

Vendor Assessment Criteria

Onramp / Offramp Providers

Solana Developer Platform (SDP)

1. Overview

This document defines the assessment criteria for onboarding onramp and offramp providers to the Solana Developer Platform. Ramp providers enable the conversion between fiat currencies and digital assets on Solana, supporting institutional payment flows, retail crypto purchases, and issuer mint/burn operations.

Provider types: This assessment covers three provider profiles under a single framework. Providers may fall into one or more categories:

- **Institutional Ramp:** Fiat-to-stablecoin conversion for institutional clients. Handles large transactions, banking relationships, and institutional KYB. **Retail Onramp:** Consumer-facing buy/sell flows for end users via card, bank transfer, or local payment methods. Typically widget or API integration.
- **Issuer-as-Ramp:** Stablecoin issuers who provide direct mint/burn functionality by accepting fiat to a designated bank account and minting tokens to an onchain address (and the reverse for redemption). The token is already on Solana via SDP; the ramp assessment covers the fiat conversion and settlement infrastructure.

Integration model: The SDP integration layer for ramp providers is still being defined. Current integrations are bespoke. This assessment evaluates provider capability and fitness independent of the specific integration mechanism. Technical integration details will be determined during onboarding.

Framing: Onboarded providers are presented as *available integrations*, not endorsed or recommended partners. The Solana Foundation assumes no liability for provider performance, settlement, or regulatory compliance.

2. Assessment Structure

The assessment uses the same two-tier model as the custodial wallet and RPC provider assessments: Hard Gates (pass/fail) and Scored Criteria (weighted evaluation).

Key difference from other assessments: Because the SDP integration model for ramps is still maturing, the scored criteria weight coverage and compliance maturity more heavily than technical integration depth. The intake form serves as a comprehensive capability inventory which maps the provider's currency coverage, payment rails, geographic reach, and licensing. The Solana Foundation will use this to evaluate coverage fit alongside the scored evaluation.

Hard Gates (Section 3): All three gates must be passed. Any single failure is disqualifying.

Scored Criteria (Section 4): Evaluated on a 1-5 scale across three weighted categories. Minimum composite score of 3.0 required. Scores below 2.0 on any individual criterion trigger a review. Assessment scorecard is available here: [SDP Ramps Scorecard](#)

3. Hard Gates (Pass / Fail)

Each gate must be cleared before proceeding to score evaluation.

GATE 1: SOLANA CAPABILITY		
Criterion	Requirement	Evidence Required
Solana Settlement	Must be able to settle digital assets on Solana. For institutional ramps and retail onramps, this means delivering stablecoins or tokens to a Solana address. For issuer-as-ramp providers, this means mint/burn operations that result in tokens on Solana. Must support SPL tokens and ideally Token-2022 mints as well.	Demonstration of settlement flow on devnet or documentation of existing Solana settlement capability on mainnet
Stablecoin Support	Must support at least one major stablecoin on Solana (e.g. USDC) or operate as an issuer of a Solana-native stablecoin. Providers that only support SOL/crypto purchases without stablecoin capability are ineligible.	List of supported stablecoins on Solana; for issuers, documentation of the token and mint authority

GATE 2: REGULATORY & COMPLIANCE BASELINE		
Criterion	Requirement	Evidence Required
Licensing / Registration	Must hold at least one relevant license or registration for money transmission, payment services, or equivalent in a recognized jurisdiction. The license must authorize the fiat-to-crypto (or crypto-to-fiat) activity the provider performs. Recognized jurisdictions include but are not limited to: USA (state MTLs, federal), EU/EEA (EMI/PI under PSD2, MiCA), UK (FCA), Singapore (MAS), UAE (VARA/ADGM), Brazil (BCB), and other jurisdictions where the provider operates.	List of all licenses/registrations with jurisdiction, type, and issuing authority. Copy of primary license.
AML/KYC/KYB Program	Must maintain a documented AML compliance program with KYC (for retail providers) and/or KYB (for institutional	AML/KYC/KYB policy summary

GATE 2: REGULATORY & COMPLIANCE BASELINE

	providers) procedures appropriate to their business model and jurisdictions of operation.	
Sanctions Screening	Must perform sanctions screening (OFAC, EU, UN) on all transactions and counterparties. Must be able to demonstrate compliance with applicable sanctions regimes.	Self-attestation; description of sanctions screening methodology in AML policy

