Regen10

Guidance for Applying the Regen10 Outcomes Framework

DEFINE | MAP | COORDINATE

1. Define

Defining regenerative outcomes for your work

2. Map

Mapping regenerative outcomes for your work

3. Coordinate

Coordinating action around shared outcomes



Introduction

Why this guidance exists

This guidance is for actors who want to understand how an existing tool, standard, program or methodology relates to the Regen10 Outcomes Framework – what it covers, where coverage differs or is absent, and what those differences mean.

Different tools, standards, methodologies and programs exist for different purposes. A certification scheme designed to assure buyers of specific practices is not trying to do the same job as a landscape-level assessment tool, and neither is trying to do the same job as an organization's own internal monitoring system. Comparing these directly can be misleading unless the comparison is approached carefully, including considering their intended purpose, users, decision context, evidence requirements and any claims they are designed to support.

The Regen10 Outcomes Framework is designed to bridge that gap: rather than serving one purpose or actor, it sets out a comprehensive set of regenerative outcomes across every dimension and scale, so it can act as a common reference point against which tools built for different purposes can be considered. In practice, this means that actors can take an existing standard, assessment tool, program or corporate commitment and map it against the Framework to understand which regenerative outcomes it addresses, where gaps remain, and whether those gaps matter for its intended purpose. The findings can then help identify opportunities to strengthen existing approaches, improve monitoring or complement them with other tools where needed.

A gap is not automatically a deficiency
Tools may be designed to achieve a specific outcome, and don't always consider the bigger picture. For example, a certification scheme focused on pesticide use may not measure landscape governance. This is not automatically a deficiency, but understanding the limitations of particular tools on wider outcomes is essential. Acknowledging gaps is an important step in identifying where other complementary tools might be needed. The value of a mapping exercise is in surfacing gaps and differences, not in 'ranking'. Gaps often show where complementary tools may be needed, and may be entirely justifiable given a tool's intended purpose and scope.

A note on terminology
Throughout this guidance, 'the Framework' always refers specifically to the Regen10 Outcomes Framework — the shared reference point everything in this document is mapped against.

'Tool' is used as shorthand for whatever you are comparing against the Framework — this might be a certification scheme, a standard, an indicator set, an internal monitoring system, a program methodology, or in some cases another framework entirely. Rather than repeating "tool, standard, program or methodology" at every mention, this guidance uses "tool" as the general term, since the mapping process described here works the same way regardless of what specific form your tool takes.

'Element' is a distinct part of a landscape outcome, named in the outcome's wording. For example, food security is one element of the landscape governance outcome.

What this guidance will help you do

- **Understand** what a tool, standard, program or methodology already covers relative to the Regen10 Outcomes Framework, where the gaps are and whether those gaps matter for how the tool will be used.
- **Choose** the granularity of comparison that matches what you actually need.
- **Add nuance** to your comparison, noting where there may be differences in data types, sources, boundaries and time horizons.
- **Interpret** gaps as information and opportunity rather than failure, and communicate what you find constructively.
- **Decide** what to do next – whether that is refining your own tool, understanding a partner's tool better, comparing multiple tools against a shared reference, or building findings and insights into your communications or strategy.

How to use this guidance

This guidance follows six steps. Each step builds on the previous one, helping you move from choosing your approach to mapping coverage and knowing what to do with what you find. A template accompanies this guidance and follows the six steps. You can use it as a worksheet to record your answers as you go. It is optional, and you can use any format that suits you.

Step	Outcome
1. Define your aim	A clear understanding of what you are mapping, why, and who the findings are for. You should also decide a scale - whether you are using the farm or landscape level outcomes, or both.
2. Decide your level of comparison	A decision on what level of evidence – broad or specific – you'll use for this comparison, and an understanding of why that's the right choice for your purpose.
3. Map coverage	A completed coverage map, classifying each outcome as 'covered', 'partially covered' or 'not covered'.
4. Add depth to your coverage notes	Your coverage map from Step 3, with notes on the type, source, boundary and time horizon of evidence behind the classifications.
5. Interpret what you've found	An understanding of what this mapping means for your intended use.
6. Communicate and use what you've found	A plan for how to use, share or act on your findings.

Step 1 · Define your aim

Why this step matters

Actors map tools for different reasons. The reason for the exercise affects what counts as a useful result. This step helps you decide what you are mapping and why before you start. This keeps the exercise focused, shapes how much detail you need, and gives you something to return to when you interpret and use your findings.

