policy Research Institute (FPRI) (United States)
34.	Resources for the Future (RFF) (United States)
35.	Worldwatch Institute (United States)
36.	Earth Institute (United States)
37.	Inter-American Dialogue (United States)
38.	Center for Climate and Energy Solutions (C2ES) United States)
39.	Manhattan Institute for Policy Research (MI) (United States)
40.	International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) (United States)
41.	Reason Foundation (United States)
42.	Open Society Foundations (OSF), FKA Open Society Institute (United States)

43.	Center for the National Interest (CFTNI), FKA Nixon Center (United States)
44.	Mercatus Center (United States)
45.	Aspen Institute (United States)
46.	Economic Policy Institute (EPI) (United States)
47.	Foundation for Economic Education (FEE) (United States)
48.	Center for Transatlantic Relations (CTR) (United States)
49.	Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF) (United States)
50.	Pacific Research Institute (PRI) (United States)
51.	Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) (United States)
52.	Bipartisan Policy Center (BPC) (United States)
53.	Demos (United States)
54.	Independent Institute (United States)
55.	EastWest Institute (EWI) (United States)
56.	Migration Policy Institute (MPI) (United States)
57.	Atlas Network (United States)
58.	Kaiser Permanente Institute for Health Policy (KPIHP) (United States)
59.	Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI) (United States)
60.	Center for Economic and Policy Research (CEPR) (United States)

Top Think Tanks in Central Asia
Table 8

1.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)
2.	Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies (KazISS) (Kazakhstan)
3.	Caucasus Research Resource Center (CRRC) (Azerbaijan)
4.	Armat Center for the Development of Democracy and Civil Society (Armenia)
5.	Aga Khan Foundation (AKF) (Afghanistan)
6.	Caucasus Institute for Peace, Democracy and Development (CIPDD) (Georgia)
7.	Armenian International Policy Research Group (AIPRG) (Armenia)
8.	Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) (Georgia)
9.	Armenian Center for National and International Studies (ACNIS) (Armenia)
10.	Asia Foundation - Afghanistan (Afghanistan)
11.	Center for Economic Research (CER) (Uzbekistan)
12.	Analytical Centre on Globalization and Regional Cooperation (ACGRC) (Armenia)
13.	Advanced Social Technologies (AST) (Armenia)
14.	Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit (AREU) (Afghanistan)
15.	Free Minds Association (FMA) (Azerbaijan)
16.	Caucasus Research Resource Center (CRRC) (Georgia)
17.	South-Caucasus Institute of Regional Security (SCIRS) (Georgia)
18.	Center for Social and Economic Research in Kyrgyzstan (CASE) (Kyrgyzstan)
19.	Turpanjian Center for Policy Analysis (TCPA) (Armenia)
20.	Centre for Political Studies (CPS) (Uzbekistan)
21.	Armenia 2020 (Armenia)
22.	New Economic School (NESG) (Georgia)
23.	Strategic Research Center (SRC) (Georgia)
24.	Georgian Research and Educational Networking Association (GRENA) (Georgia)
25.	Civil Society Institute (CSI) (Armenia)
26.	Public Policy Research Center (PPRC) (Kazakhstan)
27.	Institute of Strategic and Inter-Regional Research (Uzbekistan)
28.	Entrepreneurship Development Foundation (EDF) (Azerbaijan)
29.	Economic Research Center (ERC) (Azerbaijan)
30.	Institute for Regional Studies (IFRS) (Kyrgyzstan)
31.	Caucasus Research Resource Center (CRRC) (Armenia)
32.	Tahlil Centre for Social Research (Uzbekistan)
33.	Liberty Institute (Georgia)
34.	Strategic Research Center under the President of Tajikistan (Tajikistan)
35.	Bureau on Human Rights and Rule of Law (Kyrgyzstan)
36.	International Council on Security and Development (ICOS), FKA The Senlis Council (Afghanistan)
37.	Partnership for Social Initiatives (PSI) (Georgia)
38.	Afghanistan Institute for Rural Development (AIRD) (Afghanistan)
39.	R.B. Suleimenov Institute of Oriental Studies (Kazakhstan)
40.	Economic Policy Institute - Bishkek Consensus (EPI) (Kyrgyzstan)
41.	KIMEP University, FKA Kazakhstan Institute of Management, Economics and Strategic Research (Kazakhstan)

42.	Peace Research Center of Kyrgyzstan (Kyrgyzstan)
43.	Institute for Public Policy (IPP) (Kyrgyzstan)
44.	Center for Strategic Studies (SAM) (Azerbaijan)
45.	Georgian Foundation for Strategic and International Studies (GFSIS) (Georgia)

Top Think Tanks in China, India, Japan, and the Republic of Korea	
Table 9	
1.	Korea Development Institute (KDI) (Republic of Korea)
2.	Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) (Japan)
3.	China Institute of International Studies (CIIS) (China)
4.	Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP) (Republic of Korea)
5.	China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) (China)
6.	Asan Institute for Policy Studies (AIPS) (Republic of Korea)
7.	Asia Forum Japan (AFJ) (Japan)
8.	Observer Research Foundation (ORF) (India)
9.	Carnegie – Tsinghua Center for Global Policy (China)
10.	Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA) (India)
11.	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) (China)
12.	National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS) (Japan)
13.	Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC) (China)
14.	Centre for Civil Society (CCS) (India)
15.	East Asia Institute (EAI) (Republic of Korea)
16.	Institute of International and Strategic Studies (IISS), FKA Center for International and Strategic Studies (China)
17.	Centre for Policy Research (CPR) (India)
18.	Shanghai Institutes for International Studies (SIIS) (China)
19.	Institute of Developing Economies, Japan External Trade Organization (IDE-JETRO) (Japan)
20.	Japan Center for International Exchange (JCIE) (Japan)
21.	Delhi Policy Group (DPG) (India)
22.	Institute for International Policy Studies (IIPS) (Japan)
23.	Development Alternatives (DA) (India)
24.	Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) (India)
25.	Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI) (Japan)
26.	Center for Study of Science, Technology and Policy (CSTEP) (India)
27.	National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER) (India)
28.	Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry (RIETI) (Japan)
29.	Gateway House: Indian Council on Global Relations (India)
30.	Korea Institute for Defense Analyses (KIDA) (Republic of Korea)
31.	Unirule Institute for Economics (China)
32.	Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS) (India)
33.	Cathay Institute for Public Affairs (CIPA) (China)
34.	National Institute for Research Advancement (NIRA) (Japan)
35.	Japan Institute for International Development (Japan)
36.	Institute for National Policy Research (INPR) (China)
37.	Korea Energy Economics Institute (KEEI) (Republic of Korea)
38.	Indian Council for Research in International Economic Relations (ICRIER) (India)
39.	Center for Free Enterprise (CFE) (Republic of Korea)
40.	Sejong Institute (Republic of Korea)
41.	Tokyo Foundation (Japan)

42.	China Center for International Economic Exchanges (CCIEE) (China)
43.	Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies (IPCS) (India)
44.	Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies (RDCY) (China)
45.	Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences (SASS) (China)
46.	Institute of Economic Growth (IEG) (India)
47.	Center for China and Globalization (CCG) (China)
48.	Research Institute for Peace and Security (RIPS) (Japan)
49.	China Finance 40 Forum (CF40) (China)
50.	United Service Institution of India (USI) (India)

Top Think Tanks in Southeast Asia and the Pacific
Table 10

1.	Australian Institute for International Affairs (AIIA) (Australia)
2.	Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (Indonesia)
3.	Centre for Strategic Studies (CSS) (New Zealand)
4.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
5.	Lowy Institute for International Policy (Australia)
6.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
7.	Taiwan Foundation for Democracy (TFD) (Taiwan)
8.	Strategic and Defense Studies Centre (SDSC) (Australia)
9.	Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS) (Singapore)
10.	Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS) (Malaysia)
11.	Centre for Independent Studies (CIS) (Australia)
12.	Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS) (Singapore)
13.	East Asian Institute (EAI) (Singapore)
14.	Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia (ERIA) (Indonesia)
15.	Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI) (Thailand)
16.	Pakistan Institute of International Affairs (PIIA) (Pakistan)
17.	Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS) (Bangladesh)
18.	Taiwan Institute of Economic Research (TIER) (Taiwan)
19.	Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) (Pakistan)
20.	Bangladesh Institute of International and Strategic Studies (BIISS) (Bangladesh)
21.	Centre for Economic Development and Administration (CEDA) (Nepal)
22.	Institute for Strategic and International Studies (Philippines)
23.	Chung-Hua Institution for Economic Research (CIER) (Taiwan)
24.	Alternate Solutions Institute (Pakistan)
25.	Institute for Social and Environmental Transition (ISET-N) (Nepal)
26.	Institute for International Relations (Taiwan)
27.	Institute of Policy Studies (IPS) (Bangladesh)
28.	Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS) (Philippines)
29.	Social Policy and Development Centre (SPDC) (Pakistan)
30.	Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace (CICP) (Cambodia)
31.	Institute of Policy Studies of Sri Lanka (IPS) (Sri Lanka)
32.	Institute of World Economics and Politics (IWEP) (Vietnam)
33.	Regional Centre for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Sri Lanka)
34.	Political Risks Assessment Group (Singapore)
35.	Institute of Security and International Studies (ISIS) (Thailand)
36.	Institute of National Capacity Studies (INCS) (Indonesia)
37.	Institute of Policy Studies (IPS) (Pakistan)
38.	Brunei Darussalam Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies (BDIPSS) (Brunei)
39.	Diplomatic Academy of Vietnam (DAV) (Vietnam)
40.	Center for Research on Economic and Social Transformation (CREST) (Pakistan)
41.	Vietnam Institute of Economics (VIE) (Vietnam)
42.	Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA) (Sri Lanka)

43.	Economic Institute of Cambodia (EIC) (Cambodia)
44.	Alternative Development Initiative (ADI) (Bangladesh)
45.	Centre for Strategic and Policy Studies (CSPS) (Brunei)
46.	Center for Policy Dialogue (CPD) (Bangladesh)
47.	Myanmar Institute of Strategic and International Studies (MISIS) (Myanmar)
48.	Bangladesh Enterprise Institute (BEI) (Bangladesh)
49.	Institute for Governance Studies (IGS) (Bangladesh)
50.	Associates for Community and Population Research (ACPR) (Bangladesh)
51.	Center for Global Studies (Bangladesh)
52.	Applied Economics Research Centre (AERC) (Pakistan)
53.	Area Study Centre for Far East and Southeast Asia (FESEA) (Pakistan)
54.	Centre for Bhutan Studies and GNH Research (Bhutan)
55.	Bangladesh Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (BCSIR) (Bangladesh)
56.	Institute of Social Welfare and Research (ISWR) (Bangladesh)
57.	Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies (CNAS) (Nepal)
58.	Asian Institute of Management Policy Center (APC) (Philippines)
59.	Nepal South Asia Centre (NESAC) (Nepal)
60.	Institute for Social and Environmental Transitions (ISET) (Taiwan)

Top Think Tanks in Central and Eastern Europe
Table 11

1.	Carnegie Moscow Center (Russia)
2.	Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) (Poland)
3.	Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM) (Poland)
4.	Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO RAS) (Russia)
5.	Razumkov Centre (Ukraine)
6.	Centre for Economic and Financial Research (CEFIR) (Russia)
7.	Prague Security Studies Institute (PSSI) (Czech Republic)
8.	Center for Democracy and Human Rights (CEDEM) (Montenegro)
9.	Center for Security and Defense Studies Foundation (CSDS) (Hungary)
10.	Lithuanian Free Market Institute (LFMI) (Lithuania)
11.	Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO) (Russia)
12.	Centre for Liberal Strategies (CLS) (Bulgaria)
13.	EUROPEUM Institute for European Policy (Czech Republic)
14.	Slovak Foreign Policy Association (SFPA) (Slovakia)
15.	Belgrade Centre for Security Policy (BCSP), FKA Centre for Civil-Military Relations (Serbia)
16.	F.A. Hayek Foundation (Slovakia)
17.	demosEUROPA – Centre for European Strategy (Poland)
18.	Institute for Foreign Affairs and Trade (IFAT), FKA Hungarian Institute of International Affairs (Hungary)
19.	Independent Institute for Social Policy (IISP) (Russia)
20.	Centre for Public Policy PROVIDUS (Latvia)
21.	Center for Policy Studies (CPS) (Hungary)
22.	Albanian Institute for International Studies (AIIS) (Albania)
23.	PRAXIS Center for Policy Studies (Estonia)
24.	Centre for Eastern Studies (OSW) (Poland)
25.	Institute for the U.S. and Canadian Studies (ISKRAN) (Russia)
26.	Ludwig von Mises Institute (Romania)
27.	Centre for Geopolitical Studies (Lithuania)
28.	Liberalni Institut (Czech Republic)
29.	Ye.T. Gaidar Institute for Economic Policy, FKA Institute for the Economy in Transition (Russia)
30.	Open Society Foundations (OSF), FKA Open Society Institute (Hungary)
31.	Economic Expert Group (EEG) (Russia)
32.	Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman (KNEU) (Ukraine)
33.	European Institute (Bulgaria)
34.	TARKI Social Research Institute (Hungary)
35.	St. Petersburg Center for Humanities and Political Studies (Russia)
36.	Institute for Economic Research (IER) (Slovenia)
37.	Institute of International Relations (IIR) (Czech Republic)
38.	Peace Institute – Institute for Contemporary Social and Political Studies (Slovenia)
39.	Kosovar Civil Society Foundation (KCSF) (Kosovo)
40.	International Centre for Policy Studies (ICPS) (Ukraine)

41.	Center for Research and Policy Making (CRPM) (Macedonia)
42.	Institute for Market Economics (IME) (Bulgaria)
43.	Institute for Urban Economics (IUE) (Croatia)
44.	Institute of Public Affairs (Bulgaria)
45.	International Centre for Defense Studies (ICDS) (Estonia)
46.	Analytical Center for the Government of the Russian Federation (Russia)
47.	Economics Institute (Serbia)
48.	Populari (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
49.	Institute for Public Affairs (IVO) (Slovakia)
50.	Institute of Economics, Zagreb (EIZ) (Croatia)
51.	Institute for Public Policy (IPP) (Romania)
52.	Institute for Security and International Studies (Bulgaria)
53.	Center for International Relations (CIR) (Poland)
54.	Institute of Baltic Studies (IBS) (Estonia)
55.	Russian International Affairs Council (RIAC) (Russia)

Top Think Tanks in Western Europe
Table 12

1.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
2.	Bruegel (Belgium)
3.	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (Sweden)
4.	French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)
5.	Amnesty International (AI) (United Kingdom)
6.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
7.	Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
8.	International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
9.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
10.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
11.	Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations (Netherlands)
12.	Carnegie Europe (Belgium)
13.	Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) (Denmark)
14.	German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (Germany)
15.	Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB) (Spain)
16.	Adam Smith Institute (ASI) (United Kingdom)
17.	World Economic Forum (WEF) (Switzerland)
18.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
19.	European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR) (United Kingdom)
20.	Kiel Institute for World Economy (IfW) (Germany)
21.	German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) (Germany)
22.	IDEAS (United Kingdom)
23.	Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) (Norway)
24.	Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) (Italy)
25.	Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) (United Kingdom)
26.	Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) (United Kingdom)
27.	Civitas: Institute for the Study of Civil Society (United Kingdom)
28.	Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (United Kingdom)
29.	Real Instituto Elcano (Spain)
30.	EGMONT – The Royal Institute for International Relations (Belgium)
31.	German Development Institute (DIE) (Germany)
32.	Ecologic Institute (Germany)
33.	Fundacion para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Dialogo (FRIDE) (Spain)
34.	Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) (United Kingdom)
35.	Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) (Norway)
36.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
37.	Hanns Seidel Foundation (HSS) (Germany)
38.	Demos (United Kingdom)
39.	Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies, FKA Centre for European Studies (Belgium)
40.	Institute of International and European Affairs (IIEA) (Ireland)
41.	European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) (France)

42.	Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches Internationales (CERI) (France)
43.	Centre for European Reform (CER) (United Kingdom)
44.	Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Freedom (FNF) (Germany)
45.	Heinrich Boll Foundation (HBS) (Germany)
46.	Fondation pour l'Innovation Politique (Fondapol) (France)
47.	Bertelsmann Foundation (Germany)
48.	Timbro (Sweden)
49.	Institut des Relations Internationales et Strategiques (IRIS) (France)
50.	Notre Europe (France)
51.	Centre d'Etudes Prospectives et d'Informations Internationales (CEPII) (France)
52.	Center for Political Studies (CEPOS) (Denmark)
53.	Centro Studi Internazionali (Ce.S.I.) (Italy)
54.	Fabian Society (United Kingdom)
55.	Friends of Europe (Belgium)
56.	European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) (The Netherlands)
57.	Foreign Policy Center (FPC) (Belgium)
58.	European Policy Center (EPC) (Belgium)
59.	Policy Network (United Kingdom)
60.	Fundacion Alternativas (Spain)
61.	Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP) (Greece)
62.	Fundacion para el Analisis y los Estudios Sociales (FAES) (Spain)
63.	Hayek Institute (Austria)
64.	German Institute for Economic Research (DIW) (Germany)
65.	European Centre for International Political Economy (ECIPE) (Belgium)
66.	Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) (United Kingdom)
67.	Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) (United Kingdom)
68.	Institute for Government (IfG) (United Kingdom)
69.	Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) (United Kingdom)
70.	Lisbon Council for Economic Competitiveness and Social Renewal (Belgium)
71.	International Centre for Black Sea Studies (ICBSS) (Greece)
72.	Institucion Futuro (Spain)
73.	Istituto Bruno Leoni (IBL) (Italy)
74.	Oxford Council on Good Governance (OCGG) (United Kingdom)
75.	Policy Exchange (United Kingdom)
76.	Avenir Suisse (Switzerland)
77.	ResPublica (United Kingdom)
78.	Fondation pour la Recherche Strategique (FRS) (France)
79.	Security and Defence Agenda (SDA) (Belgium)
80.	Jacques Delors Institut (Germany)

