# Betting the Farm

## *Inside India's ₹28,000 crore agri-tech startup wave - and why the money isn't enough?*

**Rishab Biswas & Sanjiv Kumar**
ICAR-National Academy of Agricultural Research Management (NAARM), Hyderabad, Telangana, India.
Corresponding Author: rishabbiswas.pgdm24@naarm.org.in

*Between 2014 and 2026, investors poured $2.9 billion into Indian agri-tech across 925 companies. Not one is profitable. This is the story of what the money built-and what it hasn't.*

Between 2014 and 2026, investors poured $2.9 billion into Indian agri-tech startups across 925 companies. The sector has 13,705 registered companies, a government mission with ₹2,817 crore behind it, and a stated ambition to digitally transform the lives of 140 million farming households. And yet, of the 14 agri-tech companies whose financial statements were examined for this analysis, not one was profitable.

That is not a failure. It is a deliberate bet on network effects, on scale, on a market that is still being built. Understanding that bet, and whether it will pay off, requires looking at where the money actually went, what it built, and what it has not yet managed to fix.

### Where The Money Went

The funding story of Indian agri-tech can be divided into three clear phases. The surge: from a modest base in 2019, investment exploded to a peak of $5.1 billion across 260 deals in 2021, fuelled by pandemic-era digital adoption and large rounds for Ninjacart, WayCool, and DeHaat. The correction: $3.3 billion in 2022, then a sharp retreat to $850 million in 2023 as global risk appetite contracted and investors began demanding unit economics overgrowth narratives. The recovery: $2.1 billion across 164 deals in 2024, rising to $3.8 billion in 2025 - signaling renewed institutional confidence in the sector's fundamentals.

**Table 1: Annual Investment in Indian Agri-Tech (2019-2026)**

| Year | Investment Amount | Deal Count |
|---|---|---|
| 2019 | ~$600 Mn | 86 |
| 2020 | ~$800 Mn | 156 |
| 2021 | ~$5.1 Bn | 260 |
| 2022 | ~$3.3 Bn | 302 |
| 2023 | ~$850 Mn | 167 |
| 2024 | ~$2.1 Bn | 164 |
| 2025 | ~$3.8 Bn | 133 |
| 2026 (YTD) | ~$200 Mn | 15 |

*Source: Inc42 Datalabs*

The 2021 peak was driven disproportionately by large late-stage rounds - and the stage-wise breakdown reveals an important structural truth about how agri-tech capital is actually allocated. Seed funding accounts for over half of the total deal count (50.47%) but a small fraction of total dollars. The real capital is concentrated at Series B and above, where market linkage platforms, raising logistics and working capital rounds dominate.

**Table 2: Funding by Stage - Deal Count Share**

| Funding Stage | Share of Total Deal Count |
|---|---|
| Seed | 50.47% |
| Others | 20.75% |
| Series A | 12.71% |
| Series B | 8.22% |
| Debt Financing | 7.85% |

*Source: Inc42 Datalabs*

By aggregate funding amount, the picture flips entirely. Series D rounds commanded the largest capital pool at $880 million across just 13 deals. Debt financing - at $700 million across 42 deals - reflects the working capital intensity of marketplace models. Seed funding, despite representing half of all deals, accounts for $240 million out of $2.9 billion total.

**Table 3: Funding by Round - Aggregate (2014-Q3 2025)**

| Funding Round | Funding Amount (Approx.) | Deal Count |
|---|---|---|
| Series D | $880 Mn+ | 13 |
| Series B | $720 Mn+ | 44 |
| Debt Financing | $700 Mn+ | 42 |
| Series C | $500 Mn+ | 18 |
| Series A | $400 Mn+ | 68 |
| Undisclosed | $300 Mn+ | 48 |
| Seed | $240 Mn+ | 270 |

*Source: Inc42 Datalabs*

The geographic distribution of this capital is equally revealing. Chennai dominates by funding amount, at 26.15% of all capital deployed, driven primarily by Samunnati, WayCool, and Aquaconnect, despite ranking second in deal count. Bengaluru leads in deal count (154 deals), reflecting its venture capital density. Pune, anchored by AgroStar's $148.2 million across eight rounds, ranks third. The National Capital Region - Gurugram and Noida combined - accounts for a further 22% of deal count, concentrated in digital marketplace models.

**Table 4: City-wise Agritech Funding Distribution (2014-Q3 2025)**

| City | Funding Amount (%) | Deal Count | Notable Startups |
|---|---|---|---|
| Chennai | 26.15% | 80 | Samunnati, WayCool, Aquaconnect |
| Bengaluru | 23.31% | 154 | CropIn, Ninjacart, Fasal, Stellapps |
| Pune | 16.42% | 68 | AgroStar, Ecozen, FarmERP |
| Gurugram | 13.74% | 78 | Arya.ag, DeHaat, Bijak |
| Noida | 8.40% | 21 | FarMart, MoooFarm |
| New Delhi | 6.85% | 31 | Unnati, Otipy |
| Mumbai | 5.14% | 29 | StarAgri, Innoterra |

*Source: Inc42 Datalabs*

What the geography reveals is a system still urban in its roots. The capital is concentrated in tech hubs, not in the farming belts it is trying to serve.

