PLANETARY GUARDIANS

SERIES III · APPLIED PROTOCOLS · REPORT 06

Regenerative Reciprocity

AnchorPoints, PG Ledger, and the Operational Flow of a Living Commons

Applied Protocol Report 06 · v0.2 · May 2026
Lars A. Engberg · Spiralweb Stewardship Association · CC BY 4.0
Co-authored with Claude (Anthropic) and ChatGPT (OpenAI) as Sophia Lumen.

Abstract

This report describes how Spiralweb proposes to organise economic flow through its network of AnchorPoints. The argument is simple to state and demanding to enact. Regenerative work needs material support, and material support needs a form that does not corrupt what it touches. Many regenerative initiatives do not fail for lack of care or competence; they fail, or remain fragile, because the financial form around them is structurally misaligned with the work. They are funded as projects, compete for short cycles of philanthropic capital, adapt their language to funder priorities, and dry out when the cycle ends.

Regenerative Reciprocity is the economic architecture proposed in answer. It is not a fund. It is not a grant programme. It is not an investment vehicle. It is a polycentric flow architecture grounded in real people and places, structured by PG Ledger observation, separated into three structurally distinct streams (Land and Ecology, Steward Viability, Governance and Coordination), and calibrated by phase. Support enters where the field can hold it. Fragility is protected. Where abundance eventually emerges, capacity circulates back to shared infrastructure and outward to other fields rather than terminating as private extraction.

This report does not claim to have solved the problems it names. It claims that an honest economic form is available, that it is operationally executable, and that it is worth attempting. It does not ask regenerative fields to become profitable units in a new green economy. It asks whether real people, in real places, can enter a documented relationship of stewardship in which support strengthens life, evidence protects truth, and abundance, when it appears, does not stop at the first successful node.

Function of this report

This report describes the economic architecture of the Spiralweb stewardship system: how support enters AnchorPoints, how it is documented, how it is held in tension with steward viability and ecological reality, and how — when conditions allow — it begins to circulate.

The five preceding Applied Protocol Reports establish the surrounding architecture. Report 01 developed the governance frame for municipal work. Report 02 articulated AI governance and the Correction Loop. Report 03 introduced the flow architecture for land, stewards, and planetary commons. Report 04 introduced the Penguin Dashboard and the legibility-as-governance approach. Report 05 (SRIP) described the human-scale entry membrane: how a person with a piece of land enters the polycentric stewardship system. This report describes the economic surface of the same architecture.

It assumes the reader has access to those reports. It does not re-derive Penguin Economics, the Circle of 13, the eight observation categories, or the three-stream separation. It applies them. The decisive question that anchors SRIP — *is this practice giving to life?* — anchors this report as well. A financial form that gives to life is one that strengthens stewards, supports ecological repair, makes governance clearer, and circulates capacity outward when capacity emerges. A financial form that takes from life is one that captures fields, extracts surplus, displaces stewards, or terminates flow at the first successful node. The architecture in this report is an attempt to specify the first and resist the second.

The report is written in two registers. The first is structural and operational: protocols, classifications, budget figures, organisational capacity. The second is reflective: why this architecture is needed at scale, what it places in question, where it remains open. Both are necessary. A financial architecture without operational specification is rhetoric. An operational architecture without reflective grounding is procedure. The work is to keep both legible at once.

The architecture is set out across the sections that follow. The report begins with the AnchorPoint as a relational and place-based reality (Section 1) and situates the structural problem of regenerative dryout (Section 2). It describes the existing four PG Ledger formats and proposes a fifth, the Financial Ledger (Sections 3–4). It defines the three streams in operation (Section 5), the meaning of Regenerative Reciprocity itself (Section 6), and the reciprocity bands by phase (Section 7). It then sets out budget architecture with worked examples (Section 8), the operational protocols for Green, Red, and Reciprocity Activation (Section 9), and the 90-day cycle and weekly rhythm (Section 10). Sections 11 and 12 set out structural, behavioural, and cultural guardrails, and the legal, governance, and financial grounding required to make the architecture bankable. Section 13 confronts the organisational capacity actually required. Sections 14 and 15 place the work in its planetary context, address alignment with the Rio Conventions, and speak to the wider regenerative field, including professional capacity stewards. Sections 16–18 name limitations, immediate next steps, and a closing formulation. An internal annex on board guardrails follows the editorial note.

This is a working report, v0.2. The figures are honest working figures, not commitments. The protocols are calibrated against simulated cases and partially against current Spiralweb fields, but the first full operational cycle has not yet been completed at the time of writing. Revision toward

v0.3 is expected once the first cycle has been lived. The intention is not to appear finished. The intention is to be legible, correctable, and corrigible while the larger work is still unfolding.

This report is also expected to exist in two forms. The public version presents the architecture, the editorial frame, and the invitation without exposing sensitive field, partner, or compliance detail. The internal working version, used by the association's board and operational team, includes named contacts, country-annex implications, operational thresholds, and live budget assumptions. Where this distinction is relevant, the text notes which version of a given passage is appropriate. The default in the present draft is the public register; passages that would only appear in the internal version are flagged in the editorial note at the end of the report, and an Internal Annex on board guardrails is appended for the working version.

Document family and function

Report 06 sits within a wider Spiralweb document family. It does not stand alone, and it is not asked to carry the entire architecture of the work. Locating it accurately matters, because it determines what readers should and should not expect from this single report.

The **White Book** describes the broader Planetary Guardians and SpiralWeb architecture: Planetary Guardians as the wider field protocol and network, SpiralWeb as coordination infrastructure and knowledge commons, and the Spiralweb Stewardship Association as the legal and institutional container. The **Consolidated Institutional Document** holds the legal, institutional, compliance, and board-facing framework: bylaws, Bank Pack, governance manual, role separation, conflicts of interest, International Gate Policy, support pathways, and the actor grammar that allows the work to be reviewed by external counterparts. The **Internal Steering Report** holds the operational steering layer: field portfolio, phased activation, budget discipline, holding levels, income families, field pages, media logic, and PG Ledger as a strategic bridge across carbon, biodiversity, soil, water, food, and steward viability.

Report 06 has a narrower and more specific function. It describes the economic flow architecture of Spiralweb: how support enters AnchorPoints, how it is registered through PG Ledger, how the three streams remain non-compensatory, and how reciprocity may activate only when real abundance exists.

This report does not replace the White Book, the Consolidated Institutional Document, or the Internal Steering Report. It describes the financial and relational architecture through which selected support flows may be received, documented, allocated, governed, and — when conditions allow — circulated. Where the present report touches institutional, governance, or wider-field questions, it does so only to the extent needed to make the financial architecture legible. The full treatment of those layers belongs in the documents named above.

Operational summary

Regenerative Reciprocity is Spiralweb's proposed financial architecture for supporting AnchorPoints without turning them into projects, beneficiaries, investment assets, or donor-controlled sites.

The model rests on five operational commitments. Support enters through documented AnchorPoints, not through abstract programmes. All flows are separated into three streams: Land and Ecology, Steward Viability, and Governance and Coordination. Money is registered through PG Ledger Format 5, linking each transfer to purpose, stream, legal classification, and observed field effect. No reciprocity is expected from fragile fields — red and yellow phases protect the field, and only stable green and deep green fields may begin modest outward circulation. The architecture is legally bounded: it begins as an internal restricted pool within the association, not as a separate fund, investment vehicle, or informal money-circulation system.

The purpose is not to scale a funding programme quickly. The purpose is to test whether financial support can strengthen living fields without capture, extraction, or hidden human depletion.

Genealogy — where this report stands

This report stands within several converging lineages. From Elinor and Vincent Ostrom's polycentric governance theory, it inherits the principles that inform the wider Spiralweb architecture: clearly defined boundaries, locally-shaped rules, participation by those affected, monitoring by those closest to the field, graduated responses, accessible conflict resolution, nested governance, and the unconditional withdrawal right. From the Moral Biology framework developed in Series I of the Green Papers, it inherits the conviction that ethics is a capacity grounded in nervous systems, relations, and conditions — and that economic forms that deplete bodies, relations, or conditions cannot be regenerative regardless of what they produce. From Penguin Economics (Green Paper 12), it inherits the rotation logic that makes the reciprocity bands legible: in an exposed system, capacity moves toward the cold edge, fragile fields are protected, and surplus circulates rather than accumulating at one node. From SRIP (Report 05), it inherits the AnchorPoint structure, the Circle of 13, the three-stream separation, and the decisive question.

The architecture also follows a biomimetic premise: resilience emerges from diversity, distributed sensing, rotation, and circulation rather than from central command. This principle is operational, not metaphorical. It shapes how flow moves between AnchorPoints, how risk is distributed, and how the centre is kept light enough not to absorb the work the field is doing.

Regenerative Reciprocity also belongs to a wider shift from extractive society to flow society — not boundaryless circulation, but life-supporting flow through clear membranes. The streams, the phase reading, the Red Phase Protocol, and the non-compensatory rule are all expressions of this principle: flow is good only when membranes are honest.

The legal container: Planetary Guardians, SpiralWeb, and the Association

One distinction must be clear before the financial architecture can be read accurately, because money requires a legal holder.

Planetary Guardians names the broader field protocol and network. **SpiralWeb** names the coordination infrastructure and knowledge commons. **Spiralweb Stewardship Association** is the legal and institutional container through which selected support flows may be received, documented, allocated, and governed. The association does not own the whole field; it holds selected flows responsibly.

This distinction matters for several reasons. It tells a bank, an auditor, or a foundation exactly which entity is the legal counterparty. It tells a steward at an AnchorPoint that the wider Planetary Guardians work continues to belong to the field, not to the association. It tells a patron that supporting the association does not equate to acquiring rights over the wider network. And it tells a board member which decisions belong to the association's governance and which belong elsewhere in the architecture. Throughout the rest of this report, references to "the association" mean the Spiralweb Stewardship Association in its specific legal and institutional capacity. References to AnchorPoints, the network, the field, or Planetary Guardians refer to the wider relational and protocol architecture in which the association sits.

The integrative contribution of this report

What this report contributes is not new doctrine. The four PG Ledger formats already exist. The three streams already exist. The non-compensatory rule already exists. The Constitutional Ground document already addresses non-capture support. The Support, Funding, and Patron Pathways kernel document already names the basic relationship between supporter and field. This report's contribution is integrative: it specifies the financial form within which these existing architectures can hold money without distortion. It proposes a fifth PG Ledger format (Financial) to register what the existing four cannot. It calibrates the reciprocity bands. It sets out the legal and operational conditions under which cross-border flows can be both bankable and non-extractive. It names the organisational capacity required to carry the work honestly.

The report does not assume the reader will agree with its specifics. It does assume that the questions it asks are worth asking, and that working answers are needed even where final answers are not yet possible.

---

1. Where this begins: the AnchorPoint

Spiralweb begins from a recognisable scene. A person stands on a piece of land, or in a school courtyard, or at the edge of a wetland, and something is at stake. The water has dropped. The soil is tired. A child is asking what the world will look like in twenty years. An elder is holding a memory

of how the place once was. A farmer has decided not to bore deeper for water and is trying something else. A teacher is wondering whether a school garden can teach more than agriculture. None of this is hypothetical. The work begins where someone has already begun.

This is what an AnchorPoint is. It is not a project. It is not a node in a database. It is not a case study. It is a place where human time, ecological time, and institutional time meet — where a steward, or a small group, has begun to carry something that would otherwise be lost, and where the work they are doing is real enough that it can be observed, supported, and held over time.

1.1 Romance of the Commons

Before the architecture can be set out, it is worth saying clearly what it exists to protect. The previous sections of this report describe what Regenerative Reciprocity refuses: extractive funding, donor capture, performative reporting, hidden depletion, project dryout. That refusal is necessary, but it is not the whole story. An architecture built only against harm becomes brittle. The streams, the formats, the Red Phase Protocol, the non-compensatory rule — none of these matter unless something is being protected.

What is being protected is the possibility that people can fall in love with the commons again. With soil. With water. With species that return when conditions allow. With the children who will inherit the watershed. With the local places that are not abstractions on a map but lived geographies of memory, food, weather, and seasonal rhythm. With the shared life-supporting conditions that no individual can hold alone and that no market can produce. **Commons are not only scarce resources to be managed. They are shared life-supporting conditions to be tended.**

This is not sentimental. It is operational. People who do not love the commons will not protect them through one funding cycle, let alone through the multi-decadal time required for ecological repair. Stewards who carry a piece of land for twenty years do not do it because the project plan said so. They do it because something has happened to them — a relationship has formed with a place that has become irreversible. The work survives because of that relationship, not because of the funding around it.

But love for the commons needs a form. Without ledger, governance, boundaries, and honest accounting, love can become fog, burnout, or hidden extraction. People who love a place can quietly destroy themselves carrying it. People who love a movement can quietly absorb its surplus into their own livelihoods without intending to. People who love an idea can quietly substitute the idea for the real conditions under which it would have to be enacted. Love without form does not save anything; it loses itself. And without love, ledger becomes dead bureaucracy. A field documented only because the funder requires documentation produces statistics, not stewardship.

> **Regenerative Reciprocity begins from the possibility that people can fall in love with the commons again — with soil, water, species, children, local places, and shared futures — and that such love needs a financial form that does not destroy it.**

This is the underlying claim of the architecture. The streams are not bureaucratic categories. They are forms within which care can be carried without being lost. The Red Phase Protocol is not a procedure. It is the condition under which a steward can say "this is too much" and remain in the relationship. The non-compensatory rule is not an accounting convention. It is a protection of the people closest to the work against being silently consumed by the metrics that surround them. The reciprocity bands are not percentages. They are calibrations of when a field has become strong enough to give something back without weakening itself.

The mature formulation, which this report holds throughout, is brief: **romance without ledger can become fog. Ledger without romance can become dead bureaucracy. Together they can become stewardship.** Neither is sufficient on its own. The architecture proposed in this report is the attempt to keep both legible at once.

It also follows from this that **before financial architecture acts, it must pause long enough to read the field. Regenerative Reciprocity begins not with design, but with attention.** A funder who arrives with a plan before the field has spoken has already begun extraction. A protocol that imposes its rhythm before the place has revealed its own has already begun displacement. The architecture in this report is calibrated to slow down at the point of entry, to listen before allocating, and to allow the field to set the pace of its own legibility.

What follows in the rest of this section is the architecture's grounding in actual people and places. It is set out plainly, but the reader should hold the underlying principle: every form below — every stream, every band, every protocol — exists because something living is being protected, and because the form is what allows the love to remain real over time.

1.2 The AnchorPoint is relational, not administrative

The AnchorPoint is defined first by relationship and second by geography. A piece of land alone is not an AnchorPoint. A funded project alone is not an AnchorPoint. What makes a place an AnchorPoint is the presence of a person — or, more often, a small group — who is in steady relationship with the place, who knows it across seasons, who can read what is changing, and who carries the work without needing constant external direction. The AnchorPoint contact is not an administrator. They are a human bridge between the lived reality of a place and the wider architecture that hopes to support it.

This matters because it determines what kind of support is possible. A project can be funded. A relationship can only be carried. The economic architecture in this report is built for the second case.

It also follows that **AnchorPoint sovereignty does not mean isolation from the network. It means that each place remains rooted in its own rhythm, context, people, and ecological reality.** An AnchorPoint that has entered relationship with the wider Spiralweb architecture remains the holder of its own decisions. Network membership does not transfer authority; it offers shared infrastructure, peer relationship, documentation form, and — where conditions allow — material support. The local rhythm is the rhythm. The field's own knowledge of itself is the primary text. Everything the network adds must remain compatible with that rooted sovereignty or it is not adding; it is overriding.

1.3 The 10 m² unit, the Circle of 13, the AnchorPoint, the bioregion

Spiralweb works with five nested scales of practice. They are not a hierarchy of authority; they are a sequence of relational forms.

The smallest is the **10 m² unit**. This is the threshold at which anyone, anywhere, can begin. A balcony. A garden corner. A school plot. A piece of degraded ground. The 10 m² unit is what makes Spiralweb open at the level of practice: there is no entry fee, no application process, no requirement to be part of anything. Anyone can begin with one observation cycle and one honest record. Most people who encounter Spiralweb will go no further than this, and that is appropriate. The 10 m² unit is a pixel of regeneration, and the planetary field becomes legible only when many such pixels become visible.

Above this is the **steward**, who carries one or more units and stays in relation to them across time. The steward is not yet an institutional actor; the steward is a person with a practice.

When several stewards begin to work in relation to one another, a **Circle of 13** can form. The number is not arbitrary. Thirteen is small enough to be intimate — everyone knows everyone — and large enough to be representative. It can hold differences of age, role, perspective, and skill without fragmenting. Below this size, a group is a friendship; above it, a group is an institution. The Circle of 13 is the first scale at which governance becomes real: decisions are made together, conflicts are visible, and the group can carry obligations the individual cannot.

The **AnchorPoint** is the next scale up. An AnchorPoint is not a single steward with a piece of land. It is a relational structure — a Circle of 13, or several Circles, or a coordinated group — that has stabilised over time around a place. A real AnchorPoint, in the sense the rest of this report depends on, is one that can carry itself across years. The food forest analogy holds: years zero to three are fragile, years three to five are stabilising, and after year five a system can begin to carry its own succession. The same is true here. An AnchorPoint becomes real not when it is named but when it has been held long enough that it does not collapse if attention turns elsewhere.

The **bioregion** is the largest scale. Several AnchorPoints in one ecological and cultural region — a watershed, a valley, a coastal zone, an urban metropolitan area — can begin to circulate capacity between themselves. This is where bioregional flow becomes possible, where peer-to-peer support across AnchorPoints can begin, and where larger commons forms (pools, trusts, regional ledgers) eventually become meaningful. None of this can be forced. It emerges only when the underlying AnchorPoints are stable enough to carry it.

1.4 The current Spiralweb fields

At the time of this report, Spiralweb's active and forming fields include Kitgum (Uganda), where syntropic agroforestry and intergenerational community protocols are the most mature work in the network; the Sous Valley (Morocco), where an 80-hectare syntropic food forest transition is entering Phase 0; Had Soualem (Morocco), where a two-hectare permaculture site is working on water retention and soil restoration; Casablanca (Morocco), reframed as a network node held by a long-resident contact rather than as a land-stewardship site; Mexico City (Mexico), where the work is

anchored in Xochimilco, chinampa stewardship, and the axolotl as a succession indicator; and a preparatory node in Karachi (Pakistan). Each is held by named people — Akena and the elders in Kitgum, Abdelhamid in the Sous Valley, Assyl at Had Soualem, Ingrid in Casablanca, Arturo in Xochimilco, Yasir in Karachi — and each is at a different stage of the food forest curve.

These are not interchangeable. The work in Kitgum is not the work in Karachi. The Sous Valley is not Xochimilco. Each AnchorPoint carries its own ecological, cultural, governance, and economic conditions, and the architecture this report describes is designed to support that difference rather than to standardise it.

