Socioeconomic Indicators for Regenerative Agriculture

Technical Feasibility Report

Contents

Introduction

Background

Sustainable Agriculture Initiative Platform (SAI Platform) is a non-profit organisation of more than 190 global food and beverage companies committed to driving the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices. SAI Platform serves as a pre-competitive avenue to drive collaborative action across institutional and farming landscapes, develop and deploy technical frameworks, industry solutions, and build and share relevant expertise and knowledge. Its latest farm-gate industry solution, the Regenerating Together (RT) framework, operationalises regenerative agriculture at the farm-level and across the value chain. Despite growing evidence of environmental, farm-level, and supply-chain benefits, a critical gap remains in understanding how farmers themselves perceive and adopt these practices—insights that are essential to driving wider uptake.

In 2025, supported by The Rockefeller Foundation, SAI Platform collaborated with 60 Decibels to develop socioeconomic indicators that capture farmer perspectives related to regenerative agriculture to complement SAI Platform's RT Framework. These metrics were tested and validated with smallholder potato farmers in India. The long-term goal is to use farmer voice to develop a scalable approach to track the socio-economic impact of regenerative practices and support farmer resilience. Based on discussions with SAI Platform members—including PepsiCo, McCain Foods Limited (McCain), Arla, and Nestlé—60 Decibels developed indicators to provide an in-depth understanding of the feasibility, impact, and drivers of the adoption and long-term sustainability of regenerative practices.

The survey indicators focus on the specific regenerative practices that farmers have adopted through their participation in programmes with their respective corporate collaborators. Find out more on the next page.

About This Report

This report summarises learnings from piloting the survey with 402 farmers associated with McCain and PepsiCo in India (201 farmers each).

It reviews each survey metric—how farmers interpreted it and how useful it was for understanding their perspectives—and distils technical learnings, key considerations for phone-based surveys, and metrics to consider in future. Finally, it offers practical recommendations for companies that wish to collect similar data from farmers in their supply chains in the future and outlines potential next steps for refining and scaling this approach.

The Approach

Between October – November 2025, 60 Decibels piloted a survey with potato farmers associated with McCain and PepsiCo supply chains in Gujarat and West Bengal respectively. The goal of this exercise was to test the relevance of these metrics with farmers who had already begun adopting regenerative practices in different settings, through the corporate programmes of McCain and PepsiCo.

Given the differences in operating models for each company, we had to modify our survey and approach accordingly:

- **McCain:** Farmers have been receiving training on regenerative practices including soil health, importance of crop diversity, ground coverage, reduced tillage, decision support systems and BMP for pesticide (use and handling), water and fertiliser since 2021. However, for the survey, farmers were specifically asked to reflect on cover cropping, as it was one of the most widely adopted practices.
- **PepsiCo:** PepsiCo's farmers have received training for two or more years on a variety of topics, including land preparation, seed selection, soil management, pest or disease treatment, and storage practices. Because the programmes incorporate multiple regenerative techniques, farmers were asked to reflect on the practice that has resulted in the most significant change on their farm.

More broadly, this work is intended offer companies an approach to assess how farmers experience regenerative practices. Understanding whether farmers see these practices as useful, manageable, and worth continuing provides a critical input for programme design—helping companies adjust training, support, and incentives to improve the feasibility and long-term uptake as well as continuation of regenerative practices in their supply chains.

Survey Design

From the outset, our goal was to develop an approach that takes account of farmer livelihoods compatible with the implementation of SAI Platform's RT framework.

To inform this work, 60 Decibels held discussions with SAI Platform members—including PepsiCo, Arla, McCain, and Nestlé—to understand their current regenerative agriculture programmes and identify the socio-economic metrics that would be most useful to them.