Top Think Tanks in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA)

Table 13

1.	Carnegie Middle East Center (Lebanon)
2.	Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies (ACPSS) (Egypt)
3.	Brookings Doha Center (Qatar)
4.	Center for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies (EDAM) (Turkey)
5.	Institute for National Security Studies (INSS) (Israel)
6.	Al Jazeera Centre for Studies (AJCS) (Qatar)
7.	Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV) (Turkey)
8.	Gulf Research Center (GRC) (Saudi Arabia)
9.	Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies (Israel)
10.	Center for Strategic Studies (CSS) (Jordan)
11.	Association for Liberal Thinking (ALT) (Turkey)
12.	Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches en Sciences Sociales (CERSS) (Morocco)
13.	Egyptian Center for Economic Studies (ECES) (Egypt)
14.	Regional Center for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Egypt)
15.	RAND-Qatar Policy Institute (Qatar)
16.	Harry S. Truman Research Institute for the Advancement of Peace (Israel)
17.	Information and Decision Support Center (IDSC) (Egypt)
18.	European Stability Initiative (ESI) (Turkey)
19.	Center of Arab Women for Training and Research (CAWTAR) (Egypt)
20.	Economic Research Forum (ERF) (Egypt)
21.	Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research (ECSSR) (United Arab Emirates)
22.	Center for Arab Unity Studies (CAUS) (Lebanon)
23.	Israel Democracy Institute (IDI) (Israel)
24.	Amadeus Institute (Morocco)
25.	Contemporary Center for Studies and Policy Analysis (Medad) (Palestine)
26.	Egyptian Council for Foreign Affairs (ECFA) (Egypt)
27.	Arab Thought Forum (ATF) (Jordan)
28.	Al-Quds Center for Political Studies (Jordan)
29.	International Institute for Counter-Terrorism (ICT) (Israel)
30.	Mitvim – The Israeli Institute for Regional Foreign Policies (Israel)
31.	International Strategic Research Organization (USAK) (Turkey)
32.	Arab Planning Institute (API) (Kuwait)
33.	Moshe Dayan Center for Middle Eastern and African Studies (Israel)
34.	Tunisian Institute for Strategic Studies (ITES) (Tunisia)
35.	Economic Policy and Research Center (EPRC) (United Arab Emirates)
36.	Israel Center for Social and Economic Progress (ICSEP) (Israel)
37.	Ibn Khaldun Center for Development Studies (ICDS) (Egypt)
38.	Maurice Falk Institute for Economic Research (Israel)
39.	Center of Strategic and Future Studies (CSFS) (Kuwait)
40.	Van Leer Jerusalem Institute (VLJI) (Israel)
41.	Kuwait Institute for Scientific Research (KISR) (Kuwait)
42.	Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs (JCPA) (Israel)

43.	Royal Institute for Strategic Studies (IRES) (Morocco)
44.	OCP Policy Center (Morocco)
45.	Reut Institute (Israel)
46.	Future Studies Center (Egypt)
47.	Institut Francais de Recherche en Iran (IFRI) (Iran)
48.	Lebanese Center for Policy Studies (LCPS) (Lebanon)
49.	Sheba Center for Strategic Studies (SCSS) (Yemen)
50.	Sheikh Saud bin Saqr Al Qasimi Foundation for Policy Research (United Arab Emirates)
51.	Sadeq Institute (Libya)
52.	Tunisian Observatory for a Democratic Transition (Tunisia)
53.	Issam Fares Institute for Public Policy and International Affairs (IFI) (Lebanon)
54.	Tawasul (Oman)
55.	Arab Forum for Alternatives (AFA) (Egypt)

Top Think Tanks by Area of Research

Top Defense and National Security Think Tanks	
Table 14	
1.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
2.	RAND Corporation (United States)
3.	International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
4.	Brookings Institution (United States)
5.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
6.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
7.	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (Sweden)
8.	Atlantic Council (United States)
9.	Center for a New American Security (CNAS) (United States)
10.	Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) (United Kingdom)
11.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
12.	European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) (France)
13.	Cato Institute (United States)
14.	Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments (CSBA) (United States)
15.	Center for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies (EDAM) (Turkey)
16.	Australian Strategic Policy Institute (APSI) (Australia)
17.	Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (United States)
18.	Regional Center for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Egypt)
19.	Centre for Military Studies (CMS) (Denmark)
20.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
21.	United States Institute of Peace (USIP) (United States)
22.	Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) (Japan)
23.	Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies (ACPSS) (Egypt)
24.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
25.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
26.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
27.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
28.	Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) (Italy)
29.	German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (Germany)
30.	Institute for the U.S. and Canadian Studies (ISKRAN) (Russia)
31.	Institut des Relations Internationales et Strategiques (IRIS) (France)
32.	French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)
33.	Hoover Institution (United States)
34.	Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) (Switzerland)
35.	Belgrade Center for Security Policy (BCSP), FKA Center for Civil-Military Relations (Serbia)
36.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
37.	Fondation pour la Recherche Strategique (FRS) (France)
38.	PLA National Defence University (China)
39.	Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations (Netherlands)

40.	Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA) (India)
41.	Stimson Center (United States)
42.	Institute for National Security Studies (INSS) (Israel)
43.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
44.	National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS) (Japan)
45.	German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) (United States)
46.	Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) (Denmark)
47.	China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) (China)
48.	Carnegie Europe (Belgium)
49.	Australian Institute for International Affairs (AIIA) (Australia)
50.	Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB) (Spain)
51.	Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO RAS) (Russia)
52.	Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) (Norway)
53.	Strategic and Defense Studies Centre (SDSC) (Australia)
54.	Observer Research Foundation (ORF) (India)
55.	Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (Indonesia)
56.	Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI) (Argentina)
57.	Council on Foreign and Defence Policy (SVOP) (Russia)
58.	Chicago Council on Global Affairs (United States)
59.	Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) (United Kingdom)
60.	Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (HSFK) (Germany)
61.	Foreign Policy Research Institute (FPRI) (United States)
62.	Center for Strategic Studies (CSS) (Jordan)
63.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
64.	EGMONT – The Royal Institute for International Relations (Belgium)
65.	Hudson Institute (United States)
66.	Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO) (Russia)
67.	West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP) (Ghana)
68.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
69.	Security Defence Agenda (SDA) (Belgium)
70.	Centre for Arab Unity Studies (CAUS) (Lebanon)
71.	Centre for Rising Powers (CRP) (United Kingdom)
72.	Centre for Land Warfare Studies (CLAWS) (India)
73.	Institute for International Policy Studies (IIPS) (Japan)
74.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
75.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
76.	International Strategic Analysis and Research Center (USTAD) (Turkey)
77.	Regional Centre for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Sri Lanka)
78.	Global Security (United States)
79.	Hague Centre for Strategic Studies (HCSS) (The Netherlands)
80.	EUROPEUM Institute for European Policy (Czech Republic)
81.	Observer Research Foundation (ORF) (India)
82.	Slovak Foreign Policy Association (SFPA) (Slovakia)
83.	Institute for Foreign Affairs and Trade (IFAT), FKA Hungarian Institute of International Affairs (Hungary)

84.	Armenian Center for National and International Studies (ACNIS) (Armenia)
85.	Albanian Institute for International Studies (AIIS) (Albania)

Top Domestic Economic Policy Think Tanks
Table 15

1.	Brookings Institution (United States)
2.	National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) (United States)
3.	Adam Smith Institute (ASI) (United Kingdom)
4.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
5.	Cato Institute (United States)
6.	Bruegel (Belgium)
7.	RAND Corporation (United States)
8.	German Institute for Economic Research (DIW) (Germany)
9.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
10.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
11.	Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) (Poland)
12.	Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) (United Kingdom)
13.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
14.	Korea Development Institute (KDI) (Republic of Korea)
15.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
16.	Urban Institute (United States)
17.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
18.	Kiel Institute for the World Economy (IfW) (Germany)
19.	Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research (Germany)
20.	Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) (United States)
21.	Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC) (Argentina)
22.	Hoover Institution (United States)
23.	Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies (WIIW) (Austria)
24.	Centro de Estudios Publicos (CEP) (Chile)
25.	C.D. Howe Institute (Canada)
26.	Center for Economic and Financial Research (CEFIR) (Russia)
27.	Association for Liberal Thinking (ALT) (Turkey)
28.	Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP) (Republic of Korea)
29.	Center for Economic and Policy Research (CEPR) (United States)
30.	Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) (United Kingdom)
31.	Austrian Institute of Economic Research (WIFO) (Austria)
32.	Fundacao Armando Alvares Penteado (FAAP) (Brazil)
33.	Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) (United Kingdom)
34.	Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC) (China)
35.	Centro de Estudio de la Realidad Economica y Social (CERES) (Uruguay)
36.	Libertad y Desarrollo (LyD) (Chile)
37.	Cathay Institute for Public Affairs (CIPA) (China)
38.	Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis (CPB) (Netherlands)
39.	Unirule Institute of Economics (China)
40.	Manhattan Institute for Policy Research (MI) (United States)
41.	Institute of World Economics and Politics (IWEP) (China)
42.	demosEUROPA – Centre for European Strategy (Poland)

43.	Fundacion para el Analisis y los Estudios Sociales (FAES) (Spain)
44.	Center for European Economic Research (ZEW) (Germany)
45.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
46.	Centro de Investigacion y Docencia Economicas (CIDE) (Mexico)
47.	Egyptian Center for Economic Studies (ECES) (Egypt)
48.	Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies (RDCY) (China)
49.	Economics Institute (Serbia)
50.	Center for Fiscal Policy (CFP) (Russia)
51.	Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI) (Ireland)
52.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
53.	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA) (Kenya)
54.	Fundacion para la Educacion Superior y el Desarrollo (Fedesarrollo) (Colombia)
55.	Economic Policy Institute (EPI) (United States)
56.	Grattan Institute (Australia)
57.	Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO) (Russia)
58.	IMANI Center for Policy and Education (Ghana)
59.	Research Institute of the Finnish Economy (ETLA) (Finland)
60.	Sejong Institute (Republic of Korea)
61.	Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry (RIETI) (Japan)
62.	National Institute of Economic and Social Research (NIESR) (United Kingdom)
63.	Swedish Institute for Social Research (SOFI) (Sweden)
64.	National Center for Public Policy Research (NCPPI) (United States)
65.	Economic Policy Research Center (EPRC) (Uganda)
66.	Center for Liberal-Democratic Studies (CLDS) (Serbia)
67.	Central Institute for Economic Management (CIEM) (Vietnam)
68.	Timbro (Sweden)
69.	Economics Institute (CERGE-EI) (Czech Republic)
70.	Fundacion de Estudios de Economia Aplicada (FEDEA) (Spain)
71.	TARKI Social Research Institute (Hungary)
72.	Levy Economics Institute (United States)
73.	Institute of Economics (EIZ) (Croatia)
74.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
75.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
76.	Institute for Advanced Studies (IAS) (Austria)
77.	Institute for Economic Research (IER) (Slovenia)
78.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)
79.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
80.	Lithuanian Free Market Institute (LFMI) (Lithuania)

Top Education Policy Think Tanks
Table 16

1.	Urban Institute (United States)
2.	RAND Corporation (United States)
3.	Brookings Institution (United States)
4.	Cato Institute (United States)
5.	National Institute for Educational Policy Research (NIER) (Japan)
6.	Center for Education Policy Research (CEPR) (United States)
7.	Faculty of Educational Management, FKA Center for Educational Policy Studies (Russia)
8.	Center for Social and Economic Strategies (CESES) (Czech Republic)
9.	Center for Educational Policy Analysis (CEPA) (Hungary)
10.	Center for Education Policy, SRI International (United States)
11.	Institute for Research on Education Policy and Practice (IREPP) (United States)
12.	Education Policy and Data Center (EPDC) (United States)
13.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
14.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
15.	Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC) (China)
16.	Center for Educational Policy (CEP) (Ukraine)
17.	Institute of Education (IOE) (United Kingdom)
18.	Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (United Kingdom)
19.	Mathmatica Policy Research (MPR) (United States)
20.	Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI) (Thailand)
21.	Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) (United States)
22.	Fundacion para la Educacion Superior y el Desarrollo (Fedesarrollo) (Colombia)
23.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
24.	Institute of Public Affairs, Education Policy Program (ISP) (Poland)
25.	Education Policy Center (EPC) (Lithuania)
26.	Centre for Education Policy (CEP) (Serbia)
27.	Center for Educational Policy Studies (CEPS) (Slovenia)
28.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)
29.	Istanbul Policy Center (IPC) (Turkey)
30.	Center for Democratic Education (CDE) (Albania)
31.	Slovak Governance Institute (SGI) (Slovakia)
32.	Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences (MSSSES) (Russia)
33.	Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) (Philippines)
34.	Educational Reform Circles (Serbia)
35.	PRAXIS Center for Policy Studies (Estonia)
36.	proMENTE Social Research (Bosnia and Herzegovina)
37.	Mongolian Education Alliance (MEA) (Mongolia)
38.	Educational Studies Center (Ukraine)
39.	Centre for Public Policy PROVIDUS (Latvia)
40.	Institute for Social Research in Zagreb (IDIZ) (Croatia)
41.	Foundation for Education Initiatives Support (Kyrgyzstan)
42.	Macedonian Civic Education Center (MCEC) (Macedonia)

43.	Education and Training Unit (Armenia)
44.	International Institute for Education Policy, Planning and Management (EPPM) (Georgia)
45.	Education Reform Initiative (ERI) (Turkey)
46.	Socires (Netherlands)
47.	Center for Innovations in Education (CIE) (Azerbaijan)
48.	Center for Education Policy (Slovakia)
49.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
50.	Educational Reform Support Unit “Pulse” (ERSU) (Tajikistan)
51.	Centre for Educational Research and Development (CERD) (Croatia)
52.	Forum za Slobodu Odgoja (FSO) (Croatia)
53.	Institute for Public Policy (IPP) (Moldova)
54.	International Centre for Policy Studies (ICPS) (Ukraine)
55.	Kosovo Education Center (KEC) (Kosovo)

Top Energy and Resource Policy Think Tanks

Table 17

1.	Oxford Institute for Energy Studies (OIES) (United Kingdom)
2.	World Resource Institute (WRI) (United States)
3.	Institute of Energy Economics, Japan (IEEJ) (Japan)
4.	James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy (United States)
5.	RAND Corporation (United States)
6.	Center for Science of Environment, Resources and Energy (Japan)
7.	Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) (India)
8.	Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research (CEEPR) (United States)
9.	Resources for the Future (RFF) (United States)
10.	Energy Studies Institute (ESI) (Singapore)
11.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
12.	Korea Energy Economics Institute (KEEI) (Republic of Korea)
13.	Centre for Energy Policy and Economics (CEPE) (Switzerland)
14.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
15.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)
16.	Centre de Recherche en économie de l'Environnement, de l'Agroalimentaire, des Transports et de l'Énergie (CREATE) (Canada)
17.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
18.	European Centre for Energy and Resource Security (EUCERS) (United Kingdom)
19.	Center on Environment, Energy and Resource Policy (CEERP) (China)
20.	Centre for Energy Environment Resources Development (CEERD) (Thailand)
21.	Energy Policy Research Group (EPRG) (United Kingdom)
22.	UC Davis Energy Institute (United States)
23.	Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research (ECSSR) (United Arab Emirates)
24.	Centre for Population and Environmental Development (CPED) (Nigeria)
25.	Center on Global Energy Policy (CGEP) (United States)
26.	Institute for Sustainable Energy Policies (ISEP) (Japan)
27.	Center for International Energy Security Studies (China)
28.	Global Energy Studies (United Kingdom)
29.	Institute for the Analysis of Global Security (IAGS) (United States)
30.	Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies (KazISS) (Kazakhstan)

Top Environment Think Tanks

Table 18

1.	World Resources Institute (WRI) (United States)
2.	Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI) (Sweden)
3.	Worldwatch Institute (United States)
4.	Brookings Institution (United States)
5.	Center for Climate and Energy Solutions (C2ES) (United States)
6.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
7.	Ecologic Institute (Germany)
8.	Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK) (Germany)
9.	International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) (Canada)
10.	Center for Environmental Research (UFZ) (Germany)
11.	Resources for the Future (RFF) (United States)
12.	E3G – Third Generation Environmentalism (United Kingdom)
13.	Copenhagen Consensus Center (CCC) (Denmark)
14.	Centre for Economic and Ecological Studies (Cen2eco) (Switzerland)
15.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
16.	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (Kenya)
17.	Centre for Science and Environment (CSE) (India)
18.	Ashoka Trust for Research in Ecology and the Environment (ATREE) (India)
19.	Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) (India)
20.	Centro Mexicano de Derecho Ambiental (CEMDA) (Mexico)
21.	Centre for Development and Environment (SUM) (Norway)
22.	African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) (Kenya)
23.	International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) (United Kingdom)
24.	CGIAR, FKA Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (United States)
25.	Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) (Indonesia)
26.	Earth Institute (United States)
27.	Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment and Energy (Germany)
28.	Forum for the Future (United Kingdom)
29.	Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP) (United Kingdom)
30.	RAND Corporation (United States)
31.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
32.	Australia Institute (TAI) (Australia)
33.	Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM) (Italy)
34.	Chinese Academy For Environmental Planning (CAEP) (China)
35.	Centre for Population and Environmental Development (CPED) (Nigeria)
36.	Chinese Research Academy of Environmental Sciences (CRAES) (China)
37.	Development Alternatives (DA) (India)
38.	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) (Japan)
39.	Centre for Sustainable Development (CENESTA) (Iran)
40.	Property and Environment Research Center (PERC) (United States)
41.	Research Institute of Innovative Technology for the Earth (RITE) (Japan)
42.	New Zealand Climate Change Research Institute (CCRI) (New Zealand)

