



➤ 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.*