What you'll do

- **Decide what you are mapping:** which tool, and which part of it. A whole certification standard, one module of it, or a single country program will each give a different map. Note which version you are using, as tools change.
- **Decide which outcome level(s) you are mapping:** farm level, landscape level or both. Many tools work at one level. If yours does, map that level only.
- **Be clear why you are mapping it.** Find the closest row below and note what you need to understand or decide as a result. If none fits, write your own in one sentence: "I am mapping X so that I can understand or decide Y."
- **Note who will use the results, and what they will be used for.** The depth and documentation of the mapping should reflect how the findings will be used: a light internal review may require less evidence than a comparison intended to inform investment, standards development, public claims or external decision-making.

If you are trying to...	This guidance helps you...
Develop or update your own tool	Describe how it covers the Framework's outcomes, and identify where the Framework highlights outcomes, dependencies or evidence it may not cover. This also shows where other tools may be needed.
Understand or compare what existing tools cover	Map what each tool covers against the Framework's outcomes. Use the Framework as a common anchor to compare coverage, while keeping the distinctions in each tool's purpose, scope and evidence model.
Decide whether to adopt a tool	Check whether a prospective tool would let you track the outcomes you have already defined as priorities (see Define).
Assess a portfolio as a funder or investor	Combine mappings across the tools you fund to find collective blind spots, and see whether they cover the outcomes that matter for your objectives and risks.

What you'll take away

By the end of this step, you should have a short statement of what you are mapping, why, and who the findings are for.

Step 2 · Decide your level of comparison

Why this step matters

This step is about choosing how granular your comparison needs to be, since that choice shapes everything that follows. Choosing the right level for your purpose keeps the exercise proportionate to your needs.

What you'll do

- **Compare at the outcome level.** Every comparison in this guidance is made against the Framework's outcomes. This is what makes the Framework distinctive: it was deliberately designed as a common reference point across different tools, indicators, metrics and practices.
- **Choose what level of evidence from your tool to use**. Decide which part of the tool you will compare with the Framework's outcomes. Use broad topics or categories if they are enough. For a meaningful comparison, the broad topics the tool contains may be all the evidence you need. Go to indicators or metrics if you need depth. This gives you a closer view of how far the tool covers each outcome, and so of the full scope of regeneration.
- **Match the level to your purpose**. There is no single right level. Map according to what you need to get out of the exercise.

For example...

A funder with a large portfolio of grantees might map each grantee's tool at the level of broad topics, to spot gaps across the whole portfolio. For example, it might find that almost none of the tools address governance. A standards body that wants to show its standard aligns with the Framework needs to map at the level of indicators or metrics, because a claim of alignment needs specific evidence.

If you want to...	Then use the tool's...
Get a fast first-pass sense of a tool's overall shape	Broad topics or categories
Make a defensible claim about coverage or interoperability	Indicators or metrics
Compare several tools quickly, then go deeper on the ones that matter	Broad topics first, then indicators or metrics on your shortlist
Check a tool covers outcomes you've already prioritized (see Define)	Indicators or metrics, focused only on those outcomes

Remember, no matter which level of detail you choose from the tool, you will always compare it with the Regen10 Outcomes Framework's outcomes.

What you'll take away

By the end of this step, you should have a clear decision on how detailed your comparison will be.

Step 3 · Map coverage

Why this step matters

This step is the core mapping exercise: checking what the tool, standard, program or methodology you are assessing actually covers, against the Regen10 Outcomes Framework, at the level you chose in Step 2. Keeping this classification simple is deliberate – it's what makes mappings comparable with each other, and with mappings other people produce.

The linked Regen10 mapping template follows these steps and is available for you to use.

What you'll do

- **Base your assessment on the tool's prescribed indicators or explicit guidance** – not on what a skilled user could infer or choose to include. A blank, user-defined field in a tool does not count as covering an outcome unless the tool's own guidance explicitly names that outcome as something to address there.
- **Match the tool's content to the Regen10 Framework's outcomes**. Classify each outcome:
  - Covered: the core intent is addressed, nothing central is missing
  - Partially covered: some is addressed but something central is missing
  - Not covered: the tool doesn't address this part
- **Where an outcome statement names several elements, check each one**. Use the statement's own wording to decide what counts as central, not your view of what matters most. For example, the landscape governance outcome names food security, land access, tenure, rights and participation. A tool that covers tenure and participation but not food security is partially covered. In the template, we have split each landscape-level outcome into its elements, so that nothing gets missed. Classify each element, and the outcome's classification is worked out for you: covered if every element is covered, not covered if none is, and partially covered otherwise.
- **Remember, 'covered' means that the tool's content addresses the outcome's core intent**, whether through practices, indicators or direct measures. It does not mean the tool shows that the outcomes are being achieved. A tool addressing an outcome through a practice-based measure cannot tell us about whether that outcome is actually being achieved.
- **Use whichever format works for you** – there's no set required template, though we provide Regen10's mapping template as a simple and effective approach.