43.	Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI) (United States)
44.	International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) (Austria)
45.	Civic Exchange (China)
46.	African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS) (Kenya)
47.	Institute for Sustainable Development (ISD) (Poland)
48.	Oeko-Institut (Germany)
49.	Centre for Applied Research (CAR) (Botswana)
50.	Program on Energy and Sustainable Development (PESD) (United States)
51.	Departamento Ecología y Territorio, Facultad de Estudios Ambientales y Rurales (FEAR) (Colombia)
52.	Arava Institute for Environmental Studies (AIES) (Israel)
53.	Environment for Development Initiative (EfD) (Sweden)
54.	Integrated Research and Action for Development (IRADe) (India)
55.	Heschel Center for Environmental Learning and Leadership (Israel)
56.	Thailand Environment Institute (TEI) (Thailand)
57.	Global Development Research Center (GDRC) (Japan)
58.	Pembina Institute (Canada)
59.	Natuur en Milieu (Netherlands)
60.	International Center for Climate Governance (ICCG) (Italy)
61.	Instituto de Estudios Avanzados en Desarrollo (INESAD) (Bolivia)
62.	Environment and Natural Resources Foundation (FARN) (Argentina)
63.	Asociacion Nacional para la Conservacion de la Naturaleza (ANCON) (Panama)
64.	Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) (Pakistan)
65.	Institute of Water Policy (IWP) (Singapore)

Top Foreign Policy and International Affairs Think Tanks

Table 19

1.	Brookings Institution (United States)
2.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
3.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
4.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
5.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
6.	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (Sweden)
7.	China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) (China)
8.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
9.	RAND Corporation (United States)
10.	International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
11.	European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR) (United Kingdom)
12.	German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (Germany)
13.	Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
14.	Center for a New American Security (CNAS) (United States)
15.	French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)
16.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
17.	Cato Institute (United States)
18.	Atlantic Council (United States)
19.	Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM) (Poland)
20.	Hoover Institution (United States)
21.	Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies (ACPSS) (Egypt)
22.	Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) (Italy)
23.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
24.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
25.	Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) (Norway)
26.	Institut des Relations Internationales et Strategiques (IRIS) (France)
27.	Australian Strategic Policy Institute (APSI) (Australia)
28.	China Institute of International Studies (CIIS) (China)
29.	EGMONT – The Royal Institute for International Relations (Belgium)
30.	Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations (Netherlands)
31.	German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) (Germany)
32.	Real Instituto Elcano (Spain)
33.	Institute for the U.S. and Canadian Studies (ISKRAN) (Russia)
34.	Shanghai Institutes for International Studies (SIIS) (China)
35.	Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) (United Kingdom)
36.	Centre for Eastern Studies (OSW) (Poland)
37.	Belgrade Centre for Security Policy (BCSP), FKA Centre for Civil-Military Relations (Serbia)
38.	Council on Foreign and Defence Policy (SVOP) (Russia)
39.	Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) (Norway)
40.	Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (Indonesia)
41.	Hudson Institute (United States)
42.	Human Rights Watch (HRW) (United States)

43.	Institute for Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS) (Singapore)
44.	Swedish Institute of International Affairs (UI) (Sweden)
45.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
46.	Gulf Research Center (GRC) (Saudi Arabia)
47.	Center for Security and Defense Studies Foundation (CSDS) (Hungary)
48.	Center for Strategic Studies (CSS) (Jordan)
49.	Foreign Policy Research Institute (FPRI) (United States)
50.	Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) (Japan)
51.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
52.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
53.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
54.	Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) (Denmark)
55.	Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB) (Spain)
56.	EUROPEUM Institute for European Policy (Czech Republic)
57.	Slovak Foreign Policy Association (SFPA) (Slovakia)
58.	Australian Institute for International Affairs (AIIA) (Australia)
59.	Centre for Strategic Studies (CSS) (New Zealand)
60.	Strategic and Defense Studies Centre (SDSC) (Australia)
61.	Lowy Institute for International Policy (Australia)
62.	Bruegel (Belgium)
63.	Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP) (Republic of Korea)
64.	Albanian Institute for International Studies (AIIS) (Albania)
65.	European Centre for International Political Economy (ECIPE) (Belgium)
66.	Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI) (Argentina)
67.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
68.	Regional Centre for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Sri Lanka)
69.	Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (Ghana)
70.	Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments (CSBA) (United States)
71.	Institute for International Relations (IIR) (Czech Republic)
72.	Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies (IPCS) (India)
73.	East Asia Institute (EAI) (Republic of Korea)
74.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
75.	Institute for Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS) (Singapore)
76.	Prague Security Studies Institute (PSSI) (Czech Republic)
77.	Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS) (Republic of Korea)
78.	Institute for Security Studies (ISS) (South Africa)
79.	Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP) (Greece)
80.	Institute for National Security Studies (INSS) (Israel)
81.	Observer Research Foundation (ORF) (India)
82.	Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS) (Malaysia)
83.	Security and Defence Agenda (SDA) (Belgium)
84.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)
85.	Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD) (Ghana)

Top Domestic Health Policy Think Tanks
Table 20

1.	Cambridge Centre for Health Services Research (CCHSR) (United Kingdom)
2.	RAND Corporation (United States)
3.	Brookings Institution (United States)
4.	Bloomberg School of Public Health Research Centers (JHSPH) (United States)
5.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
6.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
7.	Kaiser Permanente Institute for Health Policy (KPIHP) (United States)
8.	Cato Institute (United States)
9.	Urban Institute (United States)
10.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
11.	Center for Studying Health Systems Change (HSC) (United States)
12.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
13.	Civitas: Institute for the Study of Civil Society (United Kingdom)
14.	Fundacion Mexicana para la Salud (FUNSALUD) (Mexico)
15.	National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) (United States)
16.	Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC) (China)
17.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
18.	Council on Foreign Relations, Global Health Program (CFR) (United States)
19.	Health and Global Policy Institute (HGPI) (Japan)
20.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
21.	Phillips Center for Health and Well-Being (Netherlands)
22.	Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA) (Ethiopia)
23.	Center for Health System Research (CHSR) (Vietnam)
24.	Institute for Government (IfG) (United Kingdom)
25.	China Institute for Reform and Development (CIRD) (China)
26.	Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches en Sciences Sociales (CERSS) (Morocco)
27.	Institute of Economic Growth (IEG) (India)
28.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
29.	Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics (LDI) (United States)
30.	Institute of Policy Studies of Sri Lanka (IPS) (Sri Lanka)

Top Global Health Policy Think Tanks

Table 21

1.	Cambridge Centre for Health Services Research (CCHSR) (United Kingdom)
2.	Bloomberg School of Public Health Research Centers (JHSPH) (United States)
3.	Brookings Institution (United States)
4.	RAND Corporation (United States)
5.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
6.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
7.	Council on Foreign Relations, Global Health Program (CFR) (United States)
8.	Health and Global Policy Institute (HGPI) (Japan)
9.	Kaiser Permanente Institute for Health Policy (KPIHP) (United States)
10.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
11.	Civitas: Institute for the Study of Civil Society (United Kingdom)
12.	Fundacion Mexicana para la Salud (FUNSALUD) (Mexico)
13.	National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) (United States)
14.	Cato Institute (United States)
15.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
16.	Phillips Center for Health and Well-Being (Netherlands)
17.	Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA) (Ethiopia)
18.	Center for Health System Research (CHSR) (Vietnam)
19.	Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches en Sciences Sociales (CERSS) (Morocco)
20.	Institute of Economic Growth (IEG) (India)
21.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
22.	Institute of Policy Studies of Sri Lanka (IPS) (Sri Lanka)
23.	China Institute for Reform and Development (CIRD) (China)
24.	Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (United Kingdom)
25.	Council on Health Research for Development (COHRED) (Switzerland)

Top International Development Think Tanks
Table 22

1.	Brookings Institution (United States)
2.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
3.	Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (United Kingdom)
4.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
5.	Center for International Development (CID) (United States)
6.	Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI) (Japan)
7.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
8.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
9.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
10.	Center for Global Development (CGD) (United States)
11.	Institute of Development Studies (IDS) (United Kingdom)
12.	German Development Institute (DIE) (Germany)
13.	Korea Development Institute (KDI) (Republic of Korea)
14.	Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) (Denmark)
15.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
16.	International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) (United States)
17.	World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER) (Finland)
18.	Cato Institute, Center for Global Liberty and Prosperity (United States)
19.	RAND Corporation (United States)
20.	Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) (Norway)
21.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
22.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
23.	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) (China)
24.	Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS) (Bangladesh)
25.	African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) (Kenya)
26.	Atlas Network (United States)
27.	Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) (Senegal)
28.	International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) (Canada)
29.	Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) (Poland)
30.	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (Sweden)
31.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)
32.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
33.	Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations (IDDRI) (France)
34.	Club of Rome (Switzerland)
35.	Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC) (China)
36.	Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI) (Canada)
37.	Libertad y Desarrollo (LyD) (Chile)
38.	Centre for the Study of African Economies (CASE) (United Kingdom)
39.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
40.	Centre for Development Alternatives (CFDA) (India)
41.	Fundacion para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Dialogo Exterior (FRIDE) (Spain)
42.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)

43.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
44.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
45.	Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER) (India)
46.	Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI) (Argentina)
47.	Centre for Development and the Environment (SUM) (Norway)
48.	Japan International Cooperation Agency Research Institute (JICA-RI) (Japan)
49.	Centro de Divulgacion Conocimiento Economico para la Libertad (CEDICE) (Venezuela)
50.	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) (Costa Rica)
51.	Instituto Libertad y Democracia (ILD) (Peru)
52.	African Institute for Economic Development and Planning (IDEP) (Senegal)
53.	Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO RAS) (Russia)
54.	European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) (Netherlands)
55.	Grupo de Analisis para el Desarrollo (GRADE) (Peru)
56.	International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) (United Kingdom)
57.	Institute of Developing Economies, Japan External Trade Organization (IDE-JETRO) (Japan)
58.	Hudson Institute, Center for Global Prosperity (United States)
59.	Fundacion para el Analisis y los Estudios Sociales (FAES) (Spain)
60.	Nordic Africa Institute (Sweden)
61.	Institute for Global Dialogue (IGD) (South Africa)
62.	Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) (Japan)
63.	Water and Development Research Group (WDRG) (Finland)
64.	Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC) (Argentina)
65.	Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies (RDCY) (China)
66.	Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI) (Thailand)
67.	Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) (Norway)
68.	Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) (United States)
69.	Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) (Philippines)
70.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
71.	Asociacion Latinoamericana de Organizaciones de Promocion al Desarrollo (ALOP) (Mexico)
72.	Third World Network (TWN) (Malaysia)
73.	Fundacion Carolina (Spain)
74.	Development Alternatives (Costa Rica)
75.	International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) (Switzerland)
76.	Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA) (Netherlands)
77.	Lowy Institute for International Policy (Australia)
78.	James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy (United States)
79.	Centre for Policy Dialogue (CPD) (Bangladesh)
80.	Global Industrial and Social Progress Research Institute (GISPRI) (Japan)

Top International Economic Policy Think Tanks
Table 23

1.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
2.	Brookings Institution (United States)
3.	Bruegel (Belgium)
4.	National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) (United States)
5.	Adam Smith Institute (ASI) (United Kingdom)
6.	RAND Corporation (United States)
7.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
8.	Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO RAS) (Russia)
9.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
10.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
11.	Kiel Institute for the World Economy (IfW) (Germany)
12.	Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies (WIIW) (Austria)
13.	Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP) (Republic of Korea)
14.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
15.	Cato Institute (United States)
16.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
17.	Institute of Developing Economies, Japan External Trade Organization (IDE-JETRO) (Japan)
18.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
19.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
20.	Berkeley Roundtable on the International Economy (BRIE) (United States)
21.	European Centre for International Political Economy (ECIPE) (Belgium)
22.	Center for Global Development (CGD) (United States)
23.	Centre d'Etudes Prospectives et d'Informations Internationales (CEPII) (France)
24.	Australian Institute of International Affairs (AIIA) (Australia)
25.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
26.	Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) (Poland)
27.	Centre for Independent Studies (CIS) (Australia)
28.	Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia (ERIA) (Indonesia)
29.	Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research (Germany)
30.	Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) (United States)
31.	Institute of World Economics and Politics (IWEP) (China)
32.	Centre for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies (EDAM) (Turkey)
33.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
34.	Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA) (Ethiopia)
35.	African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) (Kenya)
36.	Razumkov Centre (Ukraine)
37.	Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI) (Argentina)
38.	India Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER) (India)
39.	Institute for World Economics (IWE) (Hungary)
40.	Institute for International Economic Studies (IIES) (Sweden)
41.	Centro de Estudio de la Realidad Economica y Social (CERES) (Uruguay)

42.	Israel Center for Social and Economic Progress (ICSEP) (Israel)
43.	Baltic Development Forum (BDF) (Denmark)
44.	Policy Studies Institute (PSI) (United Kingdom)
45.	Institute for International Trade Negotiations (ICONE) (Brazil)
46.	Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO) (Russia)
47.	Institute of Economic Growth (IEG) (India)
48.	Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies (RDCY) (China)
49.	Finnish Business and Policy Forum (EVA) (Finland)
50.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)

Top Science and Technology Think Tanks
Table 24

1.	Max Planck Institutes (Germany)
2.	Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF) (United States)
3.	Center for Development Research (ZEF) (Germany)
4.	RAND Corporation (United States)
5.	Battelle Memorial Institute (United States)
6.	Institute for Future Engineering (IFENG), FKA Institute for Future Technology (Japan)
7.	Information and Communication Technologies for Development (ICT4D) (United Kingdom)
8.	Science Policy Research Unit (SPRU) (United Kingdom)
9.	Institute for Basic Research (IBR) (United States)
10.	Consortium for Science, Policy, and Outcomes (CSPO) (United States)
11.	Technology, Entertainment, Design (TED) (United States)
12.	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) (South Africa)
13.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
14.	International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) (Austria)
15.	Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) (India)
16.	Bertelsmann Foundation (Germany)
17.	Fondation Telecom (France)
18.	Technology Policy Institute (TPI) (United States)
19.	Research ICT Africa (RIA) (South Africa)
20.	Santa Fe Institute (SFI) (United States)
21.	Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS) (United States)
22.	African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS) (Kenya)
23.	Samuel Neaman Institute for Advanced Studies in Science and Technology (SNI) (Israel)
24.	Telecom Centres of Excellence (TCOE) (India)
25.	Eudoxa (Sweden)
26.	Fundacion Innovacion Bankinter (Spain)
27.	Keck Institute for Space Studies (KISS) (United States)
28.	Science Business (Belgium)
29.	Kansai Institute of Information Systems (KIIS) (Japan)
30.	Science and Technology Policy Institute (STEPI) (Republic of Korea)
31.	Center for Global Communications (GLOCOM) (Japan)
32.	National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST) (Japan)
33.	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (Sweden)
34.	World Security Institute (WSI) (United States)
35.	Unirule Institute of Economics (China)
36.	Tech Freedom (United States)
37.	Lisbon Council for Economic Competitiveness and Social Renewal (Belgium)
38.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
39.	Institute for the Encouragement of Scientific Research and Innovation of Brussels (ISRIB) (Belgium)

40.	Centre for Studies in Science Policy (CSSP) (India)
41.	Lowy Institute for International Policy (Australia)
42.	Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO) (Russia)
43.	Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV) (Turkey)
44.	Tanzania Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH) (Tanzania)
45.	Evidence-Informed Policy Network (EVIPNet), World Health Organization (Switzerland)

Top Social Policy Think Tanks
Table 25

1.	Urban Institute (United States)
2.	Brookings Institution (United States)
3.	RAND Corporation (United States)
4.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
5.	Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) (Poland)
6.	Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies (MPIfG) (Germany)
7.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
8.	Cato Institute (United States)
9.	Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty (United States)
10.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
11.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
12.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
13.	Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC) (Argentina)
14.	Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) (United States)
15.	Swedish Institute for Social Research (SOFI) (Sweden)
16.	Bruegel (Belgium)
17.	Korea Development Institute (KDI) (Republic of Korea)
18.	Israel Center for Social and Economic Progress (ICSEP) (Israel)
19.	Russell Sage Foundation (RSF) (United States)
20.	Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) (United Kingdom)
21.	Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) (United Kingdom)
22.	Centro de Estudios Distributivos, Laborales y Sociales (CEDLAS) (Argentina)
23.	Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) (United Kingdom)
24.	Grupo de Analisis para el Desarrollo (GRADE) (Peru)
25.	Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP) (Canada)
26.	Civitas: Institute for the Study of Civil Society (United Kingdom)
27.	Demos (United Kingdom)
28.	Independent Institute for Social Policy (IISP) (Russia)
29.	New America Foundation (United States)
30.	Caledon Institute of Social Policy (Canada)
31.	Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) (South Africa)
32.	Centre for Liberal Strategies (CLS) (Bulgaria)
33.	Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) (Bangladesh)
34.	Sociological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences (SI RAS) (Russia)
35.	Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA) (Ethiopia)
36.	Policy Studies Institute (PSI) (United Kingdom)
37.	Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) (Philippines)
38.	Centre for Policy Research (CPR) (India)
39.	Centre for Education Policy Development (CEPD) (South Africa)
40.	Centro de Referencia em Seguranca Alimentar e Nutricional (CERESAN) (Brazil)