Across these conversations, stakeholders expressed:

- A strong emphasis that regenerative agriculture is primarily about restoring natural capital. Stakeholders saw farmer socioeconomic metrics as a way to ensure economic viability and flag risks of disadoption—not to measure broader household wellbeing. They also stressed that expanding the scope too far could undermine the RT framework's practicality, and emphasised the need to keep it focused and aligned with the core aims of regenerative agriculture.
- A clear preference for indicators directly linked to farmers' adoption of regenerative practices and comparatively less interest in broader measures of overall household wellbeing.
- An interest in more specific indicators like the impact of the regenerative practices on farm outcomes.
- A demand for actionable takeaways to improve farmers' uptake or long-term use of regenerative practices.

In response, 60 Decibels proposed a core set of metrics that capture general wellbeing, but places greater emphasis on the viability, perceived impact, long-term outlook of regenerative practices, and challenges faced.

These indicators are designed to meet the following criteria to allow for repeatability across contexts:

- **Practice- and commodity-agnostic**: Metrics are commodity agnostic, covering both crop and livestock systems, aligning with the RT framework's design principles. The purpose of the core indicator set is to be broadly applicable across contexts, supply chains, or practices.
- **Applicable to farmers irrespective of tenure**: These metrics are intended for use with farmers who have already begun implementing regenerative approaches through company programmes—both recent adopters, who can reflect on changes before and after adoption, and longer-term users, who can speak to the sustained benefits of these practices.

All survey questions (and therefore metrics) are framed around the specific regenerative practices that farmers have adopted through their participation in programmes. In the questionnaire, "**[Regenerative practice]"** is used as a placeholder for the actual practice or bundle of practices implemented. The bracketed text is intended to be customised for each survey, based on the practices relevant to the farmers being interviewed. The complete survey tool used by 60 Decibels can be found here.

Survey Dimensions	Indicators
Household Wellbeing	• Living Standards • Financial Resilience • Profitability from Farming
Impact	• Change in Production • Change in Earnings • Climate Resilience
Near-Term Viability	• Net Promoter Score • Challenges • Access to Training and Finance
Future Outlook	• Long Term Use • Community Outlook • Future Adoption • Additional Support Required

Learning From The Pilot

This section summarises key learnings from data collection: how farmers understood regenerative practices, reported adoption and impact, and viewed company support, and further highlights practical considerations for designing future surveys and programmes.

1 A holistic lens is critical to measure the socio-economic impact of regenerative practices.

Our metrics covered a range of themes, such as farmers' adoption of regenerative practices, their day-to-day experience using them, and the changes they felt on their farms. Looking at these dimensions together gave us a clearer picture of how regenerative practices are working in practice. This resonated with participating companies, given this type of measurement is relatively new to the regenerative agriculture field.

That said, farmers may find it difficult to isolate the impact of a single practice on yield, income, or soil health, as most use multiple practices and there are parallel changes in inputs, weather, and markets. Future studies should acknowledge this complexity while still capturing perceived impact by asking farmers to reflect on "regenerative agriculture" in whatever way most closely resonates with them—whether as a single practice or as a bundle of practices.

2 Farmers have different understandings of regenerative practices and definitions may vary by context.

Our initial aim was to capture how farmers themselves understand their transition to regenerative agriculture, allowing them to define what practices they consider regenerative. However, in practice, regenerative practices are bundled and look different for each farmer, based on their local context. Meaningful evaluation thus requires precision, and we narrowed the scope to a single practice each farmer most strongly associated with being "regenerative". Which practice or group of practices to anchor on will depend on a company's business model and its relationship with farmers.

Leaving practices open-ended can yield richer, farmer-led definitions, while prescribing specific practices enables clearer, more comparable, and more actionable insights. Future surveys will need to weigh this trade-off intentionally, based on their primary objectives.

3 Providing clear, locally translated definitions of regenerative practices is essential—especially when farmers use multiple similar practices.

Helping farmers clearly identify the specific regenerative practices they are using can be challenging, especially when several are implemented at once. Translating technical practice details into local languages adds another layer of complexity, particularly when practices sound similar or overlap conceptually.