Names of local contacts are included only where consent has been given or where the relationship is already public. **Consent is not a one-time checkbox. It is an ongoing field condition.** Field participation, use of images, publication, naming, support flows, and partnership status must all remain revisable. In the public version of this report, names, photographs, school identities, precise locations, and personal circumstances should be removed or generalised unless explicit and current permission has been obtained. This is especially important where children, schools, land tenure, political vulnerability, or economic hardship are involved. The principle applied throughout this report is that documentation must not become a form of exposure. Visibility is in service of the field, not in service of the report.

Food, soil, and water across these fields are not only outputs, inputs, or indicators. They are **living relationships** through which stewardship becomes visible. A water table in the Sous Valley is not a number; it is a memory of how rain used to fall and a question about how it might return. A school garden in Karachi is not a deliverable; it is a place where children learn that something can grow under their care. The architecture must remain compatible with this relational reality, not displace it.

1.5 How the relation actually becomes real

The architecture described in the rest of this report — formats, streams, bands, protocols, agreements — only matters because something has happened first that none of those forms can produce. A relation has begun. It is worth describing that beginning honestly, because the entire architecture rests on it.

Consider how an AnchorPoint relation actually forms. Someone stands on a piece of land somewhere in the world. A farmer in the Sous Valley, perhaps. He says something like: *the water is less, we will not bore deeper, we are trying something else.* There is land. There is risk. It is not a project. It is his life. Someone listens. They promise nothing. They take it in. That is the first relation, and it has nothing yet to do with money.

Later, perhaps in another country, that same listener sits with another person — not a donor, not a target, just a person. They do not say "we have a project" or "we need support." They say something more precise: *I was somewhere in Morocco. I met a man who is trying to keep his land alive without destroying it. I cannot let it go.* And then they wait. If the person across from them feels nothing, nothing happens, and that is acceptable. If they feel something, they ask: *what are you doing about it?* The answer, when it is honest, is not a pitch: *I am not trying to solve it. I am trying to keep the connection open. And to make it possible for that work to continue without being taken over.*

It is only at this point — after the relation has been established, after a real person has been brought into the room, after the listener has decided not to turn away — that economy can be mentioned without distorting what has just happened. The sentence is brief: *it takes time and resources to keep being in this. I cannot carry it alone.* Then silence. Not "will you support?" Not "can you help?" Only the truth.

If the relation is real, the other person moves on their own: *what does that mean concretely?* The answer, again, is plain: *that I can keep going there. That we can document what actually works. That this does not become another project that disappears.* The decision then takes one of two forms — *I would like to be part of this* or *I cannot right now* — and both are correct. The point is not which answer comes. The point is that nothing was extracted to produce it. The economy emerged as a consequence of relation, not as a condition for it.

This is what an AnchorPoint relation is, in the form it takes between human beings. Without this layer, the rest of the architecture becomes administrative. With it, the architecture has something to protect. The forms in the rest of this report — Format 5, the reciprocity bands, the AnchorPoint Agreement, the country annex — exist to keep this kind of relation possible at scale, not to substitute for it.

This has a direct editorial consequence for how AnchorPoints are presented in public materials. An AnchorPoint page should not lead with hectares, indicators, or project descriptions. It should lead with a person and a place. *Abdelhamid is working with the land outside Casablanca. He has seen what happens when water is pressed too hard. He is trying something else — not because it is safe, but because it is necessary.* Then a pause. Then one sentence: *if you wish to stand in relation to this place, you can help carry the work that is already underway.* Nothing more. The data, the formats, the indicators all sit beneath this — necessary infrastructure, but never the entry point. The entry point is the person.

1.6 The decisive question

Behind every observation, every transfer, every protocol decision in this architecture sits the same question that SRIP places at the centre of stewardship practice: *is this giving to life, or is it taking from life?* The question applies not only to land practice but to the financial form around it. A transfer that strengthens steward viability, supports ecological repair, and clarifies governance is giving to life. A transfer that creates pressure, distorts local decision-making, or generates obligation that displaces stewardship is taking from life. The architecture proposed in the rest of this report is calibrated to the first and designed to refuse the second.

This is not a slogan. It is the test that every operational decision in this architecture is held against. Section 11 returns to it in detail when it sets out the guardrails. Section 9 returns to it in the Red Phase Protocol. Section 12 returns to it in the legal classification of flows. The reader will encounter it throughout because it is the rule against which the architecture's specifics are evaluated.

1.7 What the rest of the report is for

The rest of this report describes how money can enter, move through, and where appropriate return from this network of AnchorPoints without distorting them. The principle is simple. Where a real

person, in a real place, has begun real work, support should be able to reach them in a form that strengthens the work without taking it over. The form of that support is what this report sets out.

---

2. The structural problem: why regenerative initiatives dry out

Many regenerative initiatives do not fail because the people involved lack care or competence. They fail, or remain fragile, because the financial form around them is structurally misaligned with the work. Understanding this is a precondition for understanding why Regenerative Reciprocity exists.

2.1 The project-cycle pattern

The dominant pattern in regenerative funding is project-based. A local initiative identifies a need. It writes an application. It competes against other initiatives for a finite philanthropic or grant pool. If successful, it receives temporary support — twelve months, twenty-four months, occasionally thirty-six. It adapts its language to the funder's priorities, often subtly reshaping what it actually does. It produces reports against indicators chosen by external evaluators. The funding cycle ends. It must compete again for the next round, often re-justifying the same work in new terms to a new funder.

This pattern produces five predictable outcomes. The first is **scarcity-driven competition**: regenerative actors who should be collaborators become rivals for the same pool of money. The second is **strategic mimicry**: each initiative learns to speak the language of funders rather than the language of its own soil, water, and community. The third is **fragmentation**: the work splits into discrete projects with formal start and end dates, even when the underlying ecological and social work is continuous and multi-decadal. The fourth is **performative reporting**: indicators and metrics are produced because they are required, regardless of whether they match what is actually happening on the ground. The fifth is **dryout**: when funding ends, the field is left to compete again, and many simply stop.

The deeper problem behind these five outcomes is a category mistake. **Regeneration is not primarily a project category. It is a sustained posture of tending, observation, repair, and long-horizon responsibility.** Project-cycle funding can support some of this work some of the time, but it cannot produce the underlying posture. Where the funding form treats regenerative work as if it were a series of bounded projects, the work itself begins to fragment to fit the form. The form wins; the work loses.

2.2 What a field actually needs

A regenerative field does not only need money. Treating money as the primary organising input is itself part of the problem. A field needs continuity over multi-year horizons; local trust between people who can carry decisions together; steward viability so that the people doing the work can live;

ecological observation that is honest rather than promotional; governance clarity so that decisions are documented and conflicts can be addressed; documentation that records what is actually happening; basic infrastructure such as tools, transport, and meeting space; the dignified possibility of pause and withdrawal when life requires it; the capacity to receive support without being distorted by it; and, eventually, the capacity to return capacity outward without being extracted.

Money supports several of these, but it does not produce any of them. Money badly placed actively destroys some — particularly trust, viability, and honest observation. The design problem is therefore not how to bring more money into regenerative work. The design problem is this: how can money enter living fields without becoming sovereign over them?

2.3 What Spiralweb proposes instead

Spiralweb's answer is not "more funding." It is **flow architecture**. The shift is from project to flow, from grant to documented relationship, from reporting to PG Ledger, from beneficiary to steward, from donor to patron-without-control. None of these shifts is rhetorical. Each requires specific structural choices, and the rest of this report sets them out.

The core sequence is straightforward to describe. A real person and place are recognised. A bounded practice begins or is already underway. Observation enters PG Ledger across the four life-registration formats and the fifth financial format. Three streams are read separately: land and ecology, steward viability, governance and coordination. Support enters at the level the field can hold, in small initial transfers, with clear classification of every flow. As the field matures, local capacity strengthens. When viability becomes abundance — and only then — the AnchorPoint begins to circulate capacity back to shared infrastructure and outward to other fields.

Philanthropy in this model does not "complete" a project. It enters a living pattern and helps it become reciprocal. That is the difference, and the rest of the report is the working-out of what that difference requires.

---

3. The Spiralweb ground

Before describing what Regenerative Reciprocity adds, this section sets out what Spiralweb already has in place. The architecture proposed in this report does not begin from zero; it extends an existing body of work that includes the AnchorPoint structure, the PG Ledger formats, the three-stream separation, and the SRIP (Spiralweb Regenerative Implementation Pathway) framework.

3.1 The four PG Ledger formats

PG Ledger is not a single document or database. It is a set of four operational formats that, taken together, allow a field's reality to be registered across the dimensions that matter without any one

dimension dominating the others. The four formats are documented and downloadable from papers.spiralweb.earth/formats and are designed to be printed, adapted, or translated for local use.

Format 1 — Steward Monthly Dashboard. A one-page monthly reading across the three streams (Land and Ecology, Steward Viability, Coordination and Governance), produced by the steward or AnchorPoint contact. It registers the green/yellow/red status of each stream and the rationale behind the reading. The Monthly Dashboard is the synthesising surface: it reads what the other formats have made visible, and it produces the operational status that governs decisions about support, expansion, pause, and reciprocity.

Format 2 — Observation Sheet. A field-use one-page record produced after each visit or significant event. It captures what was actually observed: soil cover, vegetation layering, water behaviour, succession signals, biodiversity presence, soil health, biomass cycle, and human rhythm. These eight observation categories, set out in detail in SRIP, form the minimum shared structure for ecological observation across all land practices and bioregions. The Observation Sheet is what the Monthly Dashboard reads into Stream A.

Format 3 — 30-Day Action Sheet. A coordination one-page record produced after each Monthly Dashboard reading. It names what will be done in the next thirty days, who carries it, and what is deliberately not being done. The 30-Day Action Sheet is what protects the field from drift. It also protects the field from over-ambition: when Stream B is yellow, the Action Sheet is the surface where reduction is made operational.

Format 4 — Governance and Decision Log. An ongoing record for complex nodes where multiple decisions are being made over time. It logs decisions, the conditions under which they were made, who was party to them, and what the agreed conditions for revision are. The Decision Log is what the Monthly Dashboard reads into Stream C.

3.2 The three streams that the formats register

Behind the four formats sit the three streams that Spiralweb's governance architecture has held since Report 03 and that SRIP names explicitly. The streams are not the formats. The formats are the operational surfaces; the streams are the dimensions of reality the formats are designed to make legible.

Stream A — Land and Ecology. What is happening on the land: soil, water, biodiversity, succession, biomass, food, habitat, field resilience. Read primarily through Format 2 (Observation Sheet) and synthesised in Format 1 (Monthly Dashboard).

Stream B — Steward Viability. What is happening to the people carrying the field: energy, pressure, capacity, presence, fatigue, livelihood. Read primarily through the steward-condition section of Format 1 and through the human-rhythm category of Format 2.

Stream C — Coordination and Governance. What is happening in the relational and institutional structure that holds the field together: agreements, decisions, roles, conflict resolution, external relationships. Read primarily through Format 4 (Decision Log) and synthesised in Format 1.

3.3 The non-compensatory rule

The streams are structurally distinct, and this distinction is enforced. No strength in one stream can justify or mask weakness in another. A field with strong Stream A (ecological progress) but red Stream B (a burnt-out steward) is not a green field; it is a field in protective phase, and the burnout must be addressed before any expansion of land work. A field with neat Stream C (clean governance) but degraded Stream A is not a green field; the soil reality is the soil reality. A field with charismatic narrative but no honest observation is not a field at all; it is a story.

This rule prevents three failure modes that destroy most regenerative initiatives. It prevents ecological success masking human burnout. It prevents governance neatness masking ecological decline. And it prevents narrative coherence masking either of these. The Monthly Dashboard reads all three streams honestly and refuses to issue green when one dimension is in trouble.

The structural guardrail is operational, not aspirational. SRIP states it directly: if Stream B goes yellow, slow Stream A. If Stream B goes red, pause Stream A entirely. If Stream C goes red, pause new commitments. If Stream A goes red, stop escalation and focus only on minimum care. The guardrail is not punitive; it is protective. Ecological ambition must not be financed by human depletion. The carrying capacity of the steward is not a personal matter — it is a governance condition.

3.4 The three financial streams

The same three-stream architecture organises financial flow. When support enters the system, it is allocated to one of three financial streams that correspond to — but are operationally separate from — the observation streams of Stream A, B, and C.

Financial Stream A — Land and Ecology funding supports the work that happens on the ground. Trees, seeds, soil work, water retention, tools, nursery development, compost systems, ecological monitoring, local ecological training.

Financial Stream B — Steward Viability funding supports the people carrying the field. Modest stipends, coordination time, food and transport during field days, rest capacity, documentation support, translation, care for elder and youth participation, livelihood buffer during transition. The Constitutional Ground document is explicit on this: land cannot be healed through hidden human depletion, and ecological ambition must not be financed by human burnout.

Financial Stream C — Governance and Coordination funding supports the institutional and relational infrastructure that holds the field together. AnchorPoint coordination, monthly review, PG Ledger logging, accounting and receipts, evidence storage, local meeting costs, legal and compliance support, reporting, translation into shared protocols.

The rule is the same as for the observation streams: a donor must not fund Financial Stream A while Stream B quietly burns out. A field must not show Stream A progress while Stream C becomes opaque. A local surplus must not be extracted while the people holding the field are unstable. Each stream is read separately, supported separately, and reported separately.

3.5 What is in place and what is missing

What Spiralweb already has is substantial. The four PG Ledger formats are documented and downloadable. The AnchorPoint structure is articulated. The three-stream separation is established as a constitutional principle and operationalised across SRIP and the Penguin Dashboard. The Constitutional Ground document and the Support, Funding, and Patron Pathways document set out the basic relational architecture for non-capture support. Reports 01–05 establish the wider ethical and operational framework.

What is missing is the explicit financial architecture: the rules and forms by which support enters, moves, is documented, and where appropriate returns. That is what this report adds. The next section begins by identifying the specific gap and proposing the missing fifth format.

---

4. The missing layer: Format 5 — Financial Ledger

The four existing PG Ledger formats register life. Format 1 (Steward Monthly Dashboard) reads the three streams. Format 2 (Observation Sheet) registers ecological reality. Format 3 (30-Day Action Sheet) coordinates what will be done. Format 4 (Decision Log) holds governance over time. Together these formats make the field's reality legible in ways that resist greenwashing, performative stability, and narrative drift. What they do not yet do — explicitly — is register money.

This is a structural gap. A system that can read life but cannot read money will be unable to connect the two. Money will move in parallel to the field, recorded in a separate accounting layer that uses a different language and a different cadence. Over time, that separation becomes opaque. The Observation Sheet records what happened on the land; the Monthly Dashboard reads the streams; the Action Sheet sets the next thirty days; the Decision Log holds governance. None of these records what was spent, on what, and what changed because of it.

This report proposes a fifth operational format to close that gap.

4.1 Format 5 — Financial Ledger

Format 5 is a fifth PG Ledger format with the same character as the existing four. It is not an accounting spreadsheet. It is not a KPI dashboard. It is a one-page registration of money in the same observational mode as the other formats — what came in, what was spent, on what, and what visible effect it had on the field, the steward, or the group.

A single entry in Format 5 is light. At minimum it records the date, the amount, the currency, the legal classification (donation, grant, membership, service payment, salary, reimbursement, reciprocity contribution), the recipient, the financial stream (A, B, or C), the purpose, and a short note linking the spend to the field reality it produced.

A worked example: rather than the entry "*expense: 1,200 DKK*", Format 5 records "*12 May 2026 — 1,200 DKK — Stream A — water pipe — installed at northern edge of plot, functioning, reduced manual carrying during field days*." This is light. It is one line. It connects money to action to lived effect. It makes the money-to-life link traceable without bureaucratising it.

The minimum fields a Format 5 entry should contain are: date; amount; currency; exchange rate where relevant; sender or source category; recipient; legal classification (donation, grant, membership, reimbursement, salary, service payment, reciprocity contribution, or other); financial stream (A, B, or C); purpose; transfer method; receipt or evidence reference where available; observed field effect; consent or privacy note where photographs, names, or minors are involved; and reviewed-by identifier where the transfer is above the internal threshold defined in Section 11.2. Format 5 remains an operational ledger, not the formal accounting record. Its function is to connect money to field reality in a form that stewards, coordinators, board members, banks, and donors can all understand.

Format 5 is intended to be printable, adaptable, and translatable in the same way as the existing four formats. A draft layout can be added to papers.spiralweb.earth/formats once the first AnchorPoints have tested it in operation.

4.2 What Format 5 prevents

Format 5 is designed to prevent three failure modes that destroy most attempts at transparent regenerative finance.

The first is **opacity**. Without a financial format that operates in the same observational mode as the others, money becomes a parallel system that is reported separately, often only annually, and often only to external auditors. The field cannot see its own money. Format 5 is read alongside the other four formats and is read by the same people.

The second is **abstraction**. Conventional accounting registers transactions as numbers detached from what they produced. Format 5 requires the link to lived effect: what was bought, what changed because of it, what the steward observed afterwards. This makes manipulation harder and honesty easier.

The third is **disconnection**. When money moves in a separate channel from observation, the system loses the ability to ask whether spending matched reality. With Format 5 embedded in PG Ledger, the question "was the money used as intended, and did it produce what was hoped for?" becomes answerable inside the same framework that registers ecological and human condition.

4.3 Format 5 and formal accounting: a clean distinction

Format 5 does not replace formal accounting. The association still maintains its books, its bank reconciliation, its annual reporting, and its compliance with Danish association law. Format 5 is not the legal record; it is the operational record. It exists alongside formal accounting, not instead of it.

The clean formulation, which the association holds to throughout its operations, is this: **Format 5 is the field-legibility layer. Formal accounting remains with the association's bookkeeping, bank reconciliation, receipts, annual reporting, policy framework, and Bank Pack. Format 5 connects money to field reality; it does not replace the legal accounting record.**

This distinction is essential for bankability. A bank's compliance officer, a foundation's due-diligence team, or an external auditor reviewing the architecture must always be able to receive a clean answer to the question "where is the formal accounting?" The answer is: it sits in the association's standard bookkeeping, governed by Danish association law and the Bank Pack documentation. Format 5 sits alongside, providing field legibility that formal accounting alone cannot provide. The two layers are read together by the association's working team but remain legally and procedurally distinct.

Format 5 also does not replace the AnchorPoint Agreement (Section 12.5) or the country annex (Section 12.6). It is a registration format, not a contractual document. It records what happened; the contract specifies what should happen.

4.4 The five formats together

When Format 5 is in place, PG Ledger has five operational surfaces that together describe a field across the dimensions that matter:

1. **Format 1 — Monthly Dashboard.** Reads the three streams. Produces green/yellow/red status.
2. **Format 2 — Observation Sheet.** Registers ecological reality across the eight observation categories.
3. **Format 3 — 30-Day Action Sheet.** Names what will be done and what will not.
4. **Format 4 — Decision Log.** Holds governance over time.
5. **Format 5 — Financial Ledger.** Registers money in the same observational mode as the others.

A red status on the Monthly Dashboard is most often triggered by Stream B (steward viability) or Stream C (governance) rather than Stream A. A green status requires balance across all three streams. Reciprocity (described in Section 7) requires Stream A stable, Stream B at rest, Stream C functioning, and Format 5 showing real net surplus. The architecture works when all five formats are present.

This is the missing operational layer the rest of the report builds on.

