Zewail City of Science, Technology and Innovation

International Partnership Opportunity Assessment

Proposed *[type of agreement]* with ***[Partner institution, City, Country]***

Document control	Details
Proposed partner	*[Full legal name of partner institution, including governing body if any]* *[Official website URL]*
Country and city	*[Country, city, state or province]*
Type of agreement	*[Memorandum of Understanding / Memorandum of Agreement / Student Exchange Agreement / Joint Supervision Agreement / Other]*
Proposed by	*[Name, title, school or programme]*
Prepared by	*[Name]*, International Office
Prepared for	*[Executive President / IEIC Team / Other]*
Date	*[DD Month YYYY]*
Version	*[1.0]*

Guidance: *Blue boxes like this one explain how to complete each section. Delete every blue box before you issue the assessment.*
Grey italic text in [square brackets] is a placeholder. Replace all of them. Search the document for "[" before you submit.
Keep the section numbers and headings unchanged so assessments stay comparable across partners.
Use plain language. Spell out acronyms in full the first time, as in the existing assessments.

1. Decision and recommendation

> ***Guidance:*** *Write this section last. Take the recommendation from the score bands below, then check the override rules.*
> *Write four to six short sentences: the strongest fit, the partner's key strength, the key gap or weakness, the main risk, and the conditions for approval.*

Recommendation: *[Sign / Sign with conditions / Defer / Decline]*

Overall score: *[X.XX]* **out of 5 (***[potential band]***)**

To support a well-informed decision, this assessment covers the main criteria that paint a comprehensive picture of the potential connection between ZC and *[partner short name]*. *[State where the fit is strongest.] [State the partner's main strength or proof of commitment.] [State the main gap or weakness.] [State the main risk.]* Approve it only with *[conditions: named action plan, named focal persons, stakeholder buy-in and a 24-month review clause]*.

Score bands and decision rules

Overall score	Potential	Default recommendation
4.00 to 5.00	High	Sign
3.50 to 3.99	Moderate to high	Sign with conditions
3.00 to 3.49	Moderate	Sign with conditions; narrow the scope to the strongest themes
2.50 to 2.99	Low to moderate	Defer; revisit after due diligence or a pilot activity
Below 2.50	Low	Decline

Override rules. These apply whatever the score:

- ☐ A failed sanctions, integrity or legal recognition check in Section 9 means Decline.
- ☐ A High risk in Section 5 with no workable mitigation means Defer at best.
- ☐ No named Zewail City focal person or no stakeholder support means Defer until both are in place.

2. Partner profile

> ***Guidance:*** *Open with one or two sentences on how the two institutions compare, for example, ranking parity or a difference in size or research depth.*
> *The Zewail City column is pre-filled from the 2026 assessments. Check and update it annually. Delete rows that do not apply.*

[One or two sentences comparing the two institutions.]

Measure	Zewail City of Science, Technology and Innovation	*[Partner institution]*
Type	Non-profit public institution, founded 2012	*[Public or private; year founded; university status year]*
Location	6th of October City, Egypt	*[City, region, country]*
Students	About 1,238	*[Number; cite source if figures differ]*
International students	None reported	*[Percentage and number of countries]*
World ranking	Times Higher Education 2026: 1201 to 1500	*[Ranking body, year, band]*
National ranking	Not applicable	*[National ranking system, year, position]*
Accreditation	Egyptian national accreditation	*[National accreditation body and grade; programme accreditation]*
Core strengths	Nanoscience, materials, renewable energy, biomedical sciences, engineering	*[Main disciplines]*

Measure	Zewail City of Science, Technology and Innovation	*[Partner institution]*
Research structure	University, five research institutes, technology park	*[Number of centres, institutes, incubators]*
Research output	*[Add current figures]*	*[Publications, patents, funded projects and value in United States dollars]*

Sources: *[list the main sources]*. Links in Section 12.