In both the PepsiCo and McCain surveys, farmers struggled to distinguish between crop rotation and cover cropping, even after our enumerator teams explained the differences and shared concrete examples of crops typically used for each. For future studies, it is important to develop clear, operational definitions of each target practice and ensure these can be translated into simple, farmer-friendly language. This means stress-testing wording during questionnaire design and checking that farmers can reliably differentiate one practice from another—and, for a set of practices implemented, clearly determine what is in scope and what is not.

4 It is important to understand the extent of practice adoption, not just whether it is used.

In our survey, farmers self-reported whether they had implemented a given regenerative practice and for how long they had been using it. However, we did not capture the extent of application—for example, what proportion of their land is under that practice, how consistently they apply it, or whether they have used it at a scale and duration that would allow them to experience meaningful benefits. Understanding this level of engagement is also crucial for accurately assessing farmers' performance within the RT framework.

One practical way to do this is to pair survey findings with data that companies already hold such as acreage under specific practices, number of seasons implemented, or input usage. Where available, this data can be mapped to survey responses to examine how perceptions and outcomes vary with the level of adoption. Building this richer picture of practice intensity will strengthen future analysis and inform more targeted support to farmers.

Reflections on Survey Dimensions (1/3)

Farmer Profile

The profile section provided important context about farmers' backgrounds, which helped interpret patterns across the rest of the survey. Understanding who the farmers are, how they farm, and which practices they have adopted was essential to identify differences in perceptions and outcomes.

- **Core profile metrics**: Across both studies, a few profile metrics emerged as fundamental and should be retained in all future projects. These include tenure with the company or its program, tenure with the regenerative practice (i.e. number of years since sustained adoption of the practice), land size, and gender. Together, they form a basic but powerful lens for segmenting results and understanding where farmers are in their adoption journeys.
- **Regional variations**: Farmers reported land size using a range of local units (such as *bigha*, *khata*, and others), which vary across states and districts. For such variable metrics, it is important to standardise data into a common unit to enable comparison and analysis across respondents. Future studies should anticipate this diversity in land units and build in clear conversion guidance for enumerators.
- **Context-specific profile metrics**: Adding a small number of context-specific profile metrics can further enrich analysis. For example, understanding the extent of regenerative practice adoption (e.g. share of land under the practice), the types of crops grown, how farmers are implementing the practice (for instance, what they are using for cover cropping), and what other household income sources they have can all help link farmer characteristics more directly to practice-related outcomes and perceptions.

Household Wellbeing

The household wellbeing section provided useful background on farmers' living conditions and economic stability, helping set the context for the rest of the survey. Living standards acted as an introduction to their basic wellbeing, while perceived profitability and financial resilience offered more nuanced insights into farmers' financial stability and vulnerability to shocks.

- **Living standards as a baseline checkpoint**: These questions confirmed that most farmers had access to core elements of a decent standard of living, such as food, healthcare, and housing. This was useful as a baseline, but in relatively better-off populations these indicators did not provide significant insight into farmers' perception of regenerative practices.
- **Understanding profitability helps interpret impact**: The self-reported profitability metric acted as a bridge between household wellbeing and farm impact. Farmers' perceptions of profitability provided helpful context for interpreting views on regenerative practices or perceived impact on production.
- **Financial resilience to capture vulnerability**: Financial resilience indicators (level of savings and ability to afford emergencies) highlighted how well farmers can cope with shocks or bad seasons. They could be particularly valuable for surfacing differences across groups—for example, by gender or practice type—and for identifying farmers who may be more exposed to risk.

Reflections on Survey Dimensions (2/3)

Impact

The impact-focused questions offered valuable insight into how regenerative practices are helping farmers improve production, earnings, and, to some extent, their climate resilience. At the same time, it must be noted that impact is rarely the result of a single practice: farmers usually implement multiple practices alongside other on-farm changes. Understanding how farmers themselves connect changes in their outcomes to their understanding of regenerative agriculture remains essential for learning what is most meaningful and motivating to them. While farmers in the pilot focused on a particular regenerative practice, future studies could track farmers' perceptions of a broader bundle of practices, taking into account where each farmer is in their regenerative journey and the specific practices they are trained on by companies.