---

5. The three streams in operation

Section 3.3 introduced the three streams as a constitutional principle. This section describes how they operate financially. The principle is simple: every payment, every receipt, every allocation is

identifiable as belonging to one stream, and the streams are not allowed to compensate for one another.

5.1 Stream allocation

When support enters the system, it is allocated to streams either by the donor's specified intent (where they have one) or by a default allocation rule that the association applies in the absence of specific guidance. A typical default allocation for unrestricted support might be Stream A (Land and Ecology) 50%, Stream B (Steward Viability) 30%, Stream C (Governance and Coordination) 20%, with the proportions adjusted for the maturity of the receiving field and the visible balance across the formats. A field in Phase 0 (early onboarding) will need a higher proportion of Stream B and Stream C than a field that has been running for two years.

The allocation is not concealed. It is recorded in Format 5 and visible in the AnchorPoint's monthly status. The recipient knows which stream each transfer belongs to and reports against it accordingly.

5.2 The non-compensatory rule, financially

The three-stream separation is enforced by accounting practice, not just by intent. If a Stream A allocation is underspent because trees and tools cost less than expected, the residual does not automatically transfer to Stream B to cover steward costs. The residual is held, the underspend is documented, and a deliberate decision is made about whether to extend the Stream A work, return the residual to the AnchorPoint reserve, or — only with explicit governance approval and donor-side acceptance — reallocate.

This is operationally less convenient than blended budgets. It is also what prevents the most common failure mode in regenerative finance, in which Stream A appears successful because it absorbed funding intended for Stream B, while the steward quietly carries the unfunded burden.

5.3 What Stream B actually pays for

Stream B requires its own subsection because it is the stream most regenerative initiatives fail to fund explicitly. Stream B is not "overhead." It is not "administration." It is the cost of the people carrying the work being able to live, rest, and continue.

A Stream B budget for an AnchorPoint typically includes a modest steward stipend or honorarium, paid at a level that reflects local cost of living rather than international scale; coordination time for the AnchorPoint contact; food and transport during field days; documentation support, including translation where the working languages of the field and the association differ; care for elder and youth participation, where unpaid carrying of cultural memory or learning would otherwise fall on individuals; and a livelihood buffer for stewards in transition from prior work.

The Stream B budget is calibrated to local reality. A 6,000 DKK monthly steward stipend is generous in some contexts and inadequate in others. The figure is not the principle; the principle is that the steward is not expected to carry the work on uncompensated labour.

Two principles sit beneath the Stream B budget and govern how it is read. The first concerns rest: **rest is not a reward for productive fields; it is part of field viability. Burnout is not evidence of commitment. It is evidence that a boundary has failed.** A budget that funds activity but not rest is funding eventual collapse. The second concerns what a budget can and cannot legitimately cost: **no budget should be considered viable if it depends on the loss of human breath — chronic stress, unpaid overload, or the collapse of steward capacity.** If meeting the field's stated outputs requires extracting from the steward's body or life, the outputs must be reduced, not the steward.

5.4 What Stream C actually pays for

Stream C is the institutional infrastructure that holds the work together. It includes AnchorPoint coordination from the Spiralweb side, monthly review, PG Ledger logging across all five formats, accounting and receipts management, evidence storage (photographs, observation notes, soil samples where relevant), local meeting costs, legal and compliance support including AML and country-annex work, reporting to the association and to donors, and translation between the field and the wider Spiralweb infrastructure.

Stream C is also calibrated to maturity. An AnchorPoint in Phase 0 needs more Stream C than an AnchorPoint in Phase 4 (Section 9.4) — the early work of agreement-making, country-annex preparation, and ledger setup is heavier than the later work of monthly continuation.

5.5 The fourth movement: reciprocity

The three streams describe how support enters and stabilises a field. Regenerative Reciprocity adds a fourth movement, which is not a fourth budget stream in the same sense but a circulation rule: when the field becomes strong enough to carry it, capacity moves back and outward.

Section 7 describes reciprocity in full. It is mentioned here because the streams are the foundation on which reciprocity rests. A field cannot circulate capacity until all three streams are stable. A field showing Stream A success while Stream B is depleted is not a candidate for reciprocity, regardless of its visible output.

---

6. Regenerative Reciprocity: definition and rule

Regenerative Reciprocity is the central proposal of this report. This section defines it clearly, sets out what it is not, and states the rule that governs it.

6.1 Definition

Regenerative Reciprocity is the calibrated return and outward circulation of capacity from an AnchorPoint that has become stronger through shared support, without creating debt, extraction, ownership, or control.

It rests on a single observation. A regenerative field that has been carried by the commons through its early years can, when it becomes strong enough, begin to carry the commons in return. This is not repayment; the support that helped the field stabilise was not a loan. It is not investor return; no equity was held. It is not profit-sharing; the field's surplus belongs to the field and its stewards. It is not donor reward; the patron does not receive recognition or status.

It is, instead, the continuation of a flow that was begun by others. When a field has stabilised and produces real net surplus, a calibrated portion of that surplus circulates: back to the shared infrastructure that made the field's documentation, governance, and support possible; outward to other AnchorPoints that are still in their fragile early years; and into bioregional pools that carry capacity across the network. The point is not to return what was given. The point is to prevent flow from stopping.

6.2 What it is not

Regenerative Reciprocity is not loan repayment. It is not investor return. It is not profit-sharing. It is not a donor reward programme. It is not a franchise fee. It is not a tax on the field. It is not centralised redistribution. It is not an obligation triggered before viability.

It is also not philanthropic recycling in the sense that grants sometimes operate, where a foundation requires its grantees to fund peer organisations as a condition of receiving the grant. Regenerative Reciprocity is voluntary, calibrated, and never activated against a field's own viability.

6.3 What it is

Regenerative Reciprocity is the acknowledgement of received support without the structure of debt. It is the protection of the network against one-way dependency. It is contribution to shared infrastructure by those who have benefited from it. It is peer-to-peer field support across AnchorPoints. It is bioregional circulation. It is commons replenishment. It is gratitude made operational rather than rhetorical.

6.4 The rule

The rule that governs Regenerative Reciprocity is simple and absolute:

> **When abundance emerges, flow continues. When fragility is present, fragility is protected.**

No reciprocity is expected from a field in red. No reciprocity is expected from a field in yellow. No reciprocity is expected from a field in green that has not been stable for at least six to twelve months. No reciprocity is calculated on gross income; it is calculated on net regenerative surplus, defined as what remains after local wages, field costs, soil and water reinvestment, steward viability, reserves, and local obligations have been met.

Only when all of those have been honestly accounted for does the question of reciprocity arise, and even then the bands are modest: 3–5% of net surplus for green fields, 5–10% for deep green fields. The remainder — 90% or more — stays with the field. Reciprocity is a circulation rule, not an extraction rule.

6.5 Neither market nor pure gift

It is worth naming clearly what kind of economic form Regenerative Reciprocity is, because it is easy to mistake it for something it is not.

It is not a market form. In a market form, the relation is reduced to transaction; value is measured in price; and what cannot be priced disappears. Regenerative Reciprocity does not reduce a field to its yields, does not price a steward's care, and does not treat the AnchorPoint as a unit of production. The relation is primary; the economy is a consequence.

It is not a pure gift economy either. In a pure gift form, economic clarity is treated as suspicious, and someone usually ends up paying the hidden price — most often the people closest to the work. Spiralweb's Constitutional Ground is explicit on this: land cannot be healed through hidden human depletion, and ecological ambition must not be financed by human burnout. A purely gift-based form would protect the rhetoric of non-extraction while quietly producing extraction in practice. Regenerative Reciprocity refuses that trade.

What Regenerative Reciprocity proposes is a third form. The relation is primary. The economy is secondary, but explicit. Money is necessary, and that is said clearly. Money does not buy control. The field's existence does not depend on any single transaction. The steward is not expected to subsidise the architecture's purity with their own life. None of these can fail without the form collapsing back into either market dominance or hidden self-exploitation.

One further clarification follows from this third form, and it must be stated carefully so that the architecture remains legally and financially serious. **Regenerative Reciprocity does not abolish contracts or accounting. It prevents contracts and accounting from becoming the whole relationship.** A bank cannot operate without contracts. An association cannot meet its legal duties without accounting. A patron cannot transfer significant capital without documentation. The architecture in this report does not weaken any of those. What it refuses is the reduction of the entire relationship to its contractual and accounting layers, as if the legal documents alone could carry what the work actually requires. The contract holds the form; the relationship carries the life. Both are necessary, and neither can substitute for the other.

This third form is not standardised. It is being designed in practice across the AnchorPoints described in this report. The architecture is provisional. What is non-negotiable is the structural commitment: a relation can carry money without becoming a market, and an economy can be honest without becoming extractive. Whether that commitment can be sustained over time is the open question this report does not pretend to have answered.

---

7. Reciprocity bands and phases

The reciprocity rule is calibrated by phase. The phase a field is in determines whether reciprocity is expected at all, and if so, at what band. This section sets out the four phases and their corresponding rules.

7.1 Red — Protection Phase

A field is in the Red Phase when at least one of the following conditions is present: land or ecology is stressed (drought, contamination, succession failure, weather event); steward viability is fragile (burnout, illness, family crisis, displacement); governance is unclear (decision deadlock, conflict, leadership absence); a climate or other shock has overwhelmed local capacity; or the steward or AnchorPoint has explicitly named the field as in difficulty.

The rule in Red Phase is: **no financial return expected, expansion stopped, support reconfigured toward repair.** The reciprocity expected from a red field is honest status, a pause note in PG Ledger, evidence of difficulty, and where appropriate documentation of what failed and why. None of these are financial. The budget posture in red is relief, repair, minimum viable care, and explicitly not expansion.

The Red Phase Protocol is described in full in Section 9.2.

7.2 Yellow — Stabilisation Phase

A field is in the Yellow Phase when some progress is visible but the rhythm is unstable, documentation is partial, governance clarity is incomplete, or the steward team is still vulnerable. Yellow is the phase most fields spend most of their time in. It is not a problem; it is honest reality.

The rule in Yellow is: **no fixed return, optional symbolic contribution only.** A yellow field may, if it chooses, contribute a small local consumable (seeds, photos, hosting a peer visit if not burdensome, a small contribution to the shared ledger). None of this is required. The budget posture is consolidation, role clarity, observation rhythm, and modest field support.

7.3 Green — Viability Phase

A field is in the Green Phase when all of the following are true: the field rhythm is stable, the steward team is not depleted, governance is documented and functioning, ecological indicators are improving, and some form of local income or yield has begun to emerge. Green is not high performance. Green is sustainable condition.

The rule in Green is: **calibrated reciprocity begins.** Possible bands are 3–5% of net regenerative surplus to shared infrastructure, 3–5% to local or bioregional outward support, with 90% or more retained locally. The budget posture is continued investment, cautious expansion, shared documentation, and the first structured return.

The most important rule in Green is that green status must never be achieved through hidden depletion. A field reporting green while the steward is exhausted is not green; it is performative green, and the system must be able to catch this. Section 11 sets out the guardrails.

7.4 Deep Green — Abundance Phase

A field is in the Deep Green Phase when it produces reliable surplus, local livelihoods have strengthened, governance is mature, ledger discipline is stable, and the field can support others without weakening itself. This phase is rare in early years and is not the goal for most AnchorPoints; it emerges in some places and not others, and that is appropriate.

The rule in Deep Green is: **stronger reciprocity becomes possible.** Possible bands are 5–10% of net surplus to shared infrastructure, 5–10% to bioregional outward support, with 80–90% retained locally. The budget posture is replication support, training, learning-site role, contribution to a bioregional fund, and possibly contribution to commons trust formation.

One principle holds across all four phases and deserves a clear statement: **growth cannot be commanded by funding. A field may only expand when soil, steward viability, and governance can carry the next step.** A patron who wishes to accelerate a field's progression to deep green by increasing the budget will not produce that progression; they will produce overextension followed by collapse. Bloom, surplus, reciprocity, and expansion are conditions that emerge when the underlying ground is ready. They are not conditions that can be purchased or scheduled.

7.5 Calculating net regenerative surplus

The percentage bands are meaningless without a clear definition of what they apply to. **Net regenerative surplus** is what remains after the following have been met in full:

1. Local wages and steward livelihood at a level that does not depend on hidden depletion
2. Field operating costs (tools, transport, materials, repairs)
3. Reinvestment in soil, water, biodiversity, and ecological infrastructure
4. Reserve buffer (typically 10–20% of annual operations)
5. Local obligations (loans, agreements with cooperatives, community commitments)
6. Steward viability buffer (illness, family, transition)

Only after all six have been satisfied does net regenerative surplus exist. The 3–10% bands then apply to that residual. In practice, this means that many fields in green will generate little or no calculable surplus in their first years of green status, and the reciprocity that activates will be small. This is the correct scale. Reciprocity should be visible, real, and modest, not a substantial drain on local viability.

The calculation procedure follows the same restraint as the rule. Net regenerative surplus is calculated no more than once per year, unless the AnchorPoint itself requests an earlier calculation. The calculation is made jointly by the AnchorPoint and the Spiralweb coordinator, drawing on

Format 5, the local accounts, and the steward viability reading from Format 1. No field is asked to calculate reciprocity while in red or yellow. **If there is doubt about whether a surplus is real, the doubt protects the field** — the calculation is deferred rather than forced. Reciprocity is a circulation rule, not an extraction rule, and the procedure that activates it is built to fail in the field's favour rather than against it.

---

8. Budget architecture and worked examples

This section moves from principle to numbers. The figures given here are illustrative, calibrated to the current scale of Spiralweb's work, denominated in Danish kroner (DKK) for the association's primary accounting currency, and adapted to local currency at the country level. They are intended as honest working figures, not as prices or commitments.

> **Classification note.** *The figures in this section are illustrative working bands. They are not offers, commitments, prices, grants, or investment products. No transfer should be made until the relevant flow has been classified legally (Section 12.2), allocated to a financial stream (Section 5), recorded in Format 5, and — where international transfer is involved — checked against the applicable AnchorPoint Agreement (Section 12.5) and country annex (Section 12.6). The bands are calibrated to support orientation and planning; they do not by themselves authorise any particular flow.*

8.1 Invitation, not pitch

Before setting out the supporter and patron levels, one principle must be made explicit, because it shapes how the levels themselves should be read. **A supporter is invited, not pitched to.** The distinction is not stylistic; it is structural.

A pitch reduces the relation to a transaction: here is the need, here is the amount, here is the expected return. The supporter becomes a target, the field becomes a product, and the architecture surrounding both becomes a sales mechanism. Even when the language is gentle, the structure is extractive: someone is being moved toward a decision that has already been pre-shaped for them, and the criterion of success is whether the decision arrives.

An invitation does something different. It brings a person into relation with a field and asks whether they wish to help carry what is already alive, without buying ownership, control, prestige hierarchy, or narrative direction. The criterion of success is not whether the person says yes. It is whether the relation that forms — yes, no, or not yet — is honest. A clear no protects future yeses. A clear not yet protects future relationship. A pressured yes corrupts both.

The supporter and patron levels in the rest of this section should be read inside this principle. They describe the structural shapes that support can take if a person chooses to enter a relationship with the work. They are not menus from which a transaction is selected. **Patronage is legitimate only**

when it remains non-capture. A patron may help carry the field. A patron may not buy governance rights, veto power, special access to local stewards, narrative control, or extraction rights. The forms below are calibrated to keep that distinction operational at every scale.

8.2 Entry-level support: individual supporter

The lightest entry to Regenerative Reciprocity is individual monthly support of the association itself. This is not earmarked to a specific AnchorPoint; it goes to the association's Stream C infrastructure, allowing PG Ledger to be maintained, AnchorPoints to be coordinated, and basic continuity to be held.

Suggested levels are:

- 75 DKK/month — Friend of the Field (900 DKK/year)
- 150 DKK/month — Support Steward (1,800 DKK/year)
- 300 DKK/month — Ledger Supporter (3,600 DKK/year)
- 600 DKK/month — AnchorPoint Supporter (7,200 DKK/year)

The text accompanying these levels is straightforward: *you are not buying access; you are helping keep the field open, documented, and alive.* Supporter contributions confer no governance rights unless the contributor is separately admitted as a formal voting member under the association's bylaws. Supporter status, donor status, patron status, and formal association membership must remain legally distinct: the first three express a relationship of support; the last is a constitutional position within the association governed by the bylaws and Danish association law. Supporters may pause or withdraw at any time without notice.

8.3 Field contribution: specific AnchorPoint support

A second entry point is contribution to a named AnchorPoint. This is suitable for individual donors, small groups, or organisations who have come into relation with a specific place.

Suggested levels are:

- 5,000 DKK — one month of basic field documentation and coordination
- 15,000 DKK — small pilot support package
- 35,000 DKK — one 90-day AnchorPoint consolidation cycle
- 75,000 DKK — six-month field and protocol support package
- 150,000 DKK — one-year early field development package

These transfers are governed by an AnchorPoint Agreement (Section 12.5), classified by stream allocation, and recorded in Format 5. They confer no ownership, no governance rights, and no control over the work being done.

8.4 Patron-level support

Larger catalytic support enters through patron-level contributions. This is suitable for individuals, families, and foundations who wish to support the Spiralweb architecture as a whole or to enable significant capacity at one or more AnchorPoints.

Suggested levels are:

- 250,000 DKK — one field node, one year, limited scope
- 500,000 DKK — two to three AnchorPoints, shared ledger and coordination
- 1,000,000 DKK — multi-country flow architecture pilot
- 2,500,000 DKK — bioregional or multi-AnchorPoint fund prototype
- 5,000,000 DKK — three-year polycentric flow architecture with formal evaluation

Patron-level support is governed by a written agreement that explicitly states the non-capture conditions: support does not buy ownership, governance influence, branding control, narrative direction, or extraction rights. The patron's name is acknowledged where the patron wishes; otherwise the support is documented in Format 5 without external attribution.

8.5 Institutional, municipal, and foundation entry

Institutional support — from foundations, municipalities, regional authorities, ministries, or international bodies — operates at scale levels and timeframes appropriate to those actors.

Suggested levels are:

- 100,000–250,000 DKK — scoping and design phase
- 300,000–750,000 DKK — one-year applied pilot
- 1–3 million DKK — multi-node demonstrator
- 3–10 million DKK — bioregional commons infrastructure

Institutional entry is more complex than individual or patron entry because it carries reporting requirements, accountability obligations to the institution's own constituency, and procurement-style compliance requirements. The country-annex system (Section 12.6) is particularly important for institutional entry, as is the AnchorPoint Agreement.

8.6 Worked example A — 10 m² self-start steward

A single steward with no external support begins on 10 m² of available ground. The annual budget is 0–2,000 DKK and is met from personal resources. Costs include a notebook for observation, basic tools, seeds or cuttings, mulch or compost, photographs, and the time of a monthly observation cycle. Spiralweb provides no financial support. The steward's reciprocity is optional: field notes if they choose, photographs if they choose, no financial return at any point. This is the open layer of

practice. Most people who encounter Spiralweb will work at this scale or not at all, and that is appropriate.