3. Assessment scorecard

> ***Guidance:*** *Score each criterion from 1 to 5 using the rubric below. Do not change the weights; this keeps scores comparable across partners.*
> *Weighted score = weight x score (for example 25% x 4 = 1.00). Overall score = sum of weighted scores, rounded to two decimals.*
> *Give specific evidence for every score: rankings, named partners, schemes, dates. A score without evidence is not valid.*

Criterion	Weight	Score (1 to 5)	Weighted score	Evidence
Strategic research fit	25%	*[ ]*	*[0.00]*	*[Matching research areas and depth]*
Ranking and reputation parity	15%	*[ ]*	*[0.00]*	*[Partner ranking vs Zewail City, Times Higher Education 2026: 1201 to 1500]*
Partner commitment and track record	15%	*[ ]*	*[0.00]*	*[Active partners, especially in Egypt and the region]*
Student and staff mobility potential	10%	*[ ]*	*[0.00]*	*[Exchange schemes, international student base, scholarships]*
Access to funding	15%	*[ ]*	*[0.00]*	*[Named funding schemes on both sides]*
Risk level (5 = lowest risk)	10%	*[ ]*	*[0.00]*	*[Main risk from Section 5]*
Alignment with Zewail City strategies and national priorities	10%	*[ ]*	*[0.00]*	*[Zewail City Internationalisation Strategy 2026 to 2030; national strategies]*
Overall score	**100%**		*[X.XX]*	*[Recommendation]*

Scoring rubric

Use 2 and 4 when the evidence falls between two descriptions.

Criterion	5 (strong)	3 (adequate)	1 (weak)
Strategic research fit	Four or more partner units match Zewail City priorities, with proven research depth	Two or three matches, or matches with modest or teaching-led research depth	No clear match with Zewail City priorities
Ranking and reputation parity	Partner ranked above Zewail City and strong in the priority fields	Partner in a similar band, or unranked but nationally accredited	Unranked and weakly accredited, or reputational concerns
Partner commitment and track record	Active agreements in Egypt or the region with visible outputs	Active international partners elsewhere; none in Egypt	Few partnerships, or most are dormant
Student and staff mobility potential	Established exchange schemes and funded places on both sides	Schemes or funding exist on one side only	No mobility mechanism or funding on either side
Access to funding	Several open schemes with confirmed eligibility, plus partner co-funding	Relevant schemes exist but eligibility or deadlines are untested	No identified funding source

Criterion	5 (strong)	3 (adequate)	1 (weak)
Risk level	No High risks; all risks have low-cost mitigations	One High risk with a clear mitigation	One or more High risks with no workable mitigation
Alignment with strategies and priorities	Direct link to a target region or theme in the Zewail City Internationalisation Strategy and to national strategies in both countries	Partial link to either Zewail City or national priorities	No link to Zewail City or national priorities

4. Strategic fit

> ***Guidance:*** *Open with one sentence stating how many partner units match Zewail City priorities and where the strongest fit lies. Keep only the rows with a real match; add rows if needed.*

[Number] [partner short name] research areas directly match Zewail City priorities. *[State the strongest fit.]*

Zewail City priority	Matching *[partner]* unit	Joint opportunity
Nanoscience and materials	*[Centre, institute or department]*	*[For example co-supervised Doctor of Philosophy students, shared characterisation work]*
Renewable energy and sustainability	*[Centre, institute or department]*	*[For example solar and low-carbon materials projects, joint grant bids]*
Computing and artificial intelligence	*[Centre, institute or department]*	*[For example joint student projects, hackathons, short courses]*
Biomedical sciences	*[Centre, institute or department]*	*[Joint opportunity]*
Innovation and the Zewail City Technology Park	*[Incubator or entrepreneurship unit]*	*[For example joint startup bootcamps, cross-incubation of student ventures]*
[Other priority]	*[Unit]*	*[Joint opportunity]*

National and institutional priorities

> ***Guidance:*** *Name the national strategies in the partner's country and in Egypt that support the partnership, the bilateral cooperation history, and the partner's own strategic targets. Link the partnership to the Zewail City Internationalisation Strategy 2026 to 2030.*

[National strategy in the partner country and year launched.] [Relevant Egyptian priority.] [Bilateral cooperation programmes or history.] [Partner strategic goal that gives it a reason to invest.] The partnership also supports *[the regional pipeline]* in the Zewail City Internationalisation Strategy 2026 to 2030.