41.	Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS) (Singapore)
42.	Institute for Urban Economics (IUE) (Russia)
43.	Grattan Institute (Australia)
44.	TARKI Social Research Institute (Hungary)
45.	Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies (JCEPS) (United States)
46.	Stefan Batory Foundation (Poland)
47.	Institute for Government (IfG) (United Kingdom)
48.	Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies (RDCY) (China)
49.	Public Policy Forum (PPF) (Canada)
50.	Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences (SASS) (China)

Top Transparency and Good Governance Think Tanks

Table 26

1.	Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
2.	Amnesty International (AI) (United Kingdom)
3.	Freedom House (United States)
4.	Human Rights Watch (HRW) (United Kingdom)
5.	Mo Ibrahim Foundation (MIF) (United Kingdom)
6.	Oxford Council on Good Governance (OCGG) (United Kingdom)
7.	Brookings Institution (United States)
8.	Open Society Foundations (OSF), FKA Open Society Institute (United States)
9.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
10.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
11.	Natural Resource Governance Institute (NRGI), FKA Revenue Watch Institute (United States)
12.	National Endowment for Democracy (NED) (United States)
13.	Center for Public Integrity (CPI) (United States)
14.	Global Integrity (United States)
15.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
16.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
17.	Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) (Switzerland)
18.	Fundar, Centro de Analisis e Investigacion (Mexico)
19.	International Budget Partnership (IBP) (United States)
20.	Development Alternatives (DA) (India)
21.	Africa Institute for Energy Governance (AFIEGO) (Uganda)
22.	Taxpayers' Alliance (United Kingdom)
23.	Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW) (Indonesia)
24.	Fundacion para el Avance de las Reformas y las Oportunidades (Grupo FARO) (Ecuador)
25.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
26.	International Center for Human Development (ICHHD) (Armenia)
27.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
28.	Laboratory for Anti-Corruption Policy (LAP) (Russia)
29.	Public Affairs Centre (PAC) (India)
30.	Quality of Government Institute (QoG) (Sweden)
31.	Fundacion Jubileo (Bolivia)
32.	Center for Regional Information and Studies (PATTIRO) (Indonesia)
33.	Public Finance Monitoring Center (PFMC) (Azerbaijan)
34.	Center for Development and Democratization of Institutions (CDDI) (Albania)
35.	Cambodians for Resource Revenue Transparency (CRRT) (Cambodia)
36.	Center for Economic and Political Research (CEPR) (United States)
37.	Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) (United Kingdom)
38.	Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) (Norway)
39.	Institute for Public Policy and Good Governance (Albania)
40.	Human Rights Center Memorial (Russia)

Top Think Tanks by Special Achievement

Best Advocacy Campaign Table 27	
1.	Amnesty International (AI) (United Kingdom)
2.	Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
3.	Human Rights Watch (HRW) (United Kingdom)
4.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
5.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
6.	Center for Global Development (CGD) (United States)
7.	Pew Research Center (United States)
8.	Cato Institute (United States)
9.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
10.	Heinrich Boll Foundation (HBS) (Germany)
11.	Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty (United States)
12.	Americans for Tax Reform (ATR) (United States)
13.	Stefan Batory Foundation (Poland)
14.	Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) (Norway)
15.	Arab Forum for Alternatives (AFA) (Egypt)
16.	Taxpayers' Alliance (United Kingdom)
17.	Consejo Mexicano de Asuntos Internacionales (COMEXI) (Mexico)
18.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
19.	European Stability Initiative (ESI) (Germany)
20.	Copenhagen Consensus Center (CCC) (Denmark)
21.	European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR) (United Kingdom)
22.	Qatar Foundation (QF) (Qatar)
23.	American Principles Project (APP) (United States)
24.	Association for International Affairs (AMO) (Czech Republic)
25.	Centre for Policy Analysis (CEPA) (Ghana)
26.	Foreign Policy Initiative (FPI) (United States)
27.	African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC) (Kenya)
28.	Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches en Sciences Sociales (CERSS) (Morocco)
29.	Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment (ACODE) (Uganda)
30.	Istituto Bruno Leoni (IBL) (Italy)
31.	Global Witness (United Kingdom)
32.	Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (United Kingdom)
33.	Central Asian Free Market Institute (CAFMI) (Kyrgyzstan)
34.	Tax Foundation (United States)
35.	Center for European Policy Analysis (CEPA) (United States)
36.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
37.	FreedomWorks (United States)
38.	Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) (South Africa)
39.	Conectas Direitos Humanos (CDH) (Brazil)

40.	Centro de Investigaciones Economicas Nacionales (CIEN) (Guatemala)
41.	Corner House (United Kingdom)
42.	ONE Campaign (United States)
43.	Geneva Association (Switzerland)
44.	Institute for Economic Research and Policy Consulting (IER) (Ukraine)
45.	Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) (Senegal)
46.	Economic Research Centre (ERC) (Azerbaijan)
47.	Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI) (United States)
48.	Enough Project (United States)
49.	Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC) (Argentina)
50.	Ukrainian Center for Independent Political Research (UCIPR) (Ukraine)
51.	Center for Strategic Studies (SAM) (Azerbaijan)
52.	GRAIN (Spain)
53.	Tax Justice Network (United Kingdom)
54.	World Federalist Movement (WFM) (United States)
55.	Ethos Public Policy Lab (Mexico)
56.	Think New Mexico (United States)
57.	Refugee Advocacy Network (RAN) (Australia)
58.	Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies (IPCS) (India)
59.	Analytical Centre on Globalization and Regional Cooperation (ACGRC) (Armenia)
60.	Fundacion para el Desarrollo Economico y Social de Panama (FUDESPA) (Panama)
61.	Instituto Mexicano para la Competitividad (IMCO) (Mexico)
62.	Global Financial Integrity (GFI) (United States)
63.	Institute for Justice (IJ) (United States)
64.	Truman National Security Project (TNSP) (United States)
65.	SynergyNet (China)
66.	Property and Environment Research Center (PERC) (United States)
67.	Makerere Institute of Social Research (MISR) (Uganda)
68.	Civic Exchange (China)
69.	Ethiopian Broadcast (Ethiopia)
70.	Uwezo (Kenya)
71.	Culture and Arts Society of Ethiopia (CASE) (Ethiopia)
72.	Institut des Etudes Africaines (IEA) (Morocco)
73.	National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) (Kenya)
74.	Fortnight for Freedom (United States)
75.	National Budget Group (NBG) (Azerbaijan)

Best For Profit Think Tanks

Table 28

1.	Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) (United Kingdom)
2.	McKinsey Global Institute (MGI) (United States)
3.	Google Ideas (United States)
4.	Ernest and Young (EY) (United States)
5.	Deutsche Bank Research (Germany)
6.	Oxford Analytica (United States)
7.	Eurasia Group (United States)
8.	Strategy&, FKA Booz and Company (United States)
9.	A.T. Kearney Global Business Policy Council (GBPC) (United States)
10.	Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (FCG) (Portugal)
11.	Accenture Institute for High Performance (United States)
12.	Stratfor (United States)
13.	Samsung Economic Research Institute (SERI) (Republic of Korea)
14.	Kissinger Associates (United States)
15.	Nomura Research Institute (NRI) (Japan)
16.	IBM Institute for Business Value (United States)
17.	GovLab, Deloitte (United States)
18.	European House – Ambrosetti (TEH-A) (Italy)
19.	Boston Consulting Group (BCG) (United States)
20.	PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) (United States)
21.	Parthenon Group (United States)
22.	Bain and Company, The Bridgespan Group (United States)
23.	Economics and Country Risk (IHS), FKA Global Insight (United Kingdom)
24.	Mathmatica Policy Research (MPR) (United States)
25.	Roubini Global Economics (RGE) (United States)
26.	Daimler Benz Future Research Unit (Germany)
27.	Prioritet (Azerbaijan)
28.	Kernel Development Research P.L.C. (Ethiopia)
29.	Mitsubishi Research Institute, Inc. (MIRI) (Japan)
30.	SIR International (United States)
31.	Initiative Neue Soziale Marktwirtschaft (INSM) (Germany)
32.	Access Capital Research (Ethiopia)
33.	Roland Berger Strategy Consultants (Germany)
34.	Altran (France)
35.	Hybrid Reality Institute (United States)

Best Government Affiliated Think Tanks

Table 29

1.	Development Research Group, World Bank (DECRG) (United States)
2.	Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI) (Japan)
3.	Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) (Norway)
4.	Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) (United Kingdom)
5.	World Bank Institute (WBI), World Bank (United States)
6.	China Institute of International Studies (CIIS) (China)
7.	Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM) (Poland)
8.	Korea Development Institute (KDI) (Republic of Korea)
9.	China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations (CICIR) (China)
10.	East-West Center (EWC) (United States)
11.	European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) (France)
12.	United States Institute of Peace (USIP) (United States)
13.	European Political Strategy Centre (EPSC) (Belgium)
14.	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) (China)
15.	Centre for Eastern Studies (OSW) (Poland)
16.	Shanghai Institutes for International Studies (SIIS) (China)
17.	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) (Ecuador)
18.	German Development Institute (DIE) (Germany)
19.	Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO RAS) (Russia)
20.	Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC) (China)
21.	Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (Indonesia)
22.	Ethiopian Development Research Institute (EDRI) (Ethiopia)
23.	Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA) (India)
24.	Instituto de Pesquisa Economica Aplicada (IPEA) (Brazil)
25.	Council on Foreign and Defense Policy (SVOP) (Russia)
26.	Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry (RIETI) (Japan)
27.	Center for Strategic Studies (SAM) (Azerbaijan)
28.	United Nations University (UNU) (Japan)
29.	University of Dar es Salaam (Tanzania)
30.	Brunei Darussalam Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies (BDIPSS) (Brunei)
31.	Information and Decision Support Center (IDSC) (Egypt)
32.	Institute for Foreign Affairs and Trade (IFAT), FKA Hungarian Institute of International Affairs (Hungary)
33.	Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies (BIDS) (Bangladesh)
34.	Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI) (Thailand)
35.	Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP) (Republic of Korea)
36.	Comision Economica para America Latina (CEPAL) (Chile)
37.	Institute of World Economics and Politics (IWEP) (Vietnam)
38.	Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS) (Republic of Korea)
39.	Diplomatic Academy of Vietnam (DAV) (Vietnam)
40.	Centro de Investigacion para el Desarrollo (CIDAC) (Mexico)
41.	Institute of Strategic and Defence Studies (Hungary)
42.	Fundacao Alexandre de Gusmao (FUNAG) (Brazil)

43.	Maritime Institute of Malaysia (MIMA) (Malaysia)
44.	National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS) (Japan)
45.	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (United States)

Best Institutional Collaboration Involving Two or More Think Tanks	
Table 30	
1.	German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) (United States)
2.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
3.	Brookings Institution (United States)
4.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
5.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)
6.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
7.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
8.	Atlas Network (United States)
9.	Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM) (Poland)
10.	Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) (Italy)
11.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
12.	Swedish Institute of International Affairs (UI) (Sweden)
13.	Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC) (Argentina)
14.	Bertelsmann Foundation (Germany)
15.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
16.	Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) (Poland)
17.	Africa Institute of South Africa (AISA) (South Africa)
18.	Afrobarometer (Benin, Ghana, Kenya, South Africa, United States)
19.	EU Non-Proliferation Consortium (France, Germany, Sweden, and the United Kingdom)
20.	Migration Policy Institute (MPI) (United States) and Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Mexico Institute (United States)
21.	Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD) (Ghana)
22.	African Growth and Development Policy Modeling Consortium (AGRODEP) (Senegal)
23.	Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) (South Africa)
24.	Urban Institute (United States)
25.	Real Instituto Elcano (Spain)
26.	Notre Europe (France)
27.	Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI) (Australia) and the Brenthurst Foundation (South Africa)
28.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
29.	RAND Corporation (United States)
30.	Libertad y Desarrollo (LyD) (Chile)
31.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)
32.	International Budget Partnership (IBP) (United States)
33.	International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
34.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
35.	Regional Center for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Egypt)
36.	Kate Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research (Germany)
37.	Centro de Investigacion para el Desarrollo (CIDAC) (Mexico)

38.	Institute for Global Dialogue (IGD) (South Africa)
39.	Consejo Mexicano de Asuntos Internacionales (COMEXI) (Mexico)
40.	Gulf Research Center (GRC) (Saudi Arabia and Switzerland)
41.	French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)
42.	Green Alliance (United Kingdom)
43.	German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (Germany)
44.	Centro de Investigaciones para el Desarrollo (CID) (Colombia)
45.	German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) (Germany)
46.	Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies (RDCY) (China)
47.	Fundar, Centro de Analisis e Investigacion (Mexico)
48.	Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE) (Venezuela)
49.	China Institute for Reform and Development (CIRD) (China)
50.	Council on Energy, Environment and Water (CEEW) (India)
51.	Fundacion para el Avance de las Reformas y las Oportunidades (Grupo FARO) (Ecuador)
52.	Institute of Modern International Relations (IMIR) (China)
53.	Asian Strategy and Leadership Institute (ASLI) (Malaysia)
54.	Shanghai Advanced Institute of Finance (SAIF) (China)
55.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
56.	Grupo de Analisis para el Desarrollo (GRADE) (Peru)
57.	Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP) (Malaysia)
58.	Contorno, Centro de Prospectiva y Debate (Mexico)
59.	Ethiopian Economics Association (EEA) (Ethiopia)
60.	Fundacion Jaime Guzman (FJG) (Chile)
61.	Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) (Senegal)
62.	Coalition of Domestic Election Observers (CODEO) (Ghana)
63.	Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) (Norway)
64.	McCain Institute for International Leadership (United States)
65.	Tax Foundation (United States)
66.	Welsh Centre for International Affairs (WCIA) (United Kingdom)
67.	Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice (United States)
68.	Public Policy Forum (PPF) (Canada)
69.	GenerationLibre (France)
70.	Center for a New Economy (CNE) (Puerto Rico)
71.	Korea Economic Institute of America (KEI) (United States)
72.	Global Prosperity Wonkcast (United States)
73.	Institute for Strategic, Political, Security and Economic Consultancy (ISPSW) (Germany)
74.	Corpovisionarios (Colombia)
75.	Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) (Australia)

Best Managed Think Tanks

Table 31

1.	Brookings Institution (United States)
2.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
3.	Bruegel (Belgium)
4.	RAND Corporation (United States)
5.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
6.	Amnesty International (AI) (United Kingdom)
7.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)
8.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
9.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
10.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
11.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
12.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
13.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
14.	Urban Institute (United States)
15.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
16.	Atlantic Council (United States)
17.	Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI) (Japan)
18.	Atlas Network (United States)
19.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
20.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
21.	Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) (Denmark)
22.	BRICS Policy Center (Brazil)
23.	African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) (South Africa)
24.	Ecologic Institute (Germany)
25.	Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC) (China)
26.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
27.	Mercatus Center (United States)
28.	Regional Center for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Egypt)
29.	Centre for European Reform (CER) (United Kingdom)
30.	Korea Development Institute (KDI) (Republic of Korea)
31.	Israel Center for Social and Economic Progress (ICSEP) (Israel)
32.	Shanghai Advanced Institute of Finance (SAIF) (China)
33.	Robert Schuman Foundation (RSF) (France)
34.	International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
35.	Carnegie Moscow Center (Russia)
36.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)
37.	Libertad y Desarrollo (LyD) (Chile)
38.	Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO RAS) (Russia)
39.	Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC) (Argentina)
40.	Chicago Council on Global Affairs (United States)
41.	Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA) (Ethiopia)

42.	Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
43.	Fundar, Centro de Analisis e Investigacion (Mexico)
44.	Razumkov Centre (Ukraine)
45.	Hanns Seidel Foundation (HSS) (Germany)
46.	Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) (Poland)
47.	Africa Institute of South Africa (AISA) (South Africa)
48.	Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives (CCPA) (Canada)
49.	Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) (United States)
50.	Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI) (Argentina)
51.	Centre for Eastern Studies (OSW) (Poland)
52.	Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies (RDCY) (China)
53.	Kolegium Europy Wschodniej im. Jana Nowaka-Jezioranskiego (Poland)
54.	Asian Strategy and Leadership Institute (ASLI) (Malaysia)
55.	Carnegie Middle East Center (Lebanon)
56.	Center for Strategic Studies (SAM) (Azerbaijan)
57.	Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD) (Ghana)
58.	Fundacion para el Avance de las Reformas y las Oportunidades (Grupo FARO) (Ecuador)
59.	Fundacion Alternativas (Spain)
60.	Centro de Investigacion para el Desarrollo (CIDAC) (Mexico)
61.	Prague Security Studies Institute (PSSI) (Czech Republic)
62.	Centre for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies (EDAM) (Turkey)
63.	Institute of Modern International Relations (IMIR) (China)
64.	Institute for Ecological Economy Research (IOW) (Germany)
65.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)