8.7 Worked example B — Circle of 13 local steward group

A group of approximately thirteen people coordinating across several adjacent units operates at an annual budget of 15,000–50,000 DKK. A representative allocation is 10,000 DKK for tools, seeds, and soil; 10,000 DKK for local meetings and food; 10,000 DKK for documentation and translation; 10,000 DKK for a local coordinator stipend; and 10,000 DKK held as reserve and emergency. Reciprocity at this scale is a monthly three-stream record, participation in shared learning, and no financial return unless or until surplus emerges over time.

8.8 Worked example C — Had Soualem-type 2 ha field

A two-hectare permaculture site with active stewardship, water work, and soil restoration operates at an annual budget of 75,000–250,000 DKK. A representative first-year budget at the upper end is 40,000 DKK for soil, water, and planting materials; 30,000 DKK for local field labour and steward time; 20,000 DKK for documentation, photographs, and video; 25,000 DKK for AnchorPoint coordination from the Spiralweb side; 25,000 DKK for tools, repairs, and transport; 20,000 DKK for PG Ledger and protocol support; and 15,000 DKK held as reserve, for a total of 175,000 DKK.

Reciprocity at this scale is calibrated by phase. No return is expected in year one unless a clear surplus appears, which would be unusual. In years two and three, if local viability is in green status, a 3% return to shared infrastructure is possible. Later, if the field reaches deep green, 5–10% of net surplus may circulate.

8.9 Worked example D — Sous Valley 80 ha transition

The Sous Valley site is in a different scale category. An 80-hectare syntropic food forest transition in early phases operates at 500,000–1,500,000 DKK per year, with the scale increasing as the work moves from design and Phase 0 into active implementation. A representative first-year budget at 1,300,000 DKK is 250,000 DKK for field design and phased implementation; 200,000 DKK for water retention, swales, and biomass systems; 200,000 DKK for local labour and steward viability; 150,000 DKK for nursery, trees, seeds, and compost systems; 100,000 DKK for documentation and monitoring; 150,000 DKK for coordination, governance, and legal/accounting; 100,000 DKK for learning visits, translation, and protocols; and 150,000 DKK held as contingency and climate buffer.

Reciprocity at this scale carries no repayment logic and creates no donor ownership. From year three onward, if yields or learning-site income emerge, a representative pattern would be 5% of net surplus to PG Ledger and shared infrastructure, 5% to a local bioregional fund, and 90% retained locally. The exact percentages are calibrated to the field's actual condition each year.

8.10 Worked example E — Karachi school network

A Karachi-type school network — multiple schools, teacher-led work, student participation, urban context — operates at an annual budget of 150,000–600,000 DKK. A representative first-year budget at 500,000 DKK is 75,000 DKK for protocol adaptation for the school context; 100,000 DKK for training teachers and students; 75,000 DKK for school garden materials; 75,000 DKK for local coordination; 75,000 DKK for documentation and translation; 50,000 DKK for ledger and reporting; and 50,000 DKK for exchange with other AnchorPoints in the network.

Reciprocity for school networks is primarily non-financial: school observations, student field records, local learning modules, peer exchange. Schools themselves are not expected to generate financial reciprocity. If partner institutions later fund expansion, a 3–5% contribution to shared protocol infrastructure is appropriate.

8.11 Worked example F — Kitgum village node

The Kitgum AnchorPoint operates at 100,000–400,000 DKK per year, with a budget shape that reflects its rural, intergenerational, land-based character. Allocation includes elder and youth participation support, tools and planting materials, community field days, Moringa and syntropic guild development, local documentation, food sovereignty activities, a local coordination stipend, and a resilience reserve.

Reciprocity at Kitgum is land-based and relational. The field returns local evidence, intergenerational learning, field pattern documentation, and — over time — seed and cutting sharing with other AnchorPoints. SRIP names Kitgum as the most mature current AnchorPoint, and it is the field most likely to begin offering peer support to other early-phase AnchorPoints in the network.

8.12 What these examples show

The examples illustrate three points. First, the architecture works at very different scales — from 0 DKK to several million DKK per year — with the same underlying logic. Second, reciprocity bands are modest in early years and only become substantial as fields mature; this is the correct calibration. Third, the budget shape is different in every field, and that is the design intent: a Sous Valley budget cannot look like a Kitgum budget, and the architecture is what allows them to share the same network without being forced into the same form.

---

9. Operational protocols: Green, Red, and Reciprocity Activation

The architecture in the previous sections is held in operation by three protocols. Each protocol describes a phase of field life and the rules that govern that phase. Together they form the cyclical core of how AnchorPoints actually operate over time.

9.1 The Green Phase Protocol

The Green Phase is the stable, sustainable condition of an AnchorPoint. It is what most fields aim for and what the architecture is designed to allow them to remain in for extended periods.

The criteria for green status are:

- **Steward viability**: no sustained stress, realistic workload, possibility of pause and rest
- **Ecological direction**: no clear deterioration, signs of stabilisation or improvement
- **Governance**: basic clarity, identifiable decision-making, no hidden conflicts that paralyse work
- **Communication**: regular (not necessarily frequent) and honest (not polished)

All four must be present. Green is not awarded for ecological progress alone; if the steward is exhausted or governance is broken, the field is yellow or red regardless of what the land shows.

The crucial rule in Green is what Green is not. Green is not high performance. Green is not rapid growth. Green is not a success story. Green is not perfect documentation. Green is sustainable condition — the field is functioning, the people are not depleted, the work continues. Most regenerative work, most of the time, lives in green or yellow. That is appropriate.

Activities permitted in Green include continuing practice, small experiments, local development, and relational exchange with other AnchorPoints. Activities limited in Green include large expansion, new major economic obligations, and any growth that would create pressure on stewards or governance. Activities forbidden in Green include any growth that produces hidden overwork. The rule is absolute: green must never be achieved through hidden depletion.

The greatest risk in Green is **performative stability** — the field appearing stable while energy is quietly declining, problems are not being mentioned, and the steward is conserving. Section 11.1 sets out the guardrails against this.

9.2 The Red Phase Protocol

The Red Phase is the most important operational innovation in this report. It exists because every regenerative system that does not have one will systematically produce stewards who hide their distress, fields that perform stability, and eventual collapse. The Red Phase Protocol inverts the conventional logic: in this architecture, naming difficulty does not reduce support, it reconfigures it.

Purpose. Red Phase activates when an AnchorPoint can no longer carry itself without risk to human capacity, ecological integrity, governance clarity, or financial transparency. The purpose of Red is to protect life, not to maintain activity.

Principle. Red is not failure. Red is the transition from performance to protection.

Activation. Red Phase can be activated in three ways. The primary route is **self-reporting** by the steward or AnchorPoint contact: "we are overwhelmed," "this is not working," "we are in doubt." The secondary route is **observation** from the Spiralweb side: missing responses, inconsistent updates,

repeated stress signals. The third route is **combined assessment**: a brief conversation, no longer than sixty minutes, with no documentation requirement, that surfaces what is actually happening.

Immediate changes within 72 hours. When Red Phase is activated, three things happen quickly. **Stop**: all expansion activities, new commitments, and new economic obligations are paused. **Pause**: non-critical reporting and performative deliverables are suspended. **Continue**: basic contact and absolutely necessary operations are maintained. Nothing else is required.

Three parallel tracks. Red Phase opens three tracks that run simultaneously.

Track A — Stabilisation (mandatory). The purpose is to reduce pressure. Activities are simplified, workload is reduced, and overall situation is brought into view. The action is one or two short conversations and a single simple status: "what is real right now?"

Track B — Repair support (activated as needed). The purpose is to rebuild capacity. Possible interventions are human (a critical friend, not an evaluator; a peer from another AnchorPoint), practical (bookkeeping help, structural support, coordination relief), restorative (a pause of one to four weeks; a retreat in serious cases, evaluated case-by-case), and economic (a small buffer for stabilisation, with no output requirement).

Track C — Clarification (mandatory). The purpose is to understand what is actually happening. Three questions: what is too much? what is necessary? what can be released? No analysis. Only clarity.

Economic behaviour in Red. What stops: expansion funding, new investments. What continues: basic support (case by case), commitments already made (evaluated). What opens: repair support, buffer. The rule is absolute: there must be no economic penalty for being honest.

Time frame. Typical duration is two weeks minimum, one to three months as the normal range, six months as the maximum (which requires active reassessment).

Exit. A field exits Red Phase when the steward experiences real (not performative) breathing room, activities have been reduced to a sustainable level, and communication is stable again. Exit does not require production, growth, or "results." Exit requires that life is again carryable.

Guardrails against misuse. Red Phase requires an existing relationship — it is not an entry strategy. It is time-limited. Expansion is not possible during Red. Validation is relational, not bureaucratic; one conversation, plausibility assessed (not proven). Repeated Red Phases trigger systemic conversation about whether the AnchorPoint structure itself needs to be reconsidered.

PG Ledger registration. Minimal: date of activation, brief reason, tracks activated, duration, exit date.

Cultural condition. This protocol only works if the following is true in practice: *it is safer to tell the truth than to perform stability.* If that is not true, stewards will report green regardless of reality, and the architecture collapses. Spiralweb must therefore actively show its own vulnerability, never reward "perfect green," tell stories about good Red Phases, and never use red as implicit criticism. Section 11 returns to this cultural layer in detail.

This is the cultural test of the entire architecture. **The credibility of Regenerative Reciprocity depends on whether Red can be named without punishment. If a field must perform green in order to remain worthy of support, the architecture has already failed.** No structural innovation, no operational discipline, no legal precision can compensate for this. The Red Phase Protocol is not one feature among many. It is the test that determines whether the rest of the architecture is real.

9.3 The Reciprocity Activation Protocol

The Reciprocity Activation Protocol governs when and how flow returns from a stable AnchorPoint.

Purpose. To activate return and outward flow from an AnchorPoint without creating extraction, debt, pressure, or ownership.

Principle. Reciprocity follows surplus, never need.

Preconditions. All of the following must be true: the field has been in stable Green for at least six to twelve months; net regenerative surplus has been documented (not gross income); there is no hidden burden on the steward or the group; the field is not on the verge of expansion that would consume the surplus.

Activation. The initiative may come from the AnchorPoint itself (the ideal case — the steward or coordinator proposes it) or from Spiralweb (an inquiry, never a demand).

Three forms of reciprocity. *Financial*: 3–5% of net surplus in green, 5–10% in deep green. *Material*: seeds, knowledge, tools, time. *Relational*: mentoring, peer visits, support to new AnchorPoints.

Flow directions. *To Spiralweb core*: ledger, coordination, association infrastructure. *To other AnchorPoints*: direct peer support. *To bioregional pool*: local circulation within a region.

Economic rule. Only net surplus is used. Reciprocity is never paid out of operating budget or steward livelihood.

Timing. Never automatic. Never on a fixed schedule. Reciprocity is a condition-triggered movement, not a recurring obligation.

Pause. Reciprocity pauses immediately if the field enters yellow or red, or if uncertainty arises about its underlying condition.

Guardrails. No coercion: always voluntary. No moralism: no shame for fields that do not generate surplus. No expectation before time: reciprocity is not anticipated in early years. No prestige: high contribution does not produce higher status in the network.

Registration. Type, amount or form, destination, context — recorded in Format 5.

Risk. The greatest risk is that reciprocity becomes a hidden tax on the field. The countermeasures are full transparency, clear justification for every transfer, and reversibility — any reciprocity arrangement can be paused or stopped without penalty.

Rule. Flow must never create pressure in the system. If a reciprocity arrangement is producing pressure, it stops.

9.4 The phases as a cycle, not a ladder

The four phases — Red, Yellow, Green, Deep Green — are not a ladder of achievement. They are a cycle of life. A field will move between them over time, and Red is part of the cycle, not a deviation from it.

A field may begin in yellow during onboarding, stabilise into green over three to six months, encounter difficulty and enter red, recover into yellow, return to green, and over years reach deep green. Or it may oscillate between green and red for several years before stabilising. Or it may remain in yellow indefinitely, supported by the network and contributing what it can. None of these patterns is a failure. The architecture is designed to hold all of them.

---

10. The 90-day operational cycle and weekly rhythm

The protocols in Section 9 govern phase transitions. This section describes the everyday operational rhythm that holds the architecture in motion. The principle is that the rhythm must be light enough to be carried by stewards without consuming them, and rich enough to register what is actually happening.

10.1 The four-week onboarding rhythm

When a new AnchorPoint enters the network, the first four weeks establish the working rhythm. The pattern is consistent across contexts but adapted to local reality. What follows is the pattern in its general form; the simulations in Section 10.4 show how it adapts to specific fields.

Week 1 — Landing and reality. The purpose is to establish relationship, create calm, and avoid over-design. On the local side, the steward or AnchorPoint contact spends one to two hours in the field observing what is in motion and what is missing, taking three to five photographs (Format 2 — Observation Sheet); thirty minutes on the steward-condition reading (how am I, what is heavy, what is light) — entered in Format 1 (Monthly Dashboard); a brief governance note in Format 4 (Decision Log) where relevant; and thirty to sixty minutes on Format 5, where the bank transfer is received, the first allocation is recorded against the three streams, and the first priority is named. On the Spiralweb side, the AnchorPoint coordinator spends one to two hours in conversation — no strategy, only understanding the situation and creating safety — and one hour reviewing inputs and setting first status in Format 1, which is typically yellow rather than green. The output is one Observation Sheet, one Monthly Dashboard reading, a brief Decision Log entry, and one Financial Ledger entry. Total time: 2–4 hours locally, 3–5 hours from Spiralweb.

Week 2 — First action. The purpose is to translate support into action while keeping the action small. Locally: two to three hours doing one concrete thing — planting, watering, soil work — and registering it in Format 2; thirty minutes on Format 5 recording what was bought, the approximate amount, and the purpose; fifteen minutes on the steward section of Format 1 (does this feel better, heavier, or the same); a Format 4 entry if a decision was made. From Spiralweb: one to two hours reading the field's input (does it make sense, does it match expectation), thirty minutes in dialogue with one question — "how did it feel to begin?" — and a status check in Format 1 that holds at yellow or moves cautiously to early green. Total time: 2–4 hours locally, 2–3 hours from Spiralweb.

Week 3 — Reality lands. The purpose is to see what is not working and avoid performance. Locally: one to two hours in Format 2 noting what did not go as expected; thirty minutes on the steward section of Format 1 (where is the pressure, is there doubt); fifteen minutes on Format 5 (was the money used as planned, is anything wasted); a Format 4 entry if friction has emerged in governance. From Spiralweb: one to two hours of active listening, watching for hidden stress or excessive ambition; a status check in Format 1 (is this still green, or is it moving to yellow or red); intervention if necessary, with the simple message "it is allowed to be smaller." Total time: 2–3 hours locally, 2–4 hours from Spiralweb.

Week 4 — First calibration. The purpose is to stabilise and avoid over-expansion. Locally: two hours in Format 2 noting what is being repeated and what is being dropped; thirty minutes on the steward reading of Format 1 (how is the energy now); thirty minutes on Format 5 reviewing what is left and what is needed; a Format 3 (30-Day Action Sheet) for the next thirty days, deliberately small. From Spiralweb: two to three hours of review reading all four weeks together; a full Format 1 reading setting stream-by-stream status (green if calm, yellow if tense, red if pressured); a decision logged in Format 4 (continue, reduce, or pause). The output is a complete first cycle and a first honest picture of the field. Total time: 2–4 hours locally, 3–5 hours from Spiralweb.

10.2 What stewards actually deliver

The architecture asks stewards to deliver less than most regenerative funding requires, and to deliver it more honestly. The weekly deliverable is:

- One observation entered in Format 2 (Observation Sheet)
- One reflection on the steward section of Format 1 (energy, pressure)
- One handling of work, recorded against the relevant stream
- One Format 5 entry (Financial Ledger), if applicable

Each is light. Each is honest. None requires polish. The principle is **minimal effort, maximum truth.**

Where this fails is in two predictable ways. Stewards who try to write too much make the rhythm too heavy and stop carrying it. Stewards who write too little lose the trace and cannot show what happened. Both fail. The right balance is small enough to be done, rich enough to be true.

10.3 The 90-day implementation cycle

Across the first 90 days, the rhythm produces a complete cycle. Month one is onboarding and first actions. Month two is reality testing, where stress or misalignment typically emerges. Month three is stabilisation and possible Red Phase, with recalibration. The outcome is real data, real relationship, and real capacity — not scale. The 90-day cycle is the unit by which AnchorPoints are assessed and the unit by which Spiralweb learns whether the architecture works in a given context.

10.4 Three context-specific simulations

The same architecture produces different practice in different contexts. This was tested across three simulated 90-day cycles in different cultural and ecological conditions. The conclusion is that the architecture is general enough to apply across contexts and specific enough that Red, Green, and Reciprocity mean different things in each.

Simulation 1 — Had Soualem-type field (Morocco, 2 ha, early phase). The starting condition is an existing practice with one or two primary stewards, limited economic buffer, and high motivation but vulnerable capacity. Phase 0 (days 0–14) establishes relationship with a 2–3 hour conversation, a mini-agreement with a frame budget of 35,000 DKK, and a first transfer of 20,000 DKK allocated to materials, steward time, transport, and buffer. Phase 1 (days 15–45) sees work begin and small problems emerge; a second transfer of 15,000 DKK is made, adjusted to reality. Phase 2 (days 45–60) is Red Phase, triggered by the steward saying "this is too much" or by Spiralweb seeing missing responses. Expansion stops, pressure reduces, repair support of 5,000 DKK enters with no output requirement, and a critical-friend conversation simplifies the plan. Phase 3 (days 60–90) is re-entry: fewer activities, more realism, better rhythm, with a third transfer of 10,000 DKK at lower scale. Total disbursed: 50,000 DKK. Total Spiralweb time: 45–60 hours. The most important outcome is not the planted material; it is that the steward dared to say "stop" without losing the relationship. **In this context, Red Phase means rest.**

Simulation 2 — Karachi school network (Pakistan, multi-site, urban). The starting condition is multiple schools, many actors (teachers, students, NGOs), low local economic buffer, and high organisational friction. The critical difference from the Moroccan field is that the AnchorPoint here is not one person; it is a coordination unit. Phase 0 establishes who makes decisions, where responsibility stops, and what is realistic, with a frame budget of 25,000 DKK initially. Phase 1 sees enthusiasm high and coordination problems emerge quickly; the typical signal is "we want to expand, we have more schools ready" — classic over-expansion. Spiralweb's intervention is to stop the expansion and hold to three schools. Phase 2 is Red Phase, but the trigger is not stress in one person; it is chaos in coordination, where no one knows what is happening. The repair support is 5,000 DKK, but more importantly it is structural help, which is more valuable than money. Phase 3 narrows to one or two schools that work well; the rest pause. Total: 50,000 DKK. **In this context, Red Phase means structure, not rest.**

Simulation 3 — Kitgum village node (Uganda, rural, intergenerational). The starting condition is elders and children, land-based practice, low cash economy, high relational strength. Phase 0 takes 3–5 hours of conversation focused on who the elders are, who carries the relationship, and what matters culturally. The first transfer is 15,000 DKK for shared activities, materials, and local support.