Partner presence in Egypt and the region

> ***Guidance:*** *List the partner's existing agreements with Egyptian and regional institutions. If none exist, delete the table and state that Zewail City would be an early Egyptian partner with room to shape the terms.*

Partner	Country	Scope of cooperation
[Institution name] [Website URL]	*[Country]*	*[Main areas: training, research, mobility, conferences]*
[Institution name] [Website URL]	*[Country]*	*[Main areas]*

What this means for Zewail City: *[State which themes existing partners already cover and which gaps Zewail City should position itself in.]*

5. Risks and mitigations

> ***Guidance:*** *Open with one sentence naming the biggest risk. The rows below are the risks seen most often. Keep those that apply, set the level, and add partner-specific risks.*

> *Levels: High = likely and would stop the partnership from delivering value. Medium = possible and would reduce value. Low = unlikely or easy to absorb.*

[State the biggest risk in one sentence.]

Risk	Level	Mitigation
Dormant agreement with no activity	High	Attach a 12-month action plan, name focal persons, add a 24-month review and exit clause. Secure the buy-in of relevant Zewail City stakeholders before signing.
Zewail City positioned as a delivery or recruitment partner	*[Level]*	Define the agreement as a partnership between peers; exclude degree franchising and recruitment clauses
Overlap with the partner's existing Egyptian partners	*[Level]*	Focus on themes the other partners do not cover
Agreement diluted among many partner agreements	*[Level]*	Ask the partner to name a senior sponsor and commit budget in the action plan
Gap in research depth between the two institutions	*[Level]*	Focus on applied and innovation themes; verify researcher profiles before joint projects
Small student mobility base on one or both sides	*[Level]*	Lead with research and virtual learning; add physical exchange later
High travel and hosting cost	*[Level]*	Apply for external funding before committing mobility numbers
[Partner-specific risk]	*[Level]*	*[Mitigation]*

6. Proposed terms

> ***Guidance:*** *These are the standard terms. Keep all of them unless there is a reason to drop one, and add partner-specific terms at the end.*

- ☐ Scope limited to *[two or three]* themes: *[theme 1]*; *[theme 2]*; *[theme 3]*
- ☐ One named focal person at each institution: *[names]*
- ☐ Joint steering review every six months
- ☐ Three-year term, with a 24-month review that ends the agreement if nothing has happened
- ☐ Research and innovation partnership only; no degree delivery, franchising or student recruitment clauses
- ☐ Intellectual property handled case by case in separate project agreements
- ☐ Data protection and research ethics follow the laws of both countries
- ☐ No financial commitment unless stated in a signed annex
- ☐ *[Partner-specific term]*

7. Twelve-month action plan

> ***Guidance:*** *Set a measurable target, a named owner and a deadline for every activity. Use "Month 1 to 12" counted from signature. Delete activities that do not fit and add partner-specific ones.*

Activity	Target	Owner	Deadline
Joint online research seminars	2	*[Name]*	*[Month 3 and 9]*
Staff visits	1 each way	*[Name]*	*[Month 8]*
Co-supervised Doctor of Philosophy students	*[1 to 2]*	*[Name]*	*[Month 12]*
Joint grant or scholarship applications	1	*[Name]*	*[Month 6]*
Collaborative Online International Learning module	1 pilot	*[Name]*	*[Month 10]*
Joint online startup and innovation bootcamp (if relevant)	1	*[Zewail City technology park lead]*	*[Month 4]*