Unpacking drivers of change after adoption:

- **Production:** Across both surveys, most farmers reported some increases in production because of the regenerative practice. Future questionnaires could include a short follow-up on how this increase occurred. For example, reduced crop loss for integrated pest management, or improved soil health for cover cropping. Capturing these practice-specific pathways would make the findings more actionable.
- **Earnings:** Similarly, for increased income, a short follow-up can add useful nuance. In the McCain survey, we differentiated between income from potatoes and from cover crops, which clarified which parts of the regenerative practice implementation were driving perceived gains. Future projects could include comparable follow-ups tailored to the specific practice mix.
- **Change in Expenses**: We also asked farmers how their farm expenses and labour needs had changed since implementing the regenerative practice. This helped contextualise impact, especially where costs were rising, but companies wanted more detail on which costs were increasing (e.g. labour, inputs, machinery). A follow-up on the main drivers of cost and labour changes would make these insights more actionable in future surveys.

- **Tracking long-term impact on climate resilience:** We also asked farmers about changes in climate resilience because of the regenerative practice, but many found this difficult to answer. Climate outcomes felt too broad and "long-term" to attribute to a single practice, and some saw these shocks as an inevitable part of farming. Additionally, farmers who have not faced shocks in recent seasons may find it difficult to make hypothetical assessments about what would have happened without these practices. These questions may be more relevant for farmers who have used regenerative practices for many years, with more time to notice potential shifts or in contexts where shocks are recurrent.
- **Minimising misattribution**: Framing impact questions as changes witnessed "since implementing" a practice is intuitive, but it may also capture other concurrent changes on the farm. In the pilot, farmers were asked to reflect on a single practice, which makes it difficult to justify attributing impacts to that practice alone; instead, the practice may have been viewed as one of many factors contributing to the observed outcomes. Because most companies approach regenerative agriculture as a bundle of practices, attribution may feel more natural in those contexts. Future studies could test wording such as "because of the [regenerative practice]" to anchor responses more clearly to the bundle of practices in focus.

Reflections on Survey Dimensions (3/3)

Near-Term Viability

The near-term viability section captured how farmers felt about using regenerative practices day to day—what worked well, what was challenging, and how likely they were to continue. Some questions generated rich, practice-specific insights, while others were more context-dependent in their usefulness.

- **Open-ended data provides clear, practice-level signals:** Farmers were generally able to reflect on their experience with the regenerative practice, explain what worked, and highlight what did not. We also used the Net Promoter Score (NPS) to understand how likely they were to recommend the regenerative practice to a friend or family member (0–10), which is a strong proxy for perceived value in peer-driven communities. While most did not report major challenges, those who did shared concrete barriers to applying the practice thoroughly. These questions are worth retaining, especially as qualitative follow-ups.
- **Relevance of resource accessibility metrics:** Questions on access to finance and training were less insightful in these pilots. Both companies have strong relationships with farmers and promoted relatively low-capital practices, so few cited finance or training as constraints. These questions may add more value where companies are promoting capital-intensive practices (such as drip irrigation) or are still early in training farmers.

Future Outlook

These metrics tested for farmers' future orientation to regenerative practices and proved effective. Farmers were able to engage with most questions. However, some questions generated overlapping insights, suggesting scope to streamline this section in future surveys while retaining those that add distinctive value.