For example...

The farm-level inputs outcome says: "Reliance on synthetic fertilizers, antibiotics, agrochemicals, plastic, and fossil fuels is reduced, highly hazardous pesticides are phased out, and accessible, affordable and effective regenerative alternatives are prioritized." A certification scheme might set limits on synthetic fertilizer and ban highly hazardous pesticides, but say nothing about antibiotics, plastic, fossil fuels or access to regenerative alternatives. The scheme addresses only part of what the outcome names, so classify it as partially covered, even though it is strong on the elements it does cover.

What you'll take away

By the end of this step, you should have a completed coverage map, showing where your tool aligns with the Framework, where it partially aligns, and where there are gaps – along with notes on anything uncertain.

Step 4 · Add depth to your coverage notes

Why this step matters

Your coverage map from Step 3 tells you whether a tool addresses each outcome – 'covered', 'partially covered', or 'not covered'. That classification is deliberately simple, so different mappings stay comparable. But "covered" can mean quite different things depending on what kind of evidence sits behind it, and that difference matters once you come to interpret or share your findings.

What you'll do

For any outcome where it's useful, add a short note on the kind of evidence behind your classification. None of this changes 'covered', 'partially covered', or 'not covered' – it sits alongside the classification, as context for later.

Four things are usually worth noting.

Type of data

- **Is the tool reporting a target** (an aspiration), **a practice** (an activity being undertaken), **a result** (a near-term effect), **or the outcome** (the sustained changes the Framework describes) **itself**? A tool reporting on practices adopted is not measuring the same thing as one reporting on outcomes achieved, even if they sound related.
- A practice-based indicator can support a "covered" classification, but "covered, based on a practice reported" is a more cautious note than "covered, based on the outcome itself being measured". It is valuable to record which.
- It is also a good idea to **check whether the tool reports raw data or a score**, and whether a benchmark, such as a regional average or a target is being used for scoring. Note which one you are seeing, and the reference point if the tool states one.

> **Example:** A tool reporting on soil coverage addresses a soil health outcome through a practice that is aimed at improving it, but your notes should make it clear that this is a practice, not a direct measure of soil health.

Source of data

- **Does the tool use primary data, collected for the assessment** (for example surveys or field measurements), **or secondary data that already exists** (for example national statistics, satellite maps or global datasets)? Secondary data lowers the burden on users, but it is usually less specific to the place, so the results may be more general. Note which the tool asks for. If it does not say, record "not stated".

> **Example:** A tool might estimate soil carbon using default values for each land cover type. This is secondary data. It costs little to collect, but it assumes all cropland holds the same amount of carbon, so a farm that has built up organic matter for ten years would look the same as one that has not. Another tool might take soil samples. This is primary data. It can show the difference, but it costs more to collect. Your notes should show which source each tool uses, and how specific the result is to the place.

Boundary and scale

- **Does the tool's boundary match the scale the outcome actually describes – farm or landscape level?** This matters because some Framework outcomes are inherently about conditions at a particular scale.

> **Example:** A farm-level tool measuring nutrient run-off or water quality on one farm can support coverage of a catchment-level water quality outcome, but the note should flag that the evidence is narrower than the outcome it's being used to support.

Time horizon

- **Does the tool report a single snapshot, or change over time against a baseline?**
- A snapshot tells you where things stand right now, which may be exactly what you need if you're checking whether a condition currently holds. Evidence tracked over time tells you whether that condition is improving, declining or steady, which matters more if what you actually want to know is whether things are moving in the right direction.

> **Example:** A tool reporting "soil organic carbon measured at 2.1% in 2024" can support a "covered" classification for a soil health outcome, but the note should record this as a single data point, not evidence of a trend.

Remember, these additional notes do not change the classification of 'covered', 'partially covered', or 'not covered', they sit alongside this classification as additional information that can help you assess whether this tool can do what you need it to.

What you'll take away

By the end of this step, you should have more detail on the coverage map you produced in Step 3, with notes on the type and source of data, boundary and time horizon of evidence.

Step 5 · Interpret what you've found

Why this step matters

A completed map is not the end point. What matters most is understanding what it actually means, being clear about what the mapping can and cannot tell you.