Activity	Target	Owner	Deadline
[Partner-specific activity]	*[Target]*	*[Name]*	*[Month]*

8. Funding sources

> ***Guidance:*** *List Egyptian, partner-country and multilateral schemes. Check every deadline at the source; if unknown, state where to check.*

Funding source	Eligible activity	Next deadline
Science, Technology and Development Fund (Egypt)	Joint research projects	*[Check open calls]*
[Partner-country government scheme]	*[Eligible activity]*	*[Date or where to check]*
[Partner-country scholarship scheme]	*[Eligible activity]*	*[Date or where to check]*
[Multilateral scheme, for example Islamic Development Bank science programmes]	*[Eligible activity]*	*[Date]*
[Partner internal seed grants]	Joint pilot projects	*[Ask partner]*

9. Due diligence before signing

> ***Guidance:*** *Core checks apply to every partner. Record the finding next to each check. Add context checks that fit this partner. A failed core check triggers the override rules in Section 1.*

Core checks (every partner)

- ☐ Partner legal status and recognition in its home country confirmed: *[finding]*
- ☐ Reputation, sanctions and integrity screening completed: *[finding]*
- ☐ Scope of the partner's existing Egyptian agreements checked for overlap: *[finding]*
- ☐ Number of the partner's international agreements that are active: *[finding]*
- ☐ Researcher profiles and joint publication record in the priority themes checked in Scopus or Web of Science: *[finding]*
- ☐ Partner intent confirmed: research and innovation, not recruitment: *[finding]*
- ☐ Relevant Zewail City stakeholders consulted and on board: *[finding]*
- ☐ Partner signatory authority confirmed: *[finding]*
- ☐ Legal Affairs review of the draft agreement completed: *[finding]*

Context checks (where relevant)

- ☐ Recognition of partner degrees by Egypt's Supreme Council of Universities, if joint awards are ever planned: *[finding]*
- ☐ Access to specialist facilities (for example fabrication or cleanroom equipment) confirmed: *[finding]*
- ☐ *[Partner-specific check]*: *[finding]*

10. Next steps

> ***Guidance:*** *Adapt these standard steps. The final step always sets a first activity within 90 days of signature.*

1. Complete the due diligence checks in Section 9.
2. Nominate the Zewail City focal person *[and technology park contact, if relevant]*.
3. Brief relevant Zewail City stakeholders and confirm their support.
4. Share the draft agreement and action plan with *[partner short name]*.
5. Hold a video call between researchers in the priority themes.

6. Sign, then run the first joint *[seminar or bootcamp]* within 90 days.

11. Approval

Role	Name	Signature	Date
Prepared by (International Office)	*[Name]*		*[Date]*
Endorsed by (Dean or Institute Director)	*[Name]*		*[Date]*
Approved by (President or Provost)	*[Name]*		*[Date]*

12. Sources

> ***Guidance:*** *List every source with a working link, in the format "Title, publisher: URL". Standard sources to check for every partner:*
> *Rankings: Times Higher Education and Quacquarelli Symonds pages for the partner and for Zewail City. Partner: official website, strategic plan, international office page, research centres page. Context: national strategy documents, bilateral cooperation news, funding scheme pages.*

- *[Title, publisher]*: *[URL]*
- *[Title, publisher]*: *[URL]*
- *[Title, publisher]*: *[URL]*

Appendix: Pre-submission checklist

> ***Guidance:*** *Complete this checklist, then delete this appendix and all blue guidance boxes before issuing.*

- ☐ All *[placeholders]* replaced; no "[" left in the document
- ☐ Document code or serial added in the header
- ☐ Weights total 100%; weighted scores and overall score recalculated and checked
- ☐ Recommendation matches the score band, or the override rule used is stated in Section 1
- ☐ Every score has specific evidence in the scorecard
- ☐ Zewail City profile figures are current
- ☐ Every claim in Sections 2, 4 and 8 has a source in Section 12
- ☐ Version number and date updated on the cover