**Three Models, Three Different Bets**

The 925 companies in this ecosystem are not doing the same thing. Three distinct business models have emerged, each making a different bet on where value lies in the agricultural chain - and the funding data shows clearly which model investors have favored.

**Table 5: Segment-wise Funding vs Deal Count Share (2014-Q3 2025)**

| Segment | Funding Amount (%) | Deal Count (%) | Implied Round Size |
|---|---|---|---|
| Market Linkage | 61.7% | 53.8% | Above average |
| FarmTech | 17.6% | 27.8% | Below average |
| Agri Farm Inputs | 14.6% | 12.6% | Average |
| Others | 6.1% | 5.8% | Average |

*Source: Inc42 Datalabs*

**Market linkage platforms** - companies like Samunnati, Ninjacart, WayCool, and Arya.Ag - connect farmers directly to bulk buyers, retailers, or processors, cutting out traditional intermediary layers. They captured 61.7% of total funding despite representing only 53.8% of the deal count. That gap - larger rounds relative to deal share - reflects structural capital intensity: logistics infrastructure, cold chain facilities, and working capital demand sustained investment before margins materialize. Platform margins run at 2-4% of gross merchandise value. Scale is not optional; it is existential. Ninjacart's logistics cost reduction from ₹10.1 to ₹1.95 per kilogram - an 80.7% improvement - is a genuine operational achievement that required years of capital-intensive network building to reach.

**Farm technology platforms** - CropIn, Fasal, DeHaat, BharatAgri - captured 17.6% of funding across 27.8% of deals. Smaller average rounds reflect their software-as-a-service economics once built, the marginal cost of serving an additional farmer is low. Gross margins can exceed 60-70% once development costs are recovered. Fasal's IoT-SaaS platform has delivered 60% reductions in pesticide expenditure, 20-25% water savings, and 10-40% yield improvements for horticultural farmers, and has cumulatively conserved over 9 billion liters of water. The adoption ceiling is real but different in character: these platforms require farmers with smartphones, digital literacy, and willingness to trust algorithmic recommendations over generational knowledge.

**Agricultural input platforms** - AgroStar, Gramophone, Agrim - secured 14.6% of funding to distribute seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, and equipment through omnichannel models. AgroStar generated ₹761.51 crore in revenue in FY2024 alongside a ₹327.43 crore net loss. That ratio is deliberate - build the distribution network, establish the farmer relationships, and optimize for profitability later. These platforms face headwinds from established dealer networks, regulated input prices, and state procurement systems that resist disruption. The value proposition is documented: 15-20% input cost savings for farmers and next-day payment cycles versus 45-60 days through traditional channels.

*"Of 14 agri-tech companies whose financials were examined, not one was profitable. That is not a failure. It is a deliberate bet on a market that is still being built."*

**What The Money Has Actually Achieved**

Stepping back from business models and balance sheets, the farmer-level data is more encouraging. Ninjacart's platform serves over 800,000 farmers across 120 cities, with documented income increases of 20% compared to traditional mandi systems, attributed to eliminating middlemen and next-day payment cycles. Cropin has digitised over 16 million acres across 102 countries, with 5% yield improvements, 15% pesticide reduction, and 5% water savings documented among participating farmers. In potato cultivation, Cropin's precision agriculture increased solid content by 1.5%, generating €410 per hectare in additional value for processing clients - a figure that bridges the abstract promise of precision agriculture to a concrete line on a profit-and-loss statement.

AgroStar's advisory platform serves over 9 million farmers, delivering crop disease diagnoses from smartphone photographs in 4-5 minutes in regional languages - handling daily query volumes that traditional government extension services, chronically understaffed and underfunded, could never absorb at scale. It also reduces farmers' input costs by 15-20% through direct manufacturer procurement, bypassing the multi-layer retail markup that has always been agriculture's silent tax on smallholders. Intello Labs uses computer vision and blockchain to automate quality grading, reducing manual quality checks by 80%, cutting food rejection rates by 30%, and reducing post-harvest losses by 15% - while its Praman commodity exchange now processes $40 million in monthly transactions.

The capital concentration across this ecosystem is sharp: the top 10 companies captured approximately 55% of total funding. This is not unusual for a maturing platform sector - network effects and logistics infrastructure reward scale, and natural consolidation favors players who have already achieved market density.

**The Honest Barriers**

Three structural constraints stand between the current ecosystem and its stated ambition of transforming Indian agriculture at scale - and a fourth is emerging that deserves frank acknowledgment.

The **infrastructure gap** is the most basic. Rural internet penetration in India remains below 40%, with significant state-level variation. Large parts of rural India - precisely the areas with the greatest agricultural need - still lack the connectivity that real-time IoT functionality, mobile advisory apps, and digital marketplace participation require.

The **affordability barrier** is equally binding for smallholders. Nearly 69% of Indian farmers own less than one hectare of land. Most precision agriculture hardware - sensors, drones, automated machinery - requires upfront investment that these farmers cannot manage. Subscription models face the additional challenge that agricultural income is seasonal, creating cash flow mismatches with monthly billing cycles. Formal agricultural credit reaches only 40% of farming households.

