

The MOU Guide

Public overview · Version 1.0 draft · 22 September 2026 · soberana.network

A workplan for informed review

A memorandum of understanding, or MOU, helps suitable applicants and Soberana organize the next stage of diligence. Its purpose in the proposed journey is practical: identify the participants, explain what needs review and establish how the discussion will be managed. It does not transform an interested institution into an approved operating member.

This guide is intended for the prospective signatory and the colleagues preparing the underlying information. It explains how to read a process document carefully without providing a contract template. The signed text, if any, determines its effect. The label “MOU” does not answer whether a particular provision is binding, and this guide should not be used to make that determination.

Where the MOU sits [PROPOSED]

The MOU follows a suitable initial eligibility review and organizes further diligence. Initial review identifies the entity, intended activity and questions that need investigation. Full operating eligibility still requires the applicable regulatory, technical and control gates to be satisfied before any production activity.

The distinction prevents two misunderstandings. First, an institution should not infer that receiving an MOU means every part of its application has passed. Second, an unresolved production-readiness question need not be described as an operating permission while the parties organize a non-production review. The process records what has actually been checked and what remains open. The precise review sequence remains proposed pending adoption.

Read the document in three passes

The first pass establishes identity and purpose. Check the exact entity names, the representative's role and the activity the parties intend to examine. An applicant with several affiliates should be able to explain which entity holds each relevant permission. A familiar group brand does not resolve that question.

The second pass distinguishes the workplan from any expressly binding provisions. A description of possible future cooperation is different from a present obligation stated in the signed text. Confidentiality and information-handling requirements, where included in signed terms, should be understood before documents are exchanged. Do not infer their scope from a heading or from another institution's MOU.

The third pass follows the practical sequence. Identify who coordinates submissions, which specialists participate, how questions are raised and how changes to the review scope are documented. Where a reader cannot tell whether a statement is a proposal, a present requirement or a future approval condition, the uncertainty should be resolved before signature. This guide deliberately supplies no binding-clause list for an unapproved instrument.

The proposed workplan [PROPOSED]

WORKSTREAM	PRACTICAL QUESTION	TYPICAL CONTRIBUTION
Entity and permissions	Which institution performs each activity?	Entity chart and authorization references
Financial and settlement readiness	Can the proposed operating path be supported?	Financial records and route-level operating description
Technical and security readiness	How will systems handle normal and failed events?	Architecture explanation and test evidence
Financial-crime controls	Who makes acceptance and monitoring decisions?	Policies, accountable contacts and control evidence
Review coordination	What remains unresolved and who can answer?	Evidence index, questions and review meetings

These workstreams describe diligence, not a representation that any record is already sufficient. Information may need explanation, a more recent version or evidence about another entity in the path. An applicant's internal teams should have time to verify the accuracy and authorized disclosure of their submissions.

Participants and accountability

The applicant's coordinator makes it easier for the right specialist to answer the right question. Legal and compliance colleagues explain the permissions and control perimeter. Treasury and finance colleagues explain financial records and settlement readiness. Engineering and security colleagues explain system behavior, access and evidence of testing.

On the review side, these subjects require their corresponding specialists. A business contact can coordinate progress but cannot substitute for the function responsible for evaluating a particular risk. The proposed approach records questions by subject so that an unanswered regulatory point is not treated as resolved merely because an integration discussion went well. The MOU itself is not the final approval record.

Handling evidence responsibly

A useful evidence package contains enough context to be understood: author or issuing body, date, period covered and relevant entity. Providing a document without this context can create avoidable uncertainty. For example, a group-level security report may be informative while leaving unanswered whether the applicant's own system falls within its scope.

Use the agreed controlled channel for diligence materials. Do not attach customer files, credentials or sensitive regulatory correspondence to a general inquiry merely to demonstrate seriousness. Reviewers and applicants should first establish what information is needed and how it can be shared. Shared compliance evidence does not transfer responsibility for customer acceptance, ongoing monitoring or required reporting. Where lawful reuse cannot be established, the parties must use another permitted way to complete the review.

Milestones and changes [PROPOSED]

A workplan can use milestones such as receipt of an initial evidence set, specialist review, response to questions and confirmation of readiness for the next approval stage. Each milestone should describe an observable output. “Review completed” is useful only if the record explains the scope and any open findings.

Administrative dates support coordination; they are not a promise of admission or a prediction of a regulator's decision. A changed service provider, a new intended market or an unresolved discrepancy may require the plan to be revisited. Recording the change preserves a shared understanding of what is being assessed. It is better to identify a revised scope clearly than to carry forward a conclusion based on an earlier proposal.

Questions prospective signatories commonly ask

Does signing reserve membership or a seat? No. The public process does not treat the MOU as a reservation. Any eventual rights depend on the applicable approvals and definitive agreements.

Does it authorize a pilot using real funds? No. Payment activity requires its own lawful permissions and readiness assessment. Calling an activity a pilot does not change that boundary.

Does the MOU commit either party to invest? No. The proposed MOU organizes review. Investment approval is separate from operating eligibility and governance decisions.

Can the institution stop discussions? The public process contemplates the ability to stop discussions, subject to provisions expressly stated to be binding in the applicable signed text. This guide does not establish termination conditions, penalties or surviving obligations.

Will information supplied once be accepted everywhere? No. Another institution may need its own review, additional evidence or a different lawful handling arrangement. Standardized organization can make evidence easier to assess; it cannot replace the receiving institution's responsibilities.

What happens after diligence? If the evidence and approvals support progress, the parties consider the applicable proposed member agreements. Operational onboarding follows before a particular route begins. Neither progression nor a completion date is guaranteed.

Preparing for the next conversation

A prospective signatory can prepare by confirming the entity in scope, identifying internal evidence owners and collecting questions about the review process. The most useful questions concern what will be evaluated, what remains unconfirmed and which decision comes next. This keeps the conversation focused on a reviewable operating proposal.

What this document is not

This guide is not an MOU, legal advice, an interpretation of signed provisions or a substitute for reviewing the actual text before execution. It provides no contractual language, economic terms or assurance of a future relationship.

Membership, access and any rights are proposed, subject to counsel review and the applicable approved agreements. No payment or investment is requested at this stage.