- **Metrics suited for early adopters**: The metric assessing 'expected change in use of the regenerative practice' did not work as well in this context, as both farmer groups had already been implementing the practices for several years (median of 5 years). For them, large changes in use in the upcoming season were unlikely. This question may be more informative for farmers who are earlier in their adoption journey, where shifts in use over the next year are more plausible.
- **Community views add value when practices are less widespread**: Farmers generally understood the question on how the community views their adoption of regenerative practices, but it is likely to be more useful where the practice is less common and social acceptance is a clearer barrier or enabler. The NPS is independently a robust indicator of whether community adoption could be widespread.
- **Perceptions of long-term use and of costs vs benefits are critical**: Questions on long-term use intentions and perceived balance of costs versus benefits worked well. They were easy for farmers to answer and provided clear signals on the sustainability of continued practice use and how farmers weigh effort and expense against perceived gains.
- **Future suggestions:** Suggestions directed at companies tended to be general rather than practice-specific. When asked how companies could improve uptake of regenerative practices, farmers often gave broader feedback on company support rather than practice-specific suggestions. Their decisions to continue a practice are shaped less by "regenerative" versus "non-regenerative" support, and more by the overall quality of the relationship—trust, timely services, and income stability.

Recommended Priority Metrics

This table highlights metrics that companies can test with farmers based on where they are in their regenerative agriculture journey and the company's learning priorities. Companies are encouraged to use it alongside the RT framework's practice implementation steps.

Survey Dimension	Indicators	When to Use
Household Wellbeing	Perceived farm profitability Frequency of savings Ability to afford emergency expenses Living standards: Food, water, health, etc.	› Before promoting regenerative practices › To monitor changes over time
Near-Term Viability	Net Promoter Score and drivers Challenges Access to training/information Access to finances for implementation	› During pilot programmes › To monitor farmer experience over time
Long Term Outlook	Long term use Perceived benefits vs costs Next season planned use Community perceptions	› With early- to mid-stage adopters to predict sustained adoption
Perceived Impact	Perceived production change Perceived income change Perceived change in farm expenses Perceived change in climate resilience	› With sustained adopters › To compare farmer perception to agronomic impacts

Company Guidance for Implementation (1/3)

When gathering the data from your farmers, it is important to keep in mind a few guidelines to ensure you capture clean, accurate, and actionable data.

1 **Define survey goals and use-cases for the data**

Before starting data collection, it is important to be clear on two things: **(1)** where farmers are in their regenerative journey, and **(2)** what you want to learn from them and use the data for. This will vary by farmer group—depending on which practices they are implementing, how long they have used them, the region they farm in, the crops they grow, and what information your company already holds. For example, if farmers have been using a practice for many years, impact questions should focus on changes "because of" the practice, rather than "since you started," as they may not clearly remember the period before adoption. If farmers are using multiple practices, companies need to decide whether to ask farmers to focus on one specific practice, or to respond in terms of a broader set of regenerative practices defined by the farmer. Finally, survey design and goals should be grounded in existing company data (such as farmer surveys or field agent records) to avoid duplication. Companies should ensure that new questions are complementary to existing data to inform actionable next steps.

2 **Choose the best approach for collecting your data**

We recommend using phone-based surveys, as the survey was designed and piloted for phone-call-based data collection, and worked well. However, it can also be adapted to other methods like WhatsApp, SMS, or in-person collection, depending on what works best for your team. As you finalise the survey mode, ensure the survey tool is adapted to your business model and tailored to your farmer base.

3 **Define your respondent base clearly**

- **Practice Attribution:** The first step is to clearly identify which regenerative practice or bundle of practices you want to learn more about (see the SAI Platform's Regenerating Together Framework for more information on specific practices). Ideally, farmers can clearly identify the relevant practices—either by name or as a defined bundle attributable to the company (for example, the set of practices included in a training program). In practice, however, farmers are often trained on multiple practices (both "regenerative" and otherwise) and adopt them to varying degrees, and companies may not know which practices matter most to them. In these cases, it is helpful to first set some parameters around the practices that farmers should reflect upon and assess the extent to which each "regenerative" practice is being applied. The survey can then focus on the farmer-defined bundle, enabling the data collected to better reflect the diversity of practices in the field.
- **Sampling**: Once the target farmer population is identified, selecting respondents at random is important because it ensures the sample you choose is representative of your entire farmer base. This helps make sure your results are accurate and reflect the broader group, without favouring any group. If you don't select randomly and instead interview farmers based on factors like their availability, convenience, proximity, familiarity, or ease of access, your results may be biased. In that case, it's important to clearly mention that the sample was not random.
- **Target groups:** If you want to speak to specific segments of your participant base, set quotas based on demographics (such as gender or region) and ensure these are tracked. There are two ways:
    1. For simplicity in execution, you can set equal targets for each quota. For example, you can survey 50% female and 50% male farmers, regardless of the actual breakdown of your farmer base.
    2. You can assess how your population is split and mirror that split in your sample. For example, if your farmers are 70% male and 30% female, you can set the same target for your interviews.

