

The Impact Diligence Canvas

Distinguish genuine regeneration from greenwashing and impact-washing — looking past stated intentions to structural design. Six gates drawn from the book's frameworks.

ENTERPRISE / FUND

DATE

ANALYST

1 Structural or Bolt-On?

CHS. 2–3

Is impact embedded in the business model, ownership, and governance — or added as a CSR program, marketing layer, or reporting exercise? This is the master gate: a bolt-on fails before the other five are asked.

BOLT-ON ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ EMBEDDED

2 Ownership Alignment

CH. 4

Does the ownership structure protect mission permanently — or can mission be overridden by shareholder pressure, acquisition, or a leadership change?

OVERRIDABLE ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ LOCKED-IN

3 Capital Patience

CH. 5

Is the capital behind this enterprise patient enough for regenerative timelines — or does it demand extraction-speed returns that force short-term decisions?

IMPATIENT ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ PATIENT

4 Externality Honesty

CH. 6

Does it account for both its negative externalities (costs imposed on others) and its positive externalities (cascading benefits it isn't compensated for) — or cherry-pick favorable metrics?

CHERRY-PICKED ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ FULL LEDGER

5 Systemic or Single-Issue?

CH. 2

Does it address root causes across interconnected systems — or fix one visible symptom while leaving the extractive structures around it intact?

SYMPTOM ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ROOT CAUSE

6 Diligence Verdict

Not a pass/fail score. Where does the weight of evidence settle — and what one question would most change your read?

- ☐ **Regenerative** — embedded across structure
- ☐ **"Less bad"** — harm-reducing, not healing
- ☐ **Impact-washing** — language without structure

100× **The 100-Fold Test** — If this enterprise multiplied a hundred times, would the world be healthier? If the answer is ambiguous, the model may be *less bad* rather than regenerative. These questions are not a rubric — the struggle to apply them honestly is itself systemic intelligence.