What you'll do

- **Start with the overall pattern before looking at individual outcomes**. Is coverage broadly consistent, or concentrated in some areas? For example, is coverage strong across every ecological dimension but largely absent in the social dimensions?
- **For each gap, consider why it might exist**. A tool designed for carbon accounting may legitimately not cover governance. Not every gap is a shortcoming.
- **Reflect on the notes you added in Step 4 related to the type of data, boundary and time horizon**. Whether an outcome is classified as 'Covered' might not tell you whether the tool can perform what you need it to – you need this level of detail to assess this.
- **Most importantly, think about all of the information this mapping has given you**. Is the tool you are mapping against the Framework fit for the purpose you defined in Step 1:
  - Can the tool provide the information you need for that purpose?
  - Are the gaps acceptable because they fall outside the tool's intended purpose?
  - If not, would additional indicators, another tool or a different source of evidence help address them?

For example...

A company working with the farmers it partners with on a package of regenerative practices wants to check whether the assessment tool it uses is worth the investment. Working through this step, two things stand out:

First, coverage: the tool is strong on soil, biodiversity and water, but has nothing on community outcomes. The Framework describes regeneration across ecological, social, economic and governance outcomes together, so the tool leaves out part of what the Framework means by "regenerative".

Second, strength of evidence: most of what the tool reports is practice-based rather than focusing on the outcomes those practices are meant to produce. For a company that's already monitoring the adoption of these practices, this is not very useful. The tool can confirm farmers are implementing agreed actions and targets, but it can't yet show whether it's actually working.

What you'll take away

By the end of this step, you should have an understanding of what the mapping could mean for your intended use – including which gaps are expected, which patterns are worth raising, and whether the tool can do what you need it to.

Step 6 · Communicate and use what you've found

Why this step matters

A coverage map is only useful if you use it. It can inform a decision, start a conversation or change something in your own work. Your reason for mapping that you set out in Step 1 should guide what you do next. When you communicate your findings, your choice of words matters to make sure people can understand this accurately.

What you'll do

- **Revisit your original purpose** before deciding what to do with your findings. What you share, how you frame it and who needs to see it should follow from why you mapped it in the first place.
- **Present differences descriptively** rather than competitively. Describing what a tool covers and where there are areas of difference keeps the exercise constructive rather than divisive.
- **Be honest** about what your findings can and cannot support, and take care with the language you use.
- **Treat your findings as something to act on**, not just describe. A finding is only useful once it changes something – an internal strategy, a sourcing decision, which tool you fund, what you ask a partner to add.
- **Share your findings**, suggestions and comments with Regen10 to support a mutual learning process.

For example...

A farmers' organization maps a buyer's sourcing program against the Framework. The mapping shows that the program addresses a range of soil, water and biodiversity outcomes, with limited attention to economic outcomes at landscape level. The organization uses these findings to question the scope of the program's regenerative claims and ask how its purchasing arrangements address equitable value distribution, fair and stable contracts and risk-sharing.

What you'll take away

By the end of this step, you should have a plan for how you will use or share your findings, appropriate to your original purpose.

Where to go from here

This guidance concludes once you have mapped a tool against the Framework and worked out what the results mean for you. But your work does not stop there. Your next step is to use what you have found. That might mean improving your own tool, starting a conversation with a partner, or deciding whether a tool is right for you, and it will look different depending on who you are and what you set out to do. Remember that this is one stage in a wider process. As tools, standards and your priorities change, you can come back and repeat the exercise.

- Has your mapping shown that you need to be clearer about your own priority outcomes? Take a look at our guidance "Defining regenerative outcomes for your work".
- Does your mapping involve several actors who need to align around shared outcomes? Read our guidance "Coordinating action around shared outcomes".
- We invite anyone who uses this guidance to share what you learn with Regen10, including your findings, recommendations and comments on the Framework, so that the process supports mutual learning.

This guidance package will keep developing as the Framework is applied. Regen10's 360 place-based engagements are multistakeholder processes, currently in Brazil and Kenya, where local partners use the Framework to identify shared priorities for a landscape. Learning from these, and from other initiatives using the Framework, will shape future updates.