Best New Idea or Paradigm Developed by a Think Tank
Table 32

1.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
2.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
3.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
4.	BRICS Policy Center (Brazil)
5.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
6.	Millennium Project (United States)
7.	Third Way (United States)
8.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
9.	Brookings Institution (United States)
10.	European Policy Centre (EPC) (Belgium)
11.	Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI) (Japan)
12.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
13.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
14.	Bipartisan Policy Center (BPC) (United States)
15.	Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) (United Kingdom)
16.	Carnegie Middle East Center (Lebanon)
17.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
18.	Resources for the Future (RFF) (United States)
19.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
20.	Carnegie Moscow Center (Russia)
21.	Robert Schuman Foundation (RSF) (France)
22.	Regional Center for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Egypt)
23.	Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) (India)
24.	French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)
25.	Center for Global Development (CGD) (United States)
26.	Stimson Center (United States)
27.	Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER) (India)
28.	Heartland Institute (United States)
29.	Asian Strategy and Leadership Institute (ASLI) (Malaysia)
30.	Centro de Estudios Espinosa Yglesias (CEEY) (Mexico)
31.	Banco de Informacion para la Investigacion Aplicada en Ciencias Sociales (BIIACS) (Mexico)
32.	Centro de Investigacion (CIUP) (Peru)
33.	Centro de Investigacion para el Desarrollo (CIDAC) (Mexico)
34.	Fields of View (India)
35.	Institute of Modern International Relations (IMIR) (China)
36.	Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD) (Ghana)
37.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
38.	Contorno, Centro de Prospectiva y Debate (Mexico)
39.	Fundacion Alternativas (Spain)
40.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)

Best New Think Tank*
Table 33

Borde Politico (Mexico)
Center for Climate and Security (CCS) (United States)
Center for Policy Studies (CERPS) (Liberia)
Centre for the Study of Governance Innovation (GovInn) (South Africa)
China-ASEAN Research Institute (China)
Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies (RDCY) (China)
Delma Institute (United Arab Emirates)
Eastern Africa Policy Centre (EAPC) (Kenya)
Emirates Policy Centre (EPC) (United Arab Emirates)
Eurasian Council on Foreign Affairs (ECFA) (Belgium)
Foundation for Government Accountability (FGA) (United States)
Fundacion Chile Intercultural (FCI) (Chile)
Fundacion para el Progreso (FPP) (Chile)
Jacques Delors Institut – Berlin (Germany)
Justitia (Denmark)
Lugar Center (United States)
McCain Institute for International Leadership (United States)
Molad: The Center for the Renewal of Israeli Democracy (Israel)
Moriah Center for Studies and Media (Iraq)
Myanmar Development Institute (MDI) (Myanmar)
OCP Policy Center (Morocco)
Project for the Study of the 21st Century (PS21) (United States)
Regional Studies Center (Iraq)
Ron Paul Institute for Peace and Prosperity (United States)
Schwarzenegger Institute for State and Global Policy (United States)
Think Tank Industry Research Center, Shanghai University (China)
Washington Center for Equitable Growth (United States)

*Think Tanks in this category have been established in the last 48 months and are not ranked, but listed in alphabetical order.

Best Policy Study/Report Produced by a Think Tank (2013-2014)

Table 34

1.	Brookings Institution (United States) “Poverty: It’s More than a Job Market Story”
2.	Chatham House (United Kingdom), Real Instituto Elcano (Spain), and Agency of Research and Legislation (AREL) (Italy) “How to Fix the Euro: Strengthening Economic Governance in Europe”
3.	Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) (Italy), Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM) (Poland), Real Instituto Elcano (Spain), and Swedish Institute of International Affairs (UI) (Sweden) “Towards a European Global Strategy: Securing European Influence in a Changing World”
4.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States) “Four Changes to Trade Rules to Facilitate Climate Change Action”
5.	Fraser Institute (Canada) “Economic Freedom of the World 2014 Annual Report”
6.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States) “High Stakes for Young Lives: Examining Strategies to Stop Child Marriage”
7.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy) “Eurozone Flaws: Uncovering the Holes in the Cheese”
8.	Korea Development Institute (KDI) (Republic of Korea) “The Necessity of a Paradigm Shift in Korean Welfare Policy and Tasks to be Pursued”
9.	Shanghai Institutes for International Studies (SIIS) (China) “Coexploring and Coevolving: Constructing a New Model of the Major Power Relationship between China and the United States”
10.	LSE IDEAS (United Kingdom) “Ending the Drug Wars: Report of the LSE Expert Group on the Economics of Drug Policy”
11.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Middle East Program (United States) “Iran’s Nuclear Chess: Calculating America’s Moves”
12.	Centre d’Etudes et de Recherches en Sciences Sociales (CERSS) (Morocco) “Le rapport strategique du Maroc 2010-2013”
13.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States) “Getting India Back on Track: An Action Agenda for Reform”
14.	German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) (United States) “Africa and the Mediterranean: Evolving Security Dynamics after the Arab Uprisings”
15.	Atlantic Council, Rafik Hariri Center for the Middle East (United States) “US and EU: Lack of, Frustrated Efforts Toward the Arab Transitions”
16.	Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI) (Australia) “The Cost of Defence”
17.	Brookings Institution (United States) “Our Sobering Cyber Future: Law and Policy Implications”
18.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, International Center on Housing Risk (AEI) (United States) “House Prices and Land Prices Under the Microscope: A Property-Level Analysis”
19.	Association for International Affairs (AMO) (Czech Republic) “Trends of Czech European Policy: Study of European Policy Elites”
20.	Manhattan Institute for Policy Research (MI) (United States) “Transcending Obamacare: A Patient-Centered Plan for Near-Universal Coverage and Permanent Fiscal Solvency”
21.	Caspian Strategy Institute (Turkey) “Energy Future of Europe and the Role of the

	Southern Corridor”
22.	National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS) (Japan) “East Asian Strategic Review 2014”
23.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States) “U.S.-China Relations: Toward a New Model of Major Power Relationship”
24.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan) “Accession to the Customs Union: Shaping the strategy for Azerbaijan”
25.	Chatham House (United Kingdom) “Western Policy towards Syria: Ten Recommendations”
26.	Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies (ACRPS) (Qatar) “2014 Arab Opinion Index”
27.	Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO RAS) (Russia) and Eurasian Development Bank (EDB) (Kazakhstan) “Monitoring Mutual Investments in CIS Countries”
28.	Heritage Foundation (United States) “Job-Training Reform: Finding Out What Works”
29.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium) “Make or Break: Iraq’s Sunnis and the State”
30.	Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) (Pakistan) “State of Food Security in Pakistan and Policy Options”
32.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium) “The Tunisian Exception: Success and Limits of Consensus”
33.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States) “Is Geography Destiny? A Primer on North American Relations”
34.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States) “Afghanistan After the Drawdown”
35.	Foundation for International Development Study and Research (Ferdi) (France) “Measuring Official Development Assistance: Why and how to change”
36.	Conference of Defence Associations Institute (CDA) (Canada) “The Strategic Outlook for Canada 2014”
37.	Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies (RDCY) (China) “Ruralization In China”
38.	Centro de Investigacion para el Desarrollo (CIDAC) (Mexico) “Metodologia para el seguimiento y la evaluacion de la implementacion y operacion del nuevo sistema de justicia penal”
39.	BRICS Policy Center (Brazil) “The Brazil and South-South Cooperation: How to Respond to Current Challenges”
40.	Hague Institute for Global Justice (HIGJ) (Netherlands) “The Hague Approach: Six Principles for Achieving Sustainable Peace in Post-Conflict Situations”
41.	Royal Institute for Strategic Studies (IRES) (Morocco) “Strategic Report on Morocco’s Competitiveness”
42.	South African Institute for International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa) “The Green Economy and the BRICS Countries”
43.	European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR) (United Kingdom) “Syria’s War Economy”
44.	Institute for National Security Studies (INSS) (Israel) “The History of Israeli-Palestinian Negotiations”
45.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya) “Mainstreaming Gender in the National Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) Policy of Kenya”
46.	Action Institute (Italy) “Healthcare Roadmap 2030”

47. Atlantic Council, Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security (United States)
“Envisioning 2030: US Strategy for the Coming Technology Revolution”

Best Think Tank Conference
Table 35

1.	Munich Security Conference (MSC) (Germany)
2.	German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) (United States)
3.	Shangri-La Dialogue (Singapore)
4.	Wilton Park (United Kingdom)
5.	BRICS Policy Center (Brazil)
6.	Brookings Institution (United States)
7.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
8.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
9.	Mont Pelerin Society (MPS) (Switzerland)
10.	Centre for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies (EDAM) (Turkey)
11.	Atlantic Council (United States)
12.	Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI) (Japan)
13.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
14.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
15.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
16.	Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) (South Africa)
17.	Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty (United States)
18.	Asia-Pacific Roundtable (APR) (Malaysia)
19.	Atlas Network (United States)
20.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
21.	United States Institute of Peace (USIP) (United States)
22.	Institute for International Policy Studies (IIPS) (Japan)
23.	Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences (SASS) (China)
24.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
25.	German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (Germany)
26.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
27.	Regional Centre for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Sri Lanka)
28.	Shanghai Advanced Institute of Finance (SAIF) (China)
29.	French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)
30.	Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC) (Argentina)
31.	Centro de Divulgacion Conocimiento Economico para la Libertad (CEDICE) (Venezuela)
32.	Kiel Institute for the World Economy (IfW) (Germany)
33.	Asian Strategy and Leadership Institute (ASLI) (Malaysia)
34.	Center for a New American Security (CNAS) (United States)
35.	Middle East Institute (MEI) (Singapore)
36.	Skoll World Forum on Social Entrepreneurship (United Kingdom)
37.	OCP Policy Center (Morocco)
38.	Contorno, Centro de Prospectiva y Debate (Mexico)
39.	Ethiopian Economics Association (EEA) (Ethiopia)
40.	Instituto de Estudos Empresariais (IEE) (Brazil)

41.	Centro de Investigacion para el Desarrollo (CIDAC) (Mexico)
42.	Chulalongkorn University (Thailand)
43.	Asan Institute for Policy Studies (AIPS) (Republic of Korea)
44.	Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) (Italy)
45.	World Economic Forum (WEF) (Switzerland)
46.	Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research (ECSSR) (United Arab Emirates)
47.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
48.	Development Alternatives (DA) (India)
49.	Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP) (Canada)
50.	East Asia Institute (EAI) (Republic of Korea)
51.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Turkey)
52.	Institut des Relations Internationales et Strategiques (IRIS) (France)
53.	Milken Institute Global Conference (United States)
54.	Fundar, Centro de Analisis e Investigacion (Mexico)
55.	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA) (Kenya)

Best Think Tank Network

Table 36

1.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
2.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
3.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
4.	Brookings Institution (United States)
5.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
6.	Asian Development Bank Institute (ADB) (Japan)
7.	Euro-Mediterranean Study Commission (EuroMeSCo) (Spain)
8.	Atlas Network (United States)
9.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
10.	BRICS Policy Center (Brazil)
11.	ASEAN-Institutes of Strategic and International Studies (ASEAN-ISIS) (Malaysia)
12.	Trans-European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA) (Belgium)
13.	Think Global Act European, Notre Europe (France)
14.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
15.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
16.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
17.	Cato Institute (United States)
18.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
19.	Red Iberoamericana de Estudios Internacionales (RIBEI) (Spain)
20.	State Policy Network (SPN) (United States)
21.	European Policy Centre (EPC) (Belgium)
22.	International Development Economics Associates (IDEAs) (India)
23.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
24.	Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia (ERIA) (Indonesia)
25.	Bruegel (Belgium)
26.	Asia-Pacific Research and Training Network on Trade (ARTNeT) (Thailand)
27.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
28.	Centro de Investigacion para el Desarrollo (CIDAC) (Mexico)
29.	Policy Network (United Kingdom)
30.	Regional Center for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Egypt)
31.	German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (Germany)
32.	Think Visegrad – V4 Think Tank Platform (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia)
33.	Al-Shabaka: The Palestinian Policy Network (Transnational)
34.	Linktank (United States)
35.	Global Policy Forum (GPF) (United States)
36.	Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC) (Argentina)
37.	Consejo Mexicano de Asuntos Internacionales (COMEXI) (Mexico)
38.	Policy Association for an Open Society (PASOS) (Czech Republic)
39.	Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP) (Canada)
40.	Heartland Institute (United States)

41.	Institute of Modern International Relations (IMIR) (China)
42.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)
43.	Hanns Seidel Foundation (HSS) (Germany)
44.	Property Rights Alliance (PRA) (United States)
45.	China Institute for Reform and Development (CIRD) (China)
46.	Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) (United Kingdom)
47.	Regional Centre for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Sri Lanka)
48.	Chula Global Network (CGN) (Thailand)
49.	Red Liberal de America Latina (RELIAL) (Mexico)
50.	Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) (South Africa)
51.	Azerbaijan Think Tank Alliance (ATTA) (Azerbaijan)
52.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
53.	Ethiopian Economics Association (EEA) (Ethiopia)
54.	IPS (Republic of Korea)
55.	European Parliamentary Technology Assessment (EPTA) (Europe)
56.	Fundacion Alternativas (Spain)
57.	Asian Strategy and Leadership Institute (ASLI) (Malaysia)
58.	IMANI Center for Policy and Education (Ghana)
59.	Contorno, Centro de Prospectiva y Debate (Mexico)
60.	MEDays Forum, Amadeus Institute (Morocco)

Best Think Tanks with Political Party Affiliation

Table 37

1.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
2.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
3.	Heinrich Boll Foundation (HBS) (Germany)
4.	Demos (United Kingdom)
5.	Fabian Society (United Kingdom)
6.	Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Freedom (FNF) (Germany)
7.	Foundation for European Progressive Studies (FEPS) (Belgium)
8.	Hanns Seidel Foundation (HSS) (Germany)
9.	European Ideas Network (EIN) (Belgium)
10.	Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies, FKA Centre for European Studies (Belgium)
11.	Progressive Policy Institute (PPI) (United States)
12.	Party School of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (China)
13.	Fundacion Ideas para el Progreso (Spain)
14.	Fundacion Jaime Guzman (FJG) (Chile)
15.	New Democrat Network (NDN) (United States)
16.	Foundation for EU Democracy (Belgium)
17.	Foundation Max van der Stoel, FKA Evert Vermeer Foundation (Netherlands)
18.	Fondation pour l'Innovation Politique (Fondapol) (France)
19.	Green European Foundation (GEF) (Belgium)
20.	Rosa Luxemburg Foundation (RLS) (Germany)
21.	Fundacion para el Analisis y los Estudios Sociales (FAES) (Spain)
22.	Wiardi Beckman Foundation (WBS) (Netherlands)
23.	Terra Nova (France)
24.	Fondazione Italianeuropei (Italy)
25.	Fundacion Pensar (Argentina)
26.	Institute of Strategic Analysis and Policy Research (INSAP) (Malaysia)
27.	Fundacao Armando Alvares Penteado (FAAP) (Brazil)
28.	SEDAR Institute (Malaysia)
29.	Foundation for European Progressive Studies (FEPS) (Belgium)
30.	Institute of European Democrats (IED) (Belgium)

Best Transdisciplinary Research Program at a Think Tank
Table 38

1.	RAND Corporation (United States)
2.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
3.	Brookings Institution (United States)
4.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
5.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
6.	BRICS Policy Center (Brazil)
7.	Yale Center for the Study of Globalization (United States)
8.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
9.	World Resources Institute (WRI) (United States)
10.	Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) (Norway)
11.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
12.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
13.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
14.	Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI) (Japan)
15.	Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) (South Africa)
16.	China Institute for Reform and Development (CIRD) (China)
17.	Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD) (Ghana)
18.	Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Freedom (FNF) (Germany)
19.	Centro de Estudio de la Realidad Economica y Social (CERES) (Uruguay)
20.	Centre for European Reform (CER) (United Kingdom)
21.	Center for Global Development (CGD) (United States)
22.	Santa Fe Institute (SFI) (United States)
23.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
24.	Regional Center for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Egypt)
25.	Fundacion Proyecto Linguistico Francisco Marroquin (PLFM) (Guatemala)
26.	Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies, FKA Centre for European Studies (Belgium)
27.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
28.	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) (Costa Rica)
29.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
30.	Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC) (Argentina)
31.	Peru in 2062 (CIUP) (Peru)
32.	Asian Strategy and Leadership Institute (ASLI) (Malaysia)
33.	Centre for Policy Development Sustainable Economy Program (CPD) (Australia)
34.	Grupo de Analisis para el Desarrollo (GRADE) (Peru)
35.	Contorno, Centro de Prospectiva y Debate (Mexico)
36.	Centro de Investigacion para el Desarrollo (CIDAC) (Mexico)
37.	Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI) (Argentina)
38.	Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) (Pakistan)
39.	Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) (Senegal)