GATE 3: OPERATIONAL VIABILITY

Criterion	Requirement	Evidence Required
Business Continuity	Must be a funded, operating business with at least 6 months of production ramp service. Must have paying clients using their ramp product. Pre-revenue or beta-only providers are not eligible.	Self-attestation; SDP team conducts independent verification
Banking Relationships	Must have at least one active banking relationship that supports their ramp operations. Providers operating solely through third-party payment processors with no direct banking access must disclose this. For issuer-as-ramp providers, must have a segregated bank account for mint/burn operations.	Attestation of active banking relationship(s); for issuers, confirmation of segregated account structure
No Disqualifying Events	Must not have experienced loss of client funds, regulatory enforcement actions resulting in suspension of services, or loss of all banking relationships in the past 24 months.	Self-attestation; public record review

4. Scored Criteria (Weighted Evaluation)

Applicants who pass all three gates are evaluated on the following scored criteria. Each criterion is scored 1-5. Minimum composite score of 3.0 required.

Note on weighting: Coverage & Reach is weighted highest (40%) because the primary value of adding a new ramp provider is filling geographic, currency, or payment rail gaps in SDP's current coverage. Compliance & Risk Maturity (35%) reflects the elevated regulatory complexity of ramp operations compared to custodians or RPC providers. Operational Maturity (25%) covers reliability and developer experience.

COVERAGE & REACH (Weight: 40%)			
Criterion	What We Evaluate	Scoring	Weight
Fiat Currency Coverage	Number and relevance of fiat currencies supported. USD and EUR are baseline; additional currencies in SDP target markets (LATAM, Africa, Asia) increase score. Local payment rail integration (PIX, M-PESA, UPI, SEPA, Faster Payments, RTP, ACH) is evaluated here.	1 = USD only via card; 3 = USD + EUR + 2-3 local currencies with native rails; 5 = 5+ currencies with direct local rail integrations across multiple regions	15%
Stablecoin & Token Coverage	Range of stablecoins supported on Solana. USDC and USDT are baseline. Support for additional Solana-native stablecoins, Token-2022 assets, or custom issuer tokens increases score.	1 = single stablecoin; 3 = USDC + USDT + 1-2 additional; 5 = broad stablecoin support including T22 tokens and custom issuer tokens	10%
Geographic Reach	Number of countries/regions where the provider can legally operate and has active users. Evaluated against SDP's global user base (USA, LATAM, Africa, Asia).	1 = single region; 3 = 2-3 regions with meaningful coverage; 5 = truly global coverage across 4+ regions with local licensing	10%
Transaction Capacity	Ability to handle varying transaction sizes and volumes. Can they support both retail-scale (\$10-\$10K) and institutional-scale (\$100K+) transactions? What are their per-transaction and daily volume limits?	1 = retail only with low limits; 3 = retail + moderate institutional capacity; 5 = full capacity for large institutional clips with high daily throughput	5%

COMPLIANCE & RISK MATURITY
(Weight: 35%)

Criterion	What We Evaluate	Scoring	Weight
Regulatory Breadth	Number, quality, and relevance of licenses across jurisdictions. Providers with licenses that directly enable their claimed payment flows score higher than those relying on exemptions or passporting alone.	1 = single jurisdiction, single license; 3 = 3-5 jurisdictions with relevant licenses; 5 = 8+ jurisdictions with comprehensive licensing including major markets	15%
KYC/KYB Sophistication	Quality and coverage of identity verification. For retail: automated KYC with document verification, liveness checks, and tiered limits. For institutional: robust KYB with UBO identification and enhanced due diligence capability.	1 = basic manual KYC only; 3 = automated KYC/KYB with standard verification; 5 = sophisticated, tiered verification with enhanced due diligence and continuous monitoring	10%
Transaction Monitoring & Reporting	Automated transaction monitoring, suspicious activity detection, regulatory reporting capability (SARs/STRs), and blockchain analytics integration (e.g., Chainalysis, Elliptic).	1 = manual monitoring only; 3 = automated monitoring with blockchain analytics; 5 = comprehensive monitoring, automated SAR/STR filing, real-time risk scoring	10%

OPERATIONAL MATURITY
(Weight: 25%)