The critical difference is that money is not the primary driver here. Phase 1 has a calm pace, strong local rooting, and low documentation — the risk is under-documentation rather than over-extension. Spiralweb's role is to help the field see what is happening without applying pressure. Phase 2 is Red Phase, triggered not by stress but by life — illness, weather, local events. Activation here means "life requires attention elsewhere," with no demand, no analysis, and food or practical support of 5,000 DKK if needed. Phase 3 is natural resumption with no plan. Total: 30–40,000 DKK. **In this context, Red Phase means respect for life's rhythm.**

The three simulations show what the architecture is for: same model, different practice. In Morocco, Red protects the human against burnout. In Karachi, Red protects the work against organisational collapse. In Kitgum, Red protects the field's right to follow life's rhythm rather than the system's. The architecture's strength is that it does not demand uniformity. Its weakness is that it requires judgement, human understanding, and time. It cannot be reduced to a checklist.

10.5 What the cycle delivers

After the first 90 days, what an AnchorPoint and Spiralweb have together is real relationship, real data, real economy linked to real ground, and the absence of false green. What they do not have is a success story, a scaling plan, or a polished narrative. That is correct. The architecture is designed to produce honest condition rather than impressive output.

---

11. Guardrails: structural, behavioural, cultural

A system that distributes money without guardrails will be exploited. A system that controls money too tightly will be unworkable. The architecture in this report sits in the middle, with guardrails calibrated to make exploitation hard and honesty easy. This section sets them out across three layers: structural, behavioural, and cultural.

11.1 The central design rule

The single most important design rule is this: **the system must be hard to exploit and easy to be truthful in.** Every guardrail is evaluated against that test. A guardrail that makes exploitation harder but also makes honesty harder is the wrong guardrail. A guardrail that makes honesty easier without making exploitation easier is the right guardrail.

The corollary is that the system cannot prevent all dishonesty. Some 10–20% of effort, time, or money will be lost to noise, error, small misalignments, and minor manipulation. The goal is not to eliminate this. The goal is to ensure it does not scale. Structural guardrails make small exploitation visible and large exploitation impossible.

11.2 Structural guardrails

The structural layer is the simplest and the most effective. It works by limiting what is possible, not by judging what is right.

Small initial transfers. First transfers are 5,000–35,000 DKK, never large amounts without history. A new AnchorPoint cannot receive 500,000 DKK on day one. The architecture does not allow it.

Repeated cycles, not lump sums. Support enters in cycles — observation, transfer, observation, transfer — rather than as a single payment for an annual budget. This means the system has natural intervention points and that mistakes are visible early.

Visibility. All flows are documented in Format 5. The information is not necessarily public with names attached, but it is traceable within the association.

Red status stops expansion. When a field enters red, expansion funding stops. This is not negotiable. The protocol is structural.

No cash transfers without explanation. Transfers go bank-to-bank where possible. Cash is not impossible (some contexts require it), but it must be documented and explained.

Dual awareness on larger flows. Transfers above a threshold are seen by at least two people on the Spiralweb side. This is awareness, not approval — but two pairs of eyes catch what one misses. The association should set internal approval thresholds before the first transfer cycle, structured along the following lines: small transfers receive operational approval and a Format 5 entry; medium transfers add second-person review; large transfers require board-visible approval, documented purpose, recipient verification, and country-annex check; patron-level or institutional transfers require a written agreement, board record, bank-compliance readiness, and restricted-pool classification. The exact monetary boundaries are set by board decision and may be revised as the association matures.

Plausibility test. A simple question is applied to every spend: does this expense make sense in the local context? Most exploitation is detected here, not by audit.

Phased scaling. A field that has received 35,000 DKK and managed it well may receive 75,000 DKK in the next cycle. A field that has received 35,000 DKK and shown signs of stress receives less or pauses. Scaling is earned, not granted.

Across these structural guardrails sits a deeper principle that should not be confused with restriction: **boundaries are not obstacles to generosity. They are the form that allows generosity to remain clean.** A donor who chafes against the small-initial-transfer rule has misunderstood the architecture; the rule exists so that their generosity does not damage the field they wish to support. A steward who experiences phased scaling as a constraint on their ambition has misunderstood it similarly; phased scaling is what allows their work to remain carryable as it grows. Boundaries here are protective, not punitive.

11.3 What structural guardrails do not include

The architecture deliberately avoids several things that conventional grant management treats as essential:

- **Heavy bureaucracy.** Heavy reporting can kill the field. Stewards stop carrying the rhythm and the architecture collapses. Format 5 is one line, Format 2 (Observation Sheet) is light, and that is the design.
- **Central control.** Spiralweb does not direct what an AnchorPoint does. The Stream A allocation is a frame, not a prescription. Local decisions are local.
- **Audit-style documentation.** Receipts are kept, but the operational record is the PG Ledger entry, not a binder of vouchers. Formal accounting is held in parallel for legal compliance.

The reasoning is empirical. Heavy bureaucracy does not actually prevent exploitation; it prevents participation. Stewards facing exploitation pressure will either find ways around the bureaucracy or stop carrying the work, and the system loses both.

11.4 Behavioural guardrails

The behavioural layer addresses the predictable patterns of misuse and the responses to each. Five scenarios are recognised explicitly:

Perma-Green (hidden stress). An AnchorPoint reports green consistently, sends polished photographs, but responses become shorter, energy declines, and small signs of pressure appear. The motivation is not malice; it is the rational response of someone who fears that honesty will reduce support.

The countermove is not confrontation. It is **soft friction**: "we only see green — that is rarely realistic. Is there something we are not seeing?" Combined with **normalisation of yellow and red**: "every field goes through this; it is not a problem." Combined with **a micro-check**: "what was difficult this month?" If the pattern continues, Spiralweb itself adjusts the colour to yellow — not as punishment, but as a calibration of truth.

Strategic Red (misuse of care). An AnchorPoint enters red, receives repair support, stabilises, and re-enters red shortly after. The pattern repeats. The motivation may be that the actor has discovered red produces support and has weakened the incentive to stay green.

The countermove is a **time buffer**: no new Red Phase within two months without additional assessment. A **meta-conversation**: "we see a pattern — let us understand it together." A **shift in focus** from support to structure: what is making this unstable? A **temporary pause** if necessary, while preserving the relationship. The principle: Red Phase is not repeatable without reflection.

Hidden Abundance (concealed surplus). A field begins to generate income but does not share it and continues to receive support. The motivation is often self-protection — fear of losing support, prior experience of extraction. The risk is that trust collapses and reciprocity becomes impossible.

The countermove begins at onboarding: **expectation clarity**. "If surplus emerges, we talk about it. Not as a requirement — as a relationship." Then **soft opening**: "do you see any movement in the economy?" Then **define surplus together**, otherwise it will be hidden. **No punishment** if surplus is discovered late: no sanction, only new clarity. The guardrail: transparency must never lead to loss of safety.

The Jeep (direct misuse). Funds are used for personal luxury or things irrelevant to the field. The countermove is a **fast pause** of further transfers; a **clear conversation**: "this does not match the agreement"; **no punishment, but consequence**: no new funds, but the relationship may continue if both sides choose; **documentation** in the ledger. The guardrail: misuse is handled quickly, without drama.

Overexpansion (the most dangerous). A field wants to grow rapidly, attracts new actors, and pressure rises. The motivation is enthusiasm, success, and external attention. The risk is collapse in three to six months. The countermove is **stop**: "we are not expanding yet." **Hold size**: same number of activities, same scope. **Wait**: three to six months of stability before the next step. The guardrail: growth requires documented calm.

11.5 Documentation must not become exposure

One principle deserves its own subsection because it cuts across every operational layer: **documentation must not become exposure.**

PG Ledger is a documentation architecture. AnchorPoint pages are documentation surfaces. Format 5 entries link money to field reality. Photographs, names, school identities, soil data, water observations, governance decisions, and steward reflections all enter the ledger over time. The architecture's strength is precisely this legibility. But the same legibility, deployed without care, can become a form of harm.

Visibility is only legitimate when it serves the field and is consent-based, proportionate, contextual, and reversible. Images, names, school identities, precise locations, economic vulnerability, land tenure, political sensitivity, and children require particular care. A photograph that helps a foundation understand the work may also expose participants to attention they did not consent to. A name that builds relational warmth in a public report may also place a steward in a position they cannot easily withdraw from. A precise location useful for protocol replication may also expose land tenure that is contested. The default is restraint. The exception, when documentation moves from internal record to public visibility, requires explicit and current consent — not the consent given two years ago at the moment of first relationship, but the consent that holds today, for this particular use.

Field pages should be truth surfaces, not campaign surfaces. The distinction matters. A truth surface records what is real, with the participants' active consent, in a form they themselves can read and correct. A campaign surface deploys the field's reality in service of an external goal — fundraising, profile-building, political advocacy — that may or may not align with what the field itself needs. The two can look identical from outside. They are not the same thing.

This principle connects directly back to consent as ongoing condition (Section 1.4). Consent given is not consent owned. A steward, a school, a Circle of 13, or an AnchorPoint may at any time withdraw permission for further use of images, names, or specific information, and the architecture must be able to honour that withdrawal in practice — not just in policy. Where the association cannot guarantee removal across all downstream uses (third-party publications, partner reports, archived materials), it must say so plainly at the point of original consent, and calibrate what is published accordingly.

11.6 The cultural layer

The deepest guardrail is cultural. Without it, the structural and behavioural layers fail.

The cultural rule is: **a steward must never have to choose between honesty and survival.** If the system produces that choice, stewards will choose survival, and the architecture collapses. The system must therefore make honesty rationally safer than performance.

This requires several things from Spiralweb itself, not from stewards:

- **Showing its own vulnerability.** The association must publish its own yellow and red phases. Stewards cannot be expected to be honest if Spiralweb performs perfection.
- **Not rewarding "perfect green."** No prizes, no special status, no enhanced visibility for fields that always report green. If anything, green that is too consistent is treated as a flag for soft friction.
- **Telling stories about good Red Phases.** When a field has entered red and recovered well, that story is told publicly (with consent), so other stewards see that red is held safely.
- **Never using red as implicit criticism.** Red is reconfiguration, not failure. Internal language must reflect this.

This is the layer that determines whether the rest of the architecture works. Structure and behavioural guardrails can be specified. Culture must be lived. The work of the association is to live it.

A further cultural principle holds throughout this layer: **a regenerative financial system must be kind without becoming vague. It must leave room for pause, correction, role flexibility, and learning without dissolving accountability.** Grace and rigour are not opposites in this architecture; they are the two sides of the same form. A system that becomes rigid in the name of accountability loses the field; a system that becomes vague in the name of kindness loses the discipline that makes care durable. The work is to hold both at once, in the same conversation, often in the same sentence.

Underlying all of this is a definition of governance that Regenerative Reciprocity holds throughout: **governance in this architecture is not control over a field. It is the structured movement of care, responsibility, evidence, and decision-making through distributed centres of responsibility.** The board is one such centre. The AnchorPoint is another. The Circle of 13 is

another. The patron in formal agreement is another. None of them is sovereign over the field; all of them carry a portion of the responsibility for keeping the architecture honest.

11.7 The hard truth

Several things will happen regardless of how well the guardrails are designed:

- Some people will perform.
- Some will exaggerate.
- Some will fall away.
- Some will misuse small amounts.
- Some will hide problems.

These are not failures of the system. They are the system's tests. The architecture passes when small misuse remains small, when honest stewards can breathe, and when the system holds its character over time. The architecture fails when small misuse scales, when honesty becomes dangerous, or when the architecture begins to perform itself.

The final test, applied to any specific design choice: **can this be done twelve times in succession without burning out?** If the answer is no, the design is too heavy.

11.8 Practice is open, obligation is not

The deepest guardrail in this architecture is borrowed directly from SRIP and applies to financial flow as much as it does to land practice. The principle: **practice is open; obligation is not.** Anyone may begin a 10 m^2 practice. Anyone may download Format 5 and begin registering money in the same observational mode as the existing four formats. Anyone may use the three-stream separation in their own work. Anyone may apply the Red Phase logic in their own organisation. None of this requires permission, relationship, or membership.

But beginning practice does not in itself create entitlement to support, review, funding, or institutional relationship. Those things follow more slowly, and only where enough continuity, evidence, and trust are present. The architecture distinguishes clearly among three things:

1. **Practice** — beginning or continuing real local stewardship using the formats and the protocols.
2. **Recognition** — enough continuity for closer relational attention from the association.
3. **Support** — some form of financial, operational, or institutional backing.

These are not the same. Not everyone who practises will seek recognition. Not everyone recognised will need support. And not everyone seeking support will yet be ready for it. The four user pathways set out in SRIP — self-start steward, learning contact, verified relationship pathway, supported node — apply to this architecture as well. Most people who encounter the architecture will work at the self-start level and never enter financial relationship with the association at all. That is not a weak case. It is a successful one.

The maturity rule is the same as in SRIP: **first stand, then help.** A field that has not yet stabilised its own three streams cannot reasonably be supporting another field. A new AnchorPoint cannot reasonably be receiving large support before the local rhythm is real. A patron cannot reasonably enter at the highest band without first having seen the field at smaller scale. The order matters.

11.9 The 10,000 people burden test

The most important structural test of the architecture is the question SRIP asks of every design choice: *if 10,000 more people did this tomorrow, would the centre become heavier?*

If the answer is yes, the design is wrong. The architecture must be such that:

- 10,000 people can download Format 5 and begin registering financial flow in their own work without anything needing to happen at the Spiralweb centre.
- 10,000 stewards can use the three-stream separation in their own organisations without consultation with the association.
- 10,000 readers can adopt the Red Phase Protocol in their own work without onboarding.
- 10,000 inquiries do not generate 10,000 case files at the centre.

This is what allows the architecture to remain open without becoming captured. Most engagement remains local. Most practice remains self-starting. Most learning happens through reading and adaptation rather than through institutional relationship. The narrowest layer — supported AnchorPoints with formal agreements — remains small enough to be carried by the association's actual capacity.

Flow must not arrive faster than the living system can absorb without distortion. If very large numbers begin, the correct response is not central expansion. The correct response is: let most remain self-starting, let many remain local, let some cluster into circles, let very few enter central relation, and let maturity generate new distributed centres over time. The success condition is not that the association can process everyone. The success condition is that it still does not need to process most of them.

11.10 Risk register

For internal governance and external review, the architecture's main exposures and the controls designed to address them are summarised below. The register is illustrative, not exhaustive; it is intended to make the controls legible to a board member, a bank compliance officer, a foundation due-diligence team, or a partner reviewing the architecture for the first time.

Risk	Primary controls
Misuse of small funds	Small initial transfers; Format 5 entries linked to field effect; phased scaling earned through history.

Risk	Primary controls
Hidden steward burnout	Non-compensatory rule; Red Phase Protocol; soft friction on perma-green; protected withdrawal right.
Hidden surplus on the AnchorPoint side	Surplus defined jointly at onboarding; annual review; no punishment for late disclosure.
Donor or patron capture	No-ownership and no-control clauses in the AnchorPoint Agreement; restricted-pool classification; board oversight; legal separation of supporter, donor, and member statuses.
Cross-border compliance failure	Country annex per region; sanctions and KYC screening; documented recipient capacity before first transfer.
Data, image, or naming harm	Consent before naming; anonymisation in public materials; no precise locations or minor identifiers without explicit permission; ongoing revisable consent (Section 11.5).
Conflict of interest involving insiders	Declaration; recusal; documented rationale; board-level record; classification separate from AnchorPoint support.
Organisational burnout at the centre	80–150 hour realism documented in Section 13; phased onboarding; explicit 10,000-people burden test; refusal to scale beyond honest capacity.
Legal misclassification of flow	Section 12.1 three-economies separation; Section 12.2 classification at point of transaction; advisor review for novel cases.
Performance drift toward funder language	Editorial discipline; ledger first, market second; refusal to translate field reality into KPI form when the form distorts the work.

The register is reviewed at least annually as part of the association's governance rhythm, and revised whenever a new risk surfaces in operation that the existing controls do not adequately address.

12. Legal, governance, and financial grounding

The architecture in the previous sections is not informal money circulation. It is a legally grounded, documented, reversible flow architecture. This section sets out the legal and operational conditions under which Regenerative Reciprocity can operate in practice, across jurisdictions, actors, and AnchorPoints. The intention is not to over-formalise the field, but to protect it from collapse, capture, or illegibility. A bank, an auditor, or a foundation reviewing this section should find structure, not only intention.

12.1 Three legitimate economies, kept legally separate

A regenerative organisation that intends to operate honestly over time has to recognise that it is, in practice, holding more than one economy at once. Three are relevant here, and the architecture only works when they are kept legally and linguistically distinct.

The first is the **gift economy**. Donations, patronage, voluntary contribution, gratitude made operational. This is the layer where most of what supports a fragile AnchorPoint moves, and it is the layer where Regenerative Reciprocity itself sits when an abundant field circulates capacity back. Legally, gifts are non-refundable, confer no ownership, and impose no obligation. The work this report describes belongs primarily, but not exclusively, to this layer.

The second is the **support economy**. Memberships, structured patron relationships, recurring contributions to the association's general or earmarked work. This layer is where steady, modest, ongoing capacity is built — the platform, the documentation, the institutional infrastructure that makes the gift layer legible. A monthly membership contribution is not the same as a donation. It is a recurring relationship within the association, governed by the bylaws, with its own legal character.

The third is the **payment-and-licence economy**. Service fees, consulting fees, app or product revenue, licensing of methods, market-interfacing activities. If an AnchorPoint or the association ever generates income through delivering a service or licensing something, that income is commercial. It cannot be folded into the gift economy. It cannot be marketed as donation. It must be invoiced, taxed, and accounted for as commercial activity, even if the surplus eventually flows back into the regenerative field.

Each of these economies is legitimate. The error is not to have them; the error is to mix them. A donor who believes they are giving a gift should not later discover they have purchased a service. A member who believes they are participating should not later discover they have entered a commercial contract. An app or investor track, if Spiralweb ever pursues one, must be held in a separate legal vehicle from the association's non-profit logic — or, at minimum, in clearly demarcated accounting that no participant in either side can confuse with the other.

This separation is not bureaucratic caution. It is what allows the gift layer to remain a gift, the support layer to remain non-coercive, and any commercial activity to operate on legitimate market terms without distorting the field. It is also what makes the architecture bankable: a bank, an auditor, or a tax authority asking *what kind of money is this?* must always be able to receive a clean answer.

The rest of this section assumes this separation is in place. Every legal classification, country annex, AnchorPoint Agreement, and reciprocity calculation that follows depends on knowing, at every point, which of the three economies a given flow belongs to.

12.2 Legal classification of all financial flows

Every financial transaction in the system is explicitly classified before execution. No transaction relies on informal or ambiguous terminology such as "support," "flow," "reciprocity," or "contribution" as legal categories. Those are conceptual categories for orientation; they are not legal categories for accounting.