40.	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA) (Kenya)
41.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
42.	Washington Institute for Near East Policy (WINEP) (United States)
43.	Institute for Security Studies (ISS) (South Africa)
44.	Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS) (India)
45.	Economic Policy Research Center (EPRC) (Uganda)
46.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)
47.	Bertelsmann Foundation (Germany)
48.	Institute for International Policy Studies (IIPS) (Japan)
49.	German Development Institute (DIE) (Germany)
50.	Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia (ERIA) (Indonesia)
51.	Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO RAS) (Russia)
52.	Development Alternatives (DA) (India)
53.	Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP) (Canada)
54.	East Asia Institute (EAI) (Republic of Korea)
55.	Unirule Institute of Economics (China)
56.	Taub Center for Social Policy Studies in Israel (Israel)
57.	French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)
58.	Fundar, Centro de Analisis e Investigacion (Mexico)
59.	German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) (Germany)
60.	New America Foundation (United States)

Best University Affiliated Think Tanks

Table 39

1.	Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard University (United States)
2.	IDEAS/Public Policy Group, London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) (United Kingdom)
3.	Center for International Development (CID), Harvard University (United States)
4.	Hoover Institution, Stanford University (United States)
5.	Earth Institute, Columbia University (United States)
6.	Center for International Security and Cooperation (CISAC), Stanford University (United States)
7.	Centre for Defence Studies (CDS), King's College London (United Kingdom)
8.	BRICS Policy Center, Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio) (Brazil)
9.	James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy, Rice University (United States)
10.	Institute of International and Strategic Studies (IISS), Peking University, FKA Center for International and Strategic Studies (China)
11.	Institute of Development Studies (IDS), University of Sussex (United Kingdom)
12.	Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO) (Russia)
13.	Carnegie – Tsinghua Center for Global Policy (China)
14.	University of International Relations (UIR) (China)
15.	Center for International Studies and Research (CERI), Sciences Po (France)
16.	Brookings-Tsinghua Center for Public Policy (BTC), Tsinghua University (China)
17.	SAIS Center for Transatlantic Relations, Johns Hopkins University (United States)
18.	Weatherhead Center for International Affairs (WCFIA), Harvard University (United States)
19.	Mercatus Center, George Mason University (GMU) (United States)
20.	Center for Development Research (ZEF), University of Bonn (Germany)
21.	East Asian Institute (EAI), National University of Singapore (Singapore)
22.	Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies (FSI), Stanford University (United States)
23.	Center for Policy Studies (CPS), Central European University (CEU) (Hungary)
24.	Centre for the Study of African Economies (CSAE), Oxford University (United Kingdom)
25.	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) (Costa Rica)
26.	Strategic and Defence Studies Centre (SDSC), Australian National University (ANU) (Australia)
27.	Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS), National University of Singapore (Singapore)
28.	Center for Security Studies (CSS), Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH) Zurich (Switzerland)
29.	Council on Foreign Relations and Defense (SVOP), National Research University (Russia)
30.	Centre for International Security Studies (CISS), University of Sydney (Australia)
31.	Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS), S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University (Singapore)

32.	Weatherhead East Asian Institute (WEAI), Columbia University (United States)
33.	Fiscal Governance Centre, Hertie School of Governance (Germany)
34.	Edwin O. Reischauer Center for East Asian Studies, Johns Hopkins University (United States)
35.	Centre for Strategic Studies (CSS), Victoria University of Wellington (New Zealand)
36.	Center for Economic Research and Graduate Education, Economics Institute (CERGE-EI) (Czech Republic)
37.	Human Security Report Project (HSRP), Simon Fraser University (Canada)
38.	European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations (ERCOMER), Utrecht University (Netherlands)
39.	Centre for Security, Economics and Technology (C SET), University of St. Gallen (Switzerland)
40.	Economic Policy Research Center (EPRC), Makerere University (Uganda)
41.	Center for Political Analysis, Makerere University (Uganda)
42.	Globalisation and Development Centre (GDC), Bond University (Australia)
43.	Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies, Renmin University of China (RDCY) (China)
44.	Liu Institute for Global Issues, University of British Columbia (UBC) (Canada)
45.	Arab Studies Center, Al Mustansiriyah University (Iraq)

Best Use of Social Networks
Table 40

1.	Amnesty International (AI) (United Kingdom)
2.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
3.	Human Rights Watch (HRW) (United Kingdom)
4.	Cato Institute (United States)
5.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
6.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
7.	Brookings Institution (United States)
8.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
9.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
10.	Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
11.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
12.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
13.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
14.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
15.	Atlas Network (United States)
16.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
17.	Adam Smith Institute (ASI) (United Kingdom)
18.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
19.	Carnegie Moscow Center (Russia)
20.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
21.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
22.	BRICS Policy Center (Brazil)
23.	International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
24.	Carnegie Middle East Center (Lebanon)
25.	Center for a New American Security (CNAS) (United States)
26.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)
27.	Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI) (Australia)
28.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
29.	Lowy Institute for International Policy (Australia)
30.	Ethos Public Policy Lab (Mexico)
31.	African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) (South Africa)
32.	Gateway House: Indian Council on Global Relations (India)
33.	Libertad y Desarrollo (LyD) (Chile)
34.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)
35.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
36.	Mercatus Center (United States)
37.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
38.	Instituto Liberdade (Brazil)
39.	Regional Centre for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Sri Lanka)
40.	China Center for International Economic Exchanges (CCIEE) (China)
41.	European Policy Centre (EPC) (Belgium)
42.	Centro de Divulgacion Conocimiento Economico para la Libertad (CEDICE) (Venezuela)

43.	Heartland Institute (United States)
44.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
45.	Israel Center for Social and Economic Progress (ICSEP) (Israel)
46.	Regional Center for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Egypt)
47.	Asian Strategy and Leadership Institute (ASLI) (Malaysia)
48.	IMANI Center for Policy and Education (Ghana)
49.	Fundacion Alternativas (Spain)
50.	German Development Institute (DIE) (Germany)
51.	Development Alternatives (DA) (India)
52.	Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP) (Canada)
53.	East Asia Institute (EAI) (Republic of Korea)
54.	Unirule Institute of Economics (China)
55.	Third Way (United States)
56.	Taub Center for Social Policy Studies in Israel (Israel)
57.	French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)
58.	Fundar, Centro de Analisis e Investigacion (Mexico)
59.	German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) (Germany)
60.	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA) (Kenya)

Think Tank to Watch
Table 41

1.	BRICS Policy Center (Brazil)
2.	Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI) (Australia)
3.	Association for International Affairs (AMO) (Czech Republic)
4.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
5.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
6.	Atlantic Council (United States)
7.	IDEAS (United Kingdom)
8.	Beyond Zero Emissions (BZE) (Australia)
9.	Chicago Council on Global Affairs (United States)
10.	Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB) (Spain)
11.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
12.	Bipartisan Policy Center (BPC) (United States)
13.	Comision Economica para America Latina (CEPAL) (Chile)
14.	Observer Research Foundation (ORF) (India)
15.	Analytical Center for the Government of the Russian Federation (Russia)
16.	Ecologic Institute (Germany)
17.	Mercatus Center (United States)
18.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
19.	Heartland Institute (United States)
20.	Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA) (India)
21.	Asian Strategy and Leadership Institute (ASLI) (Malaysia)
22.	European Policy Centre (EPC) (Belgium)
23.	Third Way (United States)
24.	Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO RAS) (Russia)
25.	New America Foundation (United States)
26.	Centre for Civil Society (CCS) (India)
27.	Centro de Investigacion para el Desarrollo (CIDAC) (Mexico)
28.	Regional Centre for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Sri Lanka)
29.	IMANI Center for Policy and Education (Ghana)
30.	Institute for Democracy and Economic Affairs (IDEAS) (Malaysia)
31.	Ethos Public Policy Lab (Mexico)
32.	Vivekananda Institute of Technology (VKIT) (India)
33.	Fundacion Innovacion Bankinter (Spain)
34.	Institute for International Strategy and Information Analysis (IISIA) (Japan)
35.	McCain Institute for International Leadership (United States)
36.	Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment (GRI) (United Kingdom)
37.	International Strategic Analysis and Research Center (USTAD) (Turkey)
38.	Regional Center for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Egypt)
39.	Israel Center for Social and Economic Progress (ICSEP) (Israel)
40.	Shanghai Advanced Institute of Finance (SAIF) (China)
41.	Centre for Policy Research (CPR) (India)
42.	OCP Policy Center (Morocco)

43.	African Heritage Institution (AfriHeritage) (Nigeria)
44.	Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD) (Ghana)
45.	Korber Foundation (Germany)
46.	China Institute for Reform and Development (CIRD) (China)
47.	Audace Institut Afrique (AIA) (Cote d'Ivoire)
48.	International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) (Canada)
49.	Centro de Estudio de la Realidad Economica y Social (CERES) (Uruguay)
50.	Fundacion de Estudios de Economia Aplicada (FEDEA) (Spain)
51.	Prague Security Studies Institute (PSSI) (Czech Republic)
52.	Center for Policy Studies (CERPS) (Liberia)
53.	Gateway House: Indian Council on Global Relations (India)
54.	Strategic Outlook (SO) (Turkey)
55.	Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) (Pakistan)
56.	Center for Strategic Analyses and Research (C-SAR) (South Sudan)
57.	Fundacion para el Progreso (FPP) (Chile)
58.	Centre for Independent Studies (CIS) (Australia)
59.	Canada 2020 (Canada)
60.	Mathematica Policy Research (MPR) (United States)
61.	Economic Research Center (ERC) (Azerbaijan)
62.	Institute of Europe (IE) (Russia)
63.	Kate Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research (Germany)
64.	Instituto Mora (Mexico)
65.	Russian International Affairs Council (RIAC) (Russia)
66.	Fundar, Centro de Analisis e Investigacion (Mexico)
67.	Tax Foundation (United States)
68.	Welsh Centre for International Affairs (WCIA) (United Kingdom)
69.	Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice (United States)
70.	Ethiopian Economics Association (EEA) (Ethiopia)
71.	Council on Energy, Environment and Water (CEEW) (India)
72.	Center for a New Economy (CNE) (Puerto Rico)
73.	Korea Economic Institute of America (KEI) (United States)
74.	Global Prosperity Wonkcast (United States)
75.	Green Alliance (United Kingdom)
76.	Institute for Strategic, Political, Security and Economic Consultancy (ISPSW) (Germany)
77.	Libera (Finland)
78.	Centro de Estudios Espinosa Yglesias (CEEY) (Mexico)
79.	Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) (Australia)
80.	GenerationLibre (France)

Think Tanks with the Best External Relations/Public Engagement Program

Table 42

1.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
2.	Brookings Institution (United States)
3.	Amnesty International (AI) (United Kingdom)
4.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
5.	Human Rights Watch (HRW) (United Kingdom)
6.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
7.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
8.	Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
9.	Cato Institute (United States)
10.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
11.	Bruegel (Belgium)
12.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
13.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
14.	Atlas Network (United States)
15.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
16.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
17.	Atlantic Council (United States)
18.	International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
19.	Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations (Netherlands)
20.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
21.	Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV) (Turkey)
22.	Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC) (Argentina)
23.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
24.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
25.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
26.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
27.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)
28.	German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (Germany)
29.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)
30.	World Resources Institute (WRI) (United States)
31.	Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI) (Argentina)
32.	Carnegie Europe (Belgium)
33.	Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) (Japan)
34.	Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (United Kingdom)
35.	Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) (Norway)
36.	Urban Institute (United States)
37.	Asian Strategy and Leadership Institute (ASLI) (Malaysia)
38.	Center for a New American Security (CNAS) (United States)
39.	Lowy Institute for International Policy (Australia)
40.	Adam Smith Institute (ASI) (United Kingdom)
41.	Development Alternatives (DA) (India)
42.	Gulf Research Center (GRC) (Saudi Arabia)

43.	Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) (United Kingdom)
44.	Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) (United Kingdom)
45.	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA) (Kenya)
46.	German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) (Germany)
47.	Libertad y Desarrollo (Lyd) (Chile)
48.	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) (Costa Rica)
49.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
50.	German Development Institute (DIE) (Germany)

Think Tanks with the Best Use of the Internet
Table 43

1.	Amnesty International (AI) (United Kingdom)
2.	Cato Institute (United States)
3.	Pew Research Center (United States)
4.	Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
5.	Brookings Institution (United States)
6.	Human Rights Watch (HRW) (United Kingdom)
7.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
8.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
9.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
10.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
11.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
12.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
13.	Atlas Network (United States)
14.	Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies, FKA Centre for European Studies (Belgium)
15.	Technology, Entertainment, Design (TED) (United States)
16.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
17.	International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
18.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
19.	Center for a New American Security (CNAS) (United States)
20.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
21.	European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR) (United Kingdom)
22.	Center for Global Development (CGD) (United States)
23.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
24.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
25.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
26.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
27.	Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (United Kingdom)
28.	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) (Costa Rica)
29.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
30.	Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) (United Kingdom)
31.	Tahrir Data Project (Egypt)
32.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
33.	Ethos Public Policy Lab (Mexico)
34.	Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) (Japan)
35.	Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA) (Ethiopia)
36.	Centro de Divulgacion Conocimiento Economico para la Libertad (CEDICE) (Venezuela)
37.	Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) (Senegal)
38.	Gateway House: Indian Council on Global Relations (India)
39.	RAND Corporation (United States)

40. ResPublica (United Kingdom)

Think Tanks with the Best Use of the Media (Print or Electronic)
Table 44

1.	Pew Research Center (United States)
2.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
3.	Brookings Institution (United States)
4.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
5.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
6.	Human Rights Watch (HRW) (United States)
7.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
8.	Amnesty International (AI) (United Kingdom)
9.	Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
10.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
11.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
12.	Cato Institute (United States)
13.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
14.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
15.	German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) (United States)
16.	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (Sweden)
17.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
18.	Center for a New American Security (CNAS) (United States)
19.	European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR) (United Kingdom)
20.	RAND Corporation (United States)
21.	International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
22.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
23.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
24.	Korea Development Institute (KDI) (Republic of Korea)
25.	Ecologic Institute (Germany)
26.	Libertad y Desarrollo (LyD) (Chile)
27.	Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA) (India)
28.	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) (Costa Rica)
29.	Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS) (Singapore)
30.	REPOA, FKA Research on Poverty Alleviation (Tanzania)
31.	Hoover Institution (United States)
32.	French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)
33.	Centro de Implementacion de Politicas Publicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC) (Argentina)
34.	Lowy Institute for International Policy (Australia)
35.	Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations (Netherlands)
36.	Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV) (Turkey)
37.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)

38.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
39.	German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (Germany)
40.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)

Think Tanks with the Most Innovative Policy Ideas/Proposals

Table 45

1.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
2.	Brookings Institution (United States)
3.	Fundar, Centro de Analisis e Investigacion (Mexico)
4.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
5.	Cato Institute (United States)
6.	Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) (Poland)
7.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
8.	Zero Emissions Research and Initiatives (ZERI) (Japan)
9.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
10.	Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
11.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
12.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
13.	Urban Institute (United States)
14.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
15.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
16.	Observer Research Foundation (ORF) (India)
17.	New America Foundation (United States)
18.	Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies, FKA Centre for European Studies (Belgium)
19.	Development Alternatives (DA) (India)
20.	European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR) (United Kingdom)
21.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
22.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
23.	Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) (United Kingdom)
24.	Heinrich Boll Foundation (HBS) (Germany)
25.	IMANI Center for Policy and Education (Ghana)
26.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
27.	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) (Costa Rica)
28.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
29.	Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Freedom (FNF) (Germany)
30.	French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)

Think Tanks with the Most Significant Impact on Public Policy
Table 46

1.	Brookings Institution (United States)
2.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
3.	Bruegel (Belgium)
4.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
5.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
6.	RAND Corporation (United States)
7.	Amnesty International (AI) (United Kingdom)
8.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
9.	Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) (United States)
10.	Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
11.	Cato Institute (United States)
12.	Human Rights Watch (HRW) (United Kingdom)
13.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
14.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
15.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
16.	Center for a New American Security (CNAS) (United States)
17.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
18.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
19.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
20.	Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies, FKA Centre for European Studies (Belgium)
21.	Atlantic Council (United States)
22.	International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
23.	International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
24.	Adam Smith Institute (ASI) (United Kingdom)
25.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)
26.	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (Sweden)
27.	Fraser Institute (Canada)
28.	Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV) (Turkey)
29.	Open Society Foundations (OSF), FKA Open Society Institute (United States)
30.	German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (Germany)
31.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
32.	Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (United Kingdom)
33.	Al-Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies (ACPSS) (Egypt)
34.	German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) (Germany)
35.	Urban Institute (United States)
36.	Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO) (Russia)
37.	Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER) (India)
38.	Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) (Senegal)
39.	Libertad y Desarrollo (LyD) (Chile)
40.	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA) (Kenya)
41.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)

42.	Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) (Japan)
43.	Lowy Institute for International Policy (Australia)
44.	Center for Policy Studies (CPS) (Hungary)
45.	C.D. Howe Institute (Canada)
46.	European Centre for International Political Economy (ECIPE) (Belgium)
47.	Regional Center for Strategic Studies (RCSS) (Egypt)
48.	Asian Strategy and Leadership Institute (ASLI) (Malaysia)
49.	Centro de Estudios Publicos (CEP) (Chile)
50.	Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) (Costa Rica)
51.	IMANI Center for Policy and Education (Ghana)
52.	Council on Foreign and Defense Policy (SVOP) (Russia)
53.	New America Foundation (United States)
54.	CESifo Group (Germany)
55.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)
56.	Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) (Poland)
57.	Unirule Institute of Economics (China)
58.	Fundacion para la Educacion Superior y el Desarrollo (Fedesarrollo) (Colombia)
59.	Korea Development Institute (KDI) (Republic of Korea)
60.	Centro de Investigacion para el Desarrollo (CIDAD) (Mexico)
61.	Kiel Institute for the World Economy (IfW) (Germany)
62.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
63.	Centro de Divulgacion Conocimiento Economico para la Libertad (CEDICE) (Venezuela)
64.	Fundar, Centro de Analisis e Investigacion (Mexico)
65.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
66.	Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA) (Ethiopia)
67.	Instituto Fernando Henrique Cardoso (iFHC) (Brazil)
68.	Ecologic Institute (Germany)
69.	Heartland Institute (United States)
70.	Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP) (Canada)