Company Guidance for Implementation (2/3)

3 Define your respondent base clearly

- **Target sample size**: To decide how many farmers you want to interview, you should aim for a 90% confidence level. Together with the margin of error, this tells you how precise your results are. The table below provides an indication of the target sample size based on your participant base. Alternatively, you can calculate your ideal sample size by setting the confidence level to 90% and the margin of error to 5-6% here.

Associated Sample Sizes @ 90% Confidence Level & Margin of Error				
Population Size	6%	5%	4%	Recommended Range
500	138	177	231	140-180
5,000	183	259	393	185-260
50,000	189	271	422	190-275
500,000	189	273	426	190-275

- **Tenure of respondent:** Ideally, your sample should include farmers who have been using—or have been trained to use—the regenerative practice for at least two full farming seasons. This allows enough time for them to form meaningful perceptions about changes in yield, income, soil health, or labour. For farmers with longer tenures, some questions may need minor adaptations to keep recall periods manageable and ensure responses are comparable.

4 Train your researchers ahead of time

To conduct this type of study, companies will ideally work with 2–3 trained researchers or research assistants who can collect data in a neutral, consistent way. If hiring external researchers is not feasible, identify 2–3 field team members, agronomists, or extension staff who already interact with farmers and can be trained to play this role.
Start by running a structured training session that explains why the study is being done (to understand farmers' views and experiences with regenerative practices), who will be interviewed, and how the findings will be used. Then walk through the survey tool question by question so researchers are clear on the intent behind each item and how it links back to your regenerative agriculture goals.

Given the focus on regenerative practices, it is important that researchers are familiar with the local realities and terminology of those practices. Training should cover:

- The specific practices you are interested in (e.g. cover cropping, IPM, reduced tillage).
- The names farmers typically use for these practices in local languages.
- Practice-specific details from the ground—for example, which crops farmers commonly use for cover cropping, how they apply IPM, or what "mulching" looks like in practice.

Mock interviews using the translated tool in local languages are highly recommended to build confidence and surface potential misunderstandings early. To minimise bias and protect data quality, train researchers to:

- Record responses exactly as stated, without "tidying up" or rephrasing.
- Probe for detail ("Can you tell me more about that?") rather than prompting with examples that might lead the farmer.
- Make sure company attribution is clear—respondents should answer with their engagement with your company or programme in mind, not with generic experiences.

All researchers should also be familiar with basic data protection principles. No personally identifiable information—such as full name, phone number, or address—should appear in the data entry sheet; each respondent should be represented by an anonymised ID.

Company Guidance for Implementation (3/3)

5 **Capture data anonymously on a secure platform**

Once your randomly selected contact base is identified, ensure that you assign unique phone numbers or respondents to each researcher. A progress tracker is key to ensuring your targets are successfully met.

Researchers should record responses accurately during each interview. They may either take handwritten notes in the local language and later enter the data, or record responses directly into Excel or a secure digital platform used for data collection.

Ensure that all verbatim responses are entered exactly as stated, without changes to language or sentiment. To protect respondent privacy, do not record names. Instead, assign a unique ID so that feedback cannot be traced back to individual farmers, maintaining respondent anonymity and data integrity. If you want to capture audio recordings, ensure you seek explicit consent and document it. Please note that audio recordings may influence the respondent's answers due to social desirability bias.