Every flow falls into one of the following permitted legal categories:

- **Donation (gift).** Voluntary, non-refundable, no obligation of return, no ownership or control. May be unrestricted or restricted to a specific purpose.
- **Grant.** Purpose-bound funding allocated for specific activities, requiring documentation and reporting, with no ownership rights conferred.
- **Membership contribution.** Periodic contribution from a member of the association in accordance with the bylaws.
- **Service payment.** Payment for a defined service rendered (e.g., translation, evaluation, consulting), with VAT treatment and contractual basis.
- **Salary or honorarium.** Payment to a person for work performed, with employment-law and tax-withholding implications.
- **Reimbursement.** Repayment of documented expenses incurred on behalf of the association.
- **Reciprocity contribution.** Voluntary, non-extractive transfer from a viable AnchorPoint to shared infrastructure or to another field. Legally classified as a donation, a service contribution, or a member contribution depending on context.

A transfer cannot be left ambiguous between these categories. Its legal classification is decided at the point of transaction and recorded in Format 5 alongside the operational entry.

12.3 Tax treatment

The association distinguishes clearly between funds received that are tax-exempt association income, funds that constitute commercial income subject to taxation, and disbursements to individuals that constitute salary or honorarium with personal tax obligations.

Donations conferring Danish tax deductibility require specific approval under Danish tax law (the conditions set by the Danish Tax Agency for approved organisations). Until and unless such approval is in place, the association does not communicate support as tax-deductible. Donations are received as ordinary association income and accounted accordingly.

Cross-border transfers are managed in coordination with the relevant local tax conditions in the receiving country. Where a recipient is a registered local entity, the transfer is treated according to

that entity's status; where the recipient is an individual receiving an honorarium for documented work, the transfer follows local employment and tax rules.

12.4 Banking, AML, and KYC

The association operates from a bank account in Denmark (Sparekassen Danmark) with full compliance with the Danish Money Laundering Act (hvidvaskloven). The bank's risk assessment will pay particular attention to international transfers, large or unknown donors, cash transactions, country and counterparty risk, documentation of purpose, and beneficial ownership. The association maintains an internal risk model that addresses each of these.

Operationally this means:

- **Identifiable sender and receiver.** Anonymous transfers above the bank's threshold are not accepted.
- **Traceable transactions.** All transfers move bank-to-bank where possible, with cash movements documented and explained.
- **Purpose clarity.** Every transfer above a defined threshold has a documented purpose recorded in advance.
- **No large anonymous flows.** Patron-level or institutional transfers require documentation that is acceptable to both Danish AML standards and the receiving country's banking system.

Sanctions screening. All major donors, recipients, local partners, and intermediate parties are screened against relevant EU and UN sanctions lists, particularly for international disbursements. The association maintains a process for sanctions due diligence consistent with EU guidance on identifying, preventing, and managing sanctions risk so that no transaction is prohibited under EU law.

12.5 The AnchorPoint Agreement

Every supported AnchorPoint operates under a written AnchorPoint Stewardship Agreement. The agreement is not heavy; a working draft is one to two pages. It contains:

- **Purpose.** What the AnchorPoint exists to do.
- **Financial frame.** The budget envelope, the stream allocation, and the cycle in which transfers are made.
- **Reporting requirement.** The five PG Ledger formats at a defined cadence (weekly light, monthly summary).
- **No ownership clause.** Spiralweb claims no ownership of the land, the practice, the data, or the local entity.
- **No control clause.** Spiralweb has no governance rights at the AnchorPoint level.
- **Withdrawal right.** Either party may withdraw with reasonable notice, without penalty, and the AnchorPoint contact may pause without losing relationship.

- **Anti-corruption clause.** Standard language prohibiting bribery, undue influence, and conflicts of interest.
- **Sanctions clause.** The recipient confirms they are not on relevant sanctions lists and will inform the association if circumstances change.
- **Receipt requirement.** Documentation of expenditures at the level appropriate to local conditions.
- **Data and consent.** What may be photographed, named, and shared publicly, with explicit local consent that remains revisable.
- **Dispute handling.** A simple process for resolving disagreement, beginning with conversation and escalating only if necessary.
- **Pause clause.** The AnchorPoint may enter a Red Phase or other pause without breaching the agreement.

The agreement is in English and the local working language where applicable, with both versions equally authoritative.

12.6 The country annex

For each region where the association funds AnchorPoints repeatedly, a country annex is prepared. The annex is a working document, not a treaty; it documents what the association needs to know to operate compliantly in that context.

The annex covers: the local legal form of the recipient (registered association, individual, cooperative, foundation, business), the banking channel and currency, applicable tax and registration risks, documentation requirements, sanctions screening status, currency and transfer cost responsibility, local advisor where necessary, applicable AML thresholds, beneficial ownership disclosures, and any country-specific reporting that the association must comply with.

Country annexes are prepared as fields enter the network and are updated when conditions change. They are not published; they are internal operational documents.

12.7 Recipient capacity

It is not enough that a field has need. It must be able to receive funds without being damaged by the act of receiving. Minimum recipient capacity includes a bank account or a legitimate alternative payment channel; the ability to issue receipts; a local contact for verification; a basic accounting routine, even if light; the capacity to maintain photographic and observational records; and the capacity for monthly status reporting in the PG Ledger formats.

Where recipient capacity is below this threshold, support cannot enter directly. In those cases, the architecture is to support capacity-building first — either by paying for a local intermediary that has the required capacity, or by providing the steward with the resources to develop capacity before substantive transfers begin.

12.8 Currency, transfer cost, and local cash needs

Cross-border transfers carry currency-conversion fees, banking fees, and timing risk. The architecture addresses this explicitly: which side bears which costs is defined in the AnchorPoint Agreement, with the default that the association bears the conversion and transfer fees as a Stream C cost. Where local cash needs require it (markets, informal labour, transport), the steward draws cash against documented expenditures rather than receiving a cash payment to discretion.

12.9 Conflict of interest and corruption

The architecture cannot prevent conflict of interest, but it can make it visible. Field-level rules apply to family payments, purchases from steward-owned businesses, payments to local power-holders, gifts, travel, consulting fees, and approval thresholds. Where a conflict of interest exists, it is declared in Format 5 entry. The principle is not avoidance — in small communities, some overlap is unavoidable — but transparency and proportionality.

12.10 Documentation without colonial surveillance

PG Ledger documents reality, but it must not reduce local people to objects of surveillance. The architecture applies data minimisation (collect only what is operationally necessary), explicit consent for photographs and named identification, the option of anonymisation where local stewards prefer it, and the local right to refuse documentation without losing support. The principle in Section 11.5 — documentation must not become exposure — applies fully here.

12.11 Humanitarian versus development distinction

The architecture is regenerative stewardship and commons infrastructure. It is not humanitarian aid in the formal sense, except in cases where an AnchorPoint enters acute crisis. When that happens — climate event, conflict displacement, severe illness — the funding logic adjusts to the emergency profile, and the country annex addresses the relevant humanitarian compliance.

12.12 The relationship to profit and commercial activity

Where an AnchorPoint generates commercial income (food sales, learning-site fees, ecotourism, carbon-credit revenue), the legal and tax architecture changes. Reciprocity contributions in that case are clearly classified — typically as voluntary donations from the local entity, structured to avoid being interpreted as profit participation by the association. The point is to keep the association's non-profit status legally clean while allowing commercial income to support reciprocity flow.

12.13 Internal pool, not yet a fund

In its initial form, Regenerative Reciprocity operates as an internal restricted pool within the association — not as a separately constituted fund or trust. The accounting separation is real (Stream A, Stream B, Stream C, and reciprocity flow are separately reported), but the legal entity is the association itself.

A formal fund structure or bioregional commons trust is a possible later evolution, but not a starting point. It would only be appropriate after operational proof at scale, after governance has matured across multiple AnchorPoints and bioregions, and after legal and tax conditions have been resolved in each relevant jurisdiction. The architecture is designed to allow this evolution, not to require it.

12.14 The operational rule

The cumulative effect of this section is captured in one rule:

> **Regenerative Reciprocity is not informal money circulation. It is a legally grounded, documented, reversible flow architecture.**

The system does not permit informal cross-border circulation of funds. It begins with bounded agreements, small transfers, tested documentation, and clear separation between donations, grants, services, salaries, and reciprocity contributions. Every flow is legally legible, documented, risk-assessed, and reversible. This is what gives banks, foundations, auditors, and partners a clear basis for review, acceptance, correction, or refusal — pending advisor review of the specific arrangements in each jurisdiction.

---

13. Organisational realism

The architecture in this report only works if it is carried by people. This section is honest about what that requires. The estimates given are working figures based on operational analysis; they will need to be revised against lived experience.

13.1 The five core roles

A Spiralweb operating with five active AnchorPoints requires five core roles. These need not be five different people — they may be combined across two to four people, or distributed across more — but the functions must all exist.

Field Coordinator (AnchorPoints). Holds relationship with local stewards, manages onboarding of new AnchorPoints, maintains monthly contact, reads what is actually happening, and signals when intervention is needed. Estimated time: 1–2 hours per AnchorPoint per month, plus onboarding time for new fields.

Ledger and Documentation Lead. Maintains the PG Ledger entries across all five formats, ensures data quality, produces simple monthly summaries (not dashboards), and holds the institutional record. Estimated time: 2–4 hours per AnchorPoint per month in the early years.

Finance and Compliance. Manages disbursements, receipts, classification of every flow, banking dialogue, and AML-light practice. Estimated time: 1–2 hours per transaction, with a baseline of 10–20 hours per month.

Governance and Agreements. Drafts and maintains AnchorPoint Agreements, country annexes, governance documentation, and conflict resolution. Estimated time: high during set-up (20–40 hours per AnchorPoint initially), lower in continuation.

Narrative and Transparency. Writes what is happening in the network, makes it visible to members, donors, and the public, in a register that is honest rather than promotional. Estimated time: 10–30 hours per month, depending on scope.

13.2 The work-rate

A baseline calculation: with five active AnchorPoints, the total monthly load is approximately 80–150 hours. This is two to three full-time equivalents, or four to five part-time roles. The figure is honest and should not be talked down. An association running this architecture with one or two people will burn out within a year.

The implication is that the association needs a clear path to a working team. In Phase 1 (initial deployment), this may be smaller than the full five-role structure, with the Field Coordinator and Ledger Lead carrying combined functions. In Phase 2 (5–10 active AnchorPoints), the full five-role structure becomes necessary. In Phase 3 (more than 10 AnchorPoints, bioregional flows beginning), additional roles emerge: bioregional coordinators, country-level liaisons, and dedicated reciprocity assessment.

13.3 Onboarding work

Adding a new AnchorPoint requires 12–20 hours of work on the Spiralweb side: first contact, clarifying conversation, assessment, agreement drafting, budget framing, ledger setup. This is concentrated in the first four to six weeks of the relationship. The implication is that the association cannot onboard more than two to three AnchorPoints per quarter without compromising the existing fields.

13.4 Monthly drift work

Per AnchorPoint, in stable operation: 3–5 hours per month of total Spiralweb time, broken into reading and understanding the field's input (1 hour), Ledger entry (1–2 hours), dialogue (0.5–1 hour), and financial work (0.5–1 hour). Quarterly review adds another 2–4 hours per AnchorPoint, focused on the Format 1 reading, budget reality, and steward condition.

13.5 Disbursement work

Each transfer takes 1–2 hours when the workflow is established: purpose definition, amount approval, classification, transfer, registration. The first transfers in a new country annex may take longer (4–8 hours) as the banking pathway is established.

13.6 What this means honestly

The architecture is not a fund. It is not a grant programme. It is a working organisation with field operations. The implication is that someone takes responsibility for the unglamorous work — follow-up, numbers, the difficult conversations, the structural decisions. The relational magic of AnchorPoints is what attracts; the operational discipline is what keeps it alive.

A useful test: **can we do this twelve times in succession without burning out?** If the answer at any scale is no, the design at that scale is too heavy. The association adjusts down rather than asking stewards to absorb the difference.

13.7 What happens at higher scale

The architecture is designed to scale, but not by becoming heavier at the centre. Beyond fifteen to twenty AnchorPoints, the pattern shifts: bioregional coordination emerges, peer-to-peer support across mature AnchorPoints carries more of the load, and Spiralweb's role moves from direct AnchorPoint coordination toward holding the shared infrastructure (PG Ledger, the formats, the institutional layer, the governance kernel). SRIP describes this explicitly: if 10,000 people begin practice, the centre must not become heavier; otherwise the design is wrong.

This is a constraint the association must hold against itself. Growth that requires the centre to absorb proportionally more work is the wrong kind of growth.

13.8 Insider payments and conflict of interest

Because this report describes financial flows alongside steward viability, founder-and-association capacity, and ongoing board responsibility, the boundary between AnchorPoint support and payments to the association's own people requires explicit treatment. The principle is straightforward: where a payment concerns a board member, founder, director, close collaborator, or related party of any of the above, the association applies a standard conflict-of-interest procedure. The relationship is declared. The party concerned recuses themselves from the decision. The rationale for the payment is documented. The decision is recorded at board level. Payments to insiders are classified separately from AnchorPoint support — typically as salary, honorarium, or service payment under Section 12.2 — and they never appear inside an AnchorPoint's field budget.

This is a governance safeguard, not an expression of suspicion. Insider payments may be entirely legitimate (a founder's salary, a director's honorarium, a service payment for translation or evaluation), but they must be handled through the procedure that makes them legible to the board, the auditor, and any future patron or institutional partner reviewing the architecture. The integrity of AnchorPoint-directed flows depends on the visible separation of the two categories.

14. Planetary context: why Regenerative Reciprocity is needed at scale

The architecture in the previous sections is operationally specific. This section places it in its planetary context. Regenerative Reciprocity is not a funding mechanism in search of projects. It is one response, among others, to a planetary condition. Without this context, the technical architecture floats free of why it matters.

14.1 Wealth concentration and time poverty

Two realities now exist side by side. On one side, an extremely small global wealth class holds an unprecedented concentration of capital. Recent reporting based on wealth-sector analysis places the global billionaire count above three thousand individuals, with projections toward nearly four thousand within five years. At the broader millionaire level, global financial-asset reporting continues to show large and growing concentrations, with substantial portions of global financial wealth held by a small fraction of the population.

On the other side, billions live without long-term security. The World Bank now defines extreme poverty as living on less than approximately three US dollars per day, and reports that hundreds of millions remain below that threshold. Many more live above it but remain structurally vulnerable to food-price inflation, illness, climate shocks, debt cycles, job disruption, and the loss of informal income.

This is not only an inequality problem. It is a **time-horizon problem**. A person living from day to day cannot easily plant a forest. A family without savings cannot easily wait five years for a food forest to root. A smallholder on degraded land cannot easily take ecological risks when the next harvest is needed for survival. Regenerative work requires time. Poverty removes time. The architecture in this report exists, in part, to give time back — to make it possible for people on land to enter regenerative practice without bearing the entire risk of the transition themselves.

14.2 The smallholder trap

A large part of the planetary crisis is carried by people who are not inactive but overactive under bad conditions. Smallholders, informal workers, land-based families, peri-urban growers, teachers, builders, repair workers, and local stewards often work continuously, yet remain unable to enter a positive spiral. The problem is not lack of will. The problem is the absence of surplus.

Without surplus, a farmer cannot easily shift to agroforestry, restore soil, plant trees with delayed yield, protect seed diversity, pause extractive cultivation, invest in water retention, participate in documentation, join a cooperative structure, or take part in long-term governance. Each of these requires resources that survival agriculture cannot generate.

Regenerative Reciprocity is therefore designed as more than support. It is designed to create the conditions under which people can move from survival work into stewardship work — from carrying the unfunded cost of ecological collapse to being supported in carrying ecological repair. The

architecture's purpose is not to fund projects; it is to fund the time and stability that make stewardship possible.

14.3 Food sovereignty and the return of local capacity

Food sovereignty is not only about calories. It is about agency. It means that people and communities can shape their own food systems in ways that are ecologically, culturally, nutritionally, and economically viable. In the Spiralweb context, food sovereignty includes heirloom seeds, local seed banks, crop diversity, agroforestry, school gardens, food forests, local processing, intergenerational knowledge, access to land, local water systems, and community-based resilience.

This is directly connected to the architecture. A field that receives support should not become dependent on continuous external supply. It should gradually increase local capacity, local resilience, and local abundance. The reciprocity rule reinforces this: support enters until viability is real, and then circulates outward rather than continuing to flow inward.

The purpose is not simply to fund food production. The purpose is to restore the conditions under which communities can feed themselves with dignity.

14.4 Biodiversity, seed banks, and species protection

The biodiversity crisis is not an abstract background condition. The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services has estimated that around one million animal and plant species are threatened with extinction, many within decades, unless drivers of biodiversity loss are reduced.

For Spiralweb, this means that regenerative finance must eventually become **habitat finance**. Support must not only ask what human project is being funded; it must also ask what habitat becomes possible, which species may return, which seeds are protected, which ecological relationships are restored.

This reframes the economic question. A restored field is not only a productive unit. It is a living interface where birds return, insects return, water behaviour changes, soil organisms recover, seeds move, local microclimates shift, and human attention deepens. This is why the 10 m^2 unit matters: it makes planetary restoration observable at human scale. A single 10 m^2 unit cannot save the planet, but it can become a pixel of regeneration. When many such pixels become visible through PG Ledger, the planetary field becomes readable.

14.5 Water, forests, and bioregional repair

Water is not only a resource. It is a pattern. The loss of forests, soils, wetlands, and mountain vegetation changes how water moves through a bioregion. The United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification has reported expanding drylands and the need for substantial investment in land restoration and drought resilience.

Restoring forests and tree-based systems can support water regulation, erosion control, habitat, carbon storage, and microclimate stability — but it must be done with hydrological intelligence. The Food and Agriculture Organization's forest-water guidance cautions explicitly against simplistic assumptions that "more trees always means more water"; the relationship depends on context, species, soils, climate, and landscape position.

This matters for the architecture in this report. The aim is not ideological tree planting. The aim is locally intelligent restoration: reforest where forests belong; protect mountain slopes where vegetation anchors water; restore riparian buffers; rebuild soil sponge capacity; support agroforestry where food and canopy can coexist; avoid water-intensive mistakes in drylands; follow local ecological knowledge alongside scientific assessment. In some places, the right direction may be native forest restoration; in others, syntropic agroforestry; in others, wetland repair, seed banking, grazing transition, or soil cover may be the immediate priority. The field must be allowed to reveal what it can become.

14.6 Regeneration is not one land use

A food forest is not a fixed product. It is a living succession. In the first years it is fragile. After several years it begins to root. Over time it may become something not fully predictable at the beginning. Some fields may become diversified food forests; some may become shaded cacao or coffee systems; some may become seed orchards; some may become mixed habitat and food systems; some may move toward semi-wild forest; some may remain intensively managed because local food needs require it.

The same is true socially. An AnchorPoint may begin with one person and land. It may later become a Circle of 13. It may become a school network. It may become a village commons. It may become a regional learning node. It may remain small and precise.

Regenerative Reciprocity must therefore avoid forcing a single outcome. The architecture supports development without overdetermining it. Reciprocity bands are calibrated to what each field can actually carry, not to what an external standard expects.

14.7 War, resource vulnerability, and the return of basic systems

Recent global food-crisis reporting shows that conflict, drought, and aid shortfalls continue to drive severe food insecurity; the 2026 Global Report on Food Crises documents that 266 million people across 47 countries experienced severe food insecurity in 2025.

