



Y Ethical Farming Partnership Scorecard

Is this partnership regenerative—or extractive in disguise?

Purpose

To evaluate farming partnerships before land, trust, and dignity are damaged — using soil logic, dharmic *economics*, and *power awareness*.

Who this is for

- Farmers & landholders
- FPOs & cooperatives
- Impact investors & CSR programs
- NGOs & rural development agencies
- Regenerative agri-entrepreneurs

☞ SECTION 1 — Debt vs Risk-Sharing Checklist

What kind of money is entering the farm?

Mark each statement Yes / No

★ Capital Structure

- ☐ Returns are **linked to profit**, not fixed interest
- ☐ Repayment depends on **seasonal outcomes**, not calendar dates
- ☐ Capital provider shares **downside risk** in bad years
- ☐ No penalties for ecological recovery periods (fallow, transition years)

★ Decision Rights

- ☐ Farmer retains final say on cropping & soil practices
- ☐ No forced crop choices tied to repayment schedules
- ☐ No “default control takeover” clauses

★ Exit Ethics

- ☐ Exit does not force land sale or long-term dependency
- ☐ Exit terms are survivable, not punitive

Score Interpretation

- 0–3 Yes → **High extraction risk**
- 4–6 Yes → **Conditional partnership**
- 7+ Yes → **Regenerative-capable structure**

☞ SECTION 2 — Soil-Impact Timeline Under Repayment Pressure

What happens to the land when money gets tight?

Tick what your partnership **forces** during low-income years:

★ Short-Term Pressure Signals

- ☐ Reduced fallow or rest cycles
- ☐ Shift to high-input / high-yield crops
- ☐ Increased chemical dependency
- ☐ Soil organic matter decline ignored

★ Long-Term Regeneration Signals

- ☐ Cover crops protected even during stress years
- ☐ Soil health metrics valued alongside yield
- ☐ Transition years (organic / regenerative) financially buffered
- ☐ Regeneration seen as **investment**, not delay

Soil Truth Rule

☞ If repayment timelines override soil biology → **the land is being coerced**

🔑 *SECTION 3 — Power Imbalance Detector*

Who actually holds control when things go wrong?

Answer honestly.

★ **Control & Voice**

- ☐ Can the farmer **say no** without punishment?
- ☐ Are disagreements resolved through dialogue, not leverage?
- ☐ Does capital influence decisions indirectly through pressure?

★ **Information Asymmetry**

- ☐ Financial terms fully understood by all parties
- ☐ No hidden clauses activated only during stress
- ☐ Farmer can access independent advice

★ **Psychological Safety**

- ☐ No shame-based repayment language
- ☐ No fear of losing dignity, not just land
- ☐ Mental health not collateralized

Red Flag Indicator

🔑 If silence increases as money increases → **power is imbalanced**

SECTION 4 — Regenerative Partnership Design Guide

What healthy farming partnerships actually look like

Use this as a **design checklist**, not evaluation only.

★ Capital Design

- ☐ Profit-sharing > interest
- ☐ Multi-season averaging
- ☐ Shared reserve for climate shocks

★ Labor & Ownership

- ☐ Farmers accumulate stake, not just wages
- ☐ Stewardship rewarded over volume
- ☐ Knowledge = equity

★ Governance

- ☐ Joint review after each season
- ☐ Soil health included in performance review
- ☐ Exit pathways that preserve dignity

★ Cultural Alignment

- ☐ Trust precedes paperwork
- ☐ Responsibility shared, not outsourced
- ☐ Long-term continuity valued over short-term ROI

Design Principle

☞ *If risk is shared, care follows. If care follows, soil heals.*

Before you sign anything, score the partnership.

Soil remembers what contracts ignore.