Think Tanks with Outstanding Policy-Oriented Public Programs
Table 47

1.	RAND Corporation (United States)
2.	Brookings Institution (United States)
3.	Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (United States)
4.	Chatham House (United Kingdom)
5.	Bruegel (Belgium)
6.	Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) (United States)
7.	Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) (United States)
8.	Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
9.	Cato Institute (United States)
10.	Amnesty International (AI) (United Kingdom)
11.	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (United States)
12.	Adam Smith Institute (ASI) (United Kingdom)
13.	National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) (United States)
14.	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (Sweden)
15.	International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
16.	Urban Institute (United States)
17.	Human Rights Watch (HRW) (United Kingdom)
18.	Heritage Foundation (United States)
19.	Center for American Progress (CAP) (United States)
20.	Korea Development Institute (KDI) (Republic of Korea)
21.	Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
22.	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) (United States)
23.	World Resources Institute (WRI) (United States)
24.	German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (Germany)
25.	Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC) (China)
26.	Lowy Institute for International Policy (Australia)
27.	Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
28.	Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) (United Kingdom)
29.	Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) (Japan)
30.	Carnegie Moscow Center (Russia)
31.	Center for Global Development (CGD) (United States)
32.	Hoover Institution (United States)
33.	Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) (United Kingdom)
34.	Centro de Investigacion para el Desarrollo (CIDAC) (Mexico)
35.	Centro Brasileiro de Analise e Planejamento (CEBRAP) (Brazil)
36.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
37.	Libertad y Desarrollo (Lyd) (Chile)
38.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)
39.	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) (China)

40.	Institute of Policy Studies (IPS) (Singapore)
41.	Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA) (Singapore)
42.	Washington Institute for Near East Policy (WINEP) (United States)
43.	Institute for Security Studies (ISS) (South Africa)
44.	Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS) (India)
45.	Economic Policy Research Center (EPRC) (Uganda)
46.	South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) (South Africa)
47.	Institute for International Policy Studies (IIPS) (Japan)
48.	German Development Institute (DIE) (Germany)
49.	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV) (Brazil)
50.	Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO RAS) (Russia)
51.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
52.	Development Alternatives (DA) (India)
53.	Institute for Research on Public Policy (IRPP) (Canada)
54.	East Asia Institute (EAI) (Republic of Korea)
55.	Unirule Institute of Economics (China)
56.	Taub Center for Social Policy Studies in Israel (Israel)
57.	French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)
58.	Fundar, Centro de Analisis e Investigacion (Mexico)
59.	German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) (Germany)
60.	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA) (Kenya)

Top Think Tanks with Annual Operating Budgets of Less Than \$5 Million USD
Table 49

1.	Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM) (Poland)
2.	Foreign Policy Research Institute (FPRI) (United States)
3.	Fundar, Centro de Analisis e Investigacion (Mexico)
4.	Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) (Poland)
5.	Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
6.	Economic Policy Research Institute (EPRI) (South Africa)
7.	Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD) (Azerbaijan)
8.	African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS) (Kenya)
9.	Centro Brasileiro de Relacoes Internacionais (CEBRI) (Brazil)
10.	IMANI Center for Policy and Education (Ghana)
11.	Unirule Institute of Economics (China)
12.	Libertad y Desarrollo (Lyd) (Chile)
13.	Centro de Estudios Publicos (CEP) (Chile)
14.	Council on Energy, Environment and Water (CEEW) (India)
15.	Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) (Australia)
16.	Centro Studi Internazionali (Ce.S.I.) (Italy)
17.	Centro de Divulgacion Conocimiento Economico para la Libertad (CEDICE) (Venezuela)
18.	Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies (RDCY) (China)
19.	Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI) (Argentina)
20.	Instituto Ecuatoriano de Economia Politica (IEEP) (Ecuador)
21.	Centre for Public Policy Studies (CPPS) (Malaysia)
22.	Asian Strategy and Leadership Institute (ASLI) (Malaysia)
23.	Integrated Research and Action for Development (IRADe) (India)
24.	Action Institute (Italy)
25.	Mapungubwe Institute for Strategic Reflection (MISTRA) (South Africa)

Appendices

APPENDIX A: CALL FOR INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND REGIONAL AND FUNCTIONAL EXPERT PANEL MEMBERS

May 5, 2014

RE: First Call Expert Panelist for the 2014 Global Go To Think Tank Index

Dear Friend and Colleague:

As we prepare for the 2014 Global Go To Think Tank rankings process, we are seeking your help in identifying qualified individuals to serve on the Regional, Functional, and Special Areas of Distinction Panels for the 2013 Global Go To Think Tank Index Project. Since the Global Go To Think Tank Index is currently conducted without a staff or a budget we must rely on the Expert Panels to assure the quality and integrity of the global indexing process.

Please help us make sure the think tanks in your country and region are properly reflected in the annual global index of think tanks by nominating qualified individuals to serve on one or more of the Expert Panels.

The Expert Panel Nominations survey can be accessed by using this link:
<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx>

All nominations will be treated as strictly confidential and must include the name, title, affiliation and email address for each nominee.

The Expert Panelist nominees should possess in-depth knowledge of national and regional think tanks and/or be a functional areas expert in one or more of the areas listed below and/or be able to evaluate a think tank's performance in the specialty areas listed below.

Expert Panelists are responsible for maintaining the quality and integrity of the rankings process. No meetings with nominees are required and the reviews are conducted via email. The members of the Expert Panels will be expected to help solicit and review nominations in their area of expertise and assist with the final stage of the ranking process. The Expert Panelist's nominations and rankings are strictly confidential.

Current Expert Panelists include journalists, policymakers, academics, public and private donors, and policy-oriented civil society organization every region and most countries in the world.

We particularly encourage nominations of experts from the following regions: Asia, Eastern and Central Europe, Central and South Asia, Africa and Latin America. We are also looking for experts in the following functional areas: Science and Technology, Health, International

Development, Education and Energy and Resource Policy and all of the Specialty Categories listed below.

We also seeking your feedback on the Global Go To Index categories, selection criteria which are provided below and any suggestions for overall procedural improvements.

You are encouraged to make nominations in all categories where you can recommend qualified candidates.

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list:

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx>

To learn more about the Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program visit our website at:
www.gotothinktank.com

Thanks again for your continued interest and support.

All the best,

James G. McGann, Ph.D.
Director, Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program
Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program
Lauder Institute of Management & International Studies
Lauder-Fisher Hall Room 101
University of Pennsylvania
PHILADELPHIA, PA, USA 19104-6330
Direct Line: 215 746-2928
Mobile: 215 206-1799
Email: jmcgann@sas.upenn.edu
TTCSP Web site: <http://gotothinktank.com>

APPENDIX B: CALL FOR NOMINATIONS: 2014 GLOBAL GO TO THINK TANK INDEX

Email to over 21,500 individuals and Organizations in over 200 countries

Call for Nominations sent on: September 15, 2014

1st Reminder sent on: September 16, 2014

2nd Reminder sent on: September 24, 2014

3rd and final Reminder sent on: September 27, 2014

Nominations Round I closed on: September 30, 2014

August 2014

This is the first round of nominations for the 2014 Global Go to Think Tank Index (aka the Global Think Tank Rankings). I encourage you to submit your nominations on or before September 30, 2014.

All nominations will be tabulated at the end of Round I. All those institutions that have received a minimum to 10 nominations will be included in the rankings and indexing process (Round II). The schedule for the 2014 Global Go to Think Tank Index is as follows:

Round I (Think Tanks Nominations): August 10 – September 20, 2014

Round II (Think Tank Ranking): October 1 – October 30, 2014

Round III (Expert Panel Review): November – December 2014

2014 Global Go to Think Tanks Index Published January 22, 2015

Please only submit nominations in categories where you have knowledge and experience.

Please consult the definitions, nomination, and ranking criteria and tools for assessing think tanks when making your nominations. These tools are provided in the cover letter we sent to you and are posted on the TTCSP web site at www.gotothinktank.com for easy reference.

Please note that all nominations will be treated as strictly confidential. Your name, institutional affiliation, and nominations **WILL NOT APPEAR IN ANY PUBLICATION**.

It is essential that you carefully consider your nominations and utilize the criteria developed for assessing think tanks when developing your nominations. Once again, nominations must be submitted on or before September 30, 2014.

For any questions or problems, please contact Dr. James G. McGann at GlobalThinkTankRankings@gmail.com

Thank you in advance for completing the survey.

Sincerely,

James G. McGann, Ph.D.
Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program
Lauder Institute of Management & International Studies
Lauder-Fisher Hall Room 101
University of Pennsylvania
PHILADELPHIA, PA, USA 19104-6330

APPENDIX C: EMAIL INVITING PEERS AND EXPERT PANELISTS TO RANK 2014 NOMINATED INSTITUTIONS

Email sent on October 21, 2014

1st Reminder sent on: October 28, 2014

2nd Reminder sent on: November 6, 2014

3rd Reminder sent on: November 14, 2014

4th and final Reminder sent on: November 19, 2014

2014 Ranking Process Closed on November 24, 2014

Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program
Lauder Institute of Management & International Studies
Lauder-Fisher Hall Room 101
University of Pennsylvania
PHILADELPHIA, PA, USA 19104-6330

October 21, 2014

Dear Colleague:

The nominations round of the 2014 Global Go To Think Tank Index has concluded and the think tanks with 10 or more nominations have been tabulated and Indexing Round will now commence.

Please help rank the nominated think tanks at this time using the following survey link:https://surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=AMC5YyiW3pCQDqtjcccAQw_3d_3d

Your selections and rankings will be kept strictly confidential.

The deadline for the submission of your ranking of the leading think tanks in the world is November 15, 2014.

If you don't have the time to rank all the categories just take a few moments to rank the think tanks in your region and/or area of expertise.

Over 1500 scholars, policymakers, public and private donors and journalists have already participated in Round I Nominations phase of the 2014 indexing process.

A few important ground rules:

- 1) Use the selection criteria provided as a tool to evaluate and rank each think tank;
- 2) You are not permitted to rank your own institution;
- 3) Adhere to professional conduct by revealing and avoiding any potential conflicts of interest;
- 4) Avoid political, ideological and discipline bias when ranking institutions.

Should you have any questions, comments or suggestions don't hesitate to share them with me at jmcgann@wharton.upenn.edu

If you feel there is a glowing omission or error in the list of think tanks to be ranked please bring it to our attention and we will share it with the members of the Expert Panel.

Your participation in the process helps us recognize think tank centers of excellence in every region of the world and in all the major areas of public policy research.

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing

list: https://surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx?sm=AMC5YyiW3pCQDqtjcccAQw_3d_3d

Thanks again for your continued interest and participation in this global research project.

All the best, Jim McGann

**APPENDIX D: SAMPLE EMAIL TO REGIONAL AND FUNCTIONAL AREA
EXPERT PANEL MEMBERS REQUESTING THEIR REVIEW OF THE
PENULTIMATE 2014 LIST OF INSTITUTIONS TO BE RANKED IN ROUND II**

*Emails sent on or around September 15, 2014
Expert Panel Review Period closed on October 10, 2014*

October 10, 2014

Dear Graham:

Once again I am writing to you to seek your help in reviewing the rankings for the 2014 Global Go To Think Tank Index. Can I ask you to review the list of nominated think tanks in the following two categories: 1) top think tanks in Western and Eastern and Central Europe and the 2) Top Security and International Affairs think tanks and let me know if you find any factor errors, translation errors, typos, or serious omissions (think tanks that don't appear on the list but should be included)? We are about to launch Round II, where all of the nominated think tanks will be ranked, and I want to make sure there are not serious issues with the list of nominees. Thanks in advance for your assistance with the ranking process.

All the best,

Jim McGann

James G. McGann, Ph.D.
Senior Lecturer, International Studies
Lauder Institute for Management and International Studies
Director, Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program
Wharton School and School of Arts and Sciences
University of Pennsylvania
201 Lauder-Fischer Hall (main office)
101 Lauder-Fisher Hall (office)
256 South 37th St.
Philadelphia, PA 19104
Phone: (direct): 215 746-2928, (main) 215-898-1215
Lauder Institute: www.lauder.wharton.upenn.edu
Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program www.gotothinktank.com

2014 Nominated Top Think Tanks in Western Europe:

- Action Institute (Italy)
- Adam Smith Institute (ASI) (United Kingdom)

- Amnesty International (AI) (United Kingdom)
- Avenir Suisse (Switzerland)
- Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB) (Spain)
- Bertelsmann Foundation (Germany)
- Bruegel (Belgium)
- Carnegie Europe (Belgium)
- Center for Political Studies (CEPOS) (Denmark)
- Centre d’Etudes et de Recherches Internationales (CERI) (France)
- Centre d’Etudes Prospectives et d’Informations Internationales (CEPII) (France)
- Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) (United Kingdom)
- Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) (Belgium)
- Centre for European Reform (CER) (United Kingdom)
- Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) (United Kingdom)
- Centro Studi Internazionali (Ce.S.I.) (Italy)
- Chatham House (United Kingdom)
- Civitas: Institute for the Study of Civil Society (United Kingdom)
- Clingendael, Netherlands Institute of International Relations (Netherlands)
- Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) (Denmark)
- Demos (United Kingdom)
- Ecologic Institute (Germany)
- EGMONT – The Royal Institute for International Relations (Belgium)
- European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) (Netherlands)
- European Centre for International Political Economy (ECIPE) (Belgium)
- European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR) (United Kingdom)
- European Policy Centre (EPC) (Belgium)
- European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) (France)
- Fabian Society (United Kingdom)
- Fondation pour la Recherche Strategique (FRS) (France)
- Fondation pour l’Innovation Politique (Fondapol) (France)
- Foreign Policy Center (FPC) (Belgium)
- French Institute of International Relations (IFRI) (France)
- Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) (Germany)
- Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Freedom (FNF) (Germany)
- Friends of Europe (Belgium)
- Fundacion Alternativas (Spain)
- Fundacion para el Analisis y los Estudios Sociales (FAES) (Spain)
- Fundacion para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Dialogo Exterior (FRIDE) (Spain)
- German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) (Germany)
- German Development Institute (DIE) (Germany)
- German Institute for Economic Research (DIW) (Germany)
- German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) (Germany)
- Hanns Seidel Foundation (HSS) (Germany)

- Hayek Institute (Austria)
- Heinrich Böll Foundation (HBS) (Germany)
- Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP) (Greece)
- IDEAS (United Kingdom)
- Institucion Futuro (Spain)
- Institut des Relations Internationales et Strategiques (IRIS) (France)
- Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) (United Kingdom)
- Institute for Government (IfG) (United Kingdom)
- Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI) (Italy)
- Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) (United Kingdom)
- Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) (United Kingdom)
- Institute of International and European Affairs (IIEA) (Ireland)
- International Centre for Black Sea Studies (ICBSS) (Greece)
- International Crisis Group (ICG) (Belgium)
- International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) (United Kingdom)
- Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) (Italy)
- Istituto Bruno Leoni (IBL) (Italy)
- Kiel Institute for the World Economy (IfW) (Germany)
- Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) (Germany)
- Lisbon Council for Economic Competitiveness and Social Renewal (Belgium)
- Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) (Norway)
- Notre Europe (France)
- Open Europe (United Kingdom)
- Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (United Kingdom)
- Oxford Council on Good Governance (OCGG) (United Kingdom)
- Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) (Norway)
- Policy Exchange (United Kingdom)
- Policy Network (United Kingdom)
- Real Instituto Elcano (Spain)
- ResPublica (United Kingdom)
- Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) (United Kingdom)
- Security and Defence Agenda (SDA) (Belgium)
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (Sweden)
- Timbro (Sweden)
- Transparency International (TI) (Germany)
- Wilfried Martens Centre for European Studies, FKA Centre for European Studies (Belgium)
- World Economic Forum (WEF) (Switzerland)

APPENDIX E: SAMPLE EMAIL TO REGIONAL AND FUNCTIONAL AREA EXPERT PANEL MEMBERS REQUESTING THEIR REVIEW OF THE DRAFT 2014 GLOBAL GO TO THINK TANK INDEX

*Emails sent on or around December 1, 2014
Expert Panel Review Period Closed in December, 2014*

December 15, 2014

Dear Jorge:

I hope all is well with you. The 2014 rankings process is now complete. I am now seeking the input of members of the Expert Panel to help review the 2014 Global Go-To Think Tank Index to help identify and any gross errors or anomalies as a part of the Expert Panel review process. Please identify any issues that you feel I should be aware of and any adjustments in the rankings that might be warranted before we publish the 2014 Global Go To Think Tank Index Report.

Specifically, I would like request that you to please review the list of the top think tanks in the following two categories that fall with your area of expertise: 1) top think tanks in Latin America and 2) International Development think tanks and let me know if you find any anomalies, errors in fact, errors in translation or other issues that I we need to address.