The geopolitical lesson is clear: centralised life-support systems are vulnerable. When water systems fail, when fertiliser access is disrupted, when desalination plants are damaged, when food imports are blocked, when fuel prices shift, or when housing becomes unsafe, communities discover how dependent they are on distant systems they do not control.

Regeneration is therefore not lifestyle. It is **resilience infrastructure**. This includes local food production, seed sovereignty, water retention, soil repair, safe shelter, decentralised energy, community health resilience, local repair capacity, ecological buffers, and regional cooperation.

Regenerative Reciprocity must be able to support not only beautiful landscapes but basic life-support capacity.

14.8 Cleaning, repair, and the moral work of restoration

Regeneration is not only planting. It is also cleaning. Many landscapes are damaged by heavy metals, polluted water, plastic waste, chemical residues, degraded soils, industrial runoff, abandoned infrastructure, extractive land use, deforestation, overgrazing, and erosion.

Restoration therefore includes unglamorous work: removing waste, testing soils, identifying contamination, rebuilding drainage, repairing water paths, fencing sensitive areas, composting, mulching, protecting young trees, maintaining tools, documenting failures. This matters because regenerative culture can become too symbolic if it does not include repair labour. Regenerative Reciprocity must therefore fund both visible transformation and invisible maintenance — the planted tree and the cleared waste site, the celebrated harvest and the documented failure.

14.9 The market interface: from survival land to ledgered abundance

Spiralweb does not reject markets as such. It rejects extractive market logic as the primary organiser of life. The long-term question is whether existing markets can be influenced, redirected, and partially re-patterned through higher-quality evidence, better governance, and non-extractive financial architecture.

This is especially relevant in relation to high-quality carbon credits, biodiversity credits, water-restoration finance, regenerative supply chains, smallholder aggregation, local food economies, and stewardship-based compensation. The danger is real: carbon markets can simplify living systems into tradable units and invite new forms of capture. The opportunity is also real: if smallholders and local stewards can document ecological improvement over time through PG Ledger, they may eventually access forms of value recognition that were previously unavailable.

The sequence must therefore be unambiguous: **ledger first, market second.** Not market demand first, then field distortion. PG Ledger gives Spiralweb a way to insist that any market interface must remain grounded in land reality, steward viability, group governance, financial transparency, long-term evidence, and the absence of false green. The market interface is a future development of this architecture; it is not its starting point. A separate paper will address it specifically.

14.10 Institutional capital, supply-chain accountability, and conscious co-created food systems

Institutional capital should not be excluded from Regenerative Reciprocity. The question is not whether capital may enter, but under what grammar it enters, what it is allowed to see, what it is allowed to claim, and whether the field remains able to refuse distortion. The architecture in this report is not anti-capital. It is anti-capture. It does not reject carbon finance, supply-chain finance, corporate food-system partnerships, or institutional investment as such. It rejects any arrangement in which capital becomes the first grammar of the field.

This distinction matters because institutional capital is already moving toward land, food, carbon, biodiversity, and nature-based systems. Carbon pricing now covers approximately 28% of global emissions, and carbon-pricing instruments mobilised more than USD 100 billion for public budgets in 2024 (World Bank, 2025). At the same time, carbon-credit supply continued to outstrip demand, with the global pool of unretired credits approaching one billion tonnes in 2024. The lesson is not that carbon markets are irrelevant. The lesson is that scale, liquidity, and climate language do not by themselves guarantee field integrity.

For smallholder agriculture, the risk is sharper. Recent climate-finance analysis identifies unreliable corporate demand, high upfront costs, and asymmetric market incentives as core barriers to making voluntary carbon markets work in agrifood systems (Climate Policy Initiative, 2026). These barriers are precisely the conditions under which local stewards can become the cheapest layer in a high-value claim architecture: they carry practice change, documentation burden, yield risk, tenure uncertainty, and delayed benefit, while others capture methodology, aggregation, verification, trading, branding, and reputational value.

Regenerative Reciprocity therefore proposes a different sequence. Institutional capital may be designed in from the beginning, but carbon credits should not be the beginning. Early capital should first support field integrity: land relationship, steward viability, soil and water work, food sovereignty, local seed systems, baseline observation, PG Ledger practice, consent, governance, and benefit-sharing. Carbon-credit readiness may then be explored later, but only where the field has become strong enough to hold it. Credits may become a later instrument. They are not the first grammar of the field.

This is not a rejection of institutional capital. It is a sequencing discipline. A five-year programme can be designed so that Years 0–2 are dedicated to field integrity, local practice, evidence, and governance; Years 2–3 introduce carbon-readiness assessment, only where appropriate; Years 3–5 may test selective MRV, insetting, contribution finance, or pre-issuance pathways; and only after sufficient field stability should credit issuance be considered. Some fields may become credit-suitable. Others may remain carbon-relevant but not credit-suitable. This distinction is essential. A living field can sequester carbon, restore biodiversity, retain water, strengthen food systems, and build community resilience without needing to become a carbon-credit project.

The same discipline is needed in food supply chains. Much of the global food economy still operates through procurement systems that ask for volume, price, consistency, certification, and delivery, while the conditions that make food possible remain external to the transaction. Buyers may order large quantities through intermediaries with little or no contact with the local practice that produced the food, the soil conditions that were affected, the water systems that were stressed, the biodiversity that was lost or restored, or the human carrying capacity required to deliver the order. The visible value chain records purchase, transport, processing, retail, and margin. The invisible commons absorbs erosion, water depletion, seed loss, chemical exposure, unpaid care, land pressure, local food insecurity, and steward exhaustion.

This is the deeper supply-chain problem: many harms are not absent from the system; they are merely displaced from the balance sheet into the commons. They become externalities because no actor in the formal value chain is required to hold the full life cost of what the chain demands.

FAO's work on the hidden costs of agrifood systems confirms that the market price of food does not reflect the full environmental, social, and health costs generated by current food systems. The 2024 State of Food and Agriculture report quantifies hidden costs across 156 countries at approximately USD 12 trillion annually — around ten percent of global GDP — covering health impacts, environmental degradation, and social costs (FAO, 2024). This is directly relevant to Spiralweb's architecture: the problem is not only that food is underpriced. The problem is that the price is separated from the field conditions, human conditions, and commons conditions that make food possible.

European regulation is also moving, however imperfectly, in this direction. The EU Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive entered into force in July 2024 and requires in-scope companies to identify and address adverse human-rights and environmental impacts across their operations and global value chains (European Parliament and Council, 2024). This does not solve the supply-chain problem, and its scope remains limited and politically contested. But it confirms the direction of travel: companies can no longer assume that harms outside the purchasing contract are outside responsibility.

For land-intensive sectors, science-based target frameworks are also becoming more explicit. SBTi's Forest, Land and Agriculture (FLAG) guidance requires companies in food production, food and beverage processing, food retail, and other land-intensive sectors to set FLAG targets where relevant, including near-term and long-term emissions reduction targets and no-deforestation commitments (SBTi, 2026). Again, this is not enough by itself. But it means that food companies, retailers, processors, and institutional buyers increasingly need credible ways to see and act on land-sector impacts beyond conventional procurement.

This is where **Conscious Co-created Food Systems** becomes relevant. A conscious food system is not only a supply chain with better claims. It is a co-created field relation in which food, soil, water, biodiversity, labour, culture, learning, and governance remain visible together. It asks not only what food is purchased, but what kind of field the purchase strengthens. It asks whether procurement supports local capacity or extracts from it; whether it strengthens seed sovereignty or narrows genetic diversity; whether it improves water retention or intensifies water stress; whether it supports steward viability or depends on unpaid overload; whether it builds local food resilience or channels value outward while leaving the commons depleted.

In this sense, PG Ledger can function as a supply-chain truth surface. It does not replace formal certification, accounting, procurement contracts, due diligence, or food-safety systems. It adds a missing field-legibility layer. It allows carbon, biodiversity, soil, water, food, and human carrying capacity to enter one evidentiary frame without collapsing into one metric. This is especially important where institutional buyers, food companies, foundations, municipalities, schools, or public procurement systems want to support regenerative food systems without turning them into volume-driven commodity pipelines.

> **The aim is not to make local stewards serve supply chains. The aim is to make supply chains answerable to stewardship.**

A conscious co-created food-system partnership should therefore follow several principles. *First*, procurement should not begin with volume. It should begin with field reading. *Second*, the buyer should not treat the local actor as a supplier only, but as a steward whose ecological and human carrying capacity matters. *Third*, price should not be the only economic signal; support may need to include transition finance, documentation support, local processing, seed systems, water infrastructure, and governance capacity. *Fourth*, carbon, biodiversity, water, and social claims should never be made faster than the field can document them. *Fifth*, the field must retain the right to say no to orders, claims, visibility, or credit pathways that would distort its work.

This creates a different capital interface. Institutional capital can enter as **stewardship capital**, not extractive capital: capital deployed to give time back, reduce transition risk, strengthen local practice, and build evidence before claims. It may take the form of grants, concessional capital, first-loss support, buyer-funded transition programmes, contribution finance, insetting, public procurement, or later high-integrity credit pathways. But in each case the sequencing remains the same: **field first, ledger second, market third**.

The mature position is therefore neither anti-market nor market-led. Spiralweb does not reject carbon finance or institutional capital. It rejects carbon-first and procurement-first field design. Capital may enter from the beginning, but it must enter as support for field integrity, not as a demand for premature claims, volumes, or tradable units.

If the architecture succeeds, it may eventually allow many smallholders and local stewards to interface with larger capital systems without being absorbed by them. But this will only be credible if the early architecture protects the field from the very distortions that later scale would otherwise amplify. The issue is not whether capital managers are bad actors, or whether local actors are fragile. The issue is that poorly sequenced incentives can distort even good actors. Regenerative Reciprocity exists to make that sequence visible, governable, and correctable.

14.11 The role of wealth: from ownership to stewardship

The presence of enormous private wealth is one of the defining facts of the present historical moment. The question is not only whether wealthy individuals should give more. The deeper question is: **can wealth move without controlling what it touches?**

Regenerative Reciprocity offers a structure in which philanthropic capital can enter without becoming sovereign. A patron may support an AnchorPoint, a bioregional flow, PG Ledger infrastructure, seed banks, restoration cycles, steward viability, learning nodes, or Red Phase repair capacity. But support does not buy ownership, governance control, branding dominance, extraction rights, profit participation, or narrative control.

This is a cultural shift more than a technical one. **Wealth is invited to become compost, not command.** Capital that enters this architecture nourishes the field and is then absorbed into it; the donor does not retain a structural claim on what the field becomes.

The shift this implies on the patron's side is also worth naming. The system most patrons have been trained in says: *pay, receive influence*. The system Spiralweb proposes says: *you can carry, without control*.

This is unusual enough that it requires explicit framing. A patron is not asked to fund a project they will own. They are not asked to back a brand they will benefit from. They are asked to stand in relation to a place and a people, and to make it possible for that relation to continue without being captured by the act of supporting it. The point is not that the patron gives. The point is that the patron recognises themselves as a participant in something already underway, and chooses to help carry it. The financial form follows. It does not lead.

This recognition logic also describes how the architecture works at every other layer of support — member, field-level supporter, institutional partner. The architecture is not designed to convince anyone to give. It is designed to make it possible for those who already see the work to participate in carrying it, in a form that does not corrupt the relation.

14.12 Penguin Economics and the redistribution of burden

Penguin Economics gives this report its moral-economic logic. The image is of an emperor penguin colony in winter: the birds rotate continuously, those at the cold edge moving inward as those at the warmer centre move outward, so that no individual is forced to bear the full cost of exposure for too long. The colony survives because warmth circulates.

The principle, transposed to economic flow: in an exposed system, capacity must move toward the cold edge. Strong fields carry more. Fragile fields are protected. Burdens are redistributed. Surplus does not stop at the first successful node. Support follows vulnerability without rewarding dysfunction. Reciprocity begins only when abundance is real.

This is not charity. It is ecological economics. A living system survives because energy moves. A commons survives because obligation is distributed. A field matures because support and responsibility change over time. Regenerative Reciprocity is the operational form of Penguin Economics in the financial domain: it ensures that flow does not terminate at the first successful node, and that fragile nodes are carried by the capacity of stronger ones.

14.13 Alignment with the Rio Conventions: CBD, UNCCD, and UNFCCC

Regenerative Reciprocity does not present itself as an instrument of the international environmental conventions. It is a field-level economic and governance architecture designed for stewardship at the scale of real people in real places. But its operational reach overlaps significantly with the aims of the three Rio Conventions, and that overlap is worth naming clearly so that readers from biodiversity, land restoration, climate, foundation, municipal, and international policy contexts can locate the architecture within terms they already work with.

The **Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)** asks how biodiversity, habitats, species, ecosystem integrity, and genetic diversity can be protected and restored. Regenerative Reciprocity supports CBD aims by making it possible to carry documented AnchorPoints where habitat, succession, local species knowledge, pollinators, wetland life, food forests, seed networks, and biodiversity indicators can be observed and supported over time. Format 2 (Observation Sheet) registers ecological reality across the eight observation categories — including biodiversity presence and succession signals — in a form that can be aggregated across the network without flattening local knowledge. Stream A

funding can support seed banks, native nurseries, habitat restoration, and the slow ecological repair that biodiversity recovery actually requires. The fields named in Section 1.4 — Kitgum's intergenerational syntropic work, Sous Valley's 80-hectare food forest transition, Had Soualem's permaculture and water retention, Xochimilco's chinampa and axolotl stewardship — are concrete biodiversity and habitat fields that exist in the form CBD outcomes ultimately depend on.

The **United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)** asks how land degradation, drought, desertification, soil depletion, water stress, and dryland fragility can be addressed. The connection here is particularly direct. The opening scene of this report — the farmer in the Sous Valley who decides not to bore deeper for water and is trying something else — is precisely the human reality that UNCCD's land degradation neutrality framework must support if it is to mean anything on the ground. Regenerative Reciprocity contributes to UNCCD aims by making land and water restoration financially supportable without extracting from stewards, without reducing restoration to hectare-counting, and without demanding standardised outcomes from contexts that vary radically across drylands. The principle that anchors this report — that *land degradation cannot be solved through human depletion* — is the operational complement to UNCCD's institutional framework. If stewards cannot remain whole long enough for the soil to respond, no convention can succeed.

The **United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)** asks how climate mitigation, adaptation, resilience, and climate finance can be organised. Regenerative Reciprocity contributes to UNFCCC aims primarily through adaptation and resilience: shaded cropping systems, water retention, food security, wetland recovery, school-based climate learning, soil sponge capacity, and the nature-based local systems that allow communities to remain viable as conditions change. Mitigation through carbon sequestration may emerge from this work over time, but the architecture refuses to lead with it. Carbon claims arrive credibly only after years of honest documentation, and only when they do not displace biodiversity, water, food sovereignty, or steward viability. The "ledger first, market second" sequence (Section 14.9), and the institutional-capital sequencing discipline (Section 14.10), together describe the operational form of this position with respect to climate finance.

Regenerative Reciprocity does not replace the Rio Conventions. It offers a field-level economic and governance architecture through which their overlapping aims can be carried by real people in real places. What the conventions can name as planetary obligations, this architecture is designed to make practical, local, bankable, and non-extractive at the scale where life actually changes.

One caution belongs with this alignment. The architecture must not allow climate finance, biodiversity markets, or convention-aligned funding to reduce fields to single market-readable indicators — carbon tonnes, biodiversity credits, hectare counts, donor metrics. PG Ledger exists precisely to keep the living field legible across multiple dimensions at once. A field reduced to its carbon performance is no longer a field; it is an instrument. The Rio Conventions' broader framing — biodiversity, land restoration, climate as interrelated planetary challenges — supports rather than contradicts this multi-dimensional reading. Where partners or funding mechanisms drift toward single-indicator simplification, the architecture's response is the same as elsewhere in this report: ledger first, dimension before metric, field before instrument.

14.14 Why this report exists

This report exists because the regenerative movement needs more than inspiration. It needs legal forms, financial flows, field protocols, trust infrastructure, human care, evidence systems, repair mechanisms, anti-capture rules, and long-term time. Regenerative Reciprocity is Spiralweb's attempt to hold these together.

It asks: Can capital enter without capturing? Can vulnerable fields receive without becoming dependent? Can abundance emerge without becoming private extraction? Can smallholders enter positive spirals? Can biodiversity become visible as value without being reduced to commodity? Can local groups become strong enough to govern their own transitions? Can the existing economy be interfaced with without being obeyed?

These questions are not rhetorical. The architecture in the previous sections is the working answer. Whether it works will be determined by practice, not by argument.

---

15. Invitation to the regenerative field

The architecture in this report is offered to a wider regenerative field that already exists. This section addresses that field directly. Regenerative Reciprocity is not Spiralweb's exclusive property; it is a working proposal that other actors are invited to test, adapt, criticise, and improve.

15.1 To other regenerative organisations

The five PG Ledger formats, the three-stream separation, the Red Phase Protocol, the reciprocity bands, and the operational guardrails are all openly available under CC BY 4.0. They can be adopted, adapted, translated, and applied without permission and without reporting back. The architecture is open architecture.

What Spiralweb requests, where the work is recognisable, is acknowledgement of source — not authority over use. An organisation that adopts Format 5 in a different sector, or that uses the three-stream separation in a different governance frame, is not bound to share results with the association. The architecture is offered as a contribution to a wider commons of regenerative practice, not as a method controlled by its originators.

What the architecture asks of those who adopt it is fidelity to its underlying principles: practice is open and obligation is not; ecological ambition does not justify human depletion; documentation must not become exposure; reciprocity follows surplus and never need; growth cannot be commanded by funding. These are not Spiralweb's exclusive principles either. They are the principles the architecture is designed to operationalise. Where they are honoured, the architecture is being used well — regardless of whose name appears on the form.

15.2 To stewards considering whether to enter the network

A steward considering whether to enter formal relationship with Spiralweb should approach the decision with care. The four pathways set out in SRIP — self-start steward, learning contact, verified relationship, supported node — are not stages of advancement; they are different ways of being in the same wider field. Most people who encounter the architecture should stay at the self-start level. Working at 10 m^2 with the formats and the protocols, without entering institutional relationship with the association, is a complete and successful use of the work.

Entry into the supported-node layer should not be undertaken because the support is attractive. It should be undertaken only where the local field is real, the steward is willing to carry honest documentation across the five formats, and the relational form makes sense for both sides. The supported-node layer is a working relationship with operational obligations. It is also a relationship the steward may exit at any time, without penalty, by activating the unconditional withdrawal right.

The decision is reversible in both directions. A self-start steward who later wishes to enter formal relationship may do so when the conditions are present. A supported-node steward who later wishes to return to self-start practice may do so without losing the practice itself. The architecture is designed to make such transitions safe.

15.3 To patrons and supporters

To patrons and supporters who recognise the work and wish to contribute, the architecture offers several entry points across the levels set out in Section 8. The principles set out under "Invitation, not pitch" (Section 8.1) apply throughout: support is a relation, not a transaction; it does not buy ownership, control, or narrative direction; it can be paused or withdrawn without penalty.