Criterion	What We Evaluate	Scoring	Weight
Settlement Reliability & Speed	Consistency and speed of settlement. How long from fiat receipt to token delivery (onramp) and from token receipt to fiat delivery (offramp)? Reliability of the settlement process under normal conditions.	1 = multi-day settlement with inconsistent timing; 3 = same-day settlement with reliable SLA; 5 = near-instant or <1hr settlement	10%

OPERATIONAL MATURITY (Weight: 25%)			
		with published SLA and high reliability	
API & Integration Readiness	Quality of API documentation, webhook/callback support for transaction status, sandbox/devnet availability, and general integration readiness. Assessed at a directional level given SDP's evolving integration model.	1 = minimal API, no sandbox; 3 = documented API with sandbox and status callbacks; 5 = comprehensive API, SDKs, excellent sandbox, real-time status reporting	8%
Support & Responsiveness	Institutional support capability, dedicated account management, SLA for support response times, escalation procedures, and willingness to support SDP-specific integration needs.	1 = self-serve only; 3 = dedicated support with SLA; 5 = dedicated account manager, <1hr critical response, proactive integration support	7%

5. Assessment Process

5.1 Intake

Applicant submits a self-service intake form covering: company overview, provider type classification, fiat and stablecoin coverage, payment rail integrations, regulatory licenses, geographic reach, KYC/KYB flows, settlement capabilities, and API readiness. The intake form serves as a comprehensive capability inventory in addition to its role in gate evaluation. SDP team reviews for completeness within 5 business days.

5.2 Gate Evaluation

Gate 1 (Solana Capability) is verified through documentation and, where applicable, a devnet settlement test. Gates 2 and 3 are evaluated through documentation review and independent verification. Regulatory standing is cataloged but not evaluated on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis. SDP records what licenses the provider holds without opining on their sufficiency for specific use cases.

Timeline: Gate evaluation typically completes within 2-3 weeks, depending on applicant responsiveness and documentation completeness.

5.3 Scored Evaluation & Coverage Mapping

Applicants who pass all gates are scored by the SDP team. In addition to the composite score, the intake form data is used to map the provider's coverage against SDP's existing provider pool. Providers that fill geographic, currency, or payment rail gaps may receive prioritized onboarding even with a lower (but passing) composite score.

5.4 Decision & Onboarding

- Pass all gates + composite score 3.0+: Approved. Provider onboarded to SDP as an available integration.
- Pass all gates + composite score below 3.0: Deferred. Applicant notified of specific areas to improve. May reapply in 6 months.
- Fail any gate: Rejected with specific explanation. May reapply when deficiency is resolved.

6. Ongoing Obligations

Ramp providers face elevated ongoing monitoring requirements due to the regulatory complexity of fiat-to-crypto operations.

- Notification to SDP within 5 business days of any change in licensing status, loss of banking relationships, or regulatory enforcement action.
- Annual re-attestation of regulatory standing, banking relationships, and compliance certifications.
- Notification to SDP within 24 hours of any security breach or incident resulting in loss of client funds or unauthorized transactions.
- Maintenance of devnet integration compatibility where applicable.

- SDP reserves the right to delist a provider at any time if it determines the provider no longer meets the assessment criteria, poses reputational risk, or has experienced a material change in regulatory standing or banking access.

7. Scope Limitations & Disclaimers

This assessment evaluates fitness for listing as an available integration on SDP. It does not constitute an endorsement, recommendation, or warranty by the Solana Foundation regarding any provider's suitability for a specific institution's needs.

The regulatory catalog maintained by SDP records the provider's self-reported licensing status. The Solana Foundation does not opine on whether a provider's licenses are sufficient for any specific use case, jurisdiction, or transaction type. Institutions using SDP are responsible for conducting their own regulatory due diligence on any ramp provider they select.

All current integrations are on devnet. Criteria for mainnet promotion will be defined separately and may include additional requirements.

Appendix A: Scoring Reference

Score	Definition
5	Excellent. Industry-leading capability. Exceeds requirements with no material gaps.
4	Strong. Meets all requirements with meaningful differentiation in this area.
3	Adequate. Meets the requirement. Functional but not differentiated.
2	Below expectations. Partial capability with notable gaps. Triggers individual criterion review.
1	Deficient. Minimal or no capability in this area.