To provide feedback on the Outcomes Framework and/or these guidance materials, please use this feedback form. To work with us, please contact secretariat@regen10.org

Case Study

Mapping in practice: LandScale

LandScale's Regenerative Agriculture Assessment Lens (v1.0, August 2025) operationalizes selected landscape-level outcomes from Regen10's Outcomes Framework for landscape assessment. It adapts LandScale's four-pillar Assessment Framework—Ecosystems, Human Well-being, Governance, Production—and was developed with input from Regen10, the Rainforest Alliance, The Nature Conservancy, Field to Market, and the Sustainable Food Trust. The two tools are complementary: Regen10 provides a shared reference for the outcomes that regenerative agriculture and agrifood systems should deliver, while the Assessment Lens offers a structured, practical approach to assessing conditions and outcomes at landscape scale and tracking change over time. This case study summarizes how LandScale mapped the Assessment Lens against the Regen10 Outcomes Framework's landscape-level outcomes, and what each initiative learned from the exercise.

The mapping showed that the Assessment Lens aligns most closely where it can measure the condition of ecosystems and communities directly and credibly at landscape scale—for example, ecosystem conversion and degradation, soil, water, greenhouse gases, land tenure, and stakeholder participation. Other Regen10 outcomes are not measured directly in v1.0. Exploring these gaps proved useful, highlighting the practical considerations involved in assessing regenerative outcomes across diverse production landscapes, where technical capacity, resources, and access to data may vary.

Some Regen10 outcomes, including aspects of input supply networks, equipment, and processing facilities, relate to enabling infrastructure and wider agrifood systems. While these factors can influence landscape regeneration, they are not all directly captured by the indicators built into the Assessment Lens. Others, such as culturally appropriate food and fair contracts, may be relevant at landscape scale but require more specific data, methods, or units of analysis to assess adequately. These may include participatory community assessments, farm-level monitoring, or supply-chain tools. Their limited coverage in the Assessment Lens does not mean they are inherently unmeasurable at landscape scale or less important to regeneration; rather, they may require complementary approaches. More broadly, relationships and trade-offs between ecological, social, and economic systems often require multiple indicators to be analyzed and interpreted together and in context, rather than through any single metric.

These findings highlight that operationalizing the Outcomes Framework does not mean measuring every element of every outcome through the Assessment Lens. It means translating relevant outcomes into indicators and metrics that can be meaningfully assessed in line with the Assessment Lens' purpose and at the appropriate scale. The local context, the delineation of the landscape boundary, and the purpose of the assessment all help determine which outcomes and elements can be meaningfully assessed, and how. Where outcomes not directly covered by the Assessment Lens are locally important, LandScale's flexible approach allows users to incorporate user-defined metrics, or they can be addressed through complementary tools and data. This enables assessments to reflect local priorities without requiring every outcome to be captured by the indicators and metrics defined in the Assessment Lens.

The learning ran in both directions. For Regen10, mapping each landscape outcome as a single unit proved insufficiently informative because individual outcomes often bundle several distinct elements. This approach could obscure differences in how well the Assessment Lens covered those elements, with outcomes receiving similar coverage ratings despite meaningful differences in the extent of coverage. Regen10 subsequently revised its guidance methodology to break outcomes into their constituent elements, making coverage gaps more visible and preserving important distinctions within each outcome. The exercise also provided practical insight into how different elements of the Outcomes Framework could be measured using one or more metrics. For LandScale, the mapping highlighted potential elements for further development, including food security, access, and diversity, as well as how equity is assessed—for example, who participates in landscape decision-making and who benefits.

This mapping exercise must be understood in the context of the two initiatives' development timelines. Regen10 released a zero draft of its Outcomes Framework in 2024, LandScale published v1.0 of the Assessment Lens in 2025, and Regen10 published a revised version of the Outcomes Framework in 2026. While the mapping summarized here draws on the latest version of the Outcomes Framework, the development of the Assessment Lens was informed by an earlier version. This has provided an opportunity to revisit alignment in light of the updated Outcomes Framework and consider whether identified gaps stem from changes between versions, the Assessment Lens' scope, or its design choices. The findings can help identify opportunities to strengthen alignment and inform future refinements to both tools, particularly as piloting and implementation generate further learning.



Regen10

Regen10 is a global multi-stakeholder initiative working to support an inclusive, regenerative, and equitable agrifood systems transition. We believe the path to regenerative agrifood systems at scale requires three things: clarity on what regenerative outcomes look like across contexts, evidence on what enables or blocks transitions, and alignment among the diverse actors whose decisions shape agrifood systems. This work is grounded in Regen10's ten core principles, which hold farmer-centricity, equity, and inclusion at the center of everything we do.

Learn more at regen10.org

This work was supported by funding from the IKEA Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the McKnight Foundation.

When referencing this work, please cite as the 'Regen10 Outcomes Framework (2026).'