The **digital divide** is the least discussed but most durable constraint. Most current agri-tech platforms are designed for English-literate, connected, tech-comfortable users - not for the 140 million smallholders who form the backbone of Indian food production. Without local-language interfaces, offline-capable tools, and community-level digital literacy programs, the benefits of this revolution risk concentrating among India's largest, most progressive farms.

The **platform commoditization threat** is emerging with speed. Reliance's Jio Agri, Google, Microsoft, and Amazon are entering Indian agriculture with capital reserves and nationwide distribution that no standalone startup can match. These players can cross-subsidize agritech services at below-cost prices, integrating them into broader fintech, telecom, and e-commerce ecosystems. For early-stage agri-tech ventures, this is not a distant threat - it is already reshaping competitive dynamics.

One further structural signal: Indian agri-tech has produced zero IPOs and accounts for less than 1% of India's M&A activity since 2014 - compared to 10 IPOs for fintech and 9 for e-commerce. Six soonicorns exist, with StarAgri heading toward a public listing. But the absence of established exit pathways constrains future capital formation and signals a sector still in its built-out phase.

**What Comes Next**

India's agri-tech market trajectory - from $9 billion today toward $28 billion by 2030 - reflects extraordinary momentum. But one number puts it all in perspective: agri-tech's current share of India's $452 billion agriculture sector is just 2%. By 2030, with the sector tripling in value, that share will reach only 5%. Three-quarters of a trillion dollars of agriculture will remain untouched by the revolution being built to serve it.

The 2030 opportunity, when mapped by segment, points clearly to where the next phase of value creation will concentrate. Market linkage and supply chain platforms - the capital-intensive model that has absorbed most of the investment to date - will command the largest segment. But the fastest growing opportunity, relative to its current base, is AI: projected to surge from $0.9 billion in 2025 to $5.6 billion by 2030 at a 44% CAGR - nearly double the overall sector's 25% CAGR, and significantly ahead of the global AI-in-agriculture rate of 26%.

**Table 6: India's Agritech Market by Segment, 2030 ($28 Billion)**

| Segment | 2030 Projected Value | Market Share |
|---|---|---|
| Market Linkage & Supply Chain | $12.7 Bn | 45% |
| Precision Agriculture | $6.2 Bn | 22% |
| Agri-Fintech | $5.1 Bn | 18% |
| Digital Advisory & Inputs | $4.2 Bn | 15% |

*Source: Inc42 Analysis*

**Table 7: AI in Agritech - India vs Global Growth Trajectory**

| Market | 2025 Value | 2030 Value | CAGR |
|---|---|---|---|
| India AI in Agritech | $0.9 Bn | $5.6 Bn | 44% |
| Global AI in Agriculture | $5.9 Bn | $61 Bn | 26% |
| India Overall Agritech | $9 Bn | $28 Bn | 25% |

*Source: Inc42 Analysis*

The productivity gap that agri-tech is positioned to close is quantifiable. India's cereal yield of 3,626 kg per hectare sits 56% below the USA and 43% below China - despite India having more arable land than any of the world's top five economies. That gap is the sector's clearest ROI argument, and the most compelling case for patients, sustained capital deployment.

**Table 8: Cereal Yield Comparison - Top Five Economies**

| Country | Cereal Yield (kg/hectare) | Agricultural Land (% of area) |
|---|---|---|
| USA | 8,330 | ~45% |
| Germany | ~7,500 | ~48% |
| China | 6,418 | ~55% |
| Japan | ~5,500 | ~12% |
| India | 3,626 | ~60% |

*Source: World Bank, Inc42 Analysis*

Agri-fintech - projected at $5.1 billion by 2030 - may be the most underleveraged lever of all. Over 50 million farming households remain unbanked. Parametric crop insurance triggered by IoT sensors or satellite weather data could simultaneously transform farmer resilience, platform stickiness, and credit access - three problems solved by one well-designed product. Technology exists. The regulatory clarity and distribution infrastructure are still being built.

The technology to transform Indian agriculture already exists. The capital to fund it is flowing. The policy intent is clearly articulated. What this revolution now needs is the deliberate commitment to ensure its benefits reach every farm: subsidized sensor kits and shared IoT infrastructure for smallholders, satellite internet expansion to agri-hinterlands, transparent data ownership frameworks that protect farmer interests, and vernacular offline-capable platforms that any farmer can use regardless of connectivity or literacy.

The question is not whether India can build a digital agricultural future. It clearly can. The question is whether that future will be built for every farmer - especially the smallest ones who need it most.

*Sources: Inc42 & StarAgri Indian AgriTech Market Landscape Report 2025 | Inc42 Datalabs Investment Database | PIB, Ministry of Agriculture (2024) | PIB, Ministry of Commerce & Industry (2025) | AgFunder Developing Markets AgriFoodTech Investment Report 2025 | Ministry of Corporate Affairs company filings FY2020-2024 | World Bank Agricultural Data | Startup India Portal (2025)*

* * * * * * * * *