6 **Integrate Metrics Within RT Framework**

Our metrics can be neatly integrated into the Regenerating Together framework by fleshing out the existing pillar on farmer livelihoods and farm business viability. While the RT framework provides strong technical guidance on environmental outcomes and practices, our farmer-centred indicators add a complementary layer that focuses on feasibility, perceived impact, and long-term sustainability from the farmer's point of view. In practice, companies can integrate the two approaches through the following steps:

1. **Risk Screening Assessment**: Alongside environmental and production risks, companies can also identify socio-economic risks—such as income volatility, labour burden, adoption costs, or perceived difficulty of specific practices—based on their interactions with farmers and existing data. This helps supply-shed risk assessments reflect both biophysical and livelihood constraints.
2. **Outcome Selection**: In addition to environmental outcomes, companies can define a set of farmer-centred socio-economic outcomes (for example, perceived profitability, feasibility of practice, financial resilience, and willingness to recommend the practice). The farmer survey then becomes the primary measurement tool for these outcomes, sitting alongside soil, water, biodiversity, and climate indicators.
3. **Principles and Practices**: Insights from the farmer metrics can be used to refine which practices and support measures are promoted. For instance, if farmers report high perceived impact but low feasibility due to labour or cost, companies can respond with tailored training, input support, or practice adjustments within their regenerative transition plans.
4. **Monitor and Assess Progress**: The farmer-voice survey can be repeated at regular intervals as part of the broader monitoring protocol, providing a consistent way to track how farmer perceptions of regenerative practices evolve over time and whether interventions are improving both environmental performance and farmer resilience.

Final Reflections and What's Next

We set out to test whether a common, farmer-centric set of metrics could help companies better understand the social dimensions of regenerative agriculture in their supply chains.

As a first step, we developed and piloted this approach with PepsiCo and McCain, shared individual company reports, and incorporated their feedback into this synthesis. A final report containing both methodological learnings and farmer insights from the pilot is available here.

Companies can use these resources to incorporate farmer perspectives into their programmes and are welcome to reach out to 60 Decibels or SAI Platform for support.

Methodology

Between October and November 2025, 60 Decibels' trained researchers conducted phone interviews with farmers from both PepsiCo and McCain. In total, 201 PepsiCo farmers in West Bengal and 201 McCain farmers were randomly sampled from the respective company farmer databases. All farmers interviewed had received training on regenerative practices from the respective companies. Here is the breakdown of how we collected this data:

	PepsiCo	McCain
Country	**India**	**India**
Client Population	**557**	**428**
Interviews Completed	**201**	**201**
Response Rate	**37%**	**52%**
Languages	**Bengali, Hindi**	**Gujarati, Hindi**
Average Survey Length	**25 mins**	**24 mins**
Confidence Level	**90%**	**90%**
Margin of Error	**6%**	**4%**

About 60 Decibels

60 Decibels is the world's leading customer insights company for social impact. We bring speed and repeatability to social measurement, making it easy to listen directly to the people who matter most. Our network of 1600+ researchers in 100+ countries gives you global reach. Couple this with standardised questions across thousands of projects and you get the largest data set of social performance benchmarks worldwide — with a focus on Financial Inclusion, Off-Grid Energy, and Agriculture value chains. These data help investors, funders, Fortune 500 companies, and NGOs understand their impact performance relative to their peers. Get in touch to find out more about our award-winning approach to impact measurement.

Project Team: Ellie Turner, Malavika Rangarajan, Jacob Thamarappally.

For queries, please email:

ellie@60decibels.com

Thank You For Working With Us!

Let's do it again sometime.

Stay In Touch

Please sign up for The Volume, our monthly collection of things worth reading.

Acknowledgements

This work was generously sponsored by SAI Platform, through grant support from The Rockefeller Foundation.