In addition, I would like your overall assessment of quality and accuracy of the rankings in two categories and if there are any adjustments to the rankings that you would recommend at this time.

We are about to draft the final report and I want to make sure there are not serious issues with the rankings. Thanks in advance for your assistance with the ranking process.

All the best,

Jim McGann

James G. McGann, Ph.D.
Senior Lecturer, International Studies
Lauder Institute for Management and International Studies
Director, Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program
Wharton School and School of Arts and Sciences
University of Pennsylvania
201 Lauder-Fischer Hall (main office)
101 Lauder-Fisher Hall (office)
256 South 37th St.

Philadelphia, PA 19104

Phone: (direct): 215 746-2928, (main) 215-898-1215

Lauder Institute: www.lauder.wharton.upenn.edu

Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program www.gotothinktank.com

Background on the Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program



Think Tank 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.



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. Its peer institutions are

Harvard, Stanford, Columbia, Brown, Dartmouth and the University of Chicago in the US and Oxford and Cambridge in the UK. A world-class research institution, Penn boasts a picturesque campus in the middle of Philadelphia, a dynamic city that is conveniently located between Washington, DC and New York, New York.

Penn was founded by Benjamin Franklin in 1740 to push the frontiers of knowledge and benefit society by integrating study in the liberal arts and sciences with opportunities for research and practical, pre-professional training at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Penn is committed to meeting the full demonstrated need of all undergraduates with grant-based financial aid, making this intellectually compelling integration of liberal and professional education accessible to talented students of all backgrounds and empowering them to make an impact on the world.

The Research Team

Program Director

James G. McGann, Ph.D., is a senior lecturer at the Lauder Institute of the Wharton School and the School of Arts and Sciences at the University of Pennsylvania. He is also the director of the Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program (TTCSP) at the University of Pennsylvania. He conducts research on the trends and challenges facing think tanks and policymakers around the world and provides advice and technical assistance to think tanks, governments and public and private donors on how to improve the quality and impact of policy research. He is also a senior fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute, a think tank based in Philadelphia. Prior to coming to the University of Pennsylvania Dr. McGann was an assistant professor of Political Science at Villanova University where he taught international relations, international organizations and international law. His current research interest include: assessing global trends in security and international affairs research; the role of think tanks in shaping US domestic and foreign policy; think tanks and policy advice in the BRICS and G20 countries and transnational threats and global public policy. He is the creator and author of the annual Global Go To Think Tank Index which 6,603 think tanks in every region of the world.



Dr. McGann has served as a consultant and advisor to the World Bank; the United Nations; the United States Agency for International Development; the Soros, Rockefeller, MacArthur, Hewlett, and Gates foundations; the Carnegie Corporation; and foreign governments on the role of non-governmental, public policy, and public engagement organizations in the US and developing and transitional countries. He has served as the senior vice president for the Executive Council on Foreign Diplomats, the public policy program officer for the Pew Charitable Trusts, the assistant director of the Institute of Politics, John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. He also served as a senior advisor to the Citizens' Network for Foreign Affairs and the Society for International Development.

Among Dr. McGann's publications are "Competition for Dollars, Scholars, and Influence in the Public Policy Research Industry" (University Press of America 1995); "The International Survey of Think Tanks" (Foreign Policy Research Institute 1999); "Think Tanks and Civil Societies: Catalyst for Ideas and Action", co-edited with Kent B. Weaver (Transaction Publishers 2000); "Comparative Think Tanks, Politics, and Public Policy" (Edward Elgar 2005); "Think Tanks and Policy Advice in the U.S.: Academics, Advisors, and Advocates" (Routledge 2007); "Global Trends and Transitions: 2007 Survey of Think Tanks" (Foreign Policy Research Institute 2008); "The 2007 Global Go to Think Tanks" (Foreign Policy Research Institute 2008); "Think Tank Index" (Foreign Policy Magazine 2009); "The 2008 Global Go to Think Tank Index" (IRP, University of Pennsylvania 2009); "Democratization and Market Reform: Think Tanks As

Catalysts" (Routledge 2009), "Catalysts for Economic Growth and Development: The Role of Think Tanks in Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa" (CIPE 2009), "The 2009 Global Go to Think Tank Index" (University of Pennsylvania 2010), "Global Think Tanks, Policy Networks and Governance" (Routledge 2010), "The 2010 Global Go to Think Tank Index" (University of Pennsylvania 2011), "The 2011 Global Go to Think Tank Index" (University of Pennsylvania 2012), "Think Tanks and Global Policy Networks, chapter in edited volume, *International Organization and Global Governance*, (Routledge September 2013), "The 2012 Global Go to Think Tank Index" (University of Pennsylvania 2013), "Think Tanks and Social Development Policy: A Global Comparative Study" (Forthcoming, University of Pennsylvania Press 2013); "The Fifth Estate: Think Tanks and US Domestic and Foreign Policy" (Forthcoming 2013); "Think Tanks, Policy Advice and the Foreign Policy Challenges Facing Emerging Powers (Forthcoming late 2014).

TTCSP Research Internship Program

The **Think Tanks and Civil Society Program (TTCSP)** runs a highly selective internship program for students (grad and undergrad, domestic and international) who are interested in gaining first-hand experience in public policy research in domestic and international affairs.

Over 125 students from across the University of Pennsylvania and from area colleges and universities participated in the TTCSP Research Internship Program during the 2013-2014 academic year. 21 interns from the Program have been successfully placed in internships in the US and abroad in France, Argentina, Jordan, Brazil and Spain.

Research Interns

Global Go To Index Research, Editing, and Production Team:

Jennifer Crino

Yusi Du

William Nathaniel Rose (Project Lead)

Coco Wang

Manuscripts and Publications Team:

Bailey Scott (Team Lead)

Jochem Slor

Tamara Tur

Data Coordinator:

Thomas Littrel



Think Tanks & Civil Societies Program

The Lauder Institute

The University of Pennsylvania

“Helping to bridge the gap between knowledge and policy”
2013-2014 Milestones

2014 Global Go To Think Tank Index

The Global Go To Think Tank Index (GGTTTI) has become the gold standard of excellence for think tanks around the world and is widely cited by donors, journals, think tanks and policymakers. More importantly, it has served to raise the profile and performance of think tanks. The 2014 GGTTTI marked the 8th year of the publication of the Index report and with each year the ranking’s influence has grown. For the past several years, the Global Think Tank Index Report has been launched at the World Bank and United Nations in January. This year over 80 think tanks, intergovernmental organizations and civil society organizations simultaneously launched the Index in global cities around the world. Over 20,000 academics, policymakers, journalists and think tank scholars and executives participated in the annual indexing process. The 8th edition of the Global Go To Think Tank Index will be released on January 22, 2015.

Think Tank Regional and Global Summits

Since June 2012, the TTCSP in cooperation with its regional partners has co-sponsored and organized 8 regional Think Tank Summits, 2 National Think Tank Summits (China and Korea) and 1 International Think Tank Summit. The purpose of these Summits is to engage think tanks in peer-to-peer dialogue, knowledge exchange, and capacity-building to help improve the image, profile and performance of think tanks in every region of the world.

In addition, we plan to demonstrate the efficacy of creating a global network that engages the leading think tanks in a peer-to-peer exchange of innovative policies and best practices for research and public engagement on key domestic and international issues. The value of these Summits has been clearly demonstrated by the fact that all of the Summit partners and participants have agreed to partner with TTCSP to organize Summits on an annual basis. The European Think Tank Summit in Barcelona, Spain in March 2014 and the Asian Think Tank Summit in May 2014 are the 2nd round of summits in those regions.

A number of institutional partnerships between leading think tanks have been formed as a direct result of these Summits. Each Summit is expected to have an impact on the think tanks in each region with a set of action oriented recommendations. The Summits have helped facilitate regional and global partnerships and programs and the Summit recommendations demonstrate that each meeting is a “catalyst for ideas and action”.

MENA Summit, December 11-13, 2013 Istanbul, Turkey (Regional Partners: Fredrich Ebert Stiftung, Gulf Research Center, Center and STRATIM)

African Summit, February 3-5, 2014 Pretoria, South Africa (Regional Partners: Institute for Strategic Studies, African Capacity Building Foundation and the African Leadership Center)

European Summit March 10-12, 2014 Barcelona, Spain (Regional Partners: Barcelona Center for International Affairs (CIDOB) and Fredrich Ebert Stiftung.

North America Summit, April 16 &17, 2014 (Regional Partner, Brookings Institution and Woodrow Wilson Center)

Asia Summit, May 21-23, 2014 Tokyo, Japan (Regional Partner, Asian Development Bank Institute)

Chinese Think Tank Summit, June 24 & 25, 2014, Shanghai, China (Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences)

Geneva Think Tank Conference, August 13, 2014, Geneva, Switzerland

Latin America Think Tank Summit October 16-18, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, (Fundacao Getulio Vargas)

Global Summit December 4-6, 2014 Geneva, Switzerland (Regional Partners: UN Mission Geneva, Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Geneva Institute (AKA) International Institute for Development Studies, the US Mission, Geneva and the Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program, University of Pennsylvania)

While the regional partner's contributions to the Summits vary, many serve as the hosts for the Summit and mobilize local and regional support for them. Often this involves providing in-country logistical support, the venue and significant in-kind support and a financial contribution.

The role of the TTCSP has been to convene the think tanks and to provide the conceptual framework for the Summits which is done in conjunction with our regional partners and based on the research, global think tank index and surveys conducted by the TTCSP.

TTCSP Think Tank Publications

Think Tanks Shape Social Development Policies (University of Pennsylvania Press 2014)

We are pleased to announce the publication TTCSP book entitled, **How Think Tanks Shape Social Development Policies (June 2014)** which was funded by the New Venture Fund.

The book includes in-depth case studies involving 27 authors from 17 countries representing every region of the world. The contributors examine the case of innovative think tank aided strategies implemented in highly industrialized world powers including the United States and Russia, emerging countries such as China, India, Brazil, and Korea, and developing nations such as Ethiopia, Kenya, and Tanzania.

This book was formally launched at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and the University of Pennsylvania Press in Washington, DC on June 18, 2014 with over 200 think tanks, journalists, policymakers and policy oriented civil society organizations in attendance

International Organization and Global Governance (Routledge 2014)

Edited by **Thomas G. Weiss** and **Rorden Wilkinson**

Chapter 28 Think Tanks and Global Policy Networks, James McGann

This volume is the most comprehensive textbook available for those interested in international organization and global governance. Organized around a concern with how the world is and could be governed, the book offers:

- in-depth and accessible coverage of the history and theories of international organization and global governance;
- discussions of the full range of state, intergovernmental, and nonstate actors; and
- examinations of key issues in all aspects of contemporary global governance.

The book's chapters are arranged into 7 parts and woven together by a comprehensive introduction to the field, separate section introductions designed to guide students and faculty, and helpful pointers to further reading. *International Organization and Global Governance* is a self-contained resource enabling readers to better comprehend the role of myriad actors in the governance of global life as well as to assemble the many pieces of the contemporary global governance puzzle.

Security Expertise: Practices, Power, and Responsibility (Forthcoming Routledge 2014)

The PRIO New Security Studies Series at Routledge has agreed to publish an edited volume entitled, **Security Expertise: Practices, Power, and Responsibility**. Dr. McGann contributed a chapter on trends in security studies research in public policy research organizations, which is part of a larger book project described below.

According to Routledge, the book is the first of its kind on the market and therefore carries the promise of setting the agenda for studies in security expertise for the future. Dr. McGann is finishing a related book that explores the trend in think tanks and security studies away from traditional security issues (weapons systems and defense) to non-traditional threats (climate change, economic security, international political economy, etc.).

Books in Progress

Trends and Transitions in Traditional and Non-Traditional Security and International Affairs Research

In the last 20 years there has been an apparent shift in the research and analysis foci of security-oriented research at security and international affairs think tanks around the world. We have identified, profiled and analyzed the data on 3,686 Security and International Affairs think tanks out a total universe of over 7500 think tanks worldwide. Our initial research confirmed that a shift has occurred and SIA think tanks are now almost entirely focused on non-traditional

disciplines (economic security, environmental security, political security, human security, and peace and conflict) and defense and security have research programs have diminished in size and scope.

The end of the Cold War and consequent trends in globalization, democratization and development have placed a premium on research and scholarship relating to the policy needs and concerns of an interconnected, rapidly developing world. As a result, the field of security studies, once dominated by “traditional” military and defense-related issues, has diversified greatly, resulting in greater emphasis on “non-traditional” issues, such as environmental, human, economic and political security. As the field of security and international affairs has grown, so too has the number and variety of think tanks all over the world devoted to this burgeoning discipline.

Our current research focuses on the when and how this transition took place and its implications for the fields of defense and security and foreign policy and international affairs.

The proposed book will examine the conditions that allow for and necessitate this shift in research priorities. The book will provide both global and regional analysis, as well as predictions and recommendations for the future. Additionally, drawing on both relevant data and recent scholarship, the book has formulated definitions for traditional and non-traditional security issues and methodology for the classification of SIA think tanks and the research they conduct in this area.

Think Tanks and the Foreign Policy Challenges Facing the Emerging Powers

Dr. McGann is currently working on a book on the role think tanks play in shaping foreign policy in the emerging powers. Think tanks in Vietnam, Brazil, Argentina, South Africa, China, Nigeria, Oman, India, South Korea and Turkey have submitted draft chapters for the book.

The project’s objective is produce ten to twelve case studies that explore how emerging powers and the security and international affairs (SIA) think tanks that serve them are meeting foreign policy and security challenges they face now and in the future. The book will include a range defense and security and foreign policy issues. In its aggregate, the project hopes to identify and then examine how think tanks in a variety of political and economic contexts help their respective countries understand and respond to the new challenges and dynamics of an increasingly multipolar world.

In compiling the volume, a great deal of emphasis will be placed on identifying and explicating the unique foreign policy challenges these emerging powers face, as well as the strategies and programs that SIA think tanks have developed in response to these policy issues. In addition, we aim to identify best practices—both for research and policy advice that might improve the capacity of think tanks in Emerging Powers. A concerted effort will be made to select a representative sample of think tanks so we might explore the roles think tanks have played in shaping SIA policies at the nation, regional, and global levels.

The case studies will be include both traditional and non-traditional security issues in the areas of security, defense and foreign policy. Each case must demonstrate the think tank’s impact on SIA

policy. Each case will be crafted in such a way that illustrates how the particular strategy and structure of the think tank contributed to its ability to impact the policy issue at hand. Prospectuses are being solicited from think tanks in China, India, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Vietnam, Kenya, South Africa, Nigeria, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Turkey, Israel, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Russia, and Poland. Overall, the objective is to identify and share best practices for research, policy advice, and policy implementation in the SIA context.

Think Tanks, Civil Society and Governance

TTCSP is launching a new book project entitled, **Think Tanks, Civil Society and Governance** (or alternatively **Think Tanks, Public Policy and Governance**), which will explore how the relationship between think tanks, civil society and governments has changed since the publication of **Think Tanks and Civil Societies: Catalyst for Ideas and Action**, a volume I edited with R. Kent Weaver in 1999.

The plan for the new book is to have a regional overview and assessment for each region of the world followed by several illustrative country examples that explore a representative sample of think tanks in a range of the political and economic contexts. A number of scholars have already agreed to contribute chapters and Dr. McGann is planning to convene an international conference around this new initiative. TTCSP is seeking donors to support the book project and international partners who might want to host it.

TTCSP Publications:

Fifth Estate: Think Tanks and Domestic and Foreign Policy in the US (Forthcoming University of Pennsylvania Press 2015)

How Think Tanks Shape Social Development Policies (University of Pennsylvania Press 2014)
<http://www.upenn.edu/pennpress/book/15244.html>

2013 Global Go To Think Tank (AKA Think Tank Rankings)
http://repository.upenn.edu/think_tanks/8/

Global Think Tanks, Policy Networks and Governance (Routledge 2010)
<http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415779791/>

Democratization and Market Reform in Developing and Transitional Countries Think Tanks as Catalysts (Routledge 2010)
<http://www.routledge.com/books/Democratization-and-Market-Reform-in-Developing-and-Transitional-Countries-isbn9780415547383>

Catalysts for Growth and Development: The Role of Think Tanks in Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa (CIPE 2009)
<http://www.cipe.org/bookstore>

Comparative Think Tanks, Politics and Public Policy (Edward Elgar 2005)
http://www.e-elgar.co.uk/Bookentry_Main.lasso?id=275


Teaching

Global Issues, Actors and Institutions (Summer 2013-LPS)
Transnational Issues and Global Politics (Fall 2013-IR)
International Norms and Global Governance (Fall 2014)
Global Issues, Actors and Institutions (Fall 2013- LPS)
Research Methods (Spring 2014-IR)
Global Issues, Actors and Institutions (Spring 2014- LPS)
IGOs, Emerging Powers and the New Economic Order (Spring 2015)

If you would like to partner with us on one or more of these projects please contact James McGann at jmcgann@wharton.upenn.edu

The goal in the next 12 months is to translate this global interest and support into core funding for the Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program.





TTCSP

THINK TANKS AND CIVIL SOCIETIES PROGRAM

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THINK TANKS AND CIVIL SOCIETIES PROGRAM © 2015, Lauder Institute, University of Pennsylvania.

All rights reserved. Except for short quotes, no part of this document and presentation 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 Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program

