

2026 SMS API Provider Assessment Checklist

A Practical Evaluation Framework for A2P Messaging Providers

Who this is for: Software platforms evaluating A2P messaging API providers in 2026

How to use it: Use this checklist to assess current or prospective providers. Each item should be answered with evidence—not assumptions.

Section 1: Total Messaging Cost Visibility

- ☐ Clear visibility into carrier pass-through fees
- ☐ Registration fees are clearly documented (Brand, Campaign, CSP, etc.)
- ☐ Ongoing compliance costs are transparent and forecastable
- ☐ Message failures, retries, and additional charges are explained
- ☐ Platform surfaces inefficiencies (retries, routing issues, delivery gaps)
- ☐ Cost drivers are communicated proactively

Notes:



Section 2: Delivery & Operational Readiness

- ☐ Provider accounts for carrier-specific behavior and constraints
- ☐ Delivery issues are surfaced before impacting end users
- ☐ Sending behavior adapts dynamically as conditions change
- ☐ Platform handles traffic spikes and seasonal volume increases
- ☐ Delivery performance remains predictable at scale

Notes:

Section 3: Registration Model & Ownership

- ☐ Supports Campaign Service Provider (CSP) registration
- ☐ Platform retains ownership of Brands and Campaigns
- ☐ Registrations are portable across providers
- ☐ No forced reseller dependencies

Notes:



Section 4: Campaign Portability & Migration

- ☐ Campaigns can be migrated without downtime
- ☐ Brand and Campaign IDs are preserved
- ☐ Migration process is automated or streamlined
- ☐ No re-registration or campaign recreation required

Notes:

Section 5: Support Model & True Cost of Help

- ☐ Compliance guidance is included
- ☐ Escalation paths are clearly defined
- ☐ Support response times are predictable
- ☐ Provider offers proactive guidance
- ☐ No per-ticket or surprise support fees

Notes:



Section 4: Campaign Portability & Migration

- ☐ Campaigns can be migrated without downtime
- ☐ Brand and Campaign IDs are preserved
- ☐ Migration process is automated or streamlined
- ☐ No re-vetting or Campaign recreation required

Notes:

Section 5: Support Model & True Cost of Help

- ☐ Compliance guidance is included
- ☐ Escalation paths are clearly defined
- ☐ Support response times are predictable
- ☐ Provider offers proactive guidance
- ☐ No per-ticket or surprise support fees

Notes:



Section 6: Compliance Enablement

- ☐ Provider actively guides registration across use cases
- ☐ Safeguards prevent non-compliant traffic
- ☐ Education or tooling helps prevent content drift
- ☐ Platform balances enforcement with enablement

Notes:

Section 7: Architecture & Scalability

- ☐ Multi-DCA redundancy supported
- ☐ Carrier-aware routing
- ☐ Architecture designed for high-volume A2P traffic
- ☐ Scales without manual intervention or rework

Notes:



Section 8: Adaptability to Carrier Change

- ☐ Provider monitors carrier rule changes
- ☐ Updates are communicated proactively
- ☐ Platform adapts without customer disruption
- ☐ Customers are informed before issues arise

Notes:



Optional Scoring Summary

Score each section from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)

Category	Score
Total Cost Visibility	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delivery Readiness	<input type="checkbox"/>
Registration Model	<input type="checkbox"/>
Campaign Migration	<input type="checkbox"/>
Support	<input type="checkbox"/>
Compliance Enablement	<input type="checkbox"/>
Architecture	<input type="checkbox"/>
Carrier Adaptability	<input type="checkbox"/>

Total Score: _____ / 40

Interpretation: _____

- 35–40: Strong long-term partner
- 30–34: Acceptable with noted risks
- <30: Elevated operational and cost risk