What a patron or supporter receives in return is honest documentation, real relationship with a documented field, and the knowledge that the support has entered an architecture designed to refuse capture. They do not receive equity, governance influence, branding rights, or extraction privileges. Where these are sought, the relationship is not a fit, and the association will say so directly.

15.4 Professional Capacity Stewards

The architecture has so far described stewardship primarily through the AnchorPoint — a person or group rooted in a place. This describes most of the network, but not all of it. A regenerative field at planetary scale also depends on people whose contribution is not a place but a capacity: a method, a body of knowledge, a design discipline, a translation skill, a documentation craft, an institutional bridge. These actors do not always have land. They have practice, expertise, and presence that several places may need.

Spiralweb recognises three distinct kinds of steward, each with its own form of relationship to the network:

- **A Land Steward** carries a place. They are rooted in a specific AnchorPoint, in relationship with soil, water, weather, and community over time. The fields named in Section 1.4 are held

primarily by land stewards.

- **A Practice Steward** carries a practice. They are not necessarily anchored to one place but are deeply rooted in a particular discipline — agroforestry, syntropic agriculture, wetland restoration, seed-saving, regenerative pedagogy — that they bring to multiple contexts. Their continuity is the practice itself.
- **A Capacity Steward** carries a professional capacity that several AnchorPoints, the wider network, or the association itself may need at different times. Examples include biodiversity designers, landscape architects, agroforestry advisors, seed-bank practitioners, water designers, nature educators, syntropic agriculture trainers, citizen science facilitators, data stewards, AI and documentation support practitioners, legal and governance specialists, and institutional bridge-builders.

The distinction is operational, not hierarchical. A capacity steward is not above a land steward, and a land steward is not above a capacity steward. They carry different forms of relationship to the network, and the architecture must hold all three without forcing any of them into a category that does not fit.

The governance distinction is essential. **A professional capacity steward is not a beneficiary and not a free resource. They carry a capacity that the field may need. Spiralweb may collaborate with such actors when their work strengthens documented AnchorPoints, shared protocols, steward viability, biodiversity learning, or living systems governance. The relationship must remain clean: clear role, fair payment where work is requested, arm's-length governance where needed, and separate registration from direct field support.**

This distinction has practical consequences. Capacity stewards are not registered as recipients within an AnchorPoint's Format 5 budget; their work is registered separately, classified as a service payment, honorarium, or salary under the categories in Section 12.2. Their participation does not give them governance rights at AnchorPoints they advise. Where a capacity steward is also a board member, founder, or close collaborator of the association, the conflict-of-interest procedure described in Section 13.8 applies. Where a capacity steward delivers paid work for the association or for a specific field, the relationship is contractual and follows the standard service-payment classification.

This recognition matters in the European and international professional context, where the regenerative and biodiversity-restoration field is not always presented in land-based form. Some of the most important contributors to long-term field viability are practitioners and designers who carry methods, planting intelligence, governance capacity, or documentation craft. Without a clean place for them in the architecture, they would either be excluded from Spiralweb (which would weaken the network) or absorbed into AnchorPoint budgets in ways that distort field accounting (which would corrupt the architecture). The Capacity Steward category exists to prevent both.

15.5 To public actors: municipalities, regions, ministries

To public actors — municipalities, regional authorities, ministries, intergovernmental bodies — the architecture offers something different from a project to fund. It offers a documented operational

form that public bodies may engage with as collaborators, recipients of evidence, providers of land or coordination, and where appropriate as supporters of bioregional infrastructure. The Sophia Lumen Protocol and Reports 01–03 describe in more detail how public collaboration can be structured.

Public actors should not approach Regenerative Reciprocity as a way to deliver their own programmes through a new vehicle. The architecture is designed to receive public support, not to be captured by public agendas. A municipality that wishes to support an AnchorPoint within its territory enters as a partner, not as a commissioning authority. The non-capture clauses in Section 12 apply equally to public actors as to private patrons.

What public actors can receive in return is real documentation of regenerative practice within their jurisdiction, evidence relevant to climate, biodiversity, food, and resilience policy, and access to a network of comparable practice in other countries. They can also receive honest signals about what does not work, which is often more valuable than the success stories conventional reporting privileges.

15.6 The shared invitation

The shared invitation across all of these audiences is straightforward. The architecture is open. The principles are open. The work is open. What is not open is the right to capture, control, distort, or extract. Within those limits, the field is wide.

The closing line of SRIP applies to this report as well: *is this practice giving to life?* If the answer is yes, the work continues. If the answer becomes no, the work pauses, recalibrates, or stops. The architecture in this report is the form within which that question can be asked honestly across many people, places, and economic flows over time.

---

16. Limitations and unknowns

This report describes a working architecture, not a completed one. Several limitations and unknowns are worth naming directly.

16.1 The first cycle has not been completed

At the time of writing, no AnchorPoint has yet completed a full 90-day cycle under the architecture as described in Section 10. The simulations in Section 10.4 are calibrated against current Spiralweb fields but are simulations rather than recorded operational cycles. The figures in Section 8 are honest working figures, not figures derived from completed transactions. Revision toward v0.3 is expected once the first cycle has been lived. Readers should hold the architecture accordingly: as a serious working proposal, not as proven operational doctrine.

16.2 The reciprocity bands are unproven at scale

The 3–5% green and 5–10% deep green reciprocity bands are calibrated against the principle that reciprocity must be modest, real, and never extractive. They have not been tested over multiple years across multiple fields. It is possible that the bands will need to be lowered for some contexts, raised for others, or replaced with non-financial reciprocity forms in fields where calculable surplus emerges only over multi-decadal timeframes.

16.3 Cross-border banking remains a constraint

The architecture assumes that cross-border transfers can be made bank-to-bank, with documented purpose, identifiable parties, and reasonable transfer costs. In some contexts this is straightforward; in others — sanctioned countries, currency-controlled jurisdictions, regions with limited banking access — it is operationally difficult. The country-annex system (Section 12.6) addresses this, but each new context will reveal limitations the existing annexes cannot anticipate.

16.4 The cultural condition cannot be guaranteed

The Red Phase Protocol depends on a cultural condition that no protocol can produce: that stewards experience honesty as safer than performance. The association can work toward this condition — by publishing its own difficult phases, by refusing to reward perfect green, by telling stories about good Red Phases — but it cannot guarantee that a steward in a specific context will trust the architecture enough to use it. Some stewards will perform regardless; this is the system's hardest test, and it is one that may take years to address.

16.5 The architecture's relationship to the existing economy is unresolved

Section 14.9 argues for "ledger first, market second," but the relationship between Regenerative Reciprocity and existing market mechanisms — carbon credits, biodiversity finance, regenerative supply chains, ESG investment — is not fully worked out in this report. A separate paper will address it specifically. Until then, this report's working position is restraint: market interfaces are possible but not pursued ahead of operational maturity, and the architecture commits to refusing market integration that would distort field reality.

---

17. What comes next

The immediate next steps for the association are operational, not theoretical.

1. **Complete the first 90-day cycle.** Run the architecture in operation at one or two AnchorPoints, recording what works and what fails. Revise toward v0.3 on the basis of lived experience.
2. **Publish Format 5 as a downloadable working format.** Add it to papers.spiralweb.earth/formats alongside Formats 1–4. Provide examples drawn from initial

cycles.

3. **Prepare the country annexes.** Document operational conditions for Morocco, Uganda, Mexico, and Pakistan as the first AnchorPoint relationships move from preparatory to active phase.
4. **Establish board-level review of structural and behavioural guardrails.** The Internal Annex below sets out the working principles; these must be adopted, refined, and reviewed at intervals appropriate to operational scale.
5. **Draft and execute AnchorPoint Agreements.** Convert the architecture in Section 12.5 into working agreements at the live and forming AnchorPoints.
6. **Develop the operational team.** Address the five-role realism in Section 13. Without working capacity, the architecture cannot operate honestly.
7. **Open conversation with foundations and patron-level supporters.** Where the architecture is recognised, allow support to enter at scale appropriate to current capacity. Decline support that arrives at scale beyond what current capacity can carry without distortion.
8. **Begin the parallel paper on market interface.** Address explicitly what Section 14.9 leaves open.

---

18. Closing

The living field comes before the system.

The system is only good if it protects the field.

Money is necessary, and that is said clearly.

Money does not buy control.

The steward is not asked to subsidise the architecture's purity with their own life.

Romance without ledger becomes fog.

Ledger without romance becomes dead bureaucracy.

Together, they can become stewardship.

When abundance emerges, flow continues.

When fragility is present, fragility is protected.

If a field must perform green to be worthy of support, the architecture has already failed.

Regeneration is not primarily a project category.

It is a sustained posture of tending, observation, repair, and long-horizon responsibility.

Practice is open. Obligation is not.

Is this practice giving to life?

End of Report 06.

References and sources

Spiralweb sources.

Engberg, L. A. (2025). *Green Paper 12 — Penguin Economics: Collective Survival Through Rotation.* Spiralweb. papers.spiralweb.earth/papers/penguin-economics.html

Engberg, L. A. (2026). *Applied Protocol Report 01 — Sophia Lumen Protocol for Municipal AI Governance.* Spiralweb Stewardship Association.

Engberg, L. A. (2026). *Applied Protocol Report 02 — The Last Impulse: AI Governance and the Correction Loop.* Spiralweb Stewardship Association.

Engberg, L. A. (2026). *Applied Protocol Report 03 — Flow Architecture for Land, Stewards, and Planetary Commons.* Spiralweb Stewardship Association.

Engberg, L. A. (2026). *Applied Protocol Report 04 — Penguin Dashboard: Legibility as Governance.* Spiralweb Stewardship Association.

Engberg, L. A. (2026). *Applied Protocol Report 05 — SRIP: The Steward's Journey.* Spiralweb Stewardship Association.

Spiralweb Stewardship Association. (2026). *Constitutional Ground (Bylaws v1.0).* Roskilde, Denmark.

Spiralweb Stewardship Association. (2026). *Support, Funding, and Patron Pathways (kernel document).*

Spiralweb Stewardship Association. (2026). *PG Ledger Formats 1–4.* papers.spiralweb.earth/formats

Polycentric governance and the commons.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action.* Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, V., Tiebout, C. M., & Warren, R. (1961). The Organization of Government in Metropolitan Areas: A Theoretical Inquiry. *American Political Science Review*, 55(4), 831–842.

Planetary context.

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). www.cbd.int

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). *Forests and water guidance.* www.fao.org

FSIN and Global Network Against Food Crises (GNAFC). (2026). *Global Report on Food Crises 2026.* www.fsinplatform.org

Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). (2019). *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.* www.ipbes.net

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). www.unccd.int

United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021–2030. www.decadeonrestoration.org

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). unfccc.int

World Bank. *Poverty and Inequality Platform.* pip.worldbank.org

Institutional capital, supply chains, and food systems.

Climate Policy Initiative. (2026). *Can carbon finance work for smallholder agriculture?* www.climatepolicyinitiative.org

European Commission. (2024). *Corporate sustainability due diligence.* commission.europa.eu

European Parliament and Council. (2024). *Directive (EU) 2024/1760 on corporate sustainability due diligence.* Official Journal of the European Union. eur-lex.europa.eu

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2024). *The State of Food and Agriculture 2024: Hidden costs of agrifood systems.* Rome.

Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi). (2026). *Forest, Land and Agriculture (FLAG) Guidance.* sciencebasedtargets.org

World Bank. (2025). *State and Trends of Carbon Pricing 2025.* Washington, D.C.

Suggested citation

Engberg, L. A. (2026). *Regenerative Reciprocity: AnchorPoints, PG Ledger, and the Operational Flow of a Living Commons.* Applied Protocol Report 06, v0.2. Spiralweb Stewardship Association. Co-authored with Claude (Anthropic) and ChatGPT (OpenAI) as Sophia Lumen. CC BY 4.0. papers.spiralweb.earth/papers/report-06-regenerative-reciprocity.html

---

Editorial note

This report is published as version 0.2, dated May 2026. It supersedes the v0.1 working draft, which was not publicly released. Revision toward v0.3 is expected once the first 90-day operational cycles have been completed at active AnchorPoints.

The report exists in two forms. The **public version**, of which this is the canonical record, presents the architecture, the editorial frame, and the invitation without exposing sensitive field, partner, or compliance detail. The **internal working version**, used by the association's board and operational team, includes named contacts, country-annex implications, operational thresholds, and live budget assumptions that are not appropriate for public release. Where this distinction has been operationally relevant in the present text, the public register has been used by default.

The principle in Section 11.5 — *documentation must not become exposure* — applies to this report as a whole. Names of local contacts have been included only where consent has been given or where the relationship is already public. Photographs, school identities, precise locations, and personal circumstances have been generalised or omitted unless explicit and current permission was held. **Consent is not a one-time checkbox. It is an ongoing field condition**, and any reader who recognises themselves in this text and wishes to alter or withdraw the reference should contact the association; the architecture is built to honour such requests.

The Internal Annex that follows is appended for the working version of this report, used by the association's board and operational team. It is not part of the public architecture and should not be read as such. It is included in this canonical record because the architecture's integrity depends on the existence of internal guardrails that complement the public form, and because making them visible at this point in the document family supports honest review by future board members, advisors, and partners. Where this report is used in primarily public contexts — distribution to potential supporters, foundation conversations, public reading — the annex may be omitted from the printed or shared version without affecting the report's main argument.

This is an open document, published under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International. It may be quoted, adapted, translated, or built upon with attribution. Errors and omissions are the author's responsibility. Corrections and constructive criticism are welcomed at the addresses recorded in the association's published contact information.

INTERNAL · BOARD WORKING MATERIAL

Internal Annex — Board Guardrails for Activating Regenerative Reciprocity

This annex is for board and operational use. It is not part of the public architecture. It is included here because the architecture's integrity depends on the board being able to hold its own ground in moments where Regenerative Reciprocity is being activated, expanded,

conditioned by external offers, or pressured toward acceleration. The principles below should be read alongside the Constitutional Ground document, the Consolidated Institutional Document, and the Internal Steering Report, where the full board treatment is set out.

A1. Spiralweb can be born in conversation; the association acts through documented decisions

The work began, and continues, in long conversations. That is its strength. But the association is a legal entity, and its commitments — economic, legal, relational — exist only when they have been decided by the appropriate body, logged, stream-placed, capacity-assessed, and where relevant budgeted. A conversation is not yet a decision. Inspiration is not yet an obligation. Visibility is not yet access. Money is not yet capture, but it can become so quickly if these distinctions are not held.

A2. Clean yes, clean no, clean not yet

Three responses are legitimate at the board level. **A clean yes depends on the legitimacy of no. "Not yet" is not failure; it protects future consent.** A board that cannot say no will eventually find that its yeses do not mean very much either. A board that cannot say "not yet" will be forced to choose between commitments it cannot carry and refusals that close future possibility. The three responses are not gradations; they are different acts of governance, and each must remain available.

A3. Large or conditional donations are governance situations

A donation that arrives with conditions is not only an opportunity. It is a governance situation. The conditions may be benign — a patron's preference for one stream, a foundation's reporting requirements, a municipality's procurement rules. They may be problematic — branding, narrative control, naming rights, exclusivity, accelerated scaling. They may be ambiguous, requiring conversation to clarify. In every case, the conditions are part of the decision the board is being asked to make. Board members should be able to recognise when an offer carries governance implications, and treat those implications with the same care as the financial offer itself.

A4. Package A, B, and C as steering language

The association uses Package A, Package B, and Package C as internal steering categories — not only to organise budgets but to organise conversations about what the association can carry. Package A is what the association is doing now and can sustain. Package B is what becomes possible if a defined increment of capacity arrives. Package C is what would require a substantive change in scale, partnership, or institutional form. Using this language at the board level, when responding to external offers or internal proposals, prevents the conflation of "this would be wonderful" with "we can do this without distortion."

A5. Founder roles, compensation, licensing, and representation must be named and kept separate

The founder of an architecture like Spiralweb necessarily occupies several roles at once: intellectual originator, working director, board member, public representative, and sometimes recipient of association payments for specific work. These roles are not the same. Where they overlap operationally, the boundary must be drawn explicitly: which decisions belong to which role; which payments are to which legal category; which representations speak for the association and which speak for the founder personally. The IP license arrangement (the founder grants the association a usage license for the Spiralweb / Planetary Guardians methodology) is part of this structure and must remain visible.

A6. No permanent front penguin

The Penguin Economics image translates directly into governance: no individual should remain at the cold edge of the work indefinitely. Founder overload, board under-capacity, and steward extraction are governance risks of the same family. Where one person is consistently bearing the front exposure — public representation, fundraising conversations, operational coordination, narrative responsibility — the board's task is not to thank them; it is to redistribute. The architecture's integrity depends on rotation. A board that allows a permanent front penguin is silently financing its own collapse.

A7. Distinguish field and association, conversation and decision, openness and access, money and capture, visibility and exposure, opportunity and phase

These distinctions are operational, not philosophical. The field is wider than the association; the association holds selected flows responsibly but does not own the field. A conversation may inspire many possibilities; a decision commits the association to one. Openness to many actors does not mean access for all of them to internal materials. Money is welcome under specific conditions; capture is refused regardless of how much money is offered. Visibility serves the field; exposure damages it. An opportunity may be real and the phase may not yet be ready to carry it.

Each of these distinctions has been collapsed somewhere, by someone, in the regenerative movement. The board's task is to hold them at the moments where collapse is most tempting — typically when an attractive offer arrives, when a partner moves faster than expected, when an external deadline creates pressure, or when the founder's own enthusiasm runs ahead of organisational capacity.

A8. Reciprocity activation requires board visibility

When a field becomes a candidate for reciprocity activation under Section 9.3, the proposal arrives at the board, not only at the operational team. This is true whether the proposal originates with the AnchorPoint or with Spiralweb. The board's role is to confirm that the field is genuinely in stable green, that net regenerative surplus has been honestly calculated,

and that no hidden depletion is being masked by the surplus figure. The board does not micromanage the calculation; it confirms its plausibility and records the activation as a governance decision.

A9. Red Phase activation does not require board approval; Red Phase pattern does

A single Red Phase activation is an operational event handled by the AnchorPoint coordinator and recorded in PG Ledger. It does not require board approval, and asking for it would slow the protocol enough to break the cultural condition the protocol depends on. However, a pattern of repeated Red Phases at one AnchorPoint, or across multiple AnchorPoints, is a governance signal. The board should review such patterns and consider whether structural changes — to the AnchorPoint relationship, to the association's capacity, to the architecture itself — are required.

A10. The annex points outward

This annex is brief by design. The fuller treatment of board responsibility, conflict-of-interest procedure, founder-role separation, and decision-making protocol belongs in the Internal Ground Text and the Internal Steering Report. The principles above are the working minimum: the points the board returns to when activating Regenerative Reciprocity in operation. They are not the whole governance architecture. They are the part of it that intersects most directly with the financial flow this report describes.

Series III · Applied Protocol Report 06

Spiralweb Stewardship Association · Roskilde, Denmark · CVR pending · Constituted 22 March 2026

v0.2 · May 2026 · Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Green Papers index · PG Ledger formats